

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 26th February, 1959

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER; Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are no yet ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Barbados Statistical Service-Selected Monthly Indicators--December, 1958.

Messrs. BRANCKER, SMITH, DOWDING and STRAUGHN entered the House and took their seats.

NOTICES

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve that the sum of \$18,500 being the unexpended balance of the amount of \$30,000 provided by Resolution No. 73/1958 for purchase of machinery required for grassland development, be utilised for the purchase of additional equipment and other necessary expenses in connection with the development of grassland cultivation.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that hon. senior member for St. James be appointed as Chairman of Committees until the arrival of the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that motion and I commend the Hon. Leader of the House on his excellent choice.

The question that the hon. senior member for St. James be appointed as Chairman of Committees until the arrival of the Chairman of Committees, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. T. W. MILLER entered the House and took his seat.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958. On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was addressing the House. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, if no other hon. member wants to speak on the second reading of this Bill, I shall reply, and this is mainly for the benefit of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think he made some accusations to the effect that the amendment to this Act is tantamount to a flouting of the wishes of the electorate as directed in their votes as to the appointment of a particular member of a party or individual to the office of Mayor. His premises are based on motives in connection with which I would not like at this stage to use a strong adjective, but I would say that they are a misinterpretation of the amendment.
12.25 p.m.

Now, Sir, this particular amendment to which he refers is to Subsection (1) of Section 4 in the 1958 Act which states that the Mayor shall be appointed by the Councillors. As I pointed out then and will continue to point out, that is a mistake; the word "Councillors" crept in by mistake. The hon. member ought to remember that the 1958 Act which was passed towards the end of last year is a consolidation of the other Acts of 1954, 1956 and 1957. I think in the Objects and Reasons of that time, it was specifically set out that it was a consolidation of those three Acts and there was no new principle involved. That was quite true and the hon. senior member for the City - who unfortunately is absent - who is the most knowledgeable on Vestry matters was satisfied that no new principle was involved. It was quite obvious, Sir, that this word "Councillors" crept in by mistake, and as I said then, if you look at the 1954 Act which was incorporated in this 1958 Act, the word "Council" is used and it is stated that the Mayor shall be elected by the Council.

The 1958 Act, as I said earlier, is only a consolidation of the former Acts and there is no new principle involved, and if we did deliberately change that word "Council" to "Councillors", there would be a new principle involved. That principle, Sir, extends to the rural Councils in the election of a Chairman. Even in the 1954 Act and the 1958 Act it is stated that the Chairman of the Council shall be elected by the Council, so how could we have it on the one hand as far as the City is concerned that the Mayor shall be elected by the Councillors and the Chairman of the other two areas shall be elected by the Council?

I hope that hon. members will see that this word "Councillors" has crept into sub-section (1) of Section 4 purely by accident, and was not designed in the beginning to contravene the principle which was accepted in the 1954 Act and comes right down in the 1958 Act as far as the election of the Chairman to the Council in the two rural areas is concerned. That is the only point I want to answer, Sir, and if the hon. member would refer to the 1954 Act,

he would be convinced that the word "Councillors" crept in there by mistake.

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

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Sub-section (1) of section four of the Local Government Act, 1958, which Act is hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is hereby amended by deleting the word "Councillors" appearing on line three thereof and by substituting therefor the word "council".

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

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, in reference to the remarks which the Hon Premier made *a propos* of Clause 2 I should just like to say this in reply to the Clause which we are now considering. He has spoken about the rural Councils and the general principle of the Bill, but I would point out that as to the rural Councils, nobody seems to care very much who is the likely Chairman or who would become Chairman of the Council. Whether it is because it is only \$100 a month as against \$200 plus \$50 for entertainment or whether it is for the great honour as it seems of being called "Mayor" - certain aspirants have forgotten that it is no longer to be Lord Mayor - the principle in respect of the Northern and Southern Councils of allowing everybody to vote does not really apply to the metropolis, because it differs in having a Mayor as distinct from an ordinary Chairman, and the great excitement, as we must know in a campaign in that area where there is a Mayor, is to see who gets the most people in, and so who would be Mayor, and whether Aldermen would be put there to vote on the other side to affect the choice of the first Mayor of Bridgetown, which seems to be regarded as tantamount to the Governor and Commander-in-Chief or some very high title. So the two things are not on all fours.

Another point made by the Hon. Premier *a propos* of this same Section is that the Act of 1958 was only a consolidation. As we pointed out to him at the time, it was far from being only that. The Objects and Reasons were quite different from and something much more than a mere consolidation, because you will recall in those Objects and Reasons, Mr. Chairman, how they spoke of the extensive nature of the amendments required in respect of the previous Act which necessitated the introduction of the Act of 1958, which in my submission was far from being a mere consolidation. We have attempted to consolidate certain things, but there are extensive amendments required, and as it was put in the same Objects and Reasons, the 1958 Bill accordingly deals comprehensively with the subject of Local Government, and they went on to say that the principal provisions of the Bill which are new to the Legislature in that no provision or insufficient provision was contained in respect thereof in the Local Government Act, 1954, or were matters outside of the scope of the amending Acts of 1955 and 1956, are those relating to elections and to the transfer of officers and servants of the Vestries to the Council. They tell us further that minor modifications have had to be made and in particular a special provision has had to be made for the first elections of Councillors, as the persons who would normally have to do with those first elections, viz., the Aldermen of the Councils, would not

have assumed office prior to the first elections, and this Bill accordingly sought to make those provisions. It was also stated that further provisions relating to the transfer of officers and servants of Vestries seek to ensure that any such person who becomes redundant or is not offered a post in the new Councils suitable to his status shall be compensated. It was also pointed out in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill of 1958 which is now Statute Law in this country that it was thought that the Seventh Schedule to the Local Government Act, 1954 required considerable amendment and that the amendments in the 1958 Bill sought to carry into effect the intention of the Local Government Act, 1954, to divorce the Councils from participating in the affairs of the Church and so on.

I am submitting therefore, Mr. Chairman, that I am entitled to differ, and that the evidence is all on my side when I say that the 1958 Bill is not simply a mere consolidating Bill as has been suggested, because you may recall finally, Sir, that in the Objects and Reasons of that Bill, it was stated that the changes effected by this Bill to the Local Government Act, 1954 to which mention has already been made, are not cited as being exhaustive of the amendments made to the Law but as being amongst the most significant.

12.35 p.m.

"In certain instances provision has been made where none was contained before, e.g., clause twenty seeks to cover the position that would arise in the event of failure to hold an election, whilst clause thirty-three provides a method of recourse for challenging the claim of a person to be a member of a Council. Other amendments made by this Bill seeks to inject as much flexibility into the Law as is consistent with proper administration."

I am submitting, Sir, that that is not merely a consolidation and that is my answer to the Hon. Premier in respect of his remarks on the second reading which was relative to the section under discussion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to see the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is a parliamentarian of long years standing debating in answer to my submission earlier on such a low ground as to who is to be Mayor of the Bridgetown City Council. Nothing like that appears in the Bill and a person who is canvassing is likely to say anything. He can say anything he likes but that is no reason why the hon. member should have introduced a thing of that sort in this debate. Nobody knows who is going to be Mayor; we have to await the outcome of the elections and the sitting of the first Council. At the very first meeting of the Council it will elect the Mayor. That will not be done in this House or by people who were candidates.

As regards the amendments to the principal Act, he said that they were voluminous. Certainly, they were voluminous but he would realise that many of those amendments were verbal. Take for instance, the word "Lord" had to be omitted about 99 times. By far the amendments were verbal.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, I am wondering how the Hon. Premier could have understood me to suggest that this House would say who is the first Mayor and that that would not be done at a meeting of that Board. What I was saying is this. As we all know, great excitement seems to be surrounding who will be Mayor and it is obvious at this stage if you decide to amend the law to give Aldermen the right to vote along with the Councillors - and that is what is meant by this amendment - by the passing of this amendment we would be affecting these results and the decision of the Councillors as was set out in the Act of 1958. It would not be the same if it were not for this amendment. Surely, you will be affecting the result and the decision of the Councillors on this most highly controversial thing as Mayor. Then again, it is a question of those who are nominated being able to vote in the same way as those who have had to contest their seats and won as a result of a democratic election.

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

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to the SPEAKER 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.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grants of sums of money for the service of the Island.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 46

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$78,435.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have not got that Resolution in front of me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think there is some correction to be made to the Resolution for the sum of \$70,247.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I was about to say that over the weekend, the Resolution for \$70,247 was circulated but after it was circulated it was found that there was a mistake as far as the figures were concerned but not as regards any new material. Under Head X - Fire Brigade, Item 22 (New) Appliances - there was to be a revote of a certain amount of money plus the inclusion of a certain amount to cover the fire appliances and in the Note as set out only the revote was included. It was discovered that the other amount was not included which was the sum of \$8,188 and that amount would bring the Resolution to the sum of \$78,435. That was an error.

Hon. members will remember that when the Resolution came before us last Tuesday, the explanation was not known to us and we did not go on to consider it, but now that the Resolution is corrected and we have the explanation, we intend to go on with it today.
12.45 p.m.

HEAD X - FIRE BRIGADE

Head X - Fire Brigade was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, Head X is the first Head of this Schedule and the first Items deals with the increased travelling allowance rates. We know that as from the 1st January, 1958, the travelling allowance rates were increased and the different departments paid out the amounts which were voted and most of them within recent weeks have been coming for supplementary estimates in so far as travelling is concerned.

With regard to the next Item "Appliances", that is a new Item to which I referred a moment ago. As the note sets out, of the \$9,000 voted in the 1957-58 Estimates for the purchase of a fire appliance, the sum of \$8,188 lapsed at the end of that year and the final accounts from the Crown Agents amount to \$10,785. A revote of the lapsed

amount and a further \$2,597 are required. The lapsed amount and the new amount now required make a total of \$10,785.

I beg to move that Head X stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, Did I understand the hon. member to say that the error was made only in the calculation?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Not exactly the calculation, but the failure to include in the computation the sum of \$8,188 which lapsed. The new figure of \$2,597 was included but not the amount which lapsed at the end of the financial year.

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

HEAD XVIII - FEDERATION

Head XVIII - Federation was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Head of the Schedule deals with the mandatory levy in respect of Federation. I think that we are all acquainted with the term "Mandatory levy" which applies to the amount to be voted by the various Governments in the Federation. Under article 93 of the Constitution of the West Indies the Federal Government has decided to demand the full levy in 1958 and 1959. As the Note sets out, the maximum levy is \$9,120,000 and Barbados is liable for 8.5662 per cent of this amount, or \$780,326. A difficulty arises as far as Barbados is concerned in that the financial year of the Federation corresponds with the calendar year, whereas our fiscal year begins on the 1st April and ends on the 31st March.

I beg to move that Head XVIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Apparently what I have said is just by way of information; there is no amount to be moved under this Head.

Mr. WALCOTT: How do you mean that there is no amount to be moved?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you refer to the appropriate column you will see that there is no amount set out there.

Mr. WALCOTT: How then does it come to be in the Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I can answer it. As long as it is here before me, I will talk on it. If it has no right to be here, then it should not be here; but as long as it is here I have a right to speak on it. This is fixed by law but it does not mean that we cannot discuss the question of the Head which is dealt with; because it comes through the Legislature it does not mean that we have to sit down here like dumb people. We can comment on it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I did not hear anybody say that you could not comment on it.

Mr. WALCOTT: May I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I see that Head XVIII is "Federation". I feel that there is no motion before the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: May I make it clear to you, Mr. Chairman? I do not have to ask your permission to speak on any Item; the Resolution before us is a Resolution for \$70,247 to be granted from the Public Treasury and the Resolution has to be passed for that sum. That is what it is and that is the motion which is before the Committee.
12.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should just like to get this point clear. The \$66,738 which appears fixed by Law is not included in the \$78,435; that is what is worrying you. I am inclined to the view that you can make reference to it in as much as it appears there and in as much as the Premier has given some explanation on it, but I do not see that it is possible to go into detail because it is not to be voted and there is no motion before the House on Head XVIII.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you do not want May's for this. You have a Resolution before this Committee for an amount of money and the sum covers all the Heads in the Resolution. So far as I am concerned, I can speak on any of these Heads as I feel like. I am not concerned with what the Premier does; he can get up and move that the Resolution do now pass without speaking on any Item, but I am free to speak on this Resolution and on all the Heads before me; that is my right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. member followed me. I said it might be permissible to make general reference to the sum of \$66,738 which is not included in \$78,435.

Mr. WALCOTT: All I want to do is to make general reference in so far as Barbados is concerned to this mandatory levy. As one of the legislators in Barbados I want to draw this whole question of Federation to the attention of the Government. This money concerns the Federal Government and I want to take this opportunity to express my views, and if I cannot do it now, I do not know when I would be able to do it because it is before the Legislature now.

What I would like to say is that I have not seen any Report from this Government on the Conference either publicly or otherwise in order to throw some light on what is at present taking place. I thought that at this stage in dealing with any aspect of Federation I would have heard from the Premier what took place, because I happened to be in Dominica last week and heard one of the Ministers who had been to the Conference explaining to the public of Dominica in Market Square what had taken place, but we find in Barbados that it is a closed book. I should like to draw to the attention of the public that though Barbados is a contributing territory, last year when the Federation had the right to send people from the Trade Union to the United Kingdom, a place like Barbados which is in the vanguard of the Trade Union Movement did not have a representative selected by the Federal Government to go to the United Kingdom, but we find that in British Guiana, which is not part of the Federation, somebody was selected. My criticism is that the Federation is spending money which we are contributing and the situation arose where this Government gave up its right in matters such as these and allowed the Federal Government to select some person from a noncontributing territory to send to the United Kingdom. It is a most high-handed and outrageous thing to see that the British Guiana people who are not in the Federation are treated better than the Unit Territories who are contributing to the Federation. We by taxation contribute to the Federal Government and Barbados had the right therefore to nominate someone to go to the United Kingdom, but the Federal Government in selecting people selected some person from a territory which is not participating in the Federation. This to me is a very strange situation apart from the money we spend in the mandatory levy from the Barbados Government.

As far as allowances and salaries and what not are concerned, I am prepared to say this: whenever the Ministers meet again the Barbados Ministers should be prepared to say on behalf of the people of Barbados that many of the allowances that are given are extravagant. For a poor territory to be paying these extravagant allowances to people is beyond our capacity, and it does not show that we are people asking for aid. How can we ask people for aid if when they examine what we are paying ourselves they find that we are paying in many instances more than the richer countries do to their people for a corresponding job? It looks as though you would have to trim that somewhere. I am speaking under correction, but I understand that in the Federal Government a Minister

gets something like £900 as travelling allowance, and the members of the Unit Territories get \$160 or some amount like that.

If it is going to cost us more money, we must be frank enough to say that the allowances must bear some relation to the area in which you are operating. I have been to all the Federated Territories in the West Indies, and there is no point, if we are to play our part in the Federation and help the weaker islands, if there is no basic approach to appreciate that we are spending money in a poor area and not in a rich one, and for that reason some real attempt should be made to rationalise the allowances paid to Ministers and legislators in this Federal Parliament as compared with their duties and dignity of office. We do not want people to hold high offices and not be adequately remunerated to live in accordance with the dignity of the office which they hold; but there must be a limit as to what you could reasonably regard as a fair remuneration taking all these things into consideration. I am of the considered opinion that the allowances that we are now paying in the Federal Government are far too high for a country which is now aiming after nationhood, and we might as well say so.

Those are the two main observations I have to make. It is a positive slight apart from the personnel who had been selected, because I am quite satisfied that with my knowledge of Trade Unionists in the Caribbean you could not have selected anyone from Jamaica. Trinidad sent somebody, and so did Jamaica and British Guiana, but the only territory from which a person was not sent is Barbados. What is the basic reason? Neither the Minister of Labour nor whoever is responsible, whether it be the Governor General, can justify that in the West Indies you are sending people to the United Kingdom, and the one territory which you have left out is Barbados.

1.05 p.m.

You even send somebody from Dominica which is a place where the Trade Union Movement needs somebody from Barbados to help its leaders in putting it on a proper basis. It is no point sending to the United Kingdom somebody to learn what Trade Union means if that person does not know what it means in the West Indies. I will say that it is a positive slight to the Trade Union Movement of Barbados to send members from the various islands' unions to participate; and what is more, you are sending someone from the Federation and of all the islands, you select one from Dominica which union is the most backward. I do not know if you sent one from there because the Minister of Labour in the Federal Government comes from there. Any one who knows Dominica or the Windward Islands would ask if you can find anybody in the trade union movement in the Windward Islands who would be suitable to go.

I do not want anybody to think that I am making this protest because it is something which I desired for myself. Let me point out that I happen to be a representative of the I.C.F.T.U.; therefore I have the opportunity of going to conferences in Europe twice a year. I have brought this to the notice of this Hon. Chamber simply because it is a matter which concerns the movement and hon. members should ask themselves: "Is Barbados entitled to send someone to the United Kingdom from the movement on a post graduate course of training, particularly in view of the fact that you are sending someone from a movement which is very young in one of the other Islands?"

Sir, the Barbados Government is not responsible for these things but I feel sure that these things must be drawn to the members of the Barbados Government so that they would know that people are not sitting down and taking these things quietly. We are not going to take these things quietly and let everybody think that everything is O.K. That is why I think it is my duty to draw it to the Hon. Ministers of Government. I am sure the Ministers themselves would not have accepted an arrangement in which you have a ministerial delegation of the various colonies going somewhere and you did not allow them to send someone from here. You are a member of an old Parliament. Do not tell me that a member of Parliament from a territory like Tortola, Nevis or Anguilla would be more

suitable than you to go. Sir, I hope the Hon. Premier would draw this to the attention of the Federal Government whenever such an occasion arises.

Mr. DOWDING: Sir, I am still not quite clear on this particular part of the Resolution. The Hon. Premier made remarks and seemed to find out that nothing had to be voted. We have already found \$8,000 more to include and I am wondering if an explanation of this can be given. The provision in the Approved Estimates according to this is \$640,000 and the provision in the Supplementary Estimates again "Fixed by Law" is \$140,326 and along with that, you have a supplementary to the supplementary provision which is also "Fixed by Law" and that comes to \$66,738.

Now, Sir, I take it that this House has to agree not only to this amount of \$66,738 but also to the amount of \$780,326 as well. I would like to know exactly what is the position. Is the \$640,000 expended plus the \$140,326, and this further amount of \$66,736 is to be expended, each of which is "Fixed by Law"? I would be grateful if the Hon. Premier will enlighten the House as to the actual position.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It is quite obvious as far as the expending of the money is concerned that we have nothing to do with it. It is voted on a mandatory level. The Federal Government demands a certain sum from the Unit Governments of the Federation of which Barbados' share is a certain percentage. They say that they want this money now. I cannot say if any is expended or not. That does not concern us. It is simply that we have to carry out our obligation in the Agreement and that is to contribute \$780,326. That is all.

Mr. DOWDING: As I see it, this Resolution is really for the sum of \$780,326 plus this sum of \$66,736.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The whole Resolution before us is for \$78,435.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I may explain for the benefit of the hon. senior member for St. George, this Resolution is for the sum of \$78,435. It includes this sum of \$66,738 but the sum of \$780,326 which was voted on the mandatory level is not included under this Resolution.

Mr. DOWDING: That is my point. This sum of \$780,326 which was required under the mandatory level does not include this sum of \$66,738.

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

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (1) DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES

Head XXIII - Medical (1) Director of Medical Services - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Head XXIII deals with Medical Services and this is for an amount of \$600 to supplement the amount voted in the 1958-59 Estimates for Venereal Diseases. According to the Note, in the 1958-1959 Estimates the previous annual grant of \$1,200 to the parish of Christ Church was reduced by \$600 in anticipation that by the middle of the financial year the new V.D. Clinic would have been in operation; this new Clinic forms a part of the proposals for the establishment of a District Hospital Service at Oistins, Christ Church.

It is not expected that the new service will be in operation before 1st April 1959, and supplementary provision is now required to enable the existing V.D. Service to be carried on by the parish of Christ Church for the whole of the present financial year.

I beg to move that Head XXIII stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry I have to go back to the last Item. The hon. senior member for St. George and you, Mr. Chairman, should get the Clerk to inform you as regards what we have just passed because the explanation

given by the Hon. Premier is incorrect. You have the situation in which that amount is fixed by law but the amount cannot be paid out because it has not been passed in an appropriation estimate. We are now passing the amount of \$66,738 because although it is fixed by law it would have to be appropriated. First of all, you have the sum at mandatory level of \$640,000. That is fixed by law. Then you have the other sum of \$140,326 which you did not put in your estimates and although it is fixed by law you had to bring down a Resolution for that. Now you have this other amount of \$66,738. Things although fixed by law must be appropriated in the estimates and if it is not passed and it is not in the Appropriation Bill, the Auditor General cannot pay it out. The Auditor General cannot pay out money which is not appropriated. That is the whole thing about the matter. You cannot pay out money unless you get it in the Appropriation Bill. The Appropriation Bill is the Bill that contains the amount of money and that is why they have to put this in again. It is not a sum to be voted for in the sense that it is a sum which you cannot reduce.

1.15 p.m.

That is to say, that you do not have to include it in the total to be voted. What should be made clear is that "to be voted" is one thing and "fixed by law" is another and the total appropriation will include what is fixed by law. The total amount to be voted is one amount of money and the total Estimates is another amount of money; but the total appropriation is the amount which you hope to have and the amount fixed by law. The Appropriation Bill is the amount which is spent; you need not put into your Appropriation Bill what is to be voted but if you did not put it in your Appropriation Bill what would your Estimates contain? This is money which has to be expended although we cannot reduce the vote; that is the point on which the hon. member needed clarification. This is a mandatory levy but it is nothing which you can say that you can do without passing.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct that. I am under the impression that amounts put in the Appropriation Bill are the amounts to be voted and not amounts fixed by law. The amounts which are fixed by law do not appear in the Appropriation Bill.

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

HEAD XXIV - BARBADOS REGIMENT

Head XXIV - Barbados Regiment - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Under this Head, Mr. Chairman, the first Item is "Caretakers" and that includes the caretaker at Gun Hill. Through an oversight an incorrect amount of \$610 was included, in respect of the Caretaker at Gun Hill, in the Estimates for 1958-59 in the provision of \$1,474 relative to caretakers. The correct amount of \$710 which has been included is based on 44 hours per week at 31 cents per hour. This provision of \$100 is for the purpose of correcting that error.

As regards the Item "Uniform and Equipment" we are asking for a revote of \$639 to pay for these Items inasmuch as the goods ordered through the Crown Agents did not arrive in time; they arrived after the expiration of the 1957-58 financial year.

As to the Item "Grant to Cadet Corps", there again the amount of \$990 which is being asked for is a revote and it is due to the late arrival of badges, berets and shirts which were ordered through the Crown Agents. These Items did not arrive during the financial year 1957-58 and therefore the funds lapsed.

The next Item is Contributions to Imperial Government Pensions. The amount required under this Item is \$1,002 and it is for the purpose of supplementing the provision of \$1,512 which was provided in the Current Estimates to meet the pension contributions on behalf of the Staff Officer and Regimental Sergeant Major.

The next Item is "Training and Camp expenses" and in this connection the amount of \$2,540 is required for the purpose of settling outstanding accounts of the annual Camp of 1958. Owing to an unusual response a number of 234 volunteers attended. That is to say more volunteers attended this camp than they usually do and, of course, there is an increased expenditure to be offset. This amount is asked for to offset the amount which is now due.

Item 41 is "Motor Vehicles" and the amount required is \$96.00 to meet an outstanding account in respect of the purchase of motor vehicles, provision for which had been included in the 1957-58 Estimates. That is to say, that \$96.00 more has been expended this year than was provided in 1957-58 Estimates.

The last Item is a new one — "purchase of wireless set". Here again, the note states that owing to the delay in the arrival of equipment for wireless sets, an amount of \$224 is requested to meet an outstanding account in respect of the purchase which had been provided for in the previous year's Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, these are all legitimate items. I beg to move that Head XXIV stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD XXVIII - SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in respect of this Head, there is a new Item 6A "University College of the West Indies". The note states that it was agreed by the Standing Federation Committee in May 1957 that 32% of the net recurrent cost of operating the University College Hospital should be attributable to teaching costs to be borne by all participating Governments retrospectively from the financial year 1952-53 and that participating Governments (other than Jamaica) should reimburse the Jamaica Government with their appropriate shares.

This Government's share, 6.7%, for the period April 1952 to March 1957 is £9,874. 2s. 6d (\$47,395.80) and supplementary provision of that amount is therefore necessary to reimburse the Jamaica Government.
1.25 p.m.

This supplementary provision of \$47,395.80 is therefore required.

There is a new Item - Commonwealth Institute. For a number of years this Government contributed to the expenses of the Commonwealth (formerly Imperial) Institute which serves the interest not merely of the United Kingdom, but those of other Governments and of the Commonwealth as a whole. The educational work which is done in the galleries and the schools of the United Kingdom is designed to promote knowledge of and belief in the Commonwealth, and all the other activities, ranging from Art Exhibitions to the Commonwealth Students Club, have the single purpose of promoting the "Commonwealth idea" and understanding between its peoples. Our contribution to the Commonwealth Institute is \$1,643.

I beg to move that Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants, stand part.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, on this Commonwealth Institute, I am wondering exactly what function it performs. While on a visit to England I came across groups of Commonwealth students who were being taken care of and given educational tours all over the country. I made specific enquires as to Barbados and was told that we did not con-

tribute. To me, this Commonwealth Institute seems to bear some similarity to the Imperial Institute, and I am wondering if it is not the same thing. I would be grateful for more information on the subject because I think it somewhat parsimonious when you see Commonwealth students from all over the world with the names of their countries written on them not to have Barbados included. The only Barbadian who happened to be included in that group which I saw was a resident of the United Kingdom.

I do feel, Sir, that a great deal of good can be done if we take advantage of the facilities afforded by Associations or Institutes such as this. I am wondering, Sir, if this one has any particular branch to which, as was done in that particular instance, two or three students from Barbados could go on these courses, not only in the United Kingdom, but in Canada and other parts of the world. I should be grateful for some further information to what is in the note.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, there is a long note here and I attempted to read some of it. As I mentioned earlier, this is a new contribution as far as Barbados is concerned. I do not know how old the Institute is, but this is the first time that Barbados is contributing. The hon. member said he made enquiries when he was in England and saw these people and was told that Barbados did not contribute; Barbados is now proposing to make its first contribution. It can be seen from the notes that it is a useful Institution and I think Barbados should contribute. Apparently the name has been changed, but it used to be called the Imperial Institute, and the Government of Barbados is now coming forward and contributing to the tune of \$1,643. The note says that "this Commonwealth Institute serves the interests not merely of the United Kingdom but those of other Governments and of the Commonwealth as a whole. The education work which is done in the galleries and the schools of the United Kingdom is designed to promote knowledge of and belief in the Commonwealth, and all the other activities, ranging from Art Exhibitions to the Commonwealth Students Club, have the single purpose of promoting the "Commonwealth idea" and understanding between its peoples. In particular, the visual aids service provided by the Institute is now beginning to be used by education authorities in other countries to promote Commonwealth studies, and it has great possibilities of service for them."

To make a long story short, it is set out here that this is a useful Institution, and I think Barbados is doing the right thing by contributing to it, especially in the visual aids service which they provide and which is now being used by education authorities in other countries; so in process of time it will be used by the Education Department of Barbados in the Visual Aids section.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Premier for that information. It is clear to me that it was the same matter which I investigated when I was in England and spoke with the Head of this Organisation. I do hope that we will be taking the opportunity, and that when the time comes we can send our students, I think it is obvious that Government agrees that we will be assisted in sending them.

The question that Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT

Head XXXII - Highways and Transport was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This item, Sir, is for Highways and Transport. We are all acquainted with the need for this increased amount by way of supplementary provision to this Department. As we go about we see roads being dug up by the Telephone Company, the Gas Company, the Waterworks Department and the Electric Company, and this money is used to restore the roads.
1.35 p.m.

It is not exactly expenditure while on one hand it is expenditure by the Government. These Departments pay

'this money back into the Treasury, that is to say, they pay into the Treasury the amount which was used for restoring the roads.

I beg to move that Head XXXII stand part.

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

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to find out one little thing. I know that these funds are recoverable but I would like to know if they are recoverable in a reasonable time after the charges are made against them. I feel if Government is providing these facilities for them, the least that these companies should do is to pay back this money as soon as possible. They should do their best. I feel that the money should be recoverable in a reasonable time, that is, in three months time or less than that. I would really like to find out if the money is recoverable in that period.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, of course, this is a Head which we have to pass but I would just like to make this point. What I have come to find out is that when these Public Utilities Companies are doing a job of work on these roads, they dig up an excessively long strip of road at a time and it makes it very inconvenient for traffic to flow. I feel greater discretion should be used in the digging up of these roads. By their digging up a tremendously long strip of road at a time it causes a traffic block; therefore, I would like to throw out this suggestion. I suppose that the overall Head of this work is the Director of Highways and Transport and he should pay more attention to the length of the strip which these Public Utilities Companies dig up at a time. He should advise them if he considers that the length which they have in mind to dig up is too much and point out that too great a length would not allow a normal flow of transport. It seems to me that no consideration is given to traffic when they are digging up these strips; therefore, it would be a useful thing if the authority in charge of the work for the Utility Company would confer with the Director of Highways and Transport as regards the length of strip which could be dug up and I would suggest that the Head of the Police Department should also be called in to advise. I feel this is something which rests more with the Police than with the Director of Transport because the Police is more *au fait* with the flow of traffic along the particular road and would be able to advise along such lines.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question put by the hon. senior member for St. George, I am sorry to say that the appropriate Minister to answer it is not at present in his place, but when he comes back I will ask him to give the answer.

As regards the point made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, it is a good point because more or less the general public suffers some inconvenience as a result. I myself have had that experience along that line.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$78,435 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1958-59 NO. 48

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave for the Hon. Minister of Social Services to take charge of this Resolution for \$300.

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

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively simple matter. It is a question of asking for an additional \$300 to take care of the outdoor work which is undertaken

throughout the parishes of the southern area by the staff at the Health Centre, St. Philip. In the 1958-59 Estimates, \$1,300 was voted for the upkeep of a motor car which is used at that Centre. The work of that Centre has expanded in consequence of much attention being paid to schools in that area; therefore, we require a further sum of \$300 for the upkeep of the motor car which is used at that Centre. I hardly think there is anything more than that to say.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to the SPEAKER the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

1.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Social Services has a Resolution which he would have circulated today and he would be very glad if the House would agree to pass it today. The reason for that is that all claims on the Treasury have to be sent in by the 15th March, and, in order that the amount may not lapse, he would like to get that Resolution approved of. The Other Place will not be meeting before Tuesday week which would be just a sort of dead-line and the Resolution would not be dealt with until then. We are asking the House to agree to allow that Resolution to be dealt with today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Since this Resolution has not been circulated it is purely a matter for the House, not with a motion, but if there is unanimity on both sides to deal with the Resolution today; there can be no vote on it because it has not been circulated. If every individual member of the House agrees with that, then the Resolution goes through; otherwise it will not go through.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I could not agree to that although in principle I am not objecting to it. I must see what I am dealing with and it is not a matter of urgency; it is not a matter of life and death and therefore it does not matter if it has to wait.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution is not acceptable to the House and I will not allow any vote on it because it has not been circulated.

Hon. M. E. COX: At this stage, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 2.30 p.m., of the clock.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Leader of the House is taking this House and people in it for little children whom he can push around as he very well likes. We have a time table here. On the Order Paper which has been circulated to us you have all the matters under Government Business. You have Order No. 3 dealing with pensions and they are not going on with that. Order No. 4 is the Order with which the Hon. Leader of the House wants to deal, Order No. 5 dealing with the Executive Committee Act has not been circulated; Order No. 6 is the second reading of the Appropriation Bill and Order No. 7 is the consideration of the Estimates for 1959-60 and the hon. member has the effrontery to ask me to come back here at half past two! Are we idlers who have nothing to do? We were here to deal with Government Business and are you asking us now to come back here at 2.30 p.m.? The Government has no more business to do today and are they adjourning until 2.30 o'clock? After all, we have a job to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to understand that private members have no intention of proceeding with any business this

afternoon? If that is so, the Government can take its cue from the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The House seems to desire an adjournment until another day. If the Government has finished its business there may be an adjournment until another day; that is the gist of what has been expressed.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am asking leave to withdraw my motion.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion of that nature cannot be made. Is there a seconder?

Mr. WALCOTT: Can I make a motion that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a motion for the Hon. Leader of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Government has finished its business. We are not meeting twice a week; they came back here to finish unfinished business and they have done that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not speaking on any motion; there is no motion before the House and if there is nothing doing in another five minutes the House will be adjourned for lack of order.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon. In making that motion I should like to say.....

Mr. SPEAKER: We do not allow speeches on a motion for adjournment unless there is an explanation to be made.

Hon. M. E. COX: My explanation is this; if I had moved the adjournment of the House until next Tuesday, an hon. member might easily have jumped to his feet and said: "We have Private Members' Business to be done and the Government is trying to forestall us," as has been said on many occasions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it an enquiry might be made.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I was merely adjourning until 2.30 p.m. in order that if members had something to do under Private Members' Business they would be able to come back and do it. If I did not do that I am sure the hon. senior member for St. Peter would have got up and not only criticised but abused me as he does all the time; but he cannot help doing that. Anyhow, Sir, that is the motion.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order, as we are about to adjourn, may I just say this in connection with the Order Paper? As they are being printed or cyclostyled we notice that all the members of the Government or Ministers have their initials set out - Dr. H. G. H. Cummins, Hon. F. E. Miller, etc. May I point out before the next Order Paper is prepared the hon. members on this side of the House also have initials, and we see no reason why the initials of Ministers should be set out while the initials of the others who were duly baptized and christened should not be given initials on the Order Papers of the House?

The question that this House do now adjourn until 12 noon on Tuesday, 3rd March, 1959, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

1.55 p.m.