THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th March, 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; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; and Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education.)*

Prayers were read.

Mr. BARROW, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. TALMA and Mr. TUDOR entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings held on the 24th and 26th February and the 3rd March respectively have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will be now taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed

Mrs. BOURNE [illegible] and took her seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the nine months ended 31st December, 1958.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the ten months ended 31st January, 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Contract for the construction of a Breakwater, Wharf Wall, Reclamation, Sheds, Bulk Sugar Store and works in connection with the Bridgetown Deep Water Harbour.

Report and Audited Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. R. G. MAPP:- Resolution to place the sum of $259,662 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958 - 59, No. 50, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this Resolution through all its stages later on today.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of $102,050 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No. 51, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1959."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to continue various Expiring Laws.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1954.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to amend the Public Assistance Act, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX: A Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: A Bill to authorise the Governing Body of the Christ Church Boys' Foundation School to sell certain land to the Rector of the parish of Christ Church.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolutions which have been given notice of today except the Money Resolution for $259,662. As the Hon. Minister of Communications has intimated, I am going to ask later on for leave to be granted to deal with this Resolution through all its stages today.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am giving notice of Oral Reply to Question No. 6/1959 asked by the hon. junior member for St. John requesting an interim report on the progress and financing of the Deep Water Harbour.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, se-

conded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to continue various Expiring Laws was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1954 was read a first time.

On. motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Public Assistance Act, 1954 was read a first time.

12.25 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to authorise the Governing Body of the Christ Church Boys' Foundation School to sell certain land to the Rector of the parish of Christ Church was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, was read a first time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day I want to say that I neglected to ask earlier that this Resolution for $102,050.00 which has been circulated, be dealt with in all its stages today. Then there is also the question of the appointment of an Acting Chairman of Committees.

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

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

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

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

LEAVE ASKED TO DEAL WITH RESOLUTIONS

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with these two Resolutions - one for $259,662 and the other for $102,050 - in all their stages today.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I object to leave being granted to deal with the Resolution for $259,662 which is in connection with the Transport Board. I do not know why the Hon. Minister has lumped the two of these Resolutions together because their merits are different. One of them has reference to the Audited Statement of Accounts mentioned in the Addendum to that Resolution; that has only just been laid on the Table of this House, it has only been circulated within the last five minutes, and hon. members have not had time either to study or to read it. Therefore, as far as that Resolution is concerned, I object to leave being granted for its being dealt with today.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I must support the hon. member with regard to what he has said and for the same reason. This Resolution, which is for such a large sum of money, should have been in our hands even on Friday; they had time to present it since last Tuesday. Whether it had anything to do with the Election or not I do not know, but the Resolution arrived after the counting of the votes. For us to be presented with a Statement which has a direct bearing on a Resolution for $259,662 with which we are asked to deal today is, I think, asking too much of us. I must oppose leave being granted to deal with this Resolution today.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to refer to some references which the hon. member, who has just sat down, made during the course of his remarks. He spoke to the effect that this Resolution seemed to have been timed after the counting of the votes. I want to say that that has absolutely nothing to do with the Resolution. One of the causes why we are asking leave to deal with this Resolution is that the financial year is drawing to a close and we want to get through with the Budget; apart from that, we were waiting on the Report of the Board and that came in late. I tried to get it at an early date, I tried to get it last Tuesday but could not get it and therefore I had to circulate this Resolution to hon. members. Those are the reasons for the lateness of the arrival of the Resolution.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, our contention is that the laying of the Audited Statement should have preceded the Resolution, because until we have that Statement in our hands and have a reasonable opportunity of studying it, we could not give intelligent consideration to the Resolution. This is not a negligible amount of money even for a Legislature; it is over $1/4 million which we are asked to vote in connection with the deficiency on the operation of the transport services. The Addendum to the Resolution begins with the statement that the Audited Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board at the 31st December, 1958, shows so and so, and it tells us that the Board has been operating at a financial loss since its inception. It is therefore necessary for hon. members, those who think for themselves and those who do not think for themselves, to have ample opportunity for a careful study of this Audited Statement; otherwise, we are not in a position to say whether or not we should grant these supplies for which the Government is asking without reservation or stipulation.

We received this Audited Statement of Accounts at 12.20 o'clock today and to be asked to deal with it at any time today, would, in my submission, be unreasonable and unfair. We should have at least a week-end - some of us might think that we should have a fortnight - in order to give this Audited Statement the consideration it deserves before we embark on the consideration of the Resolution. That is why we must oppose proceeding with this matter today. It would not be fair to us and it would be surprising if hon. members of the Government did not see how unfair and how unreasonable it would be for us to consider this Resolution when we have an Audited Statement of Accounts of about eight pages or so to be considered as a necessary and indispensable prerequisite to examining the Resolution.

12.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in view of what hon. members on the other side have said, I can assure them that it is not our intention to force anything on them before they have been given an opportunity to study it. No doubt after studying it and we over here are convinced that it must go through, we are going to try to push it through. I want it to be understood that it is not our intention to stifle debate especially in the case of the Transport Board, and under the circumstances I propose to deal with it around Friday; but I cannot promise members to deal with it next Tuesday because this money has to be paid out and the Other Place has to pass this Resolution so that this money can leave the Treasury before the end of the month. I hope that members will come at least around Friday with the intention of doing this Resolution.

I should now amend my plea by asking leave to deal with the Resolution for $102,050.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to deal with the Resolution for $102,050, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting, but I have to rise because of the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House with regard to an opportunity of reading these documents. It seems to me that he wants to undertake the task of saying when we should read them and at what stage he intends to push through the Resolution. I would like the hon. member to get this clear in his mind; the question of this Report not being here before and his remarks about not waiting until next Tuesday only infuriate people, because we are not responsible for the delay in these things coming here. He is saying that we

must drop everything else in order to read the Report because he intends to deal with it before next Tuesday. That sort of dictatorial behaviour is all right, but it will catch up with you. He wants us to agree with him at what stage he should deal with this matter of spending public funds although he has admitted that we should have more time to read the Report. Are you asking members to read this document and if they have not read it you are going to push it through because you want the money by the 31st March? You do not want us to study this matter of spending $1/4 million but you said you will push it through on Friday.

I do not like this statement, Mr. Speaker, that you are not waiting until next Tuesday, because it means that no matter what business we have to do - we have to consider the Estimates and other matters - we must drop it in order to do this. Haven't I the right to consult somebody on this matter in order to be able to bring something intelligent to bear on this? I have the right to read this Report and consult somebody about it. Are you suggesting that I should not have the right to canvass as much knowledge on such matters as I can before they are dealt with? That is the sort of high-handed behaviour you want in Parliament, but it is something you must put an end to; otherwise the people will put an end to it by violence. I hope the lessons in Cyprus are not too dim for people to realise. If you do not accept constitutional behaviour, you will accept violence, and that is the only way you seem to be able to get rid of some people.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am sure.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to inform hon. members that there is a request for leave to be granted to deal with the Resolution for $102,050. There is nothing before the House at the moment, so members are speaking on nothing and I cannot let members continue to speak. I have allowed the hon. senior member for St. Peter to speak and therefore I will ask the hon. member to be very short in his remarks because he is actually speaking on nothing.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that on the matter of constitutional privileges to the people of this island, Your Honour will draw to the attention of the members of the Government that the provisions of the Transport Board Act say that as soon as possible after the financial year we and you, Sir, should have the Report of the Transport Board. I am only drawing to Your Honour's attention that it is a question of privilege and that it is now six months since the financial year ended and only now they need money they have vouchsafed to us what is our constitutional right of seeing the Report. I hope in future that Your Honour will draw to their attention when Reports have to be laid before this Legislature that according to Subsection 4 of Section 10 of the Transport Board Act, 1955, Chapter 37, a Report should be laid "as soon as possible", which does not mean when the Minister feels so disposed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I would be on the spot to interpret what "as soon as possible" means in any Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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, and that it be an instruction while in Committee of Supply to deal with the money Resolution for $102,050.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. HOLDER being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 51

Head XIV – Judiciary ,was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution for $102,050 has several Heads, and according to the custom we will take them Head by Head.

Item 35 is for Witnesses' Expenses. This amount of $900 is required to pay expenses to the Court of Grand Sessions for this month. As you know, Sir, the Court is now sitting and consequently the need for this money to be voted.

Item 36 is a similar Item - Jury Expenses - to meet expenses in connection with the sitting of the Supreme Court.

Item 46 - Travelling Expenses. This amount is required to meet the travelling expenses to the end of the current financial year of the Hon. Chief Justice, three additional clerks at District 'E', Holetown and Belleplaine and one Stenographer shared by District 'B' and 'C', and members of Liquor Licensing Authorities.

Item 47 - Incidentals. This amount is required to meet the payment of a part time cleaner for the Supreme Courts.

Item 50 - Reporter. Provision is required to pay for the services of a shorthand reporter required by the Supreme Court in connection with the recording of proceedings where an appeal is likely to be made.

I beg to move that Head XIV stand part.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, in respect of the Item, Jury Expenses, to meet the cost of transport and board and lodging of jurors, I want to point out that this allowance is not sufficiently flexible to cover such occasions as when jurymen are relieved after bus time to go to remote country districts, such as Rock Dundo, St. James, Belleplaine, St. Andrew, and so on. Sometimes, the High Court in order to finish a case carries on to completion until 7 p.m. or 8 p.m. and as a result jurymen from such remote country districts cannot get home by bus. I suggest that some bus be made available in case it happens. Of course, it would mean one bus having to go all over the Island to drop people to their various homes. However, I suggest that this allowance be made sufficiently flexible for a jury to be sent home either by bus or by taxi.

I happen to know of a case which happened quite recently, when Mr. Gomes was Chief Justice, that a jury returned a verdict in a case of murder around 7 p.m. and he gave instructions for the jury to be sent home. Of course, there were no means and the Registrar did not have money in hand to provide taxis in order to get them home.

I therefore suggest that in the case of Jury Expenses to meet the cost of transport and board and lodging of jurors the Government should make adequate allowance - more adequate than in the past - and with a proviso that in the case of jurymen with no transport of their own and where it is a case that the bus service has ceased to run, provision be made to send them home by taxi or other suitable transport.

In respect of the item, Travelling Expenses, Mr. Chairman, you must have observed reference being made to three additional clerks at District E, Holetown and Belleplaine and one stenographer shared by District B and District C. My experience as a practitioner is that one stenographer shared by these two Courts is not convenient and not in the best interest of the people who do business in these Courts. You need a Stenographer for each of the two Courts. Whenever one wants the evidence of a case typed by a stenographer, one is told that the typist is kept busy at the District B Court, that she does not get time enough to do the work in the District C Court: and whenever one wants the work of a stenographer in consequence of a case at the District "B" Court, one is told that the Magistrate of the District

"C" Court is monopolising her services and the result is that whichever Court it is from which you are seeking work there is considerable delay in getting it done and you are told that it is because the business in the other Court is encroaching so much on her time.

I submit that a case can be made out for the services of a stenographer in each of these Courts. As a matter of fact, the Magistrates themselves can let Government know that one stenographer for both of these Courts is inadequate. I cannot see any reason why Government officials should be afraid to tell the Government straight and plain that you need a stenographer at District B and one at District C and that one stenographer cannot serve both these Courts at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, one stenographer is not enough and in the interest of John Citizen, Government should supply a stenographer to each of these two Courts. As you know, District B covers St. George and considerable part of Christ Church while District C covers St. Philip and St. John.

Now, Sir, in respect of Incidentals, which is to meet the payment of a part-time cleaner for the Supreme Courts, I am wondering whether Government has been advised that a part-time cleaner is enough for the Supreme Courts. It is not our experience, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if you ever happened to frequent the Supreme Courts but even in case you did not, I am sure you will agree with me that with the number of rooms, the amount of furniture, particular furniture of ancient vintage, one part-time cleaner is not enough. As a matter of fact, we would need more than one whole-time cleaner; the only thing is that the work will have to be done on mornings very early. I am sure that a part-time cleaner for the Supreme Courts is not enough. If it is necessary to have the emphasis on part-time cleaner, then you want two part-time cleaners and they could work from 7 a.m to 9 a. m and then from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. or even in the luncheon interval of the Courts.

Then, lastly, we have under this Head, the Item, Reporter, and the Note says: "to pay for the services of a shorthand reporter required by the Supreme Court in connection with the recording of proceedings in cases of importance where an appeal is likely to be made."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I object to two of the phrases in this Note. They suggest that the person who worded this Note does not have a full sense of appreciation of the work in Her Majesty's Court and the necessity for a person to have justice even though in a particular way he may not have won his case. It is not good enough to provide for the services of a shorthand reporter only for what are regarded as cases of importance. I am sure that you are bound to agree that every case which comes before the Supreme Court is of importance. Whether, say, it is a case in dispute of a property worth $300 or one worth $300,000, it is a case of importance and the Judge should have the availability of the services of a Shorthand Reporter to do that case. As a matter of fact, the case of a property worth $300 may be just as much of importance as that of a property worth $300,000 because the point of law at issue in the case may be the same point of law.

I also object to the reference "where an appeal is likely to be made." Except in a small minority of cases one cannot prophesy correctly where an appeal is likely to be made; one cannot anticipate when the Judge may go wrong, when he will misinterpret the law or misconstrue the law or when he is about to give a verdict in a case, he gives it against the weight of the evidence in the case; therefore, it is essential that the services of a Shorthand Reporter should be continually available to the Supreme Court whenever it is in Session and not merely when in the opinion of somebody it is a case of importance or not merely when in the opinion of someone an appeal is likely to be made.

12.55 p.m.

I am not criticising the Cabinet for introducing this Resolution as it is with these notes; it may be that they have only been told, because of the timid approach of some Government Department or the official in question, that he would like the services of a Shorthand Reporter just for reporting cases of importance in order to make out a strong case for a Shorthand Reporter. I am submitting that every case in the Supreme Court is of importance and there should be a Shorthand Reporter continuously employed there. The necessity might even arise for the services of more than one Shorthand Reporter because very often there are two Courts sitting; but for the present time I would advocate the employment of one whole-time, permanent Shorthand Reporter for the Supreme Court. At any moment and quite unexpectedly some point may crop up, the acoustics are not so good and the Judge may not be quite sure of what was said and a qualified Shorthand Reporter would be available with verbatim notes in order that reference can be made to the exact words which were used.

The only alternative to that would be the use of a dictaphone. I do not know which you would prefer, Mr. Acting Chairman, and I do not know how far dictaphones are used; but we are discussing the use of a Shorthand Reporter and I submit that a strong case can be made out for a permanent Shorthand Reporter to be attached to the Supreme Court of this Island. We are not opposing the Resolution; we are only saying that we would support something which is more imaginative, something which is bolder if and when the Government with further consultation with the Head of the Crown Law Officers' Department is so advised, as I am sure it would be advised, as to the necessity for a permanent Shorthand Reporter. At least two part-time cleaners for the Supreme Court and one Stenographer for District "B", and one for District "C" are needed, and adequate arrangements should be made for the jurymen who may have missed the last bus through no fault of their own because they had been engaged in the most responsible duty in the administration of justice, even although there has been an increase in the remuneration of jurors to the betterment of their domestic economy.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to support the remarks of the last speaker, more especially in respect of the argument which has been adduced in so far as the appointment of a full-time Reporter is concerned. In most enlightened colonies in the Caribbean the services of full-time Reporters are retained even in matters engaging the attention of the inferior Courts, the Courts of Summary Jurisdiction. In my view, the time has come if justice must be administered fairly and to the satisfaction of all - if justice must not only be done but appear to be done, then the time has come when each and every Court should have the services of a Shorthand Reporter. Knowing how things are done in this country and knowing that a start should be made in a small way before any innovation can take place, I would suggest that the time has definitely come not only for the appointment of a part-time Reporter, but at least for two permanent efficient Reporters for the Supreme Court, at least for District "A". I do not mean that if the Supreme Court is not sitting, the Reporters should do nothing because there would be ample work for them to do. Now that we have a Supreme Court, at least two courts sitting at the same time, we definitely need two competent Reporters for the High Court.

In enlightened colonies like Trinidad, Jamaica and others you will find that there are Reporters even in the ordinary Magistrate's Courts, to take notes: and if Barbados is to keep abreast of the times as far as the administration of justice is concerned, then the time has come when at least two competent and efficient Reporters should be employed on a whole-time basis. It is customary for the Trial Judge or the Magistrate to take notes which would lead him to make his decision, but these notes taken by the Magistrate or Judge are just for his guidance and certainly they do not represent a verbatim account of what takes place in the Court. In matters of appeal where the appellant would want a

verbatim account of what transpired, you would be at a loss to secure something on which Counsel could argue the appeal case. I say that the time has definitely come when a case can be made out for the appointment of two competent Reporters - not one; if justice is to be administered in a fair and impartial manner and to the satisfaction of the people of Barbados, then you will need two competent and efficient Reporters attached to the High Court and their services could be utilised in other directions from time to time in any matter of public importance. A case can be made out in that respect and I am hoping that the proper authorities will look into the matter.

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

HEAD XXIII (2) - GENERAL HOSPITAL

Head XXIII (2) – General Hospital was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, the first Item under this Head, is Item 91 - Provisions. Both the quantity and the quality of the provisions at the General Hospital have been increased. In respect of the patients, nurses, especially tuberculosis patients and certain other special cases, there is the need for the supply of special diet at the request of the doctors. Naturally, with such an increase more money is spent and this sum of $84,000 which is now sought is a supplementary vote to carry on the provisions until the end of the Financial Year. Item 93 deals with "Instruments and Equipment." The sum of $5,000 is requested in order to provide for instruments and more X-ray films because more cases nowadays require X-rays than formerly and the Out-Patient Department has grown tremendously; consequently there is more X-ray work done, more films are used and this money is required so as to carry on this service for the remainder of the current year.
1.05 p.m.

Item 94 - Furniture and Equipment. There has been considerable improvement to the kitchen and dining room furniture and equipment at the Nurses' Home and the unforeseen necessity for replacement of furniture in Hospital Wards and Staff Quarters and therefore the additional provision of $3,500 is now requested.

Item 97 - Fuel, Light, Heat and Power. There has been an increase in the amount used and recently, as you know, Sir, there has been an increase in the price of natural gas. More diesel oil is used in the laundry boiler in place of the cheaper oil formerly used; therefore this provision of $3,000 is requested.

Item 107 - Commission to Debt Collector. There are some dilatory debtors who often do not pay promptly and we have to refer them to the debt collector, and this amount is required to pay the debt collector's commission. Hon. members are aware that the amount of debt when collected is paid into the Treasury.

I beg to move that Head XXIII (2) stand part..

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the phrase of the Hon. Premier about dilatory debtors; the alliteration is neat. But I think the note tends to be misleading when in speaking of the additional amount of $1,500 required for the year to meet the commission of the debt collector, it goes on to say that this expenditure is recoverable. I take it that what is meant is that if and when the money is paid that will go into the Treasury; but as to the commission of $1,500 which is what we are asked to vote, that is not recoverable; that 20% or whatever percentage Government pays is not recoverable; only the debt is. I am wondering whether this large amount of outstanding Hospital fees is for the weekly charges, and I am glad to see the Hon. Minister for Health in his place and he will no doubt be able to enlighten us in his helpful manner, whether it is principally for surgical fees, whether for amounts due for X-Ray examinations or whether it is for the weekly payments for Pay Ward A or Tercentenary. I would be glad if the Hon. Minister would give us a break-down so that we would understand what the position is in respect of these outstanding accounts. Are they for the weekly amounts for the beds and rooms at the Hospital in the Pay Ward, are they for X-Ray charges or for Surgeons' fees that we have to vote this amount of $1,500 for commission? We can have an idea of what is due if we worked out this commission on the basis of either 20% or 25%. That amount, in my submission, could never be recoverable, because you cannot charge the debtor the amount the debtor owes plus 20% which you pay the collecting agent, and it seems to me that when the Minister rises - I presume he will rise - to supply this information, he might tell us about Item 94 the Note to which speaks of "the unforeseen necessity". Why unforeseen? I do not understand this unforeseen necessity for replacement of furniture in the Hospital Wards, because I take it that an experienced business man and a Company Director such as the Hon. Minister was , would always make annual provision for the replacement of furniture. I am sure that in his business or businesses he would have had regular surveys made to decide when it would be necessary to replace furniture. I cannot see why they speak of "unforeseen." Was there a sort of small riot on the Hospital premises on one occasion, or was it an act of God which could not have been anticipated and therefore is referred to as causing the unforeseen necessity for replacement of furniture in Hospital Wards? *A propos* of that, perhaps the Hon. Minister would tell us if he has in mind in respect of replacement of furniture that there will be more beds so that it will be one bed for one patient instead of one bed for two or sometimes three patients.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that as this matter of furniture in Hospital Wards is receiving the attention of the Hon. Minister, he will never overlook the fact that apart from the furniture needing in some cases to be replaced, there is a need for additional furniture and certainly for additional beds. Even though you propose building a new Hospital in the near future, Mr. Chairman, that will still take a year or two, and meanwhile people are submitted to the discomfiture of two in a bed and sometimes three.

A distinguished visitor to this island from the United Kingdom told me early this year that he was surprised on paying a visit to the Hospital some time late in January to find three people in a particular bed. He was surprised because he does not know his Barbados as well as we do, nor his General Hospital as well as we do and as I am sure you do, Mr. Chairman, because it is part of our duty to visit Government Institutions and see that ample provision is made for the general public,not to speak of our constituents who may have to undergo the misfortune of spending time in these institutions.

I should like the Minister for Health to let us know something in connection with the replacement of furniture in Hospital Wards, and let us know something about the number of beds and whether it is proposed to increase them even although a new Hospital is in the offing. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if you increased the number of beds at the Hospital you would just have to transfer the increased number to the new Hospital, and that would be part of the initial equipment for the new Hospital which is about to be started.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to amplify some of the remarks made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am sure the Hon. Minister for Health will answer because he is given to answering these questions.

Now on the question of the Hospital and the amount for the debt collector, I should like the Minister to note that there is an error on this question of what is recoverable, because as the Hon. Leader of the Opposi-

tion said, you are not going to recover the commission which you pay because the commission would be less than the debt. I would like to ask the Minister to be even more precise in answering the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as to the outstanding amount. I should like to know among what category of people this money is owing, whether they are Government Servants and in what income group they happen to be.
1.15 p.m.

The reason why I am asking that question is because I have had the misfortune to be sued not by the Hospital Authorities but by a medical practitioner who is a member of this Chamber for medical fees and he had them collected after we ceased to be friends. During the period we were friends I never received one single bill from him. I do not know if it will happen to me with some friends of mine in the Opposition. There are some barristers with whom I have been in Court and they have never charged me any fees and I am wondering if in case we have a political difference solicitors would be asking me for fees for them. As I have said, I have had a Debt Collector collecting money from me for medical expenses after a number of years. Of course, those people from whom they are collecting fees for medical attention in the General Hospital would be in a position different from mine.

I am asking the Hon. Minister to say what is the number of people. The reason why I am getting down to that question, Mr. Chairman, is because I do not subscribe to the view to which hon. members in the Government subscribe as regards medical attention. In Barbados we have no scheme to provide for certain things to benefit the community and I know many people who go to the General Hospital cannot really afford the fees that are being charged there; but because they live in a sort of "mock" position, they feel they cannot go there unless they go into a Pay Ward. Some people who have not one single penny in their homes or in their pockets would go and borrow money so as to go in Pay Ward E or the Tercentenary Ward. The general wards of the General Hospital are treated in such a way as if when you are admitted to them, you are next door to the Almshouse, the difference being in the matter of their names. Some of these people have cases of complaints for which they are in need of immediate medical attention and which cannot be treated unless they go to the General Hospital, and although they have no means of paying the fees, yet they ask to be admitted into a Pay Ward.

I say that there should be free medical attention. Some people who work in Barbados do not have any guarantee of their wages, that is to say, when they are ill their wages cease. I believe the Hon. Minister of Health is of this view or was of this view that when it comes to medical attention for someone it should not be a question of finance but that you shall give it in such a measure as to warrant the person a quick recovery and as such, quick rehabilitation to normal life. Therefore, if it means that such is going to be a charge on the Treasury, let it be so.

I am going to ask the Hon. Minister to examine this matter again. Look and see if the amounts to be collected fall on persons who can be regarded as people who are able to pay these fees and who are not paying them, whether from examination you think the time has come when you should have a different outlook as regards the fees which are charged at the Hospital so as to relieve this embarrassment. Sir, I do not believe in a general way that a man is unwilling to pay medical expenses which have been incurred for his own health's sake or for his family's sake. We all have to meet this same fate some time or the other; illness is one of those things which you cannot avoid and the expenses that go with it; but I say that we pay so much money for the upkeep of our medical institutions that I would like to know the time has come when we look into this matter in order to see if the weight is falling too heavily on people who are being admitted there and to see what we can do to help them. We know what it means when a man is ill. A man may be a young married man and as such his wife may have children quicker than an old married man and that calls for medical expenses. Some people are very hard put to through illness running in their family. I do feel when it comes to medical attention we should not appear as if we want to hound people down for medical expenses which they incur.

According to the Note, this additional amount of $1,500 is required for the year to meet the commission of the new Debt Collector who is making all efforts to collect the large amount of outstanding Hospital fees. I take that to mean that he is making all efforts to collect large sums of money which are outstanding for Hospital fees. I would rather prefer to lock up people for non-payment of income tax than to see people being hounded down to pay Hospital fees. I know some members of this House who owe a lot of income tax and you do not hound them down or lock them up for it, but according to this note you are hounding people down for the non-payment of medical expenses. I think the time has come when the Hon. Minister of Health should go into this whole question of Hospital fees. I am bold enough to say that I believe people should have medical attention free and in such manner as to rehabilitate them as quickly as possible back into civil life. It is true that some people are fortunate to have jobs which give them great savings: but when the ordinary man takes ill or a member of his family, it is the same salary which he gets that operates when he is in Hospital - and, as you know, Sir, there is no insurance scheme for sickness for workers and employers have not emancipated to the idea that when an employee of theirs takes ill he should get something more than a salary; as a matter of fact, some employees do not even get the same salary which they got before they took ill.

I think the time has come when you should not make the payment of medical expenses a burden on the individual because when he comes back into the ordinary course of life he should not be committed to something which his illness had brought upon him. I do know that some people are hardened to these things and as long as money exists in the world, they do not care about anything else. There is a professional man in that Party who regards fees owing to a professional man as something which you should pay even at the price of going to prison for them. I have heard it expressed more than once that a man can pay. There are many members in here who have a few cents in the Bank but you do not know how much they owe away. If you want to know, wait until some of them die and see how their family is walking about and jumping around.

I do not know the cases of these people who owe Hospital expenses, but if there are cases which the Minister feels need examination from the point of view of political policy, apart from any act which can authorise you to collect them, then the Hon. Minister should look into the matter.

There is another aspect to this question. They are many people who go to the Pay Wards and some of the doctors take them for a ride. I know of a case of a young man who took ill on Christmas Eve last and he told me that after the doctor told him the fees he would have to pay, he would not have anything more to do with that doctor again. It appears from what he told me that the doctor felt he should not be sick on a Christmas Eve. I will tell you this. If I had to choose between going into a hospital on a Christmas and not going, I would postpone going until after the Christmas because I would want to enjoy myself for the last.
1.25 p.m.
This friend of mine told me that. This is a man who is working at the British Council in a small job and the amount which he is charged for the operation is not anything which he would have as a saving. That is the situation which you will find. I hope that the Minister will be able to see that we have more poor people who go to the Hospital in Barbados than we have rich ones. I am sure that if you were to go into the bank account of these people you will find that more than 50% of them do not

have a cent. We have a man who has been working in the Public Service for some time and he was in the Hospital for months and his Hospital fees had to be paid by his children; in order to keep up respectably, it means that the living standards of the family must go towards the maintenance of the person in Hospital; but the person himself who is ill is incapable of paying his own fees. He is not even receiving a pension from the Government Service. Do you think that members of the family are in a position to have money to be put down for these medical expenses? The rank and file of middle class people show a front but when it comes to substance there is nothing. For this man to be able to afford to pay the people whom he owes and for these medical expenses, that would be a miracle. I do not think that we should place impositions on people, because we do not know when we will be taken ill or what will be the nature of the illness. Sometimes we talk as if we are going to be ill for a day; sometimes we are ill for a prolonged period and in some cases the illness can be very expensive to our family.

I hope that the Hon. Minister will give this matter careful attention and give us the information for which we ask. I am sure that when he looks into this matter as compared with something else with which we have to deal - I do not think that this $250,000 which has gone down the drain is a balance with the $250,000 which has gone through the eddoes and we do not know how much more money will go; I think the Hon. Minister of Social Services is a different man in these matters from many of his other colleagues; up to the time when I knew him, when I had close association with him - well, I do not know how much he has changed. He has changed in other things and he must have changed in this matter too. I hope that we will be given what I regard as very important information so as to make an analysis to determine whether we should continue these things and make a greater resolve as to what should be done to deal with the situation which exists.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I believe I will be given some information on this matter. I notice that Item 107 deals with "Commission to Debt Collector". Lest it be thought that the hon. member who has just sat down is singing a solo, I should like to say this; I notice that the explanatory note to this Item says: "Additional amount of $1,500 is required for the year to meet the commission of the new Debt Collector". Has the old Debt Collector gone or what? I do not know what is the practice, but I see that you have previously put down an amount of $1,000. If it is that you pay 20% for collecting and you want $1,500 now it must be estimated that you have something like $7,500 out. I should only like to say in passing that it seems very reasonable for people who are in a position to pay, and if they have had work done at Hospital and they have refused to pay - I want to be very careful in my remarks - then it must be a very reasonable thing to collect the money. However, I cannot imagine that anyone would have an operation or any other medical attention at the Hospital and he is in a position to pay and is refusing to pay. There may be cases far and few and rare between; only a few weeks ago a woman presented to me a bill for some money which she was asked to pay at the Hospital or she would be sued; later I discovered that she was the mother of eight children and one of the children had had one of its feet amputated because of a cancerous condition and the father of these children had passed away. I suggested that this woman could not be sued. I want to say that unless you can pay a fee you cannot get the services of some doctors. I may say that there is a sort of racket going on; in other words, some people will suffer and go to their graves but as long as you can find a fee to pay some of the doctors you can get attention. That is something which you should not tolerate. In respect of those who had this large amount of fees outstanding, I do not know if these fees are hospitalisation fees or if they are doctors' fees; if this amount is for doctors' fees I am wondering if these fees have been paid out already. I would like to know how much of these fees would be on a 25% basis; merely to state what is in the Addendum is not good enough.

1.35 p.m.

From persons who have had hospitalisation or an operation and can afford to pay but just for worthlessness would not pay, I say "yes, collect the fees," but I am wondering if all these people who owe these fees can be placed in that category. I cannot imagine a man having his mother or child ill and is in a position to pay but would not pay; therefore I should like the Hon. Minister of Health to tell us how much is this outstanding amount, what commission they are paying for collecting the fees, whether the fees are principally hospital fees,- that is, room fees- or merely fees for doctors.

I do not think I should say anything more until the Minister gives us some further explanation as to whether or not these are doctors' fees, and if it is so, the Hon. Minister should be able to tell us that he is satisfied beyond every reasonable doubt that the fees should be collected and that there are persons who can pay and just wilfully refuse to pay. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, there are a tremendous lot of what we in this country know as decent paupers who realise very well that to get an urgent operation they must make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness. If you take the average $50 or $60 a month clerk who has to go for an operation, he never likes to think of going into the ordinary Ward, and if he did go on the waiting list he would have to wait from one to eighteen months to get an operation, although the Minister said there was no waiting list at the Hospital as such. I have taken that with a grain of salt. What we would really like to know and what the Minister should tell us is whether he is satisfied beyond any doubt that these people can pay. If there are people in the $200 bracket, by all means sue them; but if they are people working for $60 or $80 a month or even $130 or $140 a month with a family and are unable to pay, the Hospital should by now have worked out some means whereby fees could be paid by instalments and not take people to the Law Courts and humiliate them. If the doctors' fees and the Hospital's fees come to $120 and we advance that money from the Treasury to the doctor as long as the bill goes there, people should not be humiliated by having to go to the Law Courts when you should have a scheme through which they could pay by instalments. People would prefer to pay $5 or $10 a month rather than be humiliated by going into Court. I think the Hon. Minister should be able to tell us whether he is satisfied beyond every doubt that these people are in the category which can pay and would not pay. After all the hospital is not a rum shop where you can sue people for the rum they drink. When people go to the Hospital they go because they have to; nobody wants to go just for so. How can you refuse to pay for someone who is near and dear to you if you could afford to pay and had somebody at the hospital?

I would like to hear from the Minister whether Government has any scheme worked out just as there is in big countries where people can pay on the instalment plan, because we advance money for the food they get. That is our hospital and when a doctor charges Mr. X $100 for an operation, whether or not he pays, the doctor draws his money. In these days when health standards are so high in the lives of people, such a scheme should be introduced at the hospital: but I cannot appreciate your coming here in a wholesale way to tell us that $1,500 is wanted to meet the commission of the new debt collector. I do not like that term. What about the old one?

I am sure the Minister of Health will be able to tell us that he is satisfied that there are people in certain financial categories who can pay but refuse to pay, and he might also tell us whether there is a scheme through which people can pay on the instalment plan rather than go into Court and be humiliated. Everyone knows that if a person went to a public Ward he would not get an operation for two years; he would have to go to a private doctor and then to the hospital doctor in order to get that operation. I hope the Minister will be able to explain this matter.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly did not anticipate all the questions which have been

years ago or whether rendered today, and therefore one cannot argue that persons who are now out of the Government service in retirement have given less valuable service in their day than public servants do today. I know that it is sometimes said that since the Civil Service requires persons of higher educational ability, a greater knowledge and efficiency in our day, by inference persons employed in the public service twenty or thirty years ago did not have to be so well qualified, and the argument sometimes extends so far as to imply that whatever pensions they get now for services rendered thirty years ago is adequate enough. I think that we can reject any such argument out of hand. Service is service if well rendered, no matter who renders it; and the retired policeman who did not reach further, say, than the rank of Corporal ten years ago was as faithful and as efficient a public servant in his day as the Inspector or Superintendent who may retire this year or in a couple of years' time. The retired Medical Officer of today has rendered no better service than the retired nurse or the retired hospital porter of ten years ago.
2.45 p.m.
A retired Chief Clerk in any Government Department has no greater claim today on the public purse and no more claim to public consideration than the postman or any small person who gave service running into a number of years and who may have retired within the last twenty or so years or even more recently than that. Therefore, the argument along the lines that pensioners should be graded according to the time when their services were rendered or that some consideration should be given to those who retired at a time when work was more exacting, should not be countenanced at all. I repeat, it is no matter when a service was rendered, and it is no matter on what level it was rendered; therefore, I hope if this House considers making some adjustment to these pensioners, that at least will not be one of the considerations.

The second point is this, and it is more telling argument in favour of these people. Everybody complains today that five dollars spent over a shop counter gives very little in return as compared with the same amount of money spent twenty years, ten years or even five years ago. The fact that everybody today complains about the cost of living - and nearly everybody recognises that there is some justice for a cost of living bonus for those who are actually working - provides a strong case for an increase of pensions based on the fact that the cost of living has increased out of all proportions.

When a man retired ten years ago on $20 a month, it was little enough even for those days - but today, its real value is rather less than half. The Government itself admits that in every respect the cost of living has risen. That is common ground which all sides of this House share. Even in the Speech from the Throne at the end of last month which we all hope to debate soon from now, it is written in black and white that Government recognises that there is some increase in the cost of living. If you think a case can be made out for granting an increase to Government servants currently employed because what they have to buy costs them more, the same admission can be made for those whose incomes are fixed because they are pensioners.

Obviously, no pensioner expects that everytime there is a revision of public salaries there must also be a revision of public pensions. It may not be in the public interest to do that: but what they are entitled to claim is that whenever Government by its published word publicly recognises that the cost of living has risen in large proportions over ten years or so, they feel they are entitled to say that recognition by Government should be put into effect in higher pensions for them. I think they certainly have a case which cannot be too strongly put and it is no gratitude on the part of members of this House or of the public generally to allow these people to feel that their services to the State in the past is counted now so little that they have to beg and entreat the Government to do what is obviously justice to them.

Sir, this Resolution does not lay down, indeed it cannot, in specific terms what rates ought to be offered. It would be the best thing for the Government to take the issue seriously and appoint a Committee almost immediately to advise it on what it should do; the Resolution merely expresses the willingness of this House to give favourable consideration to whatever Government decides to do in the coming financial year.

I notice very carefully that no provision has been made in the Estimates envisaging any such thing: so I can be assured of this matter that up to now, whatever Government may have privately done, it has not committed itself as yet to an increase of pensions. The details will have to be worked out by them. I know of course that it is relatively easy and sometimes from practice in the case of public servants who have retired and who held and occupied important jobs carrying a lot of money that Government has found it easy to introduce special Pensions Acts, covering specific cases. I am not now pleading the case of those people of whom special adjustment will have to be made because of special circumstances; I am thinking of the number of persons running into hundreds, and perhaps thousands, who are still alive who have given service to this Government in years gone by and who are finding it difficult, if not impossible, to feed and clothe themselves and their families on these small pensions. It is those persons whom I am asking this House to bear in mind.

I do not see why a matter like this should become subjected to party or political controversy. I have no interest as to how these pensioners regard their politics or in which particular party they put their trust; but this I know. I have received correspondence from a large number of these pensioners and I have reason to believe that every single member of this House has at some time had it drawn to his attention that something will have to be done for these people. Only last week I received a letter from a very unexpected quarter, a retired Government servant, who is a member of the Other Place. It was not a confidential letter but he drew to my attention certain basic facts towards the operation of the Pension Act which he thinks Government should pay attention to and, as he hinted that he will draw Government's attention to that, it is no need for me to draw attention to that in this debate. I have every reason to suppose that that member of the Other Place is a firm supporter of the Government and it will be no question of collusion between himself and any member of the Opposition on this matter as to which section of the people, pensioners whatever their origin may be, do feel that something should be done and done pretty soon.
2.55 p.m.
I wish to emphasise this last point to the House. We are guardians of the public purse and many claims are made on the public purse, claims which are sometimes very conflicting. The Government particularly and the House generally have to weigh these conflicting claims and decide which claims are to be honoured and under what priority; however, Mr. Speaker, apart from the Old Age pensioners and one or two other persons who obviously need help including the Government Employees in the lowest paid categories - apart from persons like these, I know of no other body of persons who have as good a claim to public opinion and to the redress of their grievances than those retired Government servants.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this Resolution to the House, as I said, not in any partisan spirit and certainly not to provoke or to provide any controversy - there has been much controversy over the matter in the press and otherwise - because there could be no controversy in this House as to the plight of these people; I merely want to see whether the Government is prepared in principle to accept the fact that the claims of these people deserve attention and whether it would give an undertaking some time in the financial year to pay some attention to the distress and wants of these people. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion

for the passing of this Resolution, I should like to be associated with the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down and to say that for sometime - for quite a long time now - pensioners have been crying out and crying out loud. I remember away back down in 1952 - 53 when I was first approached by many pensioners who have since been crying out, and whether they be Policemen or Postmen, Teachers or Civil Servants, I feel that the ones in the lower brackets whose pensions do not exceed say, $20 a month find themselves in a very serious plight owing to the present high cost of living. We have to consider that the essential economics of life are on a similar footing for pensioners as it is for the average worker more especially the more fortunate ones whose income exceed $200 or $300 a month; but as to the average pensioner whose pension does not exceed $20 per month it is expecting too much of him to live on that amount. You will recall that in many cases pensioners are forced to undertake some form of employment in order to supplement their small pensions. Wherever that is possible a pensioner is willing to do so provided that he is well enough; but there are hundreds of other cases in which, owing to the unemployment position of this country, it is impossible for the pensioner who is regarded as being too old to fit in, to get employment so as to supplement his small pension.

To prove the case to the hilt, one only has to look to the present Government service. In some Departments of Government, pensioners are re-employed on a part-time basis. I refer to the Control Board, the Customs, the Currency Department, the Registry and so on. That in itself is clear proof that the pension paid to that type of public servant falls far short of what is needed to maintain life and limb together. If you take that as a crying example or principle, how much the more does it apply to the average policeman or teacher or postman or other employee such as the porter at the Hospital? The case is so straightforward and simple that it does not need any pressing; it is one which meets the eye fully and one which the Government must appreciate. I sincerely hope that the Government will soon get down to that matter; the case is a clear one; and although there are many things which the Government has to consider, I feel that the pensioners have been waiting for too long a time for this assistance. With the high cost of living, the ever-increasing cost of living, the pensioners have now reached a stage where they are faced with a serious plight. This is a case which needs the sympathy and the support of the present Government and I sincerely hope that they will look into it at an early stage in the present Session.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I do think that a clear case has been made out; it is clear that these pensioners of five years and longer are drawing a small pension in relation to those who are now retiring. When we were trying to bring the matter up to date two or three years ago, if the effort had really been made to ameliorate the condition of the old age pensioners, we would not have to be pressing this matter today. We are now referring to the old Sergeant Major, the old Sergeant of Police and that category of pensioner who is really suffering because of the increased cost of living. The Government has made attempts to give him an increase, and I believe that he has got Cost of Living Allowances over that period; but the Cost of Living Allowances have been so far below what the true cost of living is to these pensioners that the position is really amazing and I wonder how many of them make out even with the payment of the house rent.

I do not think that this is a question of trying to make out a case for these people in the big bracket; we quite realise that the Government has a great many commitments to meet, but we are thinking definitely of those people in the £100, the £150 and the £200 a year class and something should be done so as to bring them more in relation to the present cost of living. That is what we are pressing for.

3.05 p.m.

Let us be realistic; it is going to cost money, but we have the Estimates here before us and we can see that the Government has recovered over and above the Estimates for last year, something in the vicinity of $2 million in revenue over and above expenditure. It is quite gratifying to know that; it might be bad budgeting, but you cannot say that you are short of funds, and there is no way that I can see money better spent than by assisting these people who are really suffering. When you go back and are considering this - and I feel you genuinely will - try to assist them, not with a few dollars as on the last occasion when you came here and gave them $9 a month. They thanked you for it, but that was far from what we expected you to give them. We are prepared to vote for it; but let us see something realistic in the hands of the fellow who is getting £100 or £150 income per year as pension. We want something added to that to assist him in the bare necessities of life. Many of them are too old to find work, but they have done service in their day.

I have never before heard the argument propounded as it has been by some Government members that the standard of intelligence today is such that the ones before are not deserving of anymore. I have never heard of that in dealing with human-beings. It costs a man as much to live today as the intelligent ones; his pound of meal is going to cost the same; so I cannot believe that that can be put up as an argument from any quarter whatever.

I do not think we have to say more, and I am sure there can be no division in voting for it because as we have seen here funds can be made available for it, and there is no category of old people that is more deserving than those for whom we are pleading the case today.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is one member around this Table that could disagree with the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I feel, Sir, that they - Government included - will appreciate the very simple fact that money today is much more "expensive" than it was in the days when these people served the public, and I have no doubt whatsoever that this colony must have an efficient Civil Service. Personally I have no doubt whatsoever that these pensioners who deserve every cent they get and every cent they will get will be considered. I think, Sir, that it would be a great blot on this colony if the crying needs of those people were not met sufficiently, and I go so far as to say retrospectively. I will say no more because I do feel that this is a case which does not need any argument.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, just to set the records straight, I will say a few words on this matter. I want to assure the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that he was not singled out for special treatment with respect to receiving letters from these pensioners. I myself have been receiving an average of three a week ever since last year. The hon. member, the whole House and the public generally are aware that in His Excellency's Speech from the Throne he said that the question of a cost of living allowance is receiving attention, and I can assure you, Sir, and hon. members that it is receiving active attention. Hon. members will realise it is not a question of looking at Tom and saying he ought to get this amount, and then at Dick and saying he ought to get that much and so on; the whole structure of the Civil Service as far as this particular point is concerned will have to be reviewed and it has to go before Whitley Council. I do not think that pensioners were mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, but I want to assure you, Sir, the House and the public generally that the question of pensioners will not go unnoticed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I need hardly endeavour to over-emphasise this matter because in my opinion, Sir, appropriate attention has already been paid to it; but I want to appeal very briefly for a little larger consideration along those lines on the part of

the Government. Naturally, Sir, our hearts bleed with interest on behalf of pensioners who are drawing a pension inappropriate to cope with the present day cost of living; but at the same time, Sir, I sincerely want to direct the attention of the Government to the plight of people who are superannuated and who have no prospect of a pension at all. In other words, Sir, I feel that this country can afford to provide some sort of social security for all its people. Certainly, Sir, the Government servants who were underpaid during their tenure of office are entitled to more consideration; but by the same argument people in other walks of life who are entitled to no pension at all are also entitled to some sort of security in old age. It is now about ten or twelve years since on the floor of this House I tabled a Resolution which set out in detail the practical possibility of providing a system of social security for all the people in this country. Since then we have had two Reports along this line. We have had the Report by Professor Richardson and we have had also the Report by Mr. McKenzie dealing specifically with social security for agricultural workers.

Well, now, the finances of this country can afford a contributory division scheme. Every single employer in the island should be called upon to contribute to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is going beyond the scope of this Resolution. I do appreciate the sentiment expressed by the hon. member but I would not like the hon. member to make it the major theme of his speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I appreciate Your Honour's latitude, but I certainly could not allow this opportunity to pass without stressing the desirability of introducing in this country a comprehensive social security system to which employers, employees and the Government should make a contribution with the idea of providing security in old age for both Government and non-Government servants in the community.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I too would like this to pass, and the Mover of this Resolution has done something that expresses, I believe, the feeling of all hon. members.

3.15 p.m.

But what was surprising to me to hear on this question of pensions was the Hon. Premier making the statement that you are dealing with this in connection with the question of general emoluments for Civil Servants. The Premier of Barbados is also Minister of Finance. I believe what he says is so much farce. I will tell him that if he brings down any of the nonsense which he brought down on the last occasion.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I never brought down anything on the last occasion.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is denying the Government that he is leading. I am talking of the nonsense which he brought down in which you computed an increase of pensions on a 75% basis, that is to say, you said that you were giving a 75% increase making people believe that you were increasing their pensions by 75% when the amount by which you had increased them was just a mere pittance. To show you how this Government runs its affairs, this same Government is admitting in less than two years that what they have done for the pensioners is nothing much and that they are going to review it. What they have done should at least be so good as to be able to last for a period. Why I called it nonsense was because on the last occasion you said that you were going to work out something in which you were not going to give anybody drawing a pension of $200 and over anything more: but what it turned out to be was just a 75% increase.

Now, the Hon. Premier referred to the Whitley Council. Let us be frank about it. The present position is that the Whitley Council is nothing at all in Barbados,- because the Government of Barbados does not bind itself to anything agreed to by the Whitley Council nor does it bind itself to sending important things to the Whitley Council for its decision. Recently, there was a Bill which the Hon. Minister had to refer back to the Cabinet but it has not been sent to the Whitley Council. There is another bit of nonsense which we have here in a Pension Bill which we are told was not the subject of discussion by the Whitley Council but that it was only a question of Government bringing down the Bill. That matter had to be postponed. Of course, these things happen because the Civil Service Association is not a competent body to deal with matters as it does not fully represent its members.

I do not know whether the Whitley Council can represent these pensioners. I do not know if there are any pensioners in the Whitley Council because I regard that as an Association for the active part of the Civil Service. Therefore, it seems to me that pensioners would have to hope that the members of the Civil Service who are on the Whitley Council would be so good as to say something for them.

I think that all hon. members will say that it is time that the Government starts dealing with these important matters. They say that they are dealing with salaries of the people in the lower grade of the Service. As I have said, if Whitley Council sent something to the Government on this matter, the Government is not bound by it. In England, the Government accepts the decision of the Whitley Council.

In dealing with this question of pensions, I think the time has come as regards members of the Public Service who are not part of the Civil Establishment that there should be some means of providing a fund in order that such persons who are not eligible for pensionable emoluments under the Pensions Act, should benefit. You can call it a Provident Fund or what you like, but it would be a means of giving reward to such persons other than those who come under the strict limit of the Pensions Act. This is something to which marked consideration should be given because there are many workers in the Public Service who are not eligible for pension. Sir, I only have to mention one case. It does not matter now because many of them have not been long enough in the Service: but you have an example in the Government recently taking over the Transport Service. Unless you make certain legal provision for such things, the people who are working in such services of the Government, although working for the Government and not for private people, will not have any pension rights. There are numbers of people like them who fall within that line and there are other people in the Government service who are eligible owing to the nature of their employment but for whom provision should be made. There are some of these people who come outside the pale of grace of the Act and now that you are reviewing this thing, you should review it on a broad basis to cover such people.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in replying to the points made in the debate, I wish to say that I have to thank those hon. members who have spoken on this side of the Table for the generous support which they have given to the motion and the fact that they have been able to do it without denigrating or controversy.

3.25 p.m.

I know of course that on this side that is an easy job, and they really do not need my congratulations; however, I am astonished at the remarks which have been made by the Premier, unless I heard him incorrectly, attempting to give the impression that the Government was as firmly committed to an increase in pensions as it is in theory to an increase in wages for the lowest paid categories of Government Servants.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I simply said that the case of the pensioners will not go unnoticed; that is all I said. I do not want the hon. member to read more into my remarks than what I said.

Mr. TUDOR: That makes it worse because if I

understand him now it means that he has not done anything about the matter. I think he made an attempt to quote from the Speech from the Throne and he was under the impression that the Speech from the Throne made a promise about pensioners. It does not; it only says this:-

"My Government are aware that there has been some increase in the cost of living since the last salaries revision and have under consideration measures to grant some relief to the lower paid employees of the Government."

Be that as it may, this is a different case. I, for one, would not like to see the two questions mixed up; an increase of salary for the persons employed by the Government has nothing to do with the consideration being given to pensioners who should have had their full consideration some two or three years ago. If you get this question mixed up with the question of salaries revision, you will find by experience that in the revision of salaries the most will go inevitably to those who are now employed and the Government will then have a capital excuse for not doing anything much for the pensioners because they will invariably be able to say: "We did intend to do something for you but most of it went to the payment of salaries." We are therefore asking the Premier to keep the pensioners by themselves and give them the priority which is their due and do not mix that question up with the question of salary increases which are justified in any case and which will take time in thinking over. The case of the pensioners is a different one, on the other hand, and it needs nothing to recommend it.

Mr. Speaker, I should just like to ask the permission of the House to make a correction in this Resolution. By some oversight in the second paragraph and in the second line of that paragraph where it reads "for those people whose incomes are both fixed and low" the word "pensions" should have been used instead of the word "incomes". I do not think that it really needs any amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the House would accept that correction.

Mr. TUDOR: I commend this Resolution to the House without any thought of controversy and I thank those hon. members who have spoken in support of such a worthy cause.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members are asked to accept that correction in the second paragraph of the Resolution; I do not think that any hon. member would object to that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any further business under the Head "Private Members' Business"? (After a pause). There being no further Private Members' Business, the House will now resume consideration of Government Business.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion when Government Business was being considered, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. HOLDER being in the Chair.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: When we were last in Committee of Supply, we were considering a Resolution for the sum of $102,050 and Head XXIII (2) of the Schedule General Hospital was under consideration.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: When the sitting was suspended for lunch, I was answering certain questions in connection with the Hospital and I think I have covered all the questions which were asked; but if there is any further information required I shall be very happy to give that necessary information.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not intend to dilate on this matter although I must say that the Hon. Minister of Social Services went outside and dealt with things about which I did not ask. At one stage he said that he agreed with me that you are dealing with a service. I would like to tell the Hon. Minister that if we ever begin to talk about a service as to what a person can pay - you go to the United States of America or the United Kingdom and you will find out what they provide in a hospital and they do not put that charge on what a person can pay. In education you do not pay for these things; what you do is that you throw up your money in the Treasury and you pay by way of taxation. You do not pay when you go to the Hospital, but it is through your income tax that you pay. I pay more income tax than people who work for more than I am working for, but I cannot hide anything.

The argument is used as if the Ministers or some private persons are paying for the service and you cannot rate it as against what it really costs. You cannot tell a citizen who is walking along a street that he does not know what it costs to provide that street, because he is paying through his taxation. What I am getting at is this; whenever a member of Parliament gets up in England and asks a question such as I have asked the Minister, the Minister can supply the member with the information. I want to know what are the kind of people you are dealing with, the people wh o owe this money, so that you can say that these are the people who can pay. The problem which arises is that some people can keep out of hospital because special provision is being made for others who are not going to accept their responsibility.

3.35 p.m.

If you say there are people who can pay and would not pay - and there are people who usually pay their debts- we know that there are some people who do not like paying any kind of debt. The point I am raising is that we should know the people, not by name but by groups, because there are people who work for low incomes. If you say you are going to give them six months which cannot be regarded as unreasonable, I have no quarrel with the Minister about that; but as the matter is before us today, I want to know what kind of people they are who claim they cannot pay the hospital fees.

I am not going into the other question which the hon. member raised. If the hon. member has made a thorough investigation into the matter he proposes to bring down, one of the things I would ask is that he should not be impatient as a socialist with the things he found have grown up in his community - the question of a division in the community. Some of the people who live in Barbados have been bred on a division in this society, and that is something we must try to remove. There are thousands of people I know, Mr. Chairman, who are in no position to pay 25¢ or even 10¢, because some of them are unemployed, and I hope that the hon. member would not take what has been put in by his Government as the unemployment figures.

The hon. member boasts of being a socialist, and only some nights ago I read something from a socialist magazine which I will quote for the hon. member. It says: "A socialist must look at class divisions expecting to find that he disapproves of them; he must disapprove of them because they are limiting and distorting: they prevent the adequate fulfilment of the individual and hinder the social adaptation which our rapidly changing and developing society so deeply needs." He was speaking in the context of education and the divisions you get in education, and those are the divisions that create these problems. The hon. member is saying that there are some people abusing the privileges at the hospital; that is the sort of conservatism you hear among some people who find themselves in a position not to be in the class that has to look for free service, and they have always looked disdainfully upon those

who are looking for it. I had the privilege of hearing the wife of one of the representatives of this House say on one occasion that when the Maternity Wards were built they were looked upon as something too good for the type of people who were to use them. They still have the almshouse mentality, a thing that permeates into some of the middle-class people in this community up today. That is the same sort of thing which in an unconscious manner is permeating the mind of the Hon. Minister by coming down with this to make people pay for something as if they are not paying for it in another way. Remember this; if the man at the Hospital gate cannot pay 25¢ but is wearing a suit and a shirt, he is paying in another way. If you look at the customs duty you will realise how he is paying. Let us teach them to pay for different things beside medical services through the other things you want to give them free - like entertainment- as a bait. They should pay for entertainment, but for medical services you should not put a penalty on them. Let us try and gradually see how near we can get to the United Kingdom where the Labour Party did something for the people, and it was believed that that philosophy would never exist in the world, because even if the Conservatives tried, they could not change it. That is an example to emulate.

Great Britain was not as rich as the United States, but they have introduced a social scheme which has surpassed anything in the United States because the United States is not wedded to socialism; it is one of those hybrid societies in which there is plenty of money and plenty of millionaires, but you find people living in low conditions between millionaires like Rockefeller and Harriman . The national income in Great Britain is lower than that in the United States and the per capita income in the United Kingdom is much lower than that in the United States of America, but in one country you provide free medical services while in the other you do not. It is a matter of political philosophy with the Party that was in power who worked out something different.

You have a good man in Dr. Byer and also in Mr. Leacock; with them colour does not work. Mr. Leacock is a humanitarian who has surpassed many of our own colour and pigmentation, and we wish we had more of our colour like him. Not only does he not charge you, but he is willing to give human sympathy to any man who goes there. Sickness is not a monopoly for the Ministers, because when it comes to sickness we all show sympathy; only fools begin to rejoice at other people's illness; but when it comes to medical services I have the greatest sympathy for men or women who are ill and I even assist them. I am not saying that the Minister does not offer assistance, but he must revamp his thinking in this line of receiving money from people in illness. All I am asking you to do is to weigh it carefully, and whatever you do let it always be done with your eyes wide open.

I repeat Mr. Chairman, as a member of this Chamber I am asking for the facts, because I take my politics seriously. I am not asking for any private information on any member; I am asking for public information because when I get on a public platform I want to analyse any proposal which Government brings. There are some people who live above their means; I am not encouraging them to do that. If you cannot go into Pay Ward "A", God did not decree that if you take ill that you must go there. Some people believe that there is a divine dispensation which says where you must go when you are ill, but when we all die we cannot decree where we must go. I am not a party to that sort of middle class thinking which forces people to create debts and incumbrances. I am one of those people who want to examine cases which occur in illness which you cannot postpone, because I hear some people talking about a waiting list. If there is some emergency on which you should take steps with a man or woman, you cannot tell the illness to go back, or that the doctor says not to come. I know the thinking of doctors; if it is a bad case they say you will die any way; if not you can wait until the next day.

If when you examine the income group of these people you find that they can pay, I would even go further than the Minister. There are wicked people who would not pay, and if you have instances where you know this is the case, you should sue them. If I had a brother and he contracted a debt with me and I knew he could pay, I would sue him and have no compunction about that. I want you to examine the cases so that you can determine what you can do with this service at the Hospital, because I have a more considerate view than the Hon. Minister. There are some people today who have no uses for the General Hospital Services; they prefer to go to a private hospital and pay three times the fee, because there seems to be some air of dignity.
3.45 p.m.

Some feel that if somebody sees them at a private place, it sounds a bigger place and there is some air of dignity in that to them. If you go to a private hospital, you are charged $15 a day but you can go in the General Hospital and pay $4.80 a day. You have that privilege and yet you do not want to pay. Of course I would sue you. There are some girls in town who work for $50 a month who would eat every finger on their hands before they go into a General Ward of the General Hospital. They feel that conditions in those wards are the same as in the old time days when people used to wear big gowns. Because you have reduced life to that sort of vulgarity, people have resentment to these things. As I have said before, it is purely a matter as to the assessment of the people whom you are suing rather than that the cost of the running of the Hospital is very high and the people are not paying. These are things which I regard as a free service and I do not regard the charges made at the Hospital now as exorbitant. It is no secret that this thing was brewing for a long time. When I was a member of the Executive Committee, they sought to increase the charges at the Hospital both ways and to increase the fees at Harrison College; the Hon. Minister knows very well my views on that. It was felt that as more children were now going to Harrison College the fees should be increased, and there is a tendency as soon as people begin to use the various services that other people begin to relate the prices which are charged for those services to what they were for the last fifty years, forgetting that although the prices are the same as formerly, when those prices were first made, certain people were not able to use those services because of the prices.

We are doing a service to the community and we do not mind paying taxes for them. May I tell the Hon. Minister of Health that as a taxpayer I feel happy to know that my taxes are being spent in the interest of those who cannot pay direct taxes to the Treasury. I feel satisfied to pay my taxes when I know that some unfortunate man or woman would be getting some service which he could not pay for were it not for my paying taxes. The accident that they have to be in this position is one which I could be in. I say that as long as we have enough money to continue these services, let us give these people these services without this quibble. The amount of money which you are going to collect from these people is infinitesimal; it is just the same as a mosquito on the nose of a rhinoceros. I am again warning the Hon. Minister to use all his patience and tolerance in this matter. As he knows, the psychology and average mentality of the working man or woman is such that there are some of them who do not like medicine at all. They have a way of taking two doses of medicine which you give them and after that they have done with that. It is true, all of us have our idiosyncrasies and our suspicions about certain things. All of us feel when you die, you die too long: therefore we like postponing death. I say that if you are Government, you must govern.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, in initiating this debate, I queried of the Hon. Minister whether the last sentence in the note to the item "Commission to Debt Collector" was misleading. It is stated that this expenditure is recoverable. I assume that the Hon. Minister will agree that the amount to be paid to the debt collector cannot be recovered. You have to pay your debt collector something like 20% as a commission of what he collects; therefore that amount is not recoverable.

Now, Sir, I am not sure whether the Hon. Minister is in a position to supply the breakdown which I inquired about. It is not as regards the economic class of people who owe this amount but it is in respect of how much was for ward fees, how much for surgical fees, that is in respect to the amount due to the surgeons, and how much for the X-ray or any other department. I was really interested in the different departments to which this money was owed whereas the query by the hon. senior member for the City was in connection with the classes or sections of persons who owe this money. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister is in a position to give us an idea as to what percentage is due to the Wards and what percentage is due in surgical or any other fees.

As to my query in connection with furniture in the Hopsital Wards which is referred to in Note 8 in connection with Item 94, the hon. member may be taken to have replied to that query when he said something about two or three in a bed. He may have intended to reply to that question by his remark of which I strongly disapprove. He said that it is just a joke to talk about two in a bed. That shows he does not have appreciation of what two or three in a bed means when he says that it is just a joke and he went on to speak of cases of emergency. Does the Hon. Minister think there is any difficulty in getting a bed or beds to be built or to be purchased from any store in the city whereby a person can receive the separate accommodation of a separate bed to himself? It may be just a joke to the Hon. Minister of Health but it is not so to the majority of people in the community. That casual term to which he referred to two in a bed as just a joke shows that he lacks responsibility of the very serious state of affairs at the General Hospital which can be remedied and which is taking place now and which he regards as a laughing matter. I say that if he wants another bed, he can get it from any store in the City and he should get that bed and let the patient have the average comfort - it is not a luxury - of a bed for himself or herself as the case may be.

Sir, I could hardly believe my ears when in the space of less than five minutes the Hon. Minister made two remarks which were diametrically opposed to each other. He said at first: "if I had my way there would be free medical services." Of course he may have to fight a stubborn battle with other members of the Government. Then within a short time after that, he spoke of a 25¢ fee which he proposed to introduce for the outdoor department. Now, at the same time as he is saying that he would like to have a free medical service, he is introducing a 25¢ fee for the outdoor patients and we were told that there are 13,000 people who go through that Department every month. It may be said that in Great Britain although there is a free medical service there is a small fee now payable, but the fee now payable is a fee which was introduced by the Conservatives in power. I do not know if these people are the colleagues of the Hon. Minister of Health.
3.55 p.m.

This proposed fee of 25¢ per outpatient is an innovation of the Conservatives who begrudge having anything free for the people who are deserving of it and who are most worried. Anyhow, when the Hon. Minister brings that matter before us, he will have been forewarned of the reception which the proposal will get. We know that the steam roller will grind and the matter will be got through, but we will live to fight another day and the time is not far off.

Sir, although we like to say how much we follow Great Britain, you would protest with the Opposition against any suggestion of a charge of 25¢ or any sum to be paid by people visiting the Out Patients' Department. That proposal has been made simply because in one or two cases, people do not use the medicine. I should like to say that many doctors give us medicine for which we pay and which we do not use. The Hon. Minister mentioned about people being given pink medicine and they threw it away and the next day they were supplied with blue medicine. Well, you do not know if the use of that pink medicine would have saved those people's lives; but the instance of the pink bottle of medicine being thrown away would be no justification for proposing a fee for out-patients.

When the Hon. Minister said that a doctor was on call for twenty-four hours a day, I should like to know what does "on call" mean? *(Asides)* I understand it means that his name is on the Board. I have had the experience that it took forty minutes before a doctor arrived. Does "on call" mean that the doctor is at the Empire Cinema or in a yacht in Carlisle Bay? Well, the Prime Minister of the West Indies is on call too *(Laughter)*. You have a doctor on call but the only thing is the length of time during which you have to wait for the call to be answered, the length of time that it is possible for human life to survive when people are in urgent need of medical attention. Anyhow, Sir, we will leave that off for the time being and if the information is available now or at any other time I would be grateful if the Hon. Minister would tell us about this amount of debt which is due, if it is due in connection with Ward fees, surgical fees or any other fees.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Acting Chairman, the hon. senior member for the City asked the Minister if the fees that have been charged and are being collected have been paid out already. In reply to that question, the Hon. Minister said that they had not been paid out yet and that it is only after collection that the specialists get their money. On referring to the Estimates I see that there is a sum provided for the payment of fees to the tune of 50% and that comes to $24,000. I should like to know for what purpose is that; I presume that it is for the purpose of paying fees to the Specialists even before collection takes place. Is the Hon. Minister aware of that? He may be able to explain to us if what he said is correct or if he thinks that that is what is being done or if he has an amendment to make. The Hon. Minister told us that these Specialists fees are not paid out until the entire payment has been made; could he enlighten us on that matter?

Mr. DOWDING: Since I have been listening to the reply of the Hon. Minister of Social Services I am somewhat in doubt as to the ability of these people to pay. Now, Sir, if as the Minister says, these people can pay, why are they not made to pay and pay immediately? He tells us that a period of six months is allowed and if during that six months these people pay in a dollar a further period of three or four months is allowed, and he also told us that bills are sent out monthly. If these people can pay then it is a waste of public money to be sending them bills every month. Is it factual that these people can pay? The Hon. Minister went on to say that when these people are put into the hands of the Debt Collector then they pay immediately; that in itself does not necessarily mean that they can pay. Rather than face the Court, these people, or some of them, will mortgage even their souls or borrow or do anything rather than face the Court. Is the Hon. Minister really positive in his mind that these people can pay? Or is it what I am thinking, that they are unable to pay but they will do anything rather than go to the Court? Many of them will go to any part of the Hospital; but when it comes to going to the Court, if they can possibly get the money by any possible means they will get it rather than go to the Court.
4.05 p.m.
I would like, Sir, careful consideration to be given to that point. I do feel that if, as the Minister says, these people can pay, they should be made to pay immediately; it should not take six or nine months at paying $1, but it is my humble impression from the Minister's speech that these people are in the majority borderline cases who were not able to pay in the first instance. I would be grateful to have that point clarified.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, so much has come out of this debate, but I would like to reply first to some of the questions asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. What surprises me is that he was a member of a Vestry for a number of years and had to do with an almshouse where there are beds and has raised the question of beds at the hospital. The talk

about two patients in a bed particularly in the surgical wards, I would regard as a joke, because I will continue to receive people at the hospital if we have to put three in a bed and put the fourth on the floor.

Now it is not a question of getting beds, and what surprises me is that the hon. member was, I believe a member of the Almshouse Board whether it has operated well or otherwise; but it is not a question of buying a few beds.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of explanation. I have never been on an Almshouse Board or on a Board of Poor Law Guardians.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: The hon. member was a member of the Vestry and would have had to do with the almshouse; however, Sir, it is not a question of buying beds but we must provide floor space. We cannot put the beds in the yard or in the road for that matter; so it is a question of accommodation. We have decided to build a new hospital and my concern is efficiency in that hospital. With that old patch-work system which we have had for 80 years or more, Government in its wisdom decided against spending more money on it, but would build for this country a very efficient hospital with 550 beds. That is the answer in a nutshell. It is not a question of providing beds for the hospital, but you need floor space.

Now the hon. member is asking me to give a detailed break-down of the $25,000 and the number of people in that Institution with outstanding payments, and whether or not it is for food and lodging - that is a single charge for minor charges or X-ray fees. It would involve weeks, if not months, of work to provide that information. You send a bill to an individual for service at the Hospital which probably includes a charge of $4.80 a day for ten days, the X-ray fees for Specialist, Operation fees and so on, but asking for this information is asking for the impossible and reducing the whole thing to a farce, because he knows it is physically impossible to ask for details like these. Some of the people we are collecting from owe $5 and $6 and in some cases $100, and the fees are collected from people who go in the Pay Wards. We never charge for people in the Charity Wards in the 425 beds in the Hospital; there are 46 beds used in the Pay Wards. I do not know what I can say to explain this.

On the question of the 25¢ charge, it was refreshing to hear the Socialist philosophy of the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I think he knows that I am a student and an ardent believer in socialism in all its forms. This charge of 25¢ is nothing new because it has been going on for some twenty-five years. Under the Regulations there is this fee of 24¢; the idea is not for the sake of making revenue from it. I am not concerned about taking money at all, but this is what we find; take the other section of people who have rubbed and wallowed in the scheme of the present-day Vestry system to give poor relief in order to rip through the sense of human dignity and pride to satisfy that authority. That is not the business of the hospital. My concern is to provide an efficient service, and I am happy to say that we are reaching that point. We have a Surgeon Specialist, and here I should say thanks to the hon. member for all he said about Mr. Leacock. I do not know if we will find a second to him in this world, to say nothing about the other officers who are serving. We have a Physician Specialist and a tip-top gentleman as Anaesthetist at the hospital; Government has also spent $15,000 on the training of one officer in medical services. We also have an Ear, Nose and Throat Specialist, and we are coming to you shortly for a Specialist in the Eye Department on a full time basis. If we can provide that service and bring it down to the man in the street, that is what Government is concerned with, and our primary concern at the hospital, apart from having more beds in the charity wards, is to have more beds in the Pay Wards. This 25¢ fee is in keeping with the Socialist belief and ideology in human dignity. There are a lot of people who do not like to use that service free, and just to give the sense of pride, honour and individual dignity, instead of getting all this for nothing, we are charging this fee. There are some patients who go to the Hospital and receive $100 in tablets and anti-biotics which they throw away, and I feel quite satisfied that there should be this nominal fee. If you can make out a case that you cannot pay, it does not rest with the Doctor; there is a higher authority in the Superintendent. There is no case for stopping one individual, but with the shortage of doctors and the pressure on the staff at the Institution, the hon. member must appreciate that there are thirteen thousand persons going through the gate per month. I hope to heaven I could see 40,000 if it means that the standards would go up. My instructions to the staff is that if a person comes in with a cough and cold and they suspect something in his chest, they are not to give him some tablets and let him go. If you suspect a chest condition, no matter what it costs, it should go through the X-ray Department, and if it is going to be a T.B case to be laid up in bed for a year or two, then let us check it at the beginning. If you suspect any disease at the Institution, it should be trapped at the gate. There are some people with a sense of dignity, honour and pride who dislike waiting in a queue to beg for something, and because they are getting this for nothing they abandon $30 or $40 in medicine and tablets. There are people in the middle-class earning $200 a month who go there for free service they can pay for the X-ray. To collect 25¢ from a person would not bring in much revenue, because that would not even pay for the cards which are used in the Department.

4.15 p.m.

The hon. member knows that too. To collect 25¢ from an outdoor patient does not amount to any revenue as regards what it would take for the running of that Department. That would not even pay for the records in the Department which we are now trying to put in shape, but it would give the person a sense of pride and dignity which is so important in a socialist society. Probably, that person may get $200 in surgical treatment for the payment of only 25 cents. You have a lot of people going through that Department and because it is free, they do not value it. I may say that you have some people who actually sleep in the Outpatient Department all night. We want to provide the best of service in that Department. As I have said, we are handling 13,000 people each month in that Department and I believe the figures for this month will be 14,000; but, as I have said, our service there is a service to the community. Think of the number of people who occupy beds in the hospital and the number of people who spend about two years in the T.B. department! That is my concern and my interest. There is nothing new in the charging of the fee of 25 cents. That has been in the regulations ever since. I have seen it in practice in Trinidad and I can tell you that it is not a conservative idea. It is a fact that people dislike the idea of getting something free.

I hope I have answered all the questions. As regards the question of fees, you have specialists' fees paid all over the hospital. As hon. members ought to know, we are using part-time medical practitioners at the hospital in the afternoon. They are more or less paid from salaries and this money goes towards paying some of them fees. I will tell hon. members that very soon we are coming to you for an adjustment in the fees of the Physician Specialist. Nothing was done towards this specialist and as hon. members ought to know the hospital was geared towards surgery. We want to bring in equipment in order that the Physician Specialist would be provided with a service. As a matter of fact, it is only today that I was talking with Mr. Leacock who is going off to the United Kingdom on the 24th of this month. Subject to a discussion which we had in the Ministry sometime ago, he promised to investigate the possibility of the use of a bit of equipment at the Hospital and he told me he would make arrangements if we provided the necessary funds to bring that equipment here. Only today we were talking of X-ray therapy. It cost about $1/4 million for one unit and in discussing the matter with him, he told me the difference was so little that it would justify that expense.

My concern is with preventative medicine and that is

the object of the outdoor department. I have given strong instructions and I have asked them to follow it up wherever they can check all persons to see whether there are cases of tuberculosis: and if there is suspicion that such a person in a case, that person should be taken to the X-ray department and be checked. In Barbados at the moment from our reports there is no need to fear. Hitherto there was a discussion for the need of a Sanatorium for tuberculosis but I can say now that that has disappeared with the advance of medical science. We have been told that there is not much use for them now. In Trinidad, there were two sanatoriums for tuberculosis and they are now converting one into a building for another purpose. Tuberculosis is a disease which can be controlled and it is correct to say that T.B. in Barbados is now under control. I can tell you that 90% of the children entering elementary school are now examined for it so as to arrest the disease if it is present in its early stages. Watch and see what will be the position in the next twenty years as regards this disease.

I do not want to prolong the debate on this matter. I want to assure the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we have seen his point of view and I wish again to point out that I believe in a preventative service. I am a public health man and that is my concern. As regards what I said about the outdoor patients at the General Hospital, if we ask them to pay a fee of twenty-five cents, it is not that we want to pay a doctor out of it; it is because we want to give them a lift. It is more a sociological view. When you do that, you make the individual feel that he is contributing something towards his health and he is not getting it free. As I have said, he can go there and get about $100 in antiobiotics which he would throw down the drain tomorrow and that is my concern.

As I have said, we have less than 10% of the people who pay for their medical expenses. There are only 46 paying beds while there are 425 beds in the general ward. You can therefore see that it is less than 10% of the people who use beds in the paying wards.

I will say in passing that we are now collecting money due to the Waterworks Department. Imagine a water service where you only pay $1.50 a quarter and you have some people in the island from whom you have to collect that rate! I would like to provide a free service at the hospital: but since you cannot provide a free service, do you think that people should scoot out of the gate of the hospital without paying, especially when those people are able to pay? That is wrong. As I have said earlier, the man whom you are worrying about as regards his inability to pay is never in that category because I can tell hon. members again that that person would probably go to the hospital and pay his fees in advance and, in some instances, we have to refund that type of person some money because sometimes he pays for seven days when he may only stay for five or six days.
4.25 p.m.

Do you want to say that people who can pay would leave a sum of $30 unpaid for five years? If you examine the matter you will see that it is unreasonable. I have given firm instructions to the Secretary to send out bills every month for six months before any steps are taken for collection. Then you are threatened with a letter to the effect that the Debt Collector will be sent in. If at the end of six months you pay an instalment, you will probably have another period of three months. We have to teach our people responsibility for the Institution; we are fortunate in having these Specialists operating in the Hospital, thanks to the University College of the West Indies and the general interest of the medical men to make Barbados a safe place in which to live.

Mr. TUDOR: Before you put the question, Mr. Acting Chairman, there is one point which I want to put to the Minister. I have nothing to say with regard to the matters which have been previously debated. If the Minister proposes to make people pay a fee of 25 cents in respect of the Out Patient Department, in many respects he has my sympathy. I think that he should make them pay a fee of 50 cents. If they win an election and can insult the people in this way, then I say that the Minister should make them pay ten times as much. I have no quarrel with the Minister at all.

With respect to the Laundry at the Hospital, the people are complaining that the gentleman who is in charge is very sharp, domineering and tyrannical to them. They complain that at certain times during the day when they want to drink a cup of tea, the regulations are so severe that they cannot be seen drinking a cup of tea; they have to stop behind some pillar so as to drink that cup of tea. It cannot be the wish of the Minister that this state of affairs should continue and if he would speak to the proper authority to allow these people to have whatever time is due to them for refreshment or recreation or leisure during the day - perhaps he will please see to it that that is done.

I have not enquired about this man but he may think that his duties require that he should illtreat these women and prevent them from drinking a cup of tea when they reasonably desire it. This is a complaint which should be investigated in the laundry itself. I have just drawn the matter to the Hon. Minister's attention so that he can make it known that it is entirely against his wish and certainly against the policy of the Government that persons who are employed by them should be deprived of the opportunity of taking a little refreshment.

Hon. F E. MILLER: It is a pity that the hon. member did not put what he has said in the form of a question because he has made many requests and when I make a check I find that the position is exactly the opposite. The remarks have been rather vulgar, they do not touch on the matter before us at all and I therefore treat them with the contempt they deserve.

Mr. TUDOR: What has the Hon. Minister said is vulgar? The fact that I have brought a complaint against a Department for which he is responsible? I have drawn a matter to his attention.....

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: This vote is with regard to the Hospital; there is nothing directly about the laundry in it.

Mr. TUDOR: If you will look at Note No. 9 you will see that this is what is stated:

"On account of an increase in the price of natural gas and the necessity to use diesel oil for the laundry boiler in place of the cheaper oil formerly used, supplementary provision of $3,000 is requested."

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is in respect of the running of the laundry; that is nothing to do with the staff.

Mr. TUDOR: Are you saying that I cannot talk about the laundry?

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I gave you a little latitude.

Mr. TUDOR: You did not give me any latitude; that was my right.

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: If you read carefully you will see that as to the matter which you took up just now, you could have dealt with it in a different way. You have gone too far with that.

Mr. TUDOR: You cannot tell me that; why should you protect the Minister and allow him to insult an hon. member and then when I rise in protest you tell me that I am going too far?

Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN: I allowed you to speak on the Hospital.

Mr. TUDOR: With the greatest respect; it is not that you allowed me to speak on the Hospital; you could

not allow or disallow that. It is within my right to speak on the Hospital.

The question that Head XXIII (2) General Hospital stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIX – MISCELLANEOUS

Head XXIX – Miscellaneous was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with this matter it is well within the knowledge of this House that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has elected to send one of its members on a Parliamentary Course to the United Kingdom, and it is proposed that this sum of $2,000 should be paid over to the Local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I take this opportunity to mention that the Government intends to put a sum of money in the Estimates every year at the disposal of the Local Branch of the Parliamentary Association to be spent on occasions of this sort. It has been repeatedly said that such a thing should be done and I therefore take the opportunity to say that we have begun to do it this year. I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

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

4.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this is the first occasion on which I will be drawing to the attention of the taxpayers of Barbados that there is a kind of - I do not know if to call it an Organisation, a body of Free Masons or an anomalous section called the Barbados Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Now this is the biggest fiction that we have in this island of Barbados at present, because the members of this Association abide by no Rules, they pay no subscriptions, they are not proposed and seconded, neither are they elected; they belong to the Parliamentary Association by virtue merely of being members of the Legislature, so there will be twenty-four members of this Hon. Chamber, and let us say, at any one time fifteen members of the Other Place who are supposed to be members of this Association, myself included.

Now what I want to draw to the attention of the public is this: this Association performs no useful function at all; it is an extension perhaps of the Imperial Organisations whose sole purpose is to perpetuate the memory of the nearly departed British Empire and to provide joy rides for members of Parliament from one part of the Commonwealth to the other. All of that is very laudable, Mr. Chairman, if the people of Barbados used to benefit in any way from these excursions undertaken by members of this House to other territories from time to time. Now what I deplore about the Parliamentary Association is this: it neither acts as an Association nor as a democratic body. Whenever a letter arrives in this colony from the Secretary in the United Kingdom or wherever he may happen to be from time to time, we are hastily summoned to a meeting of the Other Place not as a Legislature but as constituent members of the Association, using the word in its most important sense, and called upon to vote not as representatives of the people, but as individuals, to send some member either of the Legislature or any other favoured person off to the United Kingdom or any of the four corners of the earth on an expensive trip.

I have never joined this Association; I want to get that clear; I do not even attend its meetings, and I do not think any member of this House is committing a conscious act of attending or subscribing to the programme and policy of this anomalous body which calls itself a Parliamentary Association. I am dealing specifically with Head XXIX, Item 79 (New).

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: we should examine carefully the economy here in Barbados, the things which the Government have been telling us they have not been able to do because of the limited finances of this country before we commit the taxpayers of Barbados to the expenditure of any sum of money to send anyone to the United Kingdom or to any other place on a Parliamentary course. My idea about Parliament is that any person who puts himself forward as a candidate for election to the General Assembly of this island should acquaint himself with Parliamentary Procedure, and his qualifications and his interest in Parliamentary Procedure and Practice and in the constitution of this island should be properly canvassed by him or her before he even has the temerity to offer himself as a candidate for elections. The irony of this whole situation is that I believe that the letter sent to the Clerk of this House on this particular occasion was that somebody should be sent who would be able to benefit from a Parliamentary course.

There are obviously numerous people in Barbados who could benefit from a Parliamentary course, but it is also self-evident that there are many people on that side of this House who would never be able to benefit from a Parliamentary course; and furthermore, I think that it is an insult to members of Parliament to suggest to them that they need a Parliamentary course. All the Parliamentary course anyone would normally need could be found within the four corners of the Rules of this House . Any other matter of procedure or practice is a matter for the individual member to take the trouble either to buy himself May's Parliamentary Practice or to go to the Public Library and read Campion on the Practice and Procedure of the House of Commons or read Jennings or Dicey or any of the great writers on the Constitution; all these in my opinion are the prerequisites for candidature to the House of Assembly. Therefore these Parliamentary courses that we are called upon to vote money for add up to nothing more or less than a kind of prize at Speech Day for good behaviour or for keeping your mouth shut when in the House of Assembly. It is also significant that although we meet not as a Government, not as a Legislature because we meet jointly with the Other Place, not on the command of His Excellency the Governor but on the instructions of the Clerk passed on to His Honour the Speaker of this House, the members of the Other Place have been inveigled into the position in which they never exercise their democratic right of voting as members of a Parliamentary Association on the personnel who should go on these expensive trips. The whole thing therefore is absolutely ridiculous to say the least and I do not think that the taxpayers should be called upon to provide education for members of the Legislature. If they want to be educated, we have good facilities here at the Public Library, and I am positive that no one can benefit from a course of four or twelve weeks duration if, for all the time he or she might have been a member of the Legislature, he has not displayed the slightest interest in furthering his knowledge by reading and by making himself acquainted with the material which is already at his disposal not only in the Public Library, not only on sale at booksellers but even inside this House. There are some members who have not taken the trouble and cannot tell you how to spell "May"; I say seriously that there are some members of this House who cannot spell the name of Sir Erskine May; they do not know if it is "Meye", "Maye", "Mayh" or anything else. They cannot tell you that it is "May", and although we have Campion here and the other books in the Library, Mr. Chairman, I can send for the Library Borrowing Book and I guarantee you will never find the name of the hon. member who has been selected to go on this course taking one book on Parliamentary Practice out of the Library of the Barbados House of Assembly. I make that challenge here and now. I am saying that blindly because I have not examined the Borrowing Book of the Library of the Barbados House of Assembly, but I guarantee, Sir, that you will find that the particular person chosen for this course has not even taken the trouble to borrow one book from the Library of the Barbados House of Assembly to show that he is interested in Parliamentary Procedure.

We have to be very careful in a small impoverished island in so far as the taxpayers are concerned that we do not live above our means. Every time we receive an

invitation to go to a Parliamentary Conference we should not accept it like that; everytime we receive an invitation to send someone not necessarily of the Legislature, we should not make it a Prize Day or Speech Day or Prize Giving, and I was just in time - at the door - to hear the hon. member who had just been chosen - I would not like to say elected - by the Government Party to go to this course, make a most pathetic speech thanking members of the Legislature for sending him on a course. It is clear, too, that we have never sent anybody outside the Government Party on these courses or Conferences; they never have done or never will do it because they regard it strictly as a Party matter.
4.45 p.m

I was in time to hear the most pathetic speech by the hon. member thanking members of the Legislature for sending him on a course and he is a representative of the people. He is thankful for small mercies. He has been in this House for the last twelve or thirteen years and after being pushed and shoved around from one promise to another, the only thing he can get out of his long period, apart from his salary at the end of the month, is a six or ten week's trip to the United Kingdom and, no doubt, he would go around and look at some nice buildings, attend a banquet or so and tell other people whom he happens to meet what a wonderful thing it is to be a member of the British Empire and how wealthy the people of Barbados are and that he is quite satisfied with what is going on. When he comes back here and may happen to take the Chair on some occasion, we will still be subjected to the same kind of peculiar exercises of his jurisdiction as we have had in the past. Two thousand dollars is a lot of money to send anybody on a vacation in the United Kingdom. Two thousand dollars is a lot of money to allow a Government Party to hand out patronage to one of their less fortunate brethren on the Government benches who is not fortunate enough to become a Minister. In other words, this idea of public service is generating into a function of how much you can get out of the Treasury and what you can get out of it. We have to equate the spending of the taxpayers' money to the benefit of the taxpayers and not to what a party or individual can derive from the expenditure of that particular sum of money. There can be no other considerations. As far as I am concerned, I am not in any way envious of anybody who goes on a Parliamentary course but I am a taxpayer. As a matter of fact, I would be insulted if anybody sent me on a Parliamentary Course. I would be highly insulted because I think that I should have equipped myself on parliamentary matters before I came into this Chamber and on the practice and procedure of Parliament rather than wait until I have been in here for someone to say that I should go up to England to see how Parliament conducts itself.

I would like to say this. If the Parliamentary Association were to make a levy on the people who are supposed to be members of that Association so as to send anybody to England on a Parliamentary course, you would then find out what many members of the Government would think of the efficacy of such a course. Let us say that there are forty members of the Legislature. Two thousand dollars divided by forty for sending someone on this particular excursion would mean that if a voluntary levy was called, the sum of $50 would have to be subscribed by every member of this Parliament and if that is so, I doubt very much that the hon. member who is favoured with this particular excursion would be able to reach Trinidad. I say that without any fear of contradiction. The taxpayers are paying for it because it is not your money that has to be voted. If every member of the Government everytime they committed the Treasury of this Island to an expenditure of this kind would give the matter the same kind of weighty consideration which they would give to the expenditure of their private monies, we would have a lot better control of our finances than we have at present. It is not a question that the person going is the hon. junior member for St. Michael or that I have anything against him; the only thing I have against him is that he does not open his mouth to represent the people; he only opens his mouth to vote. I am not criticising him for his ignorance of parliamentary procedure; the only thing that I would criticise him for is that he did not acquaint himself with parliamentary procedure before he sought to be a candidate for this House ten or twelve years ago. I am not criticising him because I think that he would not be able to benefit from this course, because I do not think if a person passes the age of 21 or 22 years you can teach him something new; I never subscribed to that idea. I am not criticising the individual selected on this or any grounds. This is not the first time that I have said this. Five or six years ago I protested against the farcical idea of a Commonwealth Association in Barbados whose sole function was to meet together so that the Government could send some favoured person on a conference or an excursion such as the one which the hon. junior member for St. Michael is indulging in. The idea that this is some brotherhood or some wide association of people having similar ideas is absolutely ridiculous. Our sole function is to make further demands on the people of Barbados and for that reason, I do not attend any meetings of the Association or any of the banquets or tea-parties given by that Association. In the same way, I do not believe that members of this House should expect to drink tea in here without paying for it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I take a different view from the hon. junior member for St. John on this matter, although I agree with him on certain things as regards procedure. As a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association by the fact of being elected a member of this Chamber, surely I have more privileges than I have here. If I go to London, I can travel on a train at half fare although I have never travelled that way because most of the time that I am going out of London, I am going to see a cricket match and I do not like to think that I am travelling at a subsidised rate when I am on my own business.

However, I am glad to hear the Hon. Premier say what he did. What I found in South Australia is that they provide in Parliament an amount of money which the South Australian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association controlled in such a way that they can send two or three members out on a trip to another country to see things for themselves. That is not in the same way as the Barbados branch controls it. I do not know if the Hon. Premier is wedded to the idea that if you are sending out a parliamentary delegation or a member of the branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association that such a delegation or member should be of the Government's Party. If he is wedded to that idea, that is not the purpose of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. If hon. members were to go and read the origin of this Association, they would see that it never was put on a party basis. There is no partisanship in the Association. If you go anywhere as a member of that Association, you do not create Government policy, nor anything that you do commits your Government. The whole idea of the origin of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is to bring the various members of Parliaments from the different branches together. In the old days it was called the Empire Parliamentary Association, but the word "Empire" has been dropped because those of us who have some sense of equality and dignity do not like the word "Empire"; we feel that the word "Commonwealth" is more to our liking. The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association consists of members from the Parliaments of India, Australia, Canada and even South Africa as well as all the colonies. The idea of the Association is to bring men of the various Parliaments together irrespective of their political views, but unfortunately I find here in recent years that the Government feels it must be a member of the Government Party to be selected if you are sending someone on a meeting of the Association as if you are a sort of member of the Association by being a member of the Government.

Now, the Hon. Premier says that he has just put some money in the Estimates to be used for this purpose.
4.55 p.m.
I do not know if he means that whenever you receive an invitation you will have the money for it. My idea is that if we feel that in every three years one should go out-

for instance, in South Australia, they decide that they will send three of their members to selected places for the purpose of meeting other Parliamentarians in those places. That is not controlled by the Parliamentary Association; it is controlled by the Australian Parliament in South Australia. On the last occasion there was a group sent out to India and Pakistan.

I feel that the time has come when we should adopt a system like that.As far as Trinidad is concerned, the Speaker of the Federal House of Representatives is going to th same Parliamentary Conference, but I do not think that he would need a course in Parliamentary procedure. I regard the matter more as a question of meeting people and seeing the House of Commons - it is a visit more so than a course. As the hon. member who has just sat down has rightly said, you cannot absorb a Parliamentary Course in any four weeks; Parliament is something of a life institution. I knew more about this House of Assembly when I came here than many of those who came in before me; I made three speeches on the same day on which I came into this House because I was preparing for it.

There are certain sections in this House; there is the Government section and the sections over here; and when it comes to a question of a Parliamentary Course it is not merely a matter for members of the Government. If this is what it is intended to do, I should like to know if the Premier intends to do that and if he wants to perpetuate that system. Let us take a practical view of the matter. I have been in Parliament long enough to know that we would have no objection to the hon. member who has been selected to attend this Parliamentary Course going on this Course; but that hon. member is going on this Course because on the last occasion the Hon. Minister of Agriculture had a liking to go to India. I believe that at some time or other they will send out the hon. junior member for St. James. That would crown his political ambition; an old boy getting into Parliament is like a young boy getting his first kiss. *(Laughter)*. In the evening of your days, what more could you look forward to but dying? And therefore this visit would be a crown to the hon. junior member for St. James. If you look at the lady member of this House you will feel: "Well, she has not been there yet", *(Laughter)*. I do not look at this matter in any light way. The hon senior member for St. Philip did not go to the U.K. (Mr. CRAWFORD: Purely because I did not want to go) but it is still the experience of a Parliamentarian to understand what Parliament is like. Those who speak about England from afar are different from those who have been to England. We have some people who have been to England but you cannot live as an Englishman in England and do not respect democracy. I have been in England and I have lived with people who have different political views. I have lived with Communist members of the Electrical Trade Union. I have been on the Duke of Edinburgh Conference and you know that people would say things, but they respect the machinery which gave them the power over their unions, because they said that it was on account of the ballot box that they were there, and they accepted it. Do not let us get this idea that this is a 'meeting turn' which we are running; that is to say, you had the last turn last time and therefore you must have the first turn now. *(Laughter)*.

In England you will find that the Labour Party is not the Government but you will find a member of the Labour Party going out. When you regard Liberals in the House of Commons today, what do they represent? I am saying that it is not that I have any desire to go out, but the Government Party will put a lot of nondescript people on a Committee and they think that they are doing me something. As you know, the Trade Union Movement is something for which you have to fight. Do you think that the people of this community regard all the members on that side of the House as being more worthy than I am? All of them ran up against me in the Elections and now I am back here with them! Why is that? It is because the community has accepted me as being worthwhile to be here. Do you want to tell me that the Hon. Dr. Cato deserves more from the Barbadian community than any of us who have been in politics for all of these years?

5.05 p.m.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that you should have this Parliamentary Association working in such a manner that a member from either of the Houses could go on these courses, because you are not dealing with Government policy, and you are not sending a member to a Conference as a reward. Let me put it this way; how do you know that the hon. junior member for St. James, the hon. junior member for the City or the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is more deserving of being sent from Barbados on a Parliamentary Course than the hon. senior member for St. Philip who has been in this Parliament since 1940? The hon. member for St. Philip might object, but I am making my speech. The hon.member for St. Philip has been here since 1940 and this is 1959 while the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has only been here during this Session. I feel that you should reach the stage when you have a Committee of the Barbados Branch, and when it comes to the question of dealing with these things you should work it out on the basis that if there are three members going to the Conference, because of the numerical strength of the Party in power you could send two from that side and one from this side. If you are going to send one member and on the last occasion one was sent from that side, then you should send one from this side on this occasion. When we meet as a Parliamentary Association there is no fight or opposition; there is a oneness. I feel that in the United Kingdom there are Committees in the House of Commons dealing with these things, and if the Leader of the Parliamentary Association is told that So-and-So will be nominated, there is no quarrel. Here we are getting on in Parliament like little children sharing out plums, and if you are not on my side you are not getting any. You are not acting like full-fledged Parliamentarians.

I do not subscribe to the view that we should not have these things. The majority of members in this House are young members comparatively speaking - young in Parliament and young in years - and I feel that going out and mixing with people is more than the course itself, because you cannot run a course of this nature in four weeks. What can the Speaker of the Federal House learn on Parliamentary Procedure when he has been a Judge and making decisions on these matters beside being a member of this Parliament nearly thirty years ago? You can never pass the stage of people meeting and sharing views, and I do hope that the proposition of the Premier of putting this in the Budget is with a view to protecting the concept of our Parliament and not to perpetuate the idea that you are only waiting until an invitation comes from the Secretary, whether it is an invitation to go to the United Kingdom or to any of the West Indian Islands. Although we are part of the Federation I doubt very much whether enough members of this Chamber have been associated with the Jamaican community. I would like to see a delegation from Barbados going to Jamaica, and these should be taken from all sides of the House because there is no rank at stake. People would go on the delegation, sleep in the same hotel and live together for three or four weeks, and their whole concept on life would change; and although in debate they fight on different sides as far as Parliament is concerned yet when it comes to these matters they show a united front.

If this is what the Premier has in mind, it is an excellent idea and something we should all agree with, because if over three years we can accumulate $6,000 by budgeting for $2,000 each year in the Estimates, then that money could be used on these things. It would be a very good idea for Parliament as a whole and therefore when we meet as an Association there would be no question of the Government sending someone everytime.

I must congratulate the hon. member who has been chosen. I believe he is one of those easy-going people and you must have people in this world like him. He is like one of those worms that do not turn and it is a good thing for him, because he has missed so many things in his own Parliamentary life that if this has caught up

with him now, we would not begrudge him the opportunity of going to the United Kingdom. I would say that as a course I do not believe it is going to do him much good, because he is not really a Parliamentarian; a Parliamentarian is a man who in Parliament participates in what is going on in Parliament; he is a politician and this is an excursion for him. His Party does not allow members to participate in Parliamentary life, because with all his years in the Party he would have been elevated long ere now, but they do not regard him as a Parliamentarian. You cannot go on stepping on people all the time; you must show some facade of goodwill, and I will join in that facade of offering my good wishes in his trip to the United Kingdom. I think it would be too early for me and he might get back before I get there; otherwise, being more familiar with the United Kingdom, I would have undertaken to show him a little more of London life with all the dignity attached to it which I am sure he would be proud to see. I do want to offer my congratulations to the hon. member and to congratulate the Premier with the hope that what he has said will work along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, while I must agree with the hon. junior member for St. John that this amount of money should not be borne by the taxpayers, yet I cannot subscribe to the reasons that he gave. A Parliamentary Association, Sir, by an interchange of ideas does in my opinion a lot of good, because it brings together people of all Parties and many nations from all over the world, and it is only by knowing what is going on outside the world that we can hope to progress.
5.15 p.m.

Where I do agree that this should not be paid by the taxpayers is because in my opinion it should be borne by each hon. member sitting around this Hon. Chamber and in the Other Place. If we are to make of this Association what it is in other parts of the world, we should be willing to subscribe towards the expenses. If we are going to continue to take the taxpayers' monies to run our Association, it is obvious that interest is not going to be taken in it and it is obvious that the Government in power using the taxpayers' money towards it will use it according as to how they think best which naturally would always be in the interest of the Government in power.

As I see it, this Association which is an Association that publishes numerous Parliamentary debates and other information is worthwhile to support but I question why it must be supported by the taxpayers. It is on that point to some degree that I agree with the hon. junior member for St. John. Why must taxpayers pay for the furthering of our parliamentary education? I feel that any public servant in an office such as that which we hold should have sufficient interest in it to pay out of his salary which he is getting today to further his own particular interest. This is not in the interest of the taxpayers as such; it is in the interest of the particular person who is a member of this House. If you read these debates you will see that this is to further his knowledge and to further his parliamentary knowledge. That is the reason why I cannot subscribe to the idea of the taxpayers' paying for this opportunity of a member to go on an excursion in so many instances.

I would also like to add that the person chosen for this particular trip is one whom I have always found to be impartial and willing to learn; therefore I think a good choice has been made. But I do feel that he may not gain from the trip owing to the short duration of the course. I do feel that if we pay for these things out of our own pockets we would benefit more.

Mr. BRANCKER: Sir, unless it be for the reasons which have been advanced by the hon. senior member for St. Peter or some other reason which the Hon. Premier would acquaint us on later, I am not convinced of the desirability of putting this as an annual item in the Estimates. As you know, these courses are alleged to be of an educational nature, whatever we may think of them, and their purpose is to acquaint members and officials of this Legislature, and in the various Legislatures, with certain parliamentary knowledge in a manner which they can best acquire it, that is, from the Mother of Parliaments.

We have actually gone the limit of sending our officials in this House and our leading members in connection with these courses, as you are fully aware, and this is the argument which I am raising against putting this matter in the Estimates as if we are justified in looking forward every year onwards for someone to take these courses. His Honour the Speaker has already enjoyed the benefit from one of these courses. His Honour the Deputy Speaker has also brought back to this Parliament the benefit of one of these courses. The Librarian has also taken a similar course and returned to us and published a little booklet on Parliamentary Procedure as a result of the course. Our Clerk has taken such a course and we saw the benefit of it in the energy with which he looked after the Parliamentary delegates and officials whom he met in his travels while they were here the other day. Now, this course has been allocated to the Chairman of Committees: so there is really nobody else left to enjoy the benefit of these courses unless and until a new composition of the House takes place in 1961 when I am sure there would be a new Chairman of Committees and certain other new officials and certain other new offices which certainly need to be seen around this Table today. As a matter of fact, after the Chairman of Committees has completed his course, there remains only the Marshal who has never had the benefit of such a course and who, I am sure, will benefit as much as the Clerk, the Librarian or any other member of this House. To put it in the Budget when there is only one other official for whom it is to benefit does seem to me purposeless unless it is for the reason to which the hon. senior member for St. Peter referred. As a matter of fact, it is common belief that if the hon. senior member for St. Michael had not shared with His Hon. the Deputy Speaker such a course, he may not now be able to lead the House as he has been, as a result of the course which he enjoyed the other day. I repeat, apart from the Chairman of Committees and the Marshal who has not yet has his turn, everybody has had one; therefore, what is the reason of putting it in the Budget if it is regarded purely as an educational course - a course from which you learn something and because of which you would be in the august position to assist other people who have not had the advantage of such a course? I do not know if it is that you are being groomed to be the next Chairman of Committees so that after the Marshal, you would benefit- and who would grace the Chair more than you undoubtedly do today? That is the reason given by the hon. senior member for St. Peter unless, of course, the Hon. Premier will explain another reason which he might have in mind.

Sir, we do not like these things put in the Estimates and then they remain there and we have no control of them. It is better that we have control over them by our voting for them or rescinding them than that we have to tolerate them there year after year. If the Hon. Premier will tell us, well then I will learn what he has in mind as the principal reason or reasons for proposing to put this item in the Estimates as from the coming year.
5.25 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am most amazed and bewildered to hear this debate this afternoon. One would not imagine that it is only two weeks ago that we met in the Other Place to select somebody to go on this Parliamentary course. Now the impression given by the debate this afternoon is that hon. members on this side are the only people who have the right to choose a representative to go abroad. I want to say that the members of the Opposition were there, as you know, Sir, and also members of the Other Place-- about 37 or 38 persons. The Chairman of Committees was nominated to attend this course; there was only one nomination from among the 38 persons present.

The impression given by this debate is that the members of the Government sat down and nominated one of their members to go on a joy-ride. As I have said,

there was only one nomination and now you hear this debate which has been going on this afternoon! The hon. junior member for St. John has said that he does not attend those meetings, but I am quite sure that I saw him there.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I would advise the Premier that when he is making these rash and unguarded statements, he should check his facts very, very carefully. When the hon. member was making his speech expressing his gratitude for the small mercies extended to him, I was so much depressed that I was standing outside in the gallery witnessing this very unbecoming perfromance from a responsible man. It is the most depraved position I have ever seen.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I feel fairly sure that I saw the hon.member there. I have enquired of other hon. members who were there and they have said that the hon. member was there. I am sure that I saw him there occupying a seat behind me; the hon. member was there, and therefore he had the opportunity right there and then to say all that he has been saying this afternoon, and to make another nomination if he wanted to do so.

Mr. BARROW: I have already pointed to the hon. member, who should know better, that he should not repeat statements which are unwarranted by the facts. I pushed my head through the gallery window and saw the hon. member making his speech andI made a comment to one of the Reporters. Inever went near the Chamber; I do not believe in these meetings.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In connection with the Course itself, I think I myself made the nomination of the Chairman of Committees to go on this course. A Course of this sort, a Course in Parliamentary procedure must be helpful to an hon. member who is occupying the Chair. It may be that the Course is not long enough- it could have been longer - but the hon. member will attend the Parliament in England and I think in Northern Ireland and he must benefit to some extent from this Course.

The hon. junior member for St. John said that if he were offered such a Course he would feel that he had been insulted. Well, I heard over the radio that Mr. Erskine Ward, who is a brilliant lawyer, a man who has reached the Chief Justiceship of British Honduras and is now presently the Speaker of the Federal House of Representatives, is going on that Course. I do not think that he feels that he knows all about Parliamentary Procedure. I think that Mr. Duke who is also a retired Puisne Judge and who is now Speaker of the Legislative Council of Trinidad, is one of the delegates. A few years ago Sir Donald Jackson had a similar course and now these hon. members say that this is a waste of time and it is a question of going on a joy ride! I want to put in the record the procedure which is used in selecting these candidates and to correct the impression that it is done only by a handful of members here. The procedure is that the whole House is invited - the members of the Government and of the Opposition - and the members of the Other Place. We all meet and select a candidate. There was one nomination, as I have already said, and now we hear all this talk. It is intended to put a sum of money in the Estimates so that when hon. members, whether of this Place or of the Other Place are selected to go out- I have known members of the Other Place to be selected to go - the funds will be there instead of our having to come to the House every now and again for them. If the money is not used, then it remains in the Treasury.

Mr. WALCOTT: What the Premier has said is true, but you have to be very pragmatical about these things. He knows that when members are invited, the attitude of the members of the Other Place in these matters is that they are not interested unless a member from that side is interested. The only occasion, I think, when a member was interested was when the Hon. Dr. Cato, a member of the Other Place was nominated by the Premier to go out.

5.35 p.m.

It is true, as the Premier said, that you can nominate somebody because the whole body meets, but what we are saying is that the idea is for the Government to nominate a member of the Government, and then you would find yourself in an unfortunate position. It has never happened but I heard it whispered on one occasion that if there is an adverse vote taken against the Government, they could refuse to vote the money. It has never been done and it is for the Premier to see it rectified...

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I want to correct that statement. As long as it is the decision of the local Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, their wishes will be carried out on whomever they decide; therefore I do not want the impression to be given that if there is an adverse vote the Government would not bring it down. We have not gone that low yet.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would not have to remind the Premier because there are too many discussions going on about what you would or would not do on a decision, because there is a decision of the people which is far more important than the Parliamentary Association. What I thought the Premier would have understood me to say was not only that I agreed with this course, but I indicated on the floor of this House already that it would be for the Local Branch to make the decision if it were going to send somebody, and I thought the Premier had that in mind. I can see the need for two or three Parliamentarians going to Jamaica from the point of view of seeing how the Jamaican Parliament runs, and all I was saying was that instead of reducing it to the stage where you now have an open vote, it could be by arrangement with both sides of the House to send someone, and if the Premier agrees to this method and somebody is sent from the Government side on this occasion, then you would expect to find somebody going from the other side on another occasion.

It does not seem to me necessary to vote for a matter like this because it is for a member of our Branch and we should always be willing to send a Member of our Branch if one is invited; but I was going a step further and asking whether you agreed with voting money so that the member might have an extended period. I do not accept what the hon. junior member for St. John said, because in these things I believe it does a Parliamentarian good to mix with other Parliamentarians outside. What I want to know from the Premier is whether he is in agreement with the idea of expanding the present system of putting this money in the Estimates, or would agree that the Local Branch should have the right to send somebody without receiving an invitation.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will read the note, he will see that this amount is required as a grant to the local branch of the Parliamentary Association for meeting expenses; this will be put at the disposal of the Parliamentary Association which will see that it is spent when we have passed it. I hope that satisfies the hon. member.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal first with the hon. member who has just sat down. He made the repeated statement that I was present at the meetings. I have already said that I was not present at the last meeting at which the member who has now been granted the facility for this excursion was elected. I said that I was out in the Gallery and the hon. senior member for St. Peter who spoke did not attend either nor did the hon. member for Christ Church nor the hon. senior member for St. Philip. To suggest that this Parliamentary Association is some democratic Organisation in which each man has the right to vote and listen to the different opinions expressed and vote according to their consciences is the biggest joke of the 20th Cenetury, and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Premier, should be the last person to try to give the impression, which is a false impression, that such is the case, because I well remember that towards the end of 1953 when our Gracious Sovereign, Her Majesty the Queen,was going to Jamaica -

and I will talk everything now - we went into the Legislative Chamber to send two people up to Jamaica on the invitation of the Government of Jamaica from the Parliamentary Association.

I challenge the Premier to show me one Minute of the Association. It does not even function like a Tennis Club and keep a Minute Book and Subscription Book. Be that as it may, let us get back to the point. I got up thinking it was a democratic Organisation and proposed the Hon. Mrs. Hanschell and the Hon. senior member for St. Andrew who is now in her place, being the two lady members of Parliament, feeling that it would only be fitting in Her Majesty's year of Coronation and on the occasion of the visit that we should represent the women folk of Barbados by sending the only woman member of the Other Place and the only lady member *mutatis mutandis* of the House of Assembly. Now, Sir, that was the last occasion on which the members of the Other Place have even voted at a meeting of the Association and I will tell you why they did not vote after that. After I put forward this suggestion, the Government Party spearheaded by the then leader of the Government -we did not have Ministerial Government yet - Mr. G. H. Adams put forward the present Premier the Hon. Dr. Cummins and the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke in preference to the two members whom I suggested. All the members of the Legislature looked very embarrassed but they voted in favour of his nomination, and he padded up and flew away very quickly.

Now I was very depressed to see that people of long experience in politics should attach so much importance to going up to Jamaica that they would trample over all the faces of the women folk in Barbados to go up to Jamaica on a trip. There was no Parliamentary Conference involved there. When the meeting was over, a member of the Other Place - I will not call his name because I do not think it is necessary to do so now- said that he was sorry that I did not acquaint the members of the Other Place and make my suggestion before meeting to send the two lady members of Parliament, because all they were trying to do that day was to prevent the President of the Legislative Council, Dr. Massiah, from going and that, as he put it, Cummins was a compromise candidate. I will talk because if he is going to get up and say that I subscribe to any of that voluntarily, I will tell the Hon. Premier that he was a compromise candidate because they wanted to prevent Dr. Massiah from going, and the reason he was nominated was because they did not want that and they would have been glad to have the lady members whom I had proposed.

The next year when the member for St. Michael and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph the Deputy Speaker went to a Conference in England, we were all members of the same Government Party and various suggestions were put forward, and Mr. Adams called all the members of the Legislative Council aside and had a little private meeting with them in a corner. They agreed with Mr. Adams that this is a matter which concerned the House of Assembly and they were not voting. From then they did not vote and yet the Premier says that all 37 members have a right to vote and that it is a democratic procedure they have or words to that effect. I would ask him to name one occasion since the now Present Speaker refused to go to New Zealand for financial or other reasons and Fred Bethell went that any member of the Opposition Party or of the Other Place has been granted one of these Parliamentary Conferences or otherwise outside of this island.

5.45 p.m.

I would like him to name one single occasion and I would like him to state here now that they did not make it a party issue. On the occasion of the appointment of the hon. senior member for St. Michael and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, who apparently, did not see eye to eye with each other after they left these shores, they went their separate ways as far as I can understand when they landed in the United Kingdom although they were members of the same party and I do not know what would happen if they had appointed members from both parties; but when somebody who is supposed to be responsible and who should command our respect, instead of being that, gets up and makes rash statements well knowing the sort of history of the dealings of the members of the Other Place, I consider their conduct to be sordid and that they are playing ball and conniving with the Leader of the Government to the dereliction of people who properly represent the Island of Barbados. On a public occasion when we sent the Hon. Premier in dereliction of Dr. Messiah who is the President of the Other Place and we sent Sir Archibald Cuke although we had Mrs. Hanschell of the Other Place and our lady member of this Place, Mrs. Hanschell being on the eve of her retirement, we find the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the now Premier of Barbados rushing in and padding up just as if some bequest was running upon his head. I object to the expenditure of public funds on principle when members are not prepared to put their hands in their pockets and make individual contributions towards what they consider to be a worthy cause but which I consider to be entirely undeserving.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Sir, there is a lot which can be said of the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. John and I notice that the other hon. members who have spoken, especially the hon. senior member for St. Peter — their remarks were well taken. It is quite fitting that people do not agree and it is a general rule that one seldom agrees with the hon. junior member for St. John: so one needs not belabour that point any longer.

However, I think there is just one other slight misstatement made by the hon. member and I believe it is either *lapsus linguae* or a slip of the memory. I would just like to remind the hon. junior member for St. John that he was physically and bodily present at the last meeting of the Parliamentary Association. He did come into the Council Chamber late, it is true, but it was in a spirit of friendliness that I beckoned him to come in and he came in and sat next to my side in the presence of the hon. senior member for St. Philip. I will also remind him that earlier he had called members of the Government benches kleptomaniacs and I said to him after he had come into the room:"Kleptomaniac, come here;" and he said to me: "why did you not try to explain the meaning of kleptomaniac to the hon. members over there."

Mr. BARROW: Sir, the hon. member and myself met after the meeting just by the steps outside of the Lobby. It was not inside the Chamber at all. He is making fun.

Mr. STRAUGHN: However, I am just reminding him that it is just a slight mistake by him and I am sure if the hon. senior member for St. Philip taxes his memory, he will remember that he and I were sitting together when I beckoned to the hon. junior member for St. John to come in. He was present when the Hon. C. W. W. Greenidge paid a compliment to the Clerk of this Chamber for the efficient manner in which he had carried out his duties when the Parliamentary delegation was here and asked whether they considered giving the Clerk a honorarium for his services. He was also present at the opening ceremony of the Joint Session; therefore it is not true that he does not attend these meetings; he may not have much interest in them but at times he is present.

Mrs. BOURNE: Sir, it is seldom that I enter these debates but certainly the hon. junior member for St. John is short of memory because I am sure he arrived and took his seat at the invitation of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and, if I remember hearing correctly, the hon. senior member for St. Philip said that he was there also.

Mr. BARROW: I know whom I saw outside.

Mrs. BOURNE: However, Sir, there is just one other small point which I want to make. In the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. John, he said that the hon. junior member for St. Michael who is now appointed to go on the Parliamentary Course made a very pathetic speech and even if the hon. member said he was in the corridor, I can assure you that I was sitting right behind the hon. junior member for St. Michael, the hon. junior member for St. James was on my right and the hon. senior member for St. Philip on my left; and trying to find out what the

hon. junior member for St. Michael had said, I asked the two hon. members who sat on my left and right respectively and they said that they did not hear; therefore, the hon. junior member for St. John must have had a very keen ear to hear him if he were outside. I am not saying that he did not hear but I did not hear, neither the hon. member on my right nor left could assist me in telling me what he said.

I also heard the hon. member say that since the occasion when Mrs. Hanschell and myself were nominated by the Opposition to go to Jamaica....

Mr. BARROW: I said that I was a member of the Government Party then and I stated that I nominated the hon. member and Mrs Hanschell. I am not surprised that she did not hear the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Michael she cannot hear in here.

Mrs. BOURNE: I said "the Opposition." I do not know if the hon. member is ashamed of being a member of the Oppo sition. However, I understood him to say that since then, the members of the Other Place have not taken part in the voting.

Mr. BARROW: Again, the hon. member is mistaken. The last time I have attended such meetings was when the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. Michael were nominated. I have never attended any meetings since then, therefore I do not know.

Mrs. BOURNE: The members of the Other Place have certainly taken part. They voted for the Clerk of this Chamber on the occasion when he was selected to go on a similar course. I do not think the Clerk has any political obligations; I do not know to which side of this House he belongs; he does not belong to any political party in this Chamber. I only made these points because I consider that it is a question of putting the record straight.

5.55 p.m.

If the members of the Government sit here and take things easily, it would appear as if what the other side has said is true. I know that everybody is convinced that the hon. junior member for St. John was in truth and in fact present on that occasion. We have already agreed in prinicple to send this hon. member on this Parliamentary Course and I think that what we should now concern ourselves with is the question of voting this money. If we feel that this money will be thrown down the drain, then we should not have agreed to send this delegate to this Conference. A lot of time is being wasted around this Table with this discussion when a more useful purpose would be served in the interest of the people of this colony. Members of the Opposition had an ample opportunity; any hon. member who wanted to oppose the sending of this delegate to this Conference could have done so. I am not saying that hon. members have not got the right to speak on this amount which is before the Legislature; what I do feel is that inasmuch as we have agreed to the matter in principle, a lot of this debate could have been avoided and it is unfortunate that it should have taken place especially in the absence of the hon. junior member for St. Michael. As to my plea for a free trip, whenever I want a trip abroad I hope I shall be able to provide it for myself.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not think that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has this matter in the right prospective. Nobody is challenging anybody who is going on this course; we are taking opportunity of discussing this question.

Mrs. BOURNE: I would say that I remember the hon. junior member for St. John saying that this money is being wasted and it is going down the drain.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for St. John is one member of this Chamber. If he makes a speech are you going to say that it is a waste of time if we speak?

Mrs. BOURNE: I specifically said that I do not mean to say that hon. members do not have a right to express their opinion, but I do say that my personal feeling is that quite a lot of this debate is unfortunate because it could have been avoided. When we were sitting in the Other Place it would have been a good thing to avoid this debate if we had disagreed with the proposal to send out this member on this Parliamentary Course. I cannot see that this debate has served any useful purpose this afternoon.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are discussing something because when the Hon. Premier introduced this matter as a new Item he informed hon. members that he proposed to do something which was new and therefore we wanted to discuss this new thing. I pay attention to Parliamentary matters and I challenge anybody in here about these matters; I challenge anybody as to them, no matter on which side of the House he is. I do not feel that my point has been appreciated; be that as it may, I am not objecting to the hon. member going on this course. I said that we have to be pragmatical in this matter. (ASIDES) We know that you can vote; a man is free to conserve as well as he is free to buy a Rolls Royce.

I asked about the matter and they told me that the boys were sending "Orrie" *(Laughter)*. I did not go up to the Other Place. The whole idea was that it was the intention of that Party to send the hon. junior member for St. Michael on this Course; it was a matter which was arranged prior to their coming here. I was pointing out that I was not objecting to that proposal but if you have a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association there should be arrangements made whereby it should not be a question of anybody fighting to go out. It is a question of the Premier saying: "We sent a member abroad this year and you will send a member abroad on another occasion." And there is no question of voting.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that a Resolution for $102,050.00 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 49

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Acting Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of $1,910 under three Heads, and I propose to take them separately.

HEAD XVII – INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Head XVII – Industrial School was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The first Item under this Head is Item 14 which deals with allowance to teaching staff. Ever since 1952 or 1953 it was decided by the Government that the Industrial School should be separated from Dodds Plantation and that as and when some of the older staff of overseers retired, in the interest of the boys their places should be filled by teachers. As the note states; "During the year two teachers were seconded from Primary Schools to replace one Overseer who retired and one Teacher of the staff of the Government Industrial Schools who is at present on study leave. This is the implementation of that policy and the sum of $150 is now being asked for as a Supplementary Estimate to carry out that decision.' Therefore, this amount of money is to pay one teacher who is on study leave and another who has just been promoted on the staff.

The next Item is in respect of clothing and bedding. This sum of $175 is being asked for in consequence of a recent decision to assist with the rehabilitation of pupils by starting a Scout Troup at the school during the year. It was necessary to provide scouts with uniform out of available funds and additional provision of this $175 is now requested to supplement the vote for the requirements for the remainder of the financial year.

6.05 p.m.

Item 18 - Cleaning, Water and Light. This additional provision is requested to meet an increase in rates charged for electricity and also an increase in consumption of

electricity due to improved facilities in the laundry. The laundry now uses electricity instead of fuel which was used before.

I beg to move that Head XVII - Industrial Schools, stand part.

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

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

HEAD XXIII — MATERNITY HOSPITAL

Head XXIII (8) — Maternity Hospital was called

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This amount, Sir, of $70 is to pay the fees of an Anaesthetist at the Maternity Hospital to the end of the year.

I beg to move that Head XXIII (8) - Maternity Hospital stand part.

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

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

HEAD XXVII — CHARGES OF DEBT

Head XXVII — Charges of Debt was called.

Hon Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: This is additional provision, Sir, to meet the sinking fund contributions on $6,720,000 which was the amount authorised to be raised by the Local Loan Act, 1955. The amount raised by the four issues of debentures under this Act is $6,719,780, but the face value of these debentures is $6,801,000, as the last two issues of $4,051,000 were made at 98%. In order to provide for sinking fund contributions of 1 1/2% on the issues of debentures, additional provision is required.

I beg to move that Head XXVII - Charges of Debt stand part.

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

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, the Resolution for $1,910 was passed.

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

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Drawback of Duties on Sale of Goods to Tourist (Amendment) Regulations, 1959.

DRAWBACK OF DUTIES ON SALE OF GOODS TO TOURISTS (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1959

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as you will see, this is a simple amendment. On the last occasion when a similar Resolution was passed, it referred to Regulation 7, but in actual point of fact, it should have been Regulation 8, so this is a slight correction. As you will see from the Addendum "Regulation 10 of the Drawback of Duties on Sale of Goods to Tourists Regulations, 1958, refers to "goods delivered to the customs in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 7." In fact it is Regulation 8 which deals with delivery of goods to the customs, so this Resolution seeks to amend the Regulation 7 which we passed on the last occasion. There is absolutely no reason, Sir, to say anything more and 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.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government business for today. We intend to deal with the Estimates tomorrow and then on Friday next.

THE ADJOURNMENT

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow at 12 noon.

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

The motion being put and carried nem. con. Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.15 p=m.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 11th March, 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);* Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, *(Leader of the Opposition);* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Premier);* Hon. M. E. COX, *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour);* His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; *(Deputy Speaker);* Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries);* Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E., and Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education.)*

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.

Messrs. SEARLES and STRAUGHN entered the House and took their seats.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are Questions standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew who, I observe, is not now in his place.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to put the Questions on behalf of the hon. member. The Questions are as follows:-

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:-

Will the Government take steps to enact legislation requiring the owners or attorneys of any sugar factory in this Island which is about to cease operations (by closing down or becoming demolished) to give notice of such intention in writing to Government at least one clear year before such factory or factories cease to operate?

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

Will Government take steps to cause an investigation to be made through the proper channels into the rates and rents paid by the respective tenants of the Belleplaine Housing Scheme in the Parish of Saint Andrew?

2. Will the Government also take steps to find out if the said rates and/or rents now paid create in anyway a financial burden on the said tenants or occupants?

3. If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, will Government take steps to review the situation and to cause a reduction of not less than 30% of the rents now charged to be made in favour of the occupants of the said Housing Scheme?

APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I propose to do what has been done for a few years past, that is, to make the Budget speech today and postpone any further discussion on the Estimates so as to give hon. members a chance to study the speech and raise any points which they might want to raise afterwards. I propose that on Friday we should continue with the Budget debate. That has been the custom for the past two or three years and it will be adhered to on this occasion.

Speaking on the Budget it is customary in the first stage to refer to the economic position of the Island. I shall begin by drawing the attention of this House to the effects of the recession on employment. Everybody will remember that there was a recession in England and in the U.S.A., in those two places which affect most the economy of the Island by way of Barbadian workers emigrating to those two countries. We find that owing to that recession there was a fall in the emigration to the United Kingdom and according to the figures, the numbers emigrating to the United Kingdom fell from 1,867 in 1957 to 1,242 in 1959. As far as the United States of America is concerned, as hon. members will remember, for years now we have been having Barbadians going abroad to help in the harvesting of the crops and we find that in that emigration scheme, which is very often referred to as THE FARM LABOUR PROGRAMME, the figures fell from 939 in 1957 to 758 in 1958. We also find that emigration to other countries has risen from 1445 in 1957 to 1,668 in 1958. As you know, Sir, the result of this recession would not only reflect in the numbers of persons emigrating, but also would have an effect on the money which emigrants send back to Barbados, and consequently, Sir, as I said, there would be a fall in remittances. We find that remittances from persons abroad through the Post Office and other channels decreased from $5.6 million in 1957 to $5.4 million in 1958. I suppose one would say that the fall was not so great-a difference of probably $200,000- but it is a fall nevertheless, and in our position we cannot avoid it;but naturally we do not feel happy. We would rather have increases than deductions. So, Sir, as I said, there was also an effect on remittances to Barbados as a result of this recession.

We also find, Sir, that in 1958 there were 24,945 tourists arriving in the island as against 23,773 in 1957; that is an increase of 1,172 and approximately half of these tourists were from North America and Venezuela. The receipts of hard currency from these tourists were the same as in 1957, being the equivalent of $5.8 million, but the total tourist receipts rose and were estimated in the vicinity of $10 million in 1958. So, Sir, we see that the tourist industry is proving to be a financial benefit to the

island. Of course that is what we expected and that is why we are doing our bit to encourage tourism in Barbados.

As hon. members would have heard, there is also an extension in the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, and that was extended for another year. There was also an increase in the negotiated price quota, and that has been increased to 127,296 tons. The negotiated price per ton was £43. 16. 8. (which is in the vicinity of $210.40) in 1958, but in 1958 it was agreed to increase that to £45. 2. 0. (which is in the vicinity of $216.48) in 1959. The International Sugar Agreement has been revised and extended, but recently there has been a steep fall in the free market price. Lower prices were obtained for molasses in 1958 than in the previous year.

Last year, Sir, 141,673 tons of sugar and 3,240,685 wine gallons of fancy molasses were produced. These together make the equivalent of 152,847 tons of sugar. Naturally, that is a decrease from the previous year when we produced a record crop of 204,525 tons. In 1959 the crop is estimated to produce 160,000 tons, though I have been hearing whispers within the last couple of weeks that it may be slightly over that amount. Even with these figures, Sir, we are still far off from the 204,525 tons which were produced in 1957.

As is well known, Sir, the price for molasses has been reduced, and at this point I will state that the production and sale of molasses to Canada - the country which takes most of our molasses - has been, so to speak, in jeopardy for the past few years. I am now informed that the condition this year is likely to be even worse than it was before, so that we are really not very happy about the molasses situation. I am told that most of the molasses Canada imports comes from Cuba, and they only import a small quantity from Barbados to mix with the Cuban molasses and probably increase its flavour; but I do not think there is anything we can do about that; we just have to accept it. We have been making representations to the Canadian importers on that point, but there has been no relief granted; they continue to mix and sell. Their contention is that the molasses from Cuba cost very much less, and as hon. members know, we have been doing our best in Barbados to decrease the cost of the landed product in Canada. We have even had to adopt this bulk shipping which in the very beginning we thought we would have been able to ignore and brush aside, but the people who buy our molasses would only have it that way - in bulk shipment - and we already know of the effect which this bulk shipment has had on the economy of Barbados. As I said, there is nothing we can do about it, and we have to accept it.

There is also a fall in the consumption of rum. In 1957 308,188 gallons were consumed locally and in 1958 280,118 gallons were consumed. That makes a difference of 28,070 gallons less this year than last year. As I have said earlier, this fall has been in evidence for some time and, naturally, when so little is consumed, it must reflect on our finances by way of less money received from excise.

What is the cause and the reason for this we do not know. We have several speculations, but, Sir, the significant fact is that with the decrease in the amount of rum consumed, there has been a corresponding increase in the amount of beer imported and consumed locally. In 1957, we imported 358,772 gallons of beer, the F.O.B. value being $684,726. In 1958 370,901 gallons were imported to the value of $741,477 F.O.B. I do not know whether it is that apparently the people are drinking more beer and less rum, but it is something for further consideration and some step will have to be taken to offset it.

There is also, Sir, a fall in the value of our exports and there is a large adverse balance of visible trade. Our export in 1958 was $35.4 million as compared with $45.5 million in 1957. It would be interesting to quote some figures, as far as exports in sugar, molasses, rum and confectionery are concerned. In 1957 180,733 tons of sugar were exported to the value of $36,649,370 F.O.B. In 1958, 123,597 tons were exported to the value of $26,503,980 F.O.B. So, Sir, you will see the reduction in these figures for these two years was approximately $10 million. As regards fancy molasses, in 1957 3,532,035 gallons were exported to the F.O.B. value of $3,052,890 and the vacuum pan molasses exported over the same period was 5,571,014 gallons, the F.O.B. value being $1,779,458. In 1958 the amount of fancy molasses exported was 3,780,561 gallons to the value F.O.B. of $3,085,144 and the vacuum pan exported for the same period was 8,856,866 gallons, the F.O.B. value being $1,770,182.

In 1957 proof rum exported was 779,962 gallons and the value F.O.B. of it was $2,084,059 and in 1958 we exported 835,644 gallons, the F.O.B. value being $2,249,048. As you will see in the case of proof rum, there is an increase in export in 1958 over 1957.

As regards confectionery, in 1957, 1,778,874 lbs. were exported, the F.O.B. value being $373,945 and in 1958 990,314 lbs were exported, the F.O.B. value being $238,049. Well, Sir, you will notice that there has been a big drop in the confectionery exported.

Further to our exports of sugar, molasses, rum and confectionery were the exports of soap, margarine and lard which fell from $812,510 in 1957 to $756,084 in 1958. This is a difference of approximately $100,000. From those figures, Sir, you will see that there has been a considerable drop in our exports during last year as compared with 1957. The total value of domestic exports in 1958 were $35.4 million as compared with $45.5 million in 1957 and the total value of our imports exceeded that of our exports by $33.25 million as compared with $18.5 million in 1957. Well, Sir, as I have said earlier, that is an adverse balance in our visible trade.

Sir, I would like to know that our Savings Bank is going strong and in a healthy condition, but you notice that there was an increase in withdrawals in 1958. In 1958 withdrawals from the Government Savings Bank exceeded ordinary deposits by $230,954; in the previous year ordinary deposits had exceeded withdrawals by $1,111,600. At the same time savings in the commercial banks rose by a million dollars and loans and advances by the banks rose by seven million dollars. I do not know much about figures, but I do not think that it reflects sound business when savings rise by a million dollars and loans and advances by the banks over the same period rise by seven million dollars. It shows that probably some of our people are getting further in debt by having loans and advances on the banks.

There was a large Government expenditure on development in 1958. I do not know if I need recount the schemes which are well known to us; but there is chiefly the Deep Water Harbour, and most of the funds for these ventures had to come from borrowing, and borrowing can only come from savings. Therefore if the savings decrease there might be some difficulty in facilitating the borrowers. At the same time it is better to borrow from our own savings and for that reason we are continuing to raise money by the issue of debentures locally. It has been necessary to raise money overseas as was evidenced by the Government borrowing just recently money in England to help carry on the Deep Water Harbour scheme. I think that we in this colony must be affected - and probably the world over - by the fact that the short term rates of interest have fallen off, but still the long term and medium rates remain high. That has been our experience even in raising this loan in England. When the bank rate started to fall there was a reduction in the bank rate, and we felt that we might have been able to get our loan at a reasonable rate, probably in the vicinity of 4% or 4 1/2% to which it had fallen, but as I said a moment ago, it is noticeable that while the short term rates have fallen, the rates for long term and medium loans still remain high. I need only refer to the position of the Electric Supply Corporation, the Government having had to facilitate their borrowing by allowing an increased rate of interest. I will not say anything more about that because it is very recent and it is still fresh in the minds of all of us.

I referred a moment ago to the loan raised in England and we were overjoyed with the success of it, especially as it was the first loan of that nature which

Barbados had to raise. I feel that there is in the money market a continued confidence of the lending public in the Government of Barbados. I do not want to say it boastfully, but we do know that in a minute that loan was over-subscribed by about twenty times, and that would only come as a result of confidence in the Barbados Government, especially so when just a few months earlier the Jamaica Government had some difficulty in raising their loan. It was opened to the public for a week or so, I think, and at the end of that period the underwriters had to take either 40 or 60 percent, while in the case of Barbados we did not have to do that.

I want at this stage to refer to the Government's revenue and expenditure for the current financial year. It is not possible to give figures up to the last penny because the year has not yet ended; we have approximately three weeks more to go, so that while these figures may not be accurate and up to the last minute, yet we are still in the position to give some indication as to how the financial year has been going so far. There is a Revised Estimate of Revenue of $23,368,035. There was an increase in income tax due to the fact that we had a record crop of two hundred and four thousand odd tons. That record crop was in 1957, but the effects of it from the point of view of income tax was only known during 1958.

In 1957, Sir, the gross national income rose to approximately $100 million. That figure has risen because of the 204,525 tons of sugar that we produced. Actually, the more money you get from production, the higher the national income rises.

Over the same period, Sir, there is a revised estimate of Expenditure of $21,441,552; this is about $1 million more than was originally estimated, but in spite of our watchfulness and our care to keep expenditure under control, we are very often faced with increases. The increase in 90% of cases is due to the expansion of services. I think hon. members will remember that during the last year, almost every week there was a request for increased staff, increased accommodation, increased rates of travelling and many other things which are responsible for this increase of almost $1 million in the expenditure more than what the original estimate was. I myself have often been alarmed at the rapid increase of services due to the increase of staff, and I want to assure this House, Sir, that the Financial Secretary and myself do all we can to resist these increases, and in very many cases all the increases sought were not granted. We still continue to pare down until we can do with just enough in our opinion which would carry on the service effectively. In 1959, Sir, I hope that there will at least not be to the same extent these great increases in the services. Up to this morning I saw one which I had to defer for more careful study, but, Sir, the fact is that our services are increasing, people are asking for more things - the public generally - and in our effort to grant these services, Sir, we have had necessarily to increase the staff and equipment and other things which go to make up a contented Civil Service.

Now, under the Estimates for 1959-60 which are now before us, Revenue on the basis of existing taxation amounts to $21,708,367. We envisage an increase in Customs due to a better crop expected this year, and there is a reduction in income tax due to low profits made last year. That is, the crops of last year can only reflect in the income this year. Sir, here again we have to watch very carefully our economy because while, as I said, the revenue anticipated this year is on the basis of existing taxation, yet we do envisage a reduction of income because of the low crop of last year.

Now, Sir, we come to the real subject of the Appropriation Act. The estimate of current expenditure for this year is in the vicinity of $21,133,386, and that is $638,953 more than the approved estimate for the year 1958-59. You will notice, Sir, that in the Table supplied here, every year since 1949 there has been an increase in the Recurrent and Non-Recurrent Expenditure. The total of Recurrent and Non.-Recurrent Expenditure in 1949-50 was $10,323,903, and as I said, every year since then there has been an increase except in 1950-51 when it was $9,642,684. After that we went on to $11 million, $12 million, $16 million and $19 million, and this year we have reached $21 million. Despite the reduction by $250,000 of the contribution from revenue to Capital Expenditure, the estimate of recurrent expenditure for 1959-60 is $874,033 greater than the approved estimate for 1958-59, and these increases are reflected in Pensions, Education, Federation, Subsidies and Grants, Miscellaneous, Peasants Loan Bank, Charges of Debt, Highways and Transport, Agriculture and Printing Office. Those are the Heads that are mainly responsible for the increase.

The increase under "Pensions" is made up of increases of pensions and gratuities of $75,000 to Police and the Fire Brigade, $50,000 to other public pensioners and $55,000 in cost of living allowances.

Now, Sir, we know that the Police and the Fire Brigade because of their arduous duties have a shorter period of usefulness and they do retire faster probably than other people in the Service. The Police, as you know, are called up at any hour of the night to go on duty, as well as the Fire Brigade, and because of their arduous duties, as I have said, they do not have as long a period of usefulness in the Service as those people who do not carry out these arduous duties.

There is the amount of $50,000 for public pensioners. More people, we find, have been resigning from the Service over the last year or two than were formerly. As hon. members know, sometimes at 50 years old, but usually at 55 years old, public officers can elect to retire, and at 60 years it is compulsory. Well, Sir, speaking as a doctor it is generally admitted that over the last few years with the advent of new drugs - these antibiotics and other drugs - they are more effective in curing disease and maintaining health than formerly so that there is an increase in the span of life. This is the consensus of opinion the world over and I think we have noticed it here in Barbados. Some years ago, the compulsory retirement age was at 65 years and I remember very well that in order to fall into line with other Governments in the area, we were asked to reduce our compulsory age limit to 60 years instead of 65 years. As I have said a little while ago, there is an increase in the span of life - people are living longer - and I see men today of 70 and 75 years who are still living an active life. Naturally, when a man retires at 55, unless he is in ill health which causes him to go home to recuperate, instead, he seeks to augment his pension by getting another job. I say all of that to point out this. We in Barbados are beginning to feel that since by way of new medicine, vitamins and other things, there is an increase in the span of life, we feel that the period of compulsory retirement should now be restored to 65 years. I just throw out that as a hint, but I would say that it is under active consideration not only in Barbados but in the other colonies in the area. In British Guiana, where a few years ago because of certain endemic diseases - malaria and filaria and one or two other tropical diseases - the span of life was shorter, now with the use of D.D.T. and other modern insecticides which kill off the mosquitoes which cause malaria and filaria, the span of life in that colony has also increased, and I think they too are reflecting on what should be done in a case of this sort: that is, to restore the period of retirement to 65 years. I say that because hon. members will notice that there is an increase of pensions asked for up to $50,000 to other public pensioners. As I have said, the whole thing is under consideration not only in Barbados but in other colonies of the area.

The increase under "Education" is merely due to the additional Assistant Teachers and increments of salaries. Sir, you know that last year or the year before, supernumerary teachers were of a temporary nature. They have now been drafted into full time service and, naturally, the vote will go up because of the additional cost plus the increments involved. I am not saying that as a reflection on what was done; I think it was the correct thing to do because since these people were more or less almost employed, it was only fair to give them permanent employment and all that goes with that in making it permanent.

The increase under "Federation" is to meet the demands of the Federal Government for the full mandatory levy. Currency profits will also be payable to the Federal Government but the amount is not yet known and it has not been included on either side of the account.

Unfortunately for us, the financial year of the Federal Government is the Calendar Year and in our case our financial year is from the 1st April to the 31st March of the next year; so that when the Federation makes its mandatory levy, it does not correspond with our financial year, and because of that, it may appear as if we are paying more than we ought to, but it is taken back in the following year when the figures can be adjusted.

Now, Sir, the increase under "Subsidies and Grants" is accounted for by the grant to the Tourist Board. As hon. members know, in order to encourage tourism there is the granting of concessions legally and when I say legally, I mean statutorily, because these concessions are now placed on the Statute Book. We also have given them an increased grant this year in order to encourage the Tourist Industry.

I think I will be permitted to state here and now that as far as this matching business is concerned, we had an additional amount in the Estimates for the Tourist Board on a matching basis. In short, what I want to say is that apparently the Tourist Board is not pulling its weight and expects the Government to supply everything. We will do our duty, we will grant concessions which we think advisable on that matching, and this money will remain in the Estimates. We do not intend to withdraw it; but we also do not intend that the Government should supply all the funds necessary. The Tourist Board through the merchants and the hotel-keepers and people of that sort must pull its weight. We are all anxious to see tourism succeed, but I repeat that there must be co-operation in order to effect that success. I want to repeat that the Tourist Board has not been pulling its weight, and while the Government is prepared to co-operate in making this industry a success, yet I say here and now that the Government does not intend to undertake all the financial burden.

Under the Head "Miscellaneous" there is an increased amount and that is due to the additional or doubled contribution to the Training Fund and the increase in the vote for acting allowances and the payment of substitutes. As you know, Sir, we are endeavouring to have our officers properly trained so that they will be of better service to the community. The Training Fund vote, as I have said, has been doubled so that more persons will be able to go abroad for training. That involves the payment of substitutes and acting allowances. While we are therefore endeavouring to produce a more qualified staff by way of training, yet I want it to be borne in mind that from the financial side there are other things involved.

The increase under the "Peasants Loan Bank" is due to the provision of further funds for the Bank. I think hon. members will remember that in order to spread the work of the Peasants' Loan Bank over a wider area - I have not got the figures to hand - an additional amount in the vicinity of $48,000 has been granted to the Bank.

Under the Head "Charges of Debt" there is an increase, and that is for the purpose of paying for charges on new loan money raised locally. The charges on the London loan are being capitalised and paid for from local loan funds.

Under the Head "Highways & Transport" the largest is for Parish roads, to meet the cost of the wages of cantonniers not on the unestablished staff. Here, I would like to say that it is well known that there is a revision by way of cost of living for cantonniers undertaken by the Government to assist the lowest paid staff in helping them to meet their obligations. I say that while there is an increase here, yet in a short time we will be faced with further increases so as to satisfy the demands not only of the cantonniers but those other employees in the various Departments.

The chief increase under "Science & Agriculture" is for grasslands development. Hon. members have heard the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries a week or two ago speak about the development of these grasslands. He spoke of pangola grass which forms a rich nutritious food for cattle especially, but for all stock, and the Hon. Minister is seeking to develop this grass here, hoping sooner or later that this will assist us to a great extent in providing meat for local consumption, and he has not forgotten the dairies. This grass is rich in protein from what I understand and will assist in or will form the greatest part of the food of cattle. I understand that in Jamaica it is extensively used and it has proved very economical in the feeding of animals. If this scheme succeeds we will import less of the concentrated feeds which we have been importing over the past few years because, as I understand, this grass is very rich in proteins and will supply most, if not all, of the proteins needed for cattle.

I mentioned earlier, Sir, that part of this increase in this year's Estimates is making provision for the expansion and acceleration of the Government Printery. Sir, despite all that might be said about it, it is proving a great success. It is something new as far as Government is concerned, and it has to grow up. In addition to the ordinary work which was done ten or fifteen years ago, the work of Government Departments has considerably increased, and at the time of making provision for this Printery, I do not think all of that was envisaged - that sudden increase - and consequently there was some delay in producing the work; but I think it is now gathering momentum. Just a few weeks ago you will remember, Sir, that there was provision made for increasing the number of machines and also the personnel, and we are quite confident that when we get these new machines which we hope to get in another two or three months, and they are functioning properly with the increased staff, most, if not all, of our problems with regard to printing will disappear.

To encourage the development of trade and industry, provision is made for an increase in the scope of drawbacks on goods re-exported. I think, Sir, this will apply to a great extent to the Tourist Industry whereby drawbacks will be made possible to tourists who buy things under certain regulations to take out of the island.

The increase under "Secretariat" provides for the establishment of a Ministry of Education and for an Information Service. You know that during the year, I think about September, a new Ministry of Education was founded. It is now functioning satisfactorily and it was not provided for in the last Estimates. This came in as a Supplementary, but has been given a permanent place in this Budget.

There is also the Information Service which is functioning; I do not say it has found its feet yet, but I am quite sure that the officer is doing a great service with the material at his disposal. By that, I mean that he was brought into the work and occupying an office which was not very well equipped. As a matter of fact, it is a new service and we felt that he should work for a month or two and see what is needed before meeting our requirements. A little later on when the Estimates are under consideration, you will notice that a certain amount will be moved in to pay for additional staff, equipment and furniture for that office. As I said, like everything else, it started small; we have been watching its growth, and in the interest of the island and the community we are prepared to grant it the necessary tools and equipment and other things which it is asking for.

The increase under "Fire Brigade" is largely due to the establishment of new Fire Stations. I think it will be remembered that there was money provided for the building of two new Fire Stations. One is well on the way in the Worthing View Gap, and the other is to be placed in the North. The site has been selected, but building has not been actually started on that site. We hope in a very short time that it will be started. Meanwhile, the necessary staff is undergoing training so that when the Stations are opened, the men will be fully equipped to immediately take up their duties. I may say here, Sir, since the hon. junior member for Christ Church is present, that he did raise the point some time ago when this new Fire Station was under con-

sideration of a certain amount of land that might be needed for the turn out of the Fire Engines. I will say to him that this is under active consideration, and we hope very soon it will be an accomplished fact.

As I said earlier, the site in the North has been selected, but the actual building has not started yet, but will be started soon. These two Stations will form some protection from fires for people in other areas, and they will not always altogether be dependent on the Bridgetown equipment.

Now, Sir, turning to the question of Capital Expenditure, the estimated Capital Expenditure for 1959-60 is $12,631,800. That is $1,268,607 less than the Approved Estimates for 1958-59 and $2,520,276 more than the Revised Estimates. A summary of the Capital Estimates in the framework of the Development Plan 1955-60 is given in the Table provided. I think this is the last year of our Five Year Development Plan and the money asked for for this Capital development still forms part of that Five Year Plan. You will notice, Sir, that in the allocation in the Development Plan for 1955-60, the estimated expenditure for the Deep Water Harbour from 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is $9,612,805 and the provision in the Estimate for 1959-60 is $6,800,000 which will make it a total expenditure up to the 31st March, 1960 of $16,412,805.

As regards Housing, the allocation in the Development Plan for 1955-60 is $2,522,000 and the estimated expenditure from the 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is $2,081,919. Provision in the Estimates for 1959-60 is $417,396 which will make the total estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to the 31st March, 1960 $2,499,315.

Hon. members will also notice that for the Five Year period $500,000 will be spent by the Development Board other than the $1 million which was allocated to the Board.

As regards Water Supplies, the amount allocated was $1,731,400 in the Development Plan and the estimated expenditure from the 1st April, 1955 to the 31st March, 1959 is $1,443,156. Provision is made in the Estimates for 1959-60 of $350,000, so the total estimated expenditure from the 1st April 1955 to 31st March, 1960 is $1,793,156. There again, you will see that there is a slight increase in the expenditure under Water Supplies over the amount which was originally allocated.

When you come to Medical Services, you will notice that the allocation in the Development Plan for 1955-60 is $1,938,525 and the estimated expenditure from the 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is $683,049. Then provision in the Estimates for 1959-60 is $872,750 which will make the total expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1960 $1,555,799.

Under "Education" the amount of $2,971,726 was allocated in the Development Plan for 1955-60 and the amount estimated to be spent to the 31st March 1959 is $1,961,352. Provision in the present Estimates is $560,991; therefore the total estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to 31st March 1960 is $2,522,343.

In the case of Agriculture, the allocation in the Development Plan for 1955-60 is $2,872,834 and the estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is $1,369,249. Provision in the Estimates for 1959-60 is $1,186,849 which will make the estimated expenditure to the 31st March, 1960 $2,556,098.

Under "Communications" the sum of $3,349,500 was estimated to be spent in the Development Plan for 1955-60 and the estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is anticipated to be $2,510,756. Provision in this year's Estimates is $1,005,216 and the total estimated expenditure to the 31st March, 1960 is anticipated to be $3,515,972. As you will see, that will be above the amount which was originally allocated to be spent for Communications.

I want to take the opportunity while speaking on Communications to mention that amongst other things, this money has been spent on the building of the Airport at Seawell. This building is going ahead very rapidly and it is expected to be opened to the public sometime next month. It is a lovely structure and I think when it is finished it will be one of the best in the area. Compliments have been paid to us concerning it from people arriving from many lands, such as Europe and America and even people in this area, so far as the structure is concerned.

Under "Miscellaneous" the allocation in the Development Plan for 1955-60 is $1,960,625 and the estimated expenditure from the 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is $1,720,420. The provision to be spent in the Estimates for 1959-60 under this Head is $216,598 which will make the total estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1960 $2,000,018. That too, is an increase over the amount allocated for the five year period. We come to the last Item, Road Transport. In the Five Year Development Plan the allocation for this is $1,259,190 and the estimated expenditure from 1st April, 1955 to 31st March, 1959 is anticipated to be $840,334. The provision in this year's Estimates is $409,000 which would bring it to a total of $1,249,334 which is estimated to be spent to 31st March, 1960. You will see from the figures which I have just quoted that our Five Year Development Plan is well in hand and in a few instances, as I have mentioned, the amount estimated to be spent to 31st March, 1960 exceeds the amount which was allocated in the Five Year Plan. As far as the Deep Water Harbour is concerned, I have said earlier, the sum of $6,800,000 is provided in this year's Estimates to meet the cost of constructing it.

In connection with the Deep Water Harbour I will take this opportunity to say that a Port Manager has been appointed and he is expected to arrive on or before the seventh of May. His services are at this stage urgently needed because we want a man of his experience to inform us on the question of the planning of certain buildings, and regulations for the operation of the Port, and we must get ahead with these as soon as possible. We do not want to wait until the Port has been actually opened for this gentleman to come in; we want to have him come here earlier, and from his knowledge and experience advise us on the question of making regulations for the operation of the Port. Meanwhile we propose during this year to push on with the access roads which are necessary to expedite the flow of traffic in the harbour. The contract for the loading equipment to be used in the handling of sugar in bulk has been awarded to Messrs. Spencer (Melksham) Ltd., in the sum of $1,801,417, and the work on drawings of the sugar stores is in preparation.

I did not make any mention about the Town Planning Officer who arrived during last year. His Department which was established in October is already showing its value. We are obtaining expert advice from the Town Planning Officer on the various problems relating to physical developments, and the survey carried out by the Committee under the chairmanship of the Town Planning Officer has been completed. He arrived in October and so far his work has been very beneficial by way of certain advice in connection with the physical development of the area and helping to arrange the traffic survey, and the many complexities which face us by way of traffic, parking and other things.

In connection with the Medical Services I think I should say a word about the proposed new General Hospital. I think that we are free to go ahead now. Two of the main things have been settled; one is the permission from C.D. & W. to use the remaining portion of their grant to assist in building this new hospital, and quite recently, only last week, we have been able to conclude or rather to agree on the price for the purchase of the Deanery. I think it is an open secret that that site will be used largely for the building of a new General Hospital. Therefore in the very near future hon. members will be able to see the actual work started on the site, and Capt. Tomlin - I do not know if this statement was made in the House - will be relieved of his other duties and he will devote his time solely to the building of this Hospital. Somebody will carry on for him the other works of construction, and his time, as I have said, will be devoted solely to the building of the new

Hospital. He will be responsible for that, and provision is made for expert technical advice of Consultant Engineers to be made available to him. It is proposed that later on during this year that Capt. Tomlin will go up to England to consult and confirm with the Architects. These same Architects will be retained as Consultant Engineers; they will not be on the spot, but if Capt. Tomlin is ever faced with any difficulties he will have people with experience to whom he can refer. I am sure that Capt. Tomlin is as anxious to make this venture a success as other ventures he has made in the realm of building.

Further, in the Capital Estimates, Sir, provision is being made for more quarters for Medical Staff. There will be two new houses constructed on the lands at Enmore which will be used as quarters for Hospital Staff. More and more, Sir, we are finding it necessary to have available houses for not only Medical Officers, but we find that other people coming from abroad in almost every case ask if there is a house available. We are faced with that and in order to attract suitable staff not only in the Medical field but also other experts in agriculture and other fields coming from outside, one of the first things we must do is to make provision for housing for which they ask. We have not been able up to now to house all our Medical staff, and it is proposed to build two new houses on the lands at Enmore.

In connection with Minor Industries, I am sure hon. members will be glad to hear that during last year we had a Mr. Eaton down from the International Co-operation Administration, who is a handicraft expert. He came here for about three or four weeks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the Hon. Premier that it is about one minute to 2 p.m. and he should make the motion before he finishes at this stage. The motion for the second reading has not yet been moved.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

As I was saying, Sir, this gentleman came down and made a survey of the possibility of development of handicraft, and he spent about four weeks here, went back to the United States and made a recommendation to the International Co-operation Administration and they will make available to this Government the services of a handicraft specialist for at least one year to assist in improving and expanding the handicraft of this island.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.00 p.m. of the clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.

On resumption:

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The bell was rung and a quorum was formed.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Private Members' Business was called.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now revert to Government Business.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, with reference to Education, Government is continuing its policy of providing additional school accommodation both in the primary and secondary schools. The conversion of St. Silas' Girls' School to a senior school to accommodate 240 pupils is proceeding. I think that building is well on the way and I understand that a new building is being put up. There will also be extensions made during the year to St. Matthews' Boys' School, St. John The Baptist Girls', St. Anns Junior and St. Andrew's Girls' School. The Pine Secondary Modern School will be completed this year, and will considerably relieve the pressure on population on the primary schools in St. Michael.

In view of the great demand for school places at St. Michael's Girls' School, it is planned to carry out expansions to the school with the aim of providing accommodation for another 230 pupils. The extension of the Alleyne School will also be completed during the year; so from that, as I said earlier, Government is carrying out its promise to extend as far as it possibly can certain schools and rebuilding others with a view to making provision for additional school places. At a number of schools which I mentioned, work is already underway at the moment. Another innovation in order to facilitate the success of education at secondary level which depends largely on the foundation laid at the primary stage is that the Government is providing $10,000 towards the provision of text books in primary as well as secondary schools. As far as the primary schools are concerned it is not an innovation, but it is an innovation where the secondary schools are concerned. That is to buy text books for the pupils of these schools.

Extensions to the Housecraft Centre are also occupying Government's attention. Government wants to expand the service to meet the needs of the increasing number of persons who wish to avail themselves of the opportunities which are offered at the Housecraft Centre.

There is also to be a widening of the facilities at the Evening Institute. Four new ventures will come into operation during the year.

The Government is also contributing a matching grant of $5,000 for the construction of a Children's Gallery at the Barbados Museum. The services at the Museum are utilised by approximately 5,000 children a year and Government wishes to encourage children in visual arts, history and geography of the Island. This matching grant is in accordance with the policy of Government in certain other fields. It is now being extended to the Barbados Museum and if the people who apply can provide $5,000 by way of subscriptions and other things, then Government will match it with $5,000. As hon. members know, education is no longer confined to books. There are many other concepts of education which must be encouraged, and this is one of them. One of the objects of this is to encourage children in the visual arts and the history and geography of this Island.

The Public Library continues to expand and there are now six branches in the different parishes. The St. George branch was the last opened and it is being enthusiastically patronised by the children of the district. Programmes featuring literature on records are regularly conducted at Headquarters and these programmes are well received by the school children.

I do not know whether it is generally known that in order to extend the facilities and accommodation at the Public Library, Government is contemplating, or should I say, continuing its negotiations to buy the building and piece of land in proximity to the present Library. I think that building and land is to the northern side of the Library. If we are able to get that spot of land, we would be able to extend the facilities of the Library.

As we all know, during 1958 we had some six Items of incentive legislation passed in order to encourage the industrial development in the island. There is the Pioneer Industries Act of 1958 and amendments to the Customs Tariff Act such as the Customs Tariff - Vehicles Exemption from Duty, Tourists Baggage Exemption from Duty, Travel Advertisement Articles Exemption from Duty, Drawback on Duties on Sale of Goods to Tourists and the Dumping and Subsidies Act. There is also an amendment to the Customs Tariff Act to provide for the free entry of machinery and there is also an amendment to the Hotel Aids Act. As I have said, all these are designed to encourage industry and we know that as far as hotels are concerned, they are taking advantage of the facilities offered as well as the opportunities offered by way of loans

provided under the Development Board. We know that the progress, expansion and development of hotels are being greatly facilitated because of these things.

As regards the Development Board, from February, 1959 that Board has approved of loans totalling $519,500 to seventeen persons. The sum of approximately $300,000 of this amount went to minor industries and the other $300,000 to hotel development. I am at pains to stress that because I know it is felt that only the development of hotels benefit from these funds: but as you will see, the development of minor industries is also encouraged by loans from this Development Board. I mentioned a little earlier something about an expert coming down from America and I am sure when he comes here and explores the various fields, the loans for minor industries will increase.

I mentioned a little earlier that in 1958-59 the sum of $200,000 was voted for tourist industry promotion and that nearly 25,000 tourists visited the island and spent over $10,000,000. Over half of this amount came from hard currency areas. Legislation was also passed so as to enable tourists to bring in their personal effects including motor cars without payment of duty and to buy certain things. We hope that these further concessions will increase the number of cruise ships which call here. So, Sir, you will see that the Government is committed to the development of the tourist industry and as you will see, during 1958-59 $200,000 was granted for that purpose.

Now, development under the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries continues to be concentrated on schemes likely to be of economic benefit to the island and to this end experiments have been started in the establishment of Pangola grass, as has been mentioned earlier, with a view to increasing the number of cattle available for beef and also to assist the dairy industry. I am not quite sure whether this is new to hon. members of this House, but the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is also actively considering the production of corn meal; and he hoped to begin work on the new abattoir for the cold storage of fish in the near future. This cold storage of fish will benefit not only the fishermen, but the Island generally. Provision will be made for cold storage when there is a glut; instead of the fish being thrown back in the sea the fishermen will be accommodated by the Government purchasing their fish and putting them in cold storage for development as time goes on.

There is another item which I want to mention and it is that the pilot scheme in the Scotland District continues to make satisfactory progress. The Board has been appointed as from the 1st February and has already forwarded recommendations to the Ministry. We all know that this work of soil conservation is going on in the Scotland District in St. Andrew, but most of us will not know that Mr. Collett, the gentleman in charge, might soon be leaving and we are experiencing some difficulty in getting a successor to him. The possibilities of securing a successor to Mr. Collett have been explored in the United Kingdom as well as in the U.S.A.; although I am not in a position to say definitely that an appointment has been made, I do know that efforts are being made to secure a successor.

As regards Fisheries one hundred and twenty-four powered launches were added to the fishing fleet in 1958, bringing the total number to four hundred and forty-three. Hon. members will therefore see that the fishermen are taking advantage of these loans to improve and modernize their fleet.

I mentioned earlier that the Ministry of Agriculture is looking forward some day to be able to produce corn in sufficient quantities and also to provide meal for consumption. To this end seven variety trials have been made of the four best yielding strains of corn in 1957. Four of these were abandoned due to faulty germination and the trials in three centres were reaped. How successful the Hon. Minister will be, I am unable to say at this stage, but there is some satisfaction in knowing that he is making every effort to increase the production of food. As we all know, if this scheme reaches fruition and corn is developed in sufficient quantities we will be saving in the Island the money which we now send abroad for the purchase of corn meal.

At this point, Sir, I think I will give an indication of certain fiscal proposals. A little earlier I mentioned the effect on our economy which the diminished use of rum locally is having, and I quoted figures to show that this decrease has been going on for the last two years. I also quoted figures to show an increase in the use of beer. It is proposed that in order to offset this difference the general tariff duty on beer should be one dollar and twenty cents per liquid wine gallon and the preferential duty should be one dollar and thirteen cents. This will maintain, Sir, the existing margin of preference. Before we can come to this conclusion, Sir, we have to refer this matter - in order that we might not contravene the provisions of GATT and the Canadian-West Indies Trade - to GATT and to Canada and get their agreement for this introduction. Our duty on beer has always been very low. At the moment it is 28¢ preferential and 35¢ general per wine gallon. We have been the lowest in the area. In Trinidad the duty is $1.05 preferential and $1.68 general; in Jamaica it is $1.65 preferential and $2.04 general; in British Guiana it is $2.25 preferential and $2.65 general.

Hon. members will remember that a couple of years ago we increased the duty on other liquors - Gin, Whiskey and others - but we maintained the low rate of duty on beer; so as you will see, we are not increasing for the sake of increasing, but to offset some of the difference which is being caused by less consumption of rum and the increasing consumption of beer. These new duties will come into effect as from today.

I think it is generally known, Sir, that there is a possibility of beer being manufactured locally. That is being explored at the moment, and although I do not think any firm decision has been reached, I can go so far as to say that it is being explored and there is the possibility of beer being manufactured here. It is an industry which was started here some years ago, but that did not last very long for one reason or another. Assuming the local production is supplied, if and when it comes, 7% of the mark-up from revenue and excise on beer and stout will be effected by this which will be approximately $217,000 per annum as compared with $170,000 now, and the price of beer may be increased by about 5¢ or 6¢ per bottle. It is expected that the locally brewed beer, if and when we do have it, will be sold at not more than 25¢ a bottle.

Another item for attention fiscally is Pool Betting. We know, Sir, that this Pool Betting is robbing the island of a certain amount of revenue. Everybody knows that the Government gets a revenue from tickets sold by the Turf Club; these sales are being diminished every year, while on the other hand this Pool Betting is increasing. We are not alone in this respect; it is also having an effect on the other islands - Trinidad, British Guiana and Jamaica; they are all suffering from that disease, and we are all considering legislation having for its effect the obtaining of revenue from this Pool Betting. We are now in consultation with Trinidad and British Guiana and also with the United Kingdom, and trying to get legislation affecting Pool Betting from the United Kingdom. I want to say that in the very near future there will be legislation having for its effect, as I said, the obtaining of a certain amount of revenue for the Government from this Pool Betting. It will be controlled as far as registered sellers are concerned; they will have to keep books so that a proper check may be kept on the selling of these Pool Betting tickets.

Now, Sir, I know when I say "Income Tax" all ears will be pricked, and everybody will be listening to hear what is going to happen with regard to Income Tax. First of all, we will deal with initial allowances. Hon. members will remember that during last year, several important measures were introduced to help industries, including the tourist industry. I mentioned six Acts a while ago passed during the year in connection with incentive legislation to encourage industry. I now propose that there should be an increase in the initial allowance on plant and machinery.

We know what the figures are in other places and that obtaining in the United Kingdom, and it will bear some relation to those in the United Kingdom, though it may be a little lower. This will apply to new industrial buildings and additions to such buildings. The legislation to give this relief to be obtained next year in respect of plant and machinery and new buildings erected this year will be introduced in the course of the year.

There has been some agitation for the formation of Building Societies. These Societies exist in the Caribbean area and in the United Kingdom, and in view of our large expenditure on housing, the Government is also willing to encourage private schemes so as to help people to acquire their own homes. Representation has been made to me that it will assist in the formation of Building Societies if the taxation on such Societies were the same as that on Life Insurance Companies and I agree that the rate of taxation should be extended and legislation to this effect will be introduced later. Life Insurance rates are now 17.1875% and with new rates to which I will refer later, they may be reduced to 15.604%.

Now as regards Insurance Premiums and Pension Contributions I wish to say that a careful examination has been made to various points in the income structure so as to ascertain what relief can be granted at this stage. Pension Contributions are usually compulsory and I propose that they be treated separately from Insurance Premiums. I wish to say that I am about to propose legislation for this purpose which will be introduced later on and it will also contain provision for increasing the rate of maximum relief on Insurance Premiums from 24% to 28%. This relief will also take into account those persons who take out insurance in connection with house purchase. I think it is only fair to separate Pension Contributions from Insurance Premiums. As far as Pension Contributions are concerned, it is a form of double taxation. You will pay the Income Tax and later on when you draw the Pension Contributions you will pay it again. It is considered fair that these things should be separated and, as I have said, the maximum Insurance Premiums will be increased from 24% to 28% and it is expected that these two proposals will cost in the vicinity of $7,000 a year.

Now, as regards Life Annuities, that is a concession to old people and I propose from the representations which have been made that the Capital element in life annuities purchased by them should be free from tax. This will in effect mean that they will not pay on money used in the purchase of annuities which will have already been taxed as income.

In short when you invest your money in Annuities you have already paid Income Tax; so, there again, it would appear as a form of double taxation. We feel therefore that the Capital element in these Annuities should be free from taxation. Some time ago, the Government intimated that it proposed to introduce legislation to make it clear that voluntary payment under the proviso of Section 18, Subsection (2) of the Income Tax Act means a payment made without consideration and not a payment not under a binding obligation. This will now continue but we also have under examination the Income Tax Law regarding covenants and I propose that it should be brought more into line with the United Kingdom Law. The provisions which we propose to introduce are reasonable and should be a safeguard against tax avoidance. If it is to be recognised for tax purposes, we feel it should not be less than seven years and should be irrevocable.

Some of us dispense charity to occasional persons or institutions. I think this is a matter which was raised in this House a few years ago that any money spent in that direction, that is to say, any money given to charity or charitable persons or institutions should be granted relief from taxation; and so, for the purposes of this Act, we are not against granting some relief, but it has been agreed that this must extend over a period of some years and must not be an occasional one. Our definition in relation to charity is somewhat more restricted than the Law of the United Kingdom and it is not proposed to make any change except that we say that the number of years over which this should extend should be not less than three years.

We now come to relief as regards illegitimate children. As you know, it was decided some years ago that illegitimate children should form an item of claim under the Income Tax Returns. Well, the Commissioner of Income Tax feels that this claim is very often used and that it should be subjected to some restricted legislation. For that purpose an amendment to the Act will be introduced later on to provide that a claim for illegitimate children will apply to those children who are under the custody and maintenance of the claimant. As I have said earlier, it has been drawn to our attention that this claim is very much used and therefore there will be some form of restriction on that.

Now, as regards Child Allowances, hon. members will remember that it has been a burning question for some years. The figure now for Child Allowances is $270 a year. We have been getting information from other colonies in the area on this matter - chiefly from Trinidad and British Guiana - and in consequence of the information which we have received, we are prepared to make some amendment in respect of Child Allowances. We cannot go to the same extent as is being done in these other places but we have struck a middle course and I am sure the amendments which we are about to make will bring some relief to parents as far as the education of their children is concerned.

Now the present allowance is $270 a year and it is proposed that there should be an increased allowance for children of over twelve years of age. Where the child is over twelve years and under sixteen years and is receiving full time instruction as a student at a secondary school or similar educational establishments the allowance will be increased to $360 a year. Where the child has attained the age of sixteen and is receiving full time instruction at a university college, a secondary school or a similar educational establishment within the Island, the allowance will be $420 and if it is receiving that education outside the Island the allowance will be $600. I will repeat that where the child is over twelve years and under sixteen and is receiving full time instruction at a secondary school the allowance will be increased to $360; where that child is over sixteen years and receiving education at a university college, a secondary school or similar establishment within the Island, the allowance will be $420; and if it is receiving that same education outside the Island the allowance will be $600. I think that that is only fair because as soon as the child grows older and its education expands, the parent has to spend more on the child and therefore more relief is sought.

The operation of the P.A.Y.E. system of income tax collection instituted since April 1957 has proved of great benefit, but the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is devising a system which will obviate the collection of trivial amounts of taxes; where the tax is considered trivial- I have in mind people who are employed only for a certain portion of the year, about five or six months and who pay income tax on that amount, but in the later part of the year when they do not work at all, or when they work and the income has considerably decreased and the overall picture for the year will make the tax very small.

We are receiving complaints as to taxes of a trivial amount, and then you have to send these people notices for refunds. The system which the Commissioner is devising will obviate that and the necessity of keeping accounts for trivial amounts. I think that in this way the complaints against the present system will be reduced.

Hon. members will know that there is a great deal of argument about the incidence of income tax as compared with the neighbouring islands. We are told that the income tax rates in Barbados are the highest in the area, but just a couple of weeks ago I have been able to find out that that is not quite correct. In Dominica the rates are very much higher than ours. We have had figures as to the rates from Jamaica, British Guiana and Trinidad, and if we compare them with the rates which are operative in Barbados - and while it would be a good idea and it will be well received, if we are achieving uniformity in the area-

yet we all know Barbados with our limitations of revenue. However from the figures which we show we are prepared to make some adjustment. The rate in Barbados at present is three cents on the first five hundred dollars; In Trinidad it is six cents. We cannot change that rate to bring it up to Trinidad rate. I hasten to alleviate the fears of members on the other side if they think that this rate will be increased so as to bring it up to the Trinidad rate. On the second five hundred dollars it is the same as that in Trinidad. On the second thousand dollars the rate is twelve cents whereas Trinidad's rate is ten cents. On the third thousand our rate is eighteen cents and the Trinidad rate is twelve cents; on the fourth, fifth and sixth thousand our rates are twenty-four cents, thirty cents and forty cents respectively, as compared with eighteen cents, twenty-five cents and twenty-eight cents in Trinidad. After some consideration I propose that our rates on the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth thousand dollars should be ten cents, sixteen cents, twenty-two cents, twenty-eight cents and thirty-four cents in the dollar. There is some reduction in these categories. It is expected that the cost of this concession will be $173,000. No account has been taken of these measures, these reductions, which I now propose, in the estimates of revenue.

The whole thing that I propose will reach in the vicinity of $230,000 and that has not been taken into account in the revenue, but it is expected that the estimated cost will be covered by the surplus shown in the present Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, that finishes what I have to say on the Budget. I have already moved the second reading of this Appropriation Bill.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I would like to say that this is a most important occasion - the most important occasion - and I think that it is due to every member that a copy of this most important speech be sent to him before Friday. I feel sincere on this matter. In other parts of the world where the Budget speech is considered to be the most important, hon. members of the various Houses are given their copies of the speech within a matter of days.

Sir, we have no opportunity of hearing it over the radio or seeing it in verbatim form in the Newspapers because they have not got the room, and I am asking, Sir, that such an important matter be given some consideration and hon. members be given the privilege of seeing it verbatim as soon as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: I like the end of the hon. member's speech "as soon as possible", but I do not think we have the organisation to promise the hon. member to get a copy of the Hon. Premier's speech before Friday. I am positively sure of that and I do not like to make promises which I cannot fulfil.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 13th March, at 12 noon.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, it is true that our Rules are not yet printed and maybe members are not aware of them. I just heard two motions, the motion that this Bill be read a second time and before anything was done about that motion, another motion was made that this House do now adjourn. I would like to have this thing regularised; you cannot have such an affair existing. You cannot have a motion for the second reading and before that is dealt with have a motion that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion has not yet been put. The second reading motion will be put first and then members of the Opposition will be allowed to speak as long as they like.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW MOTION

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw the motion I made just now.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to withdraw his motion, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in view of our decision that we shall consider the Budget speech with its implications and that we shall resume the debate on it after such consideration on Friday of this week, I beg to move that further debate on the motion of the Hon. Premier be now postponed.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that further discussion of the Appropriation Bill be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 13th March, 1959, at 12 noon.

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

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