

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th February, 1947.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LEV. WILSON, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, W. A. CRAWFORD, D. D. GARNER, C. E. TALMA, E. D. MOTTLEY, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and E. L. WARD.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES.

Prayers are read and the Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 18th February, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. ADAMS and WILKINSON enter the House and take their seats.

PAPERS LAID.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:—

Message No. 9 of 1947 from His Excellency the Governor:—

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has fixed the price to be paid for the 1947 sugar crop at £24. 5s. per ton. This represents an increase of £4. 15s. per ton on the price paid in 1946.

2. His Excellency the Governor has been informed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that it is proposed that of this increase only £2 per ton shall be paid direct to sugar manufacturers to enable them to meet increased costs. The remaining £2 15s. per ton will not be directly received by producers, but will be allocated between the following special funds for the benefit of the industry:—

- | | | | | |
|---|------|----|---|-----------|
| (a) Price Stabilization Fund | £1 | 5 | 0 | per ton |
| (b) Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund | | 1 | 0 | 0 per ton |
| (c) Labour Welfare Fund | | 10 | 0 | per ton |

3. In order to give effect to these proposals it is intended to introduce legislation for the establishment of these funds and for the collection and payment into them of the appropriate sums in respect of each ton of sugar exported from the island. The legislation, which will include a clause to bring it into operation as from the 1st of February, 1947, will also provide for the collection of four cents in respect of each gallon of fancy molasses exported from the island.

HILARY BLOOD,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.

25th February, 1947.

Statement showing the appropriation of the Legislative grant for 1946—47 to the Barbados General Agricultural Society.

Statement of sums of money paid over to the Colonial Treasurer by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended on the 31st December, 1946

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from His Majesty's Government in the U.K. under the provisions of the C.D. & W. Act for period ended 31st December, 1946, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. SPRINGER: Resolution for £910 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1946—47 under Head XXI, Department of Science and Agriculture, (ii) Experiment Stations and Botanic Station, Item 41, Cultivation and labour in connection with experimental crops, by £450; and Item 45, Labour for reaping canes, by £460.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of £17,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of subsidising sugar manufactured for local consumption during the year, 1947.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to authorise His Excellency the Governor in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (2) of the Clerical Service Act,

1944 (1944-27) to appoint one additional Clerk to the Clerical Staff of the Clerical Service.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Resolution to sanction Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 37 (1) of the Police Act, 1908 (1908-2).

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. GALE: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully request His Excellency to take the necessary steps to provide that all Government Pensioners be paid a cost of living allowance as from the 1st of April, 1946, at the rates set out in the schedule.

Mr. MOTTLEY: A Bill to authorise the several Vestries of this island to pay a cost of living Bonus to all persons employed by them and Parochial Boards appointed by them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: A Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act 1944—14.

Mr. MOTTLEY: A Bill to amend the Education Act 1890—12.

Mr. SPEAKER said, before allowing the Notices given by Mr. MOTTLEY, that he would have to consider whether the Bills were private or public ones.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. HAYNES: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. Is the Government aware that the Income Tax rate paid by Life Assurance Companies doing business in this Island is very much lower than what these Companies pay in the neighbouring West Indian Islands?

2. If the Answer to the above is yes, will the Government introduce a bill to bring the rate paid in line with the present Income Tax levied on Private Local Companies?

Mr. RAMSAY: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting:—

1. Is it a fact that when Government matters are broadcasted only those persons who have Radios from the Barbados Radio Distribution can listen in?

2. How many Radios have been licensed for the past (5) years in order from 1942—46, both inclusive?

3. What has become of the Government Broadcasting Station which was in operation during the War?

4. If the answer to No. 1 (one) is in the affirmative, will Government state the reason why?

Mr. COX: To enquire from the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting:—

1. Is Government aware that the bodies of persons discovered dead are conveyed by cart to the Mortuary?

2. If the answer is yes, will Government consider the possibility of providing some more convenient means of transportation?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:—

1. Is Government aware that the water supply in Alexandria, Rock Hall, Collyn's Districts in St. Lucy has been completely shut off?

2. Does Government appreciate that persons in these districts have to walk miles, sometimes uphill, in order to fetch water?

3. Will Government explain fully:—

(a) the reason, or reasons, for this water shortage?

(b) what steps are being taken to ameliorate the present situation?

(c) whether such a situation as the present is likely to recur.

APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 7/1947 informing the House of proposals for the appointment of an Architect and Town Planning Officer in place of Mr. L. de Syllas and asking for an early reply. I regret to say that there has been an oversight in not having this Select Committee appointed before and I shall be very glad if the House will agree to appoint it to-day.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that a Select Committee be appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's Message No. 7/1947 is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I appoint the members of that Committee as follows:—

The senior member for the City (Mr. MOTTLEY), the junior member for St. Peter (Mr. RAMSAY), the junior member for St. John (Mr. BLACKMAN), the junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. BRANCKER), and the senior member for St. Michael (Mr. COX).

RATES PAYABLE TO PRODUCERS OF FANCY MOLASSES.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Order No. 8 be taken as the first Order of the Day; it is a very urgent matter.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this matter be postponed as it is to be considered by the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on Thursday next. I think it will be well for the House to postpone the matter until the Board has come to a final decision on that day.

The question that Order No. 8 be taken as the first Order is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St George, —To move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolved that the House of Assembly approve the following Rate payable to producer and Rate payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on fancy molasses produced during the crop year 1946—47 fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board in accordance with Regulations 5 and 6 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Regulations, 1938:—

(a) The Rate payable to the producer of fancy molasses during the crop year 1946-47 shall be not less than eighteen pence a wine gallon;

(b) The Rate of tax payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board shall be one and one-half pence a wine gallon.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker,—This is the usual Resolution to sanction a decision taken by the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board and the Governor-in-Executive Committee in accordance with Regulations 5 and 6 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Regulations of 1938. These Regulations require that no person shall export fancy molasses during any crop year unless he shall first satisfy the Comptroller of Customs that the producer has been paid at a rate not less than that fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Board and approved by the Houses of Legislature and also that every producer shall pay to the Board, not later than the 31st July in each crop year, a tax at such a rate as shall be fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Board and approved by both Houses of the Legislature for every standard gallon of fancy molasses produced by him in the crop year. These Regulations were made necessary, as honourable members know, by the differential in the price of sugar and fancy molasses, in order that there should be equity between the respective producers. As I have said, the proposed rates are fixed in the first instance by the Board of which the senior member for St. Andrew is a member, are confirmed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and are to be approved by this House and the Other Place. I beg, therefore, to move that the Resolution approving these Rates do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to move that this Resolution be postponed for a week, in view of the fact that the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board—I have not the agenda here but I received my copy yesterday—will be discussing this matter on Thursday this week at a special meeting. I think the Board has some reason for altering these rates,—a very important reason too. Therefore, I am asking the House to postpone this Resolution for one week until the Board meets again and comes to its decision.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am also a member of that Board. When we met on the last occasion we unanimously agreed that the rates should be fixed as they are in this Resolution but since then, the factories and the different syrup manufacturers would like the rate of three cents to be changed to one of two cents, so that a cent can go to the producers of syrup. As the Board will be holding a special meeting for that purpose on Thursday this week—only two days off—I think this House will be well advised to postpone the further consideration of this Resolution until the next meeting.

Mr. SPRINGER: After hearing the senior member for St. James I think it would be wrong for us to proceed with this Resolution to-day; I shall not vote against the motion of the senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this Resolution do now pass. To that, an amendment has been moved that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. The question is that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER. The next Order is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee of Supply, Mr. Ramsay being in the Chair.

ERECTION OF NEW PAY WARD AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of £5,063 (to be subsequently refunded from loan funds) to supplement Resolution No. 17 of the 13th February, 1945, towards the cost of erecting a new Pay Ward at the General Hospital do now pass. This Resolution was considered last Tuesday but was not passed at that meeting. I have no further information to give in connection with it and I beg to move that it do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS enters the House amidst cheers and takes his seat.

Mr. WARD: I am very sorry to see that the Government up to now has not been able to give us any information and has treated us with such discourtesy as far as this matter is concerned. After being told by members of the public outside that the hospital is very greatly in need of this Pay Ward "A" I am going to move that the vote be reduced by £5 as a protest. I am voting for the Resolution only because I feel sure, from what I have been told outside by members of the public, that they are suffering very greatly for beds and I should not like to stand in the way of the Hospital Board helping people to secure beds when they are ill. A case has been made out against the Hospital Board. It seems to me that the Board is sheltering someone and if its members cannot give us an explanation as to how that money has been thrown away, they should resign or the Government should take over the institution and run it itself. I feel, Sir, that that Board should have been able to give us even the smallest iota of information about this money which has been spent. If they were running the hospital in a businesslike manner, they would have entered into a contract with a contractor for the due performance of this work. It is not only Government's money which has been thrown away but other people's money has also been thrown away and I am voting for this to-day only for the reason I have given. If it were left to me I would not vote another cent for that building. I would pull it down and build a new one. Anyhow, I will vote this money because I feel that the public is in need of beds at the hospital,—for no other reason but that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to second the motion for the reduction of this vote by £5. I regret very much, Sir, that the honourable member in charge of this Resolution should have told this House to-day, after the heated debate on this matter on Tuesday last, that he is not able to give us any further information. Well, Sir, that does not sound right. I am supporting this reduction purely because I am aware of the condition of the hospital and I should like to see this Resolution passed. The attitude of this House last week showed that honourable members are definitely dissatisfied with the manner in which this building has been erected. No one can suggest that the postponement last week was a censure on the Government. What Government could have been responsible for this building? But I say this. It does appear that as soon as some honourable members become members of the Hospital Board, they seem to think that the other honourable members should accept what they tell them

but as long as I have a hot hair in my head and a seat in this House I am going to object to that (Cheers). I feel, Sir, that this is no censure on any Government; it is only an expression of disapproval over the manner in which this building has been erected.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind the honourable member that the question before the Committee has nothing to do with the censuring of anybody and that no such word as "censure" has been used, so far, except by the honourable member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I used that word in giving my reasons for associating myself with the motion of the senior member for St. Lucy and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you will grant me that latitude. I am saying that in future I hope honourable members in charge of Resolutions relating to the various Departments will come to this House armed with the facts so as to make the passage of the particular Resolution safe, so to speak, in the House. Although, Sir, we are aware of the existing conditions at the hospital and the difficulties which middle class people are experiencing through the want of this ward, yet I feel that the Hospital Board will appreciate the stand taken by this House if honourable members will see the wisdom of voting that this amount be reduced by £5.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—I happened not to be a member of the Hospital Board at the time when this incident—regrettable though it may be—occurred. Honourable members who say, with almost one voice, that the Hospital Board should be censured must realize that the present composition of that Board merely includes one half of those who were there at the time when this regrettable incident occurred. Those honourable members who opposed this Resolution so strongly a week ago do not seem to realize that the wishes and wants of the public are paramount to their little petty squabbles in this House. We hear to-day the suggestion that this vote be reduced by £5; that is another little petty move on the part of those who make that suggestion and, in my opinion, appears to be a little more ridiculous than their action on the previous occasion. The Resolution must go through as it is or not at all; the reduction of the vote by £5 is petty. I am glad to see that they have discovered that the middle class and poor people are sadly in need of this ward and have turned around and expressed their willingness to support this Resolution. The quicker we pass this Resolution the better for all concerned. If we delay much longer, the chances are that we will have not only any building at all but that the previous sums of money will have been spent to no useful purpose.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I think the honourable member who has just spoken should realize that the opponents to this Resolution on the last occasion appreciated the fact that the public was suffering from the want of beds at the hospital, otherwise we would have moved that the Resolution be rejected; we would not have moved its postponement; so I think he makes a big mistake when he says that we did not know what we were doing. In representation of the taxpayers' money I say that I consider it a disgrace that the Hospital Board—new and old, some of the old members are still on it—should have allowed this money to be wasted as it has been wasted. It is our business to see that an enquiry is made into the matter and the honourable member, who seems to think that £5 is too small an amount by which this vote should be reduced, very nearly made me move to-day that the Resolution be rejected entirely. If the members of this Board had been spend-

ing their own money, they would have noticed that the estimate was not holding out and they would not have waited until every shilling was spent before they took steps to have their building completed. This is a hospital farce and this Government should not become a party to their misdemeanour. I consider that any member who goes on a Government Board should see that the Government's money is properly spent, otherwise he is not fit to remain on that Board.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman,—This money has to be voted and as a matter of fact if in a few months' time the Hospital Board came back to us and stated that a few more thousands of feet of lumber cannot be accounted for, we will still have to vote the money. I still feel that the Government or the Hospital Board should let us know whether a rigid enquiry is being instituted. I suggest that a Commission of Enquiry be appointed to go into the question of this shortage of lumber, otherwise we are likely to have another Resolution like this before us because if they are going to put a different person in charge of this building, he may feel that nothing happened in the first instance and he could do likewise. As far as I can see, the Hospital Board as a whole has given carte blanche to their Chairman or if they have not given it to him, he assumes that he has it. Without the knowledge of individual members of the Board, it would seem that he proceeded and agreed with a firm of engineers to supervise the erection of that building at a good rate of commission with the result that a substantial amount of money will be going into the pockets of that firm without any actual supervision having been done by them. The members of this Board should secure the services of a proper builder to supervise the erection of their building and not leave it to the Chairman to make all contracts and all the necessary arrangements for the work to be done. We cannot run the risk of anything like this happening again because if it happens again we have to foot the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think, in view of the attitude I adopted last Tuesday, I should make my position clear to-day. There is no doubt about it that in the construction of this new Pay Ward there has been gross inefficiency and neglect and even worse. Not only has there been this tremendous shortage of materials but we were told that even 30% of the ten/test had to be discarded because the sizes had to be cut to the length which was wanted. With your experience, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you must realize that there has been a sheer waste of public funds. I cannot imagine anybody with a sense of responsibility undertaking to erect a building at public expense and wasting one-third of the material just to obtain the size or length he wants. I am going to vote for the money because I have been assured in the proper quarters since last Tuesday that a most thorough investigation will be conducted in the whole affair. With that knowledge I feel satisfied to-day, Sir, in voting for the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—There is not much I am going to say, except to remind the junior member for St. Lucy that he has not put the case against the Hospital Board half as strong as I have been putting it for the past 12 or 13 years and that this Government feels as strongly on this matter as any honourable member of this House. In fact, I may say that this is the last straw that has broken the back of the General Hospital being a private institution. I thought honourable members remem-

bered that I mentioned that shortly—probably next Tuesday—a Bill to create the hospital a Government Department will be brought to the House; so that any censure or words in the nature of a censure on a dead Board is tantamount to flogging a dead horse. The Government is, however, glad that honourable members have in the past week seen that it is their duty to pass the Resolution as it stands.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I did not intend to say anything because I heard that this Resolution is going to be passed but the Hospital Board is the only Board on which I have been serving since I have been a member of this House and in view of some of the reported speeches which I have read, and some of what I have heard here to-day from the lips of honourable members of this House—some of them old members and others who had relations with the Government and, therefore, should know better—accusing the Hospital Board of neglect, questioning the integrity and scrupulousness of members of the Board and stating that if they undertake a job they should carry it out, I would like, for the enlightenment of members of this House and the general public, particularly the taxpayers, to make a few remarks on this matter. I went on that Board when this proposition was taking final shape. The Hospital Board must find more accommodation for patients and it was more inconvenient to negotiate for a suitable building outside and get it at a reasonable rental than it was to build a building contiguous to the present hospital buildings. They must, therefore, build on the limited available space in the compound. What did they do? They did not call in a layman and ask “Can we build a building here?” They asked their engineers to tell them if they could build a building there and, if so, what type of building. You, Sir, alone among the twenty-four members of this House would be able to speak with authority on this matter. You were a member of the Board at that time and you agreed to the proposition which we embarked upon and none of us can say that you do not know how to read plans or that you know nothing about foundations in your native land. I would like to know which layman on that Board would have had the audacity to come out and say that Messrs. Law and Connell are people who can only shift machinery in a sugar factory and that they know nothing about reading plans and laying foundations. Which layman on that Board would have had the audacity to come out and say “I insist that a stone building be built”, when he is told that it might fall and kill the patients. I am not telling honourable members they are wrong to criticize but so far as I can see they do not know these particular facts. Mr. Chairman, I have said this in this House already. Material of certain sizes was wanted for this building and not only did the Hospital Board have to start the building but they had to set up a saw-mill to get timbers of the right sizes; so there was considerable delay. I think it is particularly strange that the building had to get to its present proportions before a hard-headed Barbadian businessman could tell that it was a death trap, merely because he had a stone building nearby to sell to the Hospital Board. The first man who expressed that that building was a death trap was at the same time offering for sale to the Hospital Board a building adjacent to the institution. It is for the public to know these things. I feel that I have acted scrupulously since I have been a member of the Hospital Board. We have on the hospital staff a Clerk of Works. We felt we could utilize his services and we tried to build that building as cheaply as possible. But everything went against us—increased wages, difficul-

ty in obtaining materials and things of that sort. I hear now that a wooden building at the hospital is a death trap. Why should it be a death trap for Barbados and not for any other colony? Go through the length and breadth of the West Indies and see what the hospitals are built of in other colonies; they are all sorts of types built of wood and Barbadians who go to these colonies and have to enter them for treatment do not get burnt to death. I say that it is not highly improbable that a hospital building will catch fire. In any hospital a bed is inflammable material and a patient who is a smoker may catch it afire and burn himself before anybody can go to his assistance. All those things can happen. In spite of the fact that it has been said by people who are wise after the event and who now have the facts that the Hospital Board had done what is entirely wrong, I feel that they came to the only conclusion to which they could come, that is, to provide accommodation for middle class people who can pay five shillings per day for accommodation in the hospital, and I think that they would have been sadly lacking in statesmanship and their responsibility to the people if they had not set out to have this building built. I do not say that everything is perfectly in order but so far as the laymen are concerned they had to take the advice of the experts. They went to the highest they could get,—a recognised firm of engineers in this colony who have some experience in building. I take it that they bought the lumber and other materials from reputable firms. For the benefit of one or two honourable members who have come in here as the result of the last election—I hope they will vote this money even in spite of anything I may tell them—I will say that if I had been in this colony when this matter was set down for consideration I would have taken the trouble to look up the debates and see some of the projects on which the Government with more technical advice spent 50 per cent. and more than the amounts for which they set out to build them. There are many instances in which the estimated amounts were exceeded by far and if the materials went nobody ever knew about it. Certain people were on the Boards and whatever the shortages were, they were never made public. I make these remarks because I feel that as a public man and as a member of the Hospital Board it is my duty to explain to the people the part I played in this matter. I do not feel myself capable of looking at that building and saying that all the materials are not in it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I am one of those members who, not being a member of the Government, would never like it to be felt that I was offering opposition in this House for the sake of opposition, but after listening to the junior member for the City I wonder if he thinks that he has convinced any member of this House by anything he has said. The members of this House on Tuesday last lamented the fact that the introducer of this Resolution could tell us nothing about the missing 8,000 square feet of lumber and all that the junior member for the City has said is nothing but a diarrhoea of words. The fact that there is a shortage of 8,000 square feet of lumber and no explanation forthcoming caused us to oppose the passing of the Resolution on Tuesday last in order to register our disapproval. Now, Sir, the first thing I am going to say in reply to the honourable member is this. Apparently he has never worked on a Board with me yet when he said that no honourable member would have had the courage to tell the engineers—

The CHAIRMAN: Whether the junior member for the City has or has not worked on a Board with the senior member for the City has nothing to do with this Resolution. The honourable senior member for the City must confine his remarks to the Resolution before the Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am replying to remarks made by the junior member for the City.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no necessity for any reply as regards Boards on which the two honourable members may or may not have sat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that in all the democratic assemblies of the world the rights and privileges of those in the minority are usually safeguarded by the Chair. It would appear that because I happen to be in the minority and not in the Government I am not to be allowed to reply to any remarks which an honourable member may make.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, no! I am asking the honourable member not to make any reference to any Board or Boards on which he and the junior member for the City may or may not have sat. What is before the Committee is the Resolution and the honourable member must confine his remarks to that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am still making my point. If you are ruling that I cannot do so I shall have no other alternative but to appeal to Mr. Speaker. I am submitting that it is my right to reply to any statement or remarks made by another honourable member relative to a motion which I have made or seconded. I most respectfully make that submission and if you rule against it I have no alternative but to appeal to Mr. Speaker for his ruling. We cannot go on in this way. I am prepared to give the Chair its necessary respect as long as the Chair will permit me to exercise that right which is mine. I am saying that the junior member for the City was not here on Tuesday last and all he has said cannot convince honourable members that the postponement of this Resolution was not due to the fact that 8,000 sq. ft. of lumber was missing.

Mr. LEWIS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member. I would like to tell him that I do not remember saying anything against the House postponing the Resolution on the last occasion. I said nothing as to whether it was a right or a wrong procedure. I just gave an explanation from my point of view.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member referred to the fact that no member of the Board on which he sat had the courage to say whether or not the engineers were wrong or words to that effect. I am only reminding him that as members of this House we have not yet served on a Board together.

The CHAIRMAN: I have just told the honourable member that the sitting together on a Board by himself and the junior member for the City has nothing to do with this Resolution and that is my ruling.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to bow to your ruling but I submit again that in any debate I am entitled to reply to any remarks which another honourable member has made as long as in doing so I respect the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that you keep to the point.

Dr. CUMMINS enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am keeping to the point. I am talking about the honourable member as a member of the Hospital Board and the engineers who erected this building. The honourable member made the statement that no member of that Board had the temerity or courage to say that the engineers who were asked to give advice to the Board relative to the erection of the building were not capable and I am only reminding him that all his colleagues were

not on the Board and these would include me. The honourable member never heard the remarks of the junior member for St. John in reply to me. That honourable member said that the reason why the building was not built of stone was because the engineers said that the foundation would have been too costly. If that is an incorrect statement, it is not my fault. If that is a statement which the Hospital Board regrets was made in this House, that is not my fault but the fact remains that it is the statement which was made in this House. I wonder if the junior member for the City knows that it is within the knowledge of members of this House that the staircase to this building was pulled down twice. The honourable member must remember that in agreeing to the postponement of this Resolution on Tuesday last we were cognizant of our responsibility in registering our disapproval. We have come back here and expressed our willingness to vote this money but that it should be reduced by £5 as a mark of our disapproval. It is not a matter of censuring the Government or the Hospital Board. I believe that the Board, with its limited experience, has done its best but in the circumstances that best is a very bad best. Because the junior member for the City is a member of that Board are we to accept his statement that everything has gone right? As a matter of fact everything has not gone right because 8,000 sq. ft. of lumber has disappeared and one-third of the ten-test has been used not at all wisely; therefore, we registered our protest in the matter. I cannot speak too strongly on this subject. If we had merely sat by and voted for the Resolution last week, the inference would be that we are despised and would have to vote for it but that will never happen to me in this House. I go further. I am more satisfied, since the honourable senior member for St. Philip has spoken, that I should vote for the reduction of this vote by £5 because up to now the junior member for St. John has not told us whether they intend to institute a proper enquiry. I take it that the senior member for St. Philip could not have made a statement of that sort in this House if he were not certain of his facts.

Mr. WARD: I would like the junior member for the City to know that even the Government itself realizes that the Hospital Board is useless because the Government is going to take over the running of that institution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is one point I forget to make and it is this. I happen to be the honourable member who said that that building is a death trap. I do not know where the junior member for the City got his information from but although I make my money by selling things yet I have never offered the Hospital Board anything for sale; so that when the honourable member makes his innuendo I would like him to know that I am courageous enough to say that that building is a death trap.

Mr. LEWIS: The ordinary procedure in this House—I do not know if it is observed in any other place where the honourable member is a member—is that when another honourable member gets up to speak while he is speaking he should take his seat. I would like to tell him this. I do not know whether he sold the Hospital Board anything or not. I do not know whether he said that the building was a death trap or not. I particularly said that the first person who stated that the building was a death-trap was the person who offered for sale to the Board a stone building adjacent to the institution. I do not give

him any credit for the originality of the statement but if he thinks that he is the first person who made it, then that is entirely a matter for him.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—On the last occasion when I spoke on this matter I began by saying that in my opinion it was a blatant attempt to swindle the Government and I am still of that opinion. Now the junior member for the City seems to be the champion of the Hospital Board and he looks at the other members of this House in a very funny way when he says that they would not have any idea of this building. I am submitting that any member who agrees to this matter and tries to make out that it is right is absolutely wrong because any ordinary person would know that that building is not worth one half-penny more than £6,000. We are being told it will cost £11,000 and on top of that a member of the Board concerned is trying to say that they are right. I cannot imagine that a Board could be so gullible as to allow it to be thrust down their throats that that building is worth that amount of money.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is that this Resolution do now pass. An amendment has been moved to the effect that the amount be reduced by £5. Well, of course, the Chair has to put the amendment first but I am saying this: This is the second sitting on which our time has been occupied with this vote and quite enough has been said. I would crave the indulgence of honourable members and ask them not to carry on this discussion any longer; it is not going to get us any further.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to say to the junior member for St. George who is a young man and a young member of this House, that, in taking exception to the remarks which I made, the public would have a better opinion of him, as far as helpful statesmanship is concerned—

The CHAIRMAN: I must not allow the honourable member to make allusions to another honourable member. As a matter of fact every member has the right to express his opinion and the honourable member should not make allusion to statesmanship or things like that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am merely offering him a little advice and I would like to ask him this question. If he were a member of the Hospital Board, what would he have done in these circumstances?

Mr. DOWDING: I thank the honourable member but really am not in need of his advice.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not saying that the honourable member is in need of the advice but I am still going to give it to him because he may discover, when he gets older, that he is really in need of it. He is entirely mistaken if he thinks that I am taking the opportunity to try to explain away the 8.0% of lumber. What I am saying is that the Hospital Board has come to the House with the facts and have not kept things in the dark. I think certain honourable members should show some appreciation of what the Board has done (Laughter). If the honourable junior member for St. George feels that he can sit on a Board and be a builder or contractor, that is a matter for him. I was not placed on that Board as a builder or contractor and I was not going to place myself in the position of having to tell the taxpayers that I put a shoemaker to do a saddler's job. That is all I am concerned with. I have never heard of an enquiry being instituted in circumstances like these before and anything I have said is merely in defence of the attitude taken up by the laymen of the Hospital Board.

The question that the amount of £5,063 be reduced by £5 is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. MAPP, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD.—9.

Noes: Mr. LEWIS, Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SMITH, COX, FOSTER, BRANCKER, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, TALMA, Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. SPEAKER.—13.

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

DELEGATE TO VETERINARY OFFICERS' CONFERENCE IN JAMAICA.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £110 to send a representative from Barbados to a Conference of Veterinary Officers from the British West Indies to be held in Jamaica. The Agenda which perhaps will be of interest to honourable members is as follows:—

(1) Quarantine Regulations concerning inter-island movements of livestock; (2) Notification of the outbreak of contagious and infectious diseases amongst livestock in the different islands, and a free exchange of information on such outbreaks; (3) Tick control throughout the area and tick-borne diseases; (4) The prevalence and extent of equine encephalo-myelitis in the West Indies, control and eradication of same; (5) Mineral deficiencies in livestock; (6) Canine Leptospirosis; (7) Relative measures directed towards the importation of animals with particular relation to recently constructed U.S. bases; (8) The prevalence and extent of paralytic Rabies (bat transmitted) and swine fever. Methods of control and possible eradication. Those are the subjects that will be discussed at this conference. This Government has selected Dr. C. E. P. Stoute who is the only veterinary officer in this island and holds the Degrees of M.D.V., M.R.S.I. Dr. Stoute's duty is to see after the Government's animals. He is responsible for the health of some 500 Government owned animals and is also Inspector of in-coming and out-going stock. The idea is that this Conference will be of great benefit to Dr. Stoute who in turn will pass on the knowledge he has gained for the benefit of the island. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think this is a very good thing indeed but I would just like to ask the honourable junior member for St. John how the Conference came off because I see that it is being held in February and this is very near the end of February. Has it been a successful conference? (Laughter).

Mr. BLACKMAN: I can only say that the Conference is to be started late in February and will continue into the month of March.

Mr. SPRINGER: I do not think the junior member for St. James will be surprised at that. The honourable member can remember, I am sure, Resolutions for money to enable officers to go to Trinidad which were passed about two years after the officers went and returned.

Mr. LEWIS: I remember the junior member for St. James being a prominent member of the Government when the Sanitation Officer left here for a particular Course and that long after the House voted the money for him.

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

INCREASED PAY FOR UNESTABLISHED SUBORDINATE AND CASUAL STAFF OF THE HOSPITAL

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of of £6,984 for the purpose of putting the Subordinate, Unestablished and Casual Staff of the General Hospital on the same footing as officers in a similar position in the Government Service as far as salaries are concerned. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for £2,170. This is required to give a cost of living allowance to certain members of the Hospital Staff, similar to that which has been given to the Public Officers, from the 1st April, 1946. The addendum sets out the position quite clearly and I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE FOR THE POST OFFICE.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for £69 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1946—47 under Head VIII, Post Office, Item 12, Inland Mails. The contractors asked that, in view of the increased cost of living, labour and materials, they be granted an increase in the contract price for the carriage of the mails. The Postmaster has gone into the matter and is satisfied that the request is reasonable. This money is to enable increased wages totalling £2 4. 2. per week to be paid by the contractors to the employees directly concerned with the operation of the mail vans. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: I would like to know if there is any guarantee that these contractors are going to hand over this money to the drivers and I would also like to know who the contractors are.

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

INCREASED PAY FOR PERSONS EMPLOYED UNDER DEVELOPMENT AND WELFARE SCHEMES.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for £10,292 (A) to supplement the Resolutions in Column 1 of Schedule A to this Resolution by the amounts in Column II of the schedule and (B) to provide for increased rates of pay to persons employed under the Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes in Column I of Schedule B to this Resolution by the amounts in Column II of the schedule. Honourable members will see the schemes set out in the respective schedules which speak for themselves. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman,—The fourth item in Schedule A states: "No. 60 of 1946 for the installation of water services to Housing Board's houses in Deacon's Road and Belfield Tenancies £1,915." Does that mean that the Government is giving the people in these houses free water services or are the people supposed to pay for these amenities?

Mr. ADAMS: The installations remain the property of the Government and the people pay water rates. The installations are a tap in the yard

and a toilet and bath in the house. When the Deacon's Road tenantry was first started, there was an agreement that everything should be the property of the tenant after he had paid rent for 20 years but that agreement has been altered with the consent of the hirers. They agree now that the installations should remain the property of the Government.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Chairman reported the passing of six Resolutions and the postponement of one in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the six Resolutions are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

FACTORIES BILL POSTPONED.

Mr. ADAMS asks for and is granted leave to postpone the consideration of the Bill to make provision for the registration and supervision of factories and for the safety and well being of workers employed therein. He says that the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill has not yet sat.

DAIRIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George, —To move the passing of the following Resolution:—

"Resolved that the House of Assembly approve of Regulations made by the General Board of Health under Section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941. and approved and sanctioned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker,—Honourable members have had plenty of time now to consider these regulations and I expect that they will desire little information or to make little comment on any of them. The purpose of the regulations is obvious; they have been thoroughly "vetted", re-cast, supervised and even worked. The Chief Medical Officer is satisfied that they are reasonable and efficacious, and, I understand, the King's Legal Adviser, the Attorney General, has satisfied himself that they are properly drawn. It is not for me to add anything, except to move that this Resolution sanctioning these regulations do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on these regulations.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: Before the question is put I would like to express an opinion on Regulation 5. I am making a plea, not for myself because it is my intention to work along these lines to earn a livelihood but I am really making it for the planter element, those persons who will come under this regulation. Cow-pens on plantations are usually littered with grass and trash; the cattle are invariably kept clean and the owners are not dairymen who have to buy fodder and litter. Some of them have brought to my notice that this regulation will create a hardship as far as they are concerned. I am not suggesting that things like sanitation and the tuberculin testing of cattle should be neglected but I would like the Committee to see its way to make conditions as easily as possible for these people who keep cattle for agricultural purposes. For instance, one particular manager told me that he cannot make a milk-room, not because it will cost too much but that if his attorney came and saw the milk-room he would think that he has set himself up in business at the

expense of the plantation. In addition to that, the neighbouring people get their milk cheaper from these plantations and I am wondering whether this will not be a disservice to the public, although we are trying to make it easier for them now. I would like something done, whereby the agricultural people can be eased somewhat because I know as a fact that their cow-pens are invariably kept clean on account of the amount of fodder and litter at their disposal.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on these regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the regulations, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Regulations 1 to 4 inclusive are read and agreed to.

Regulation 5. (1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in Regulation 4 of these Regulations, cows may be kept for the purpose of producing milk for sale in a cow-pen which is kept in connection with an agricultural undertaking provided:

- (a) that such cow-pen is situated outside the areas mentioned in sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (b) of Regulation 14 of these Regulations;
- (b) that such cow-pen is at least fifty feet from any dwelling house;
- (c) that the provisions of paragraph (2) of this Regulation are complied with; and
- (d) that the written permission of the Commissioners has been obtained.

(2) The owner or person for the time being in charge of any cow-pen of the nature referred to in paragraph (1) of this Regulation shall ensure that the following requirements are complied with:—

- (a) clean litter shall be provided for the cows in such cow-pen at least once in every twenty-four hours;
- (b) the drainage from the cow-pen shall not lead in the direction of any dwelling house;
- (c) no cow shall be milked while in the cow-pen;
- (d) whenever there is any superstructure in relation to the cow-pen the uprights thereof and any other part of such superstructure which can be lime-washed shall be lime-washed not less than once every six months.

(3) Any permission of the Commissioners granted under this Regulation may be suspended or withdrawn by the Commissioners or by the Board at any time if they shall consider that any provision of paragraph (2) of this Regulation has not been complied with.

(4) The provisions of Regulations 8, 9, and 11 of paragraphs (1) and (2) of Regulation 12 of these Regulations shall apply so far as the same are relevant, in respect of any permission granted under this Regulation, as they apply in respect of a registration.

Mr. SPRINGER: In moving that Regulation 5 stand part of these regulations, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to give a reply to your observations and the information which you asked for when you were speaking in the House. First of all, these regulations are not sanitary regulations in the general sense; they are regulations concerning the production and sale of milk and are not intended to provide for the ordinary cow-pens where stock are kept, but are concerned with milk that is produced and sold as dairy milk. Well now, a person who keeps not more than two cattle for

the purpose of providing milk for his family is not keeping a dairy and does not come within these regulations at all; he is merely controlled by the ordinary regulations which are made by the Commissioners of Health. If you will look further on to Part 9, Regulation 26, you will see there the heading "Disposal of Surplus Milk not produced for sale", and sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 26 says this:—

"No person who keeps a milch cow or milch cows for the purpose of supplying his household with milk may sell or otherwise dispose of for profit any surplus of such milk except he shall have obtained the written permission of the Commissioners so to do.

(2) No permission shall be granted under this Regulation unless the applicant

- (a) keeps not more than two milch cows;
- (b) does not obtain milk from any source other than his two milch cows;
- (c) shall have complied with the provisions of paragraph (a) of Regulation 14 of these Regulations."

If he is selling milk he has to have a milk-room or a cupboard to store his milk in while it is awaiting sale. So that the Regulation before us now is dealing with dairies, that is to say, places where persons are engaged in the milk-producing and selling business. It says *inter alia*: "Cows may be kept for the purpose of producing milk for sale in a cow-pen which is kept in connection with an agricultural undertaking provided (a) that such cow-pen is situated outside the areas mentioned in sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph (b) of Regulation 14 of these Regulations; (b) that such cow-pen is at least fifty feet from any dwelling house . . ." I must confess that, at first, this 50 ft. business gave me a little worry myself and I had a talk with the Chief Medical Officer in order to have my mind clear on it. He has put me on the right track, as I have explained to this Committee, that is, that this is not intended to have anything to do with the ordinary small man who has one or two cows; if he finds that he has a surplus of milk, he merely goes to the Sanitary Commissioners and gets permission to dispose of his surplus. As soon as he goes and buys a third cow and is keeping that milk for sale, he will automatically have to register. Anybody keeping a large number of cows should have more land and should be able to shift his cows; he should have the floor of the pen cemented because dung that is collected will breed flies and you have to keep the pen as far away from houses as possible. So I think that if these regulations are properly understood and if these small keepers are properly advised by the Sanitary Authorities and people like that who have read them, there should not be any hardship to anybody at all. I beg to move that Regulation 5 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair and adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: With regard to the Bills of which the honourable senior member for the City gave notice this morning, they are not private Bills and they are quite in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move that these Bills be now read a first time.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to make the motions.

On motions of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GALE in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

Bill to authorise the several Vestries of this island to pay a Cost of Living Bonus to all persons employed by them and the Parochial Boards which the Vestries appoint.

Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Act 1944—14.

Bill to amend the Education Act 1890—12.

REPLIES LAID

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to Questions No. 16, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, and the Replies to Questions No. 17, standing in the name of the honourable junior for St. Joseph.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to Question No. 13 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended in order to resume Government Business.

Mr. RAMSAY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE ON DAIRIES REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment for lunch took place, the House was in Committee on the Regulations made by the General Board of Health under Section 3 of the Dairies Act, 1941, and approved and sanctioned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Regulations Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee on these Regulations, we were considering Regulation 5 of the Regulations, and the honourable senior member for St. George had made a motion.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: This Regulation says that "cows may be kept for the purpose of producing milk for sale in a cow-pen which is kept in connection with an agricultural undertaking provided:.....and then we have in paragraph (b) "that such cow-pen is at least fifty feet from any dwelling-house;" The honourable senior member for St. George has told us that persons who own two cows do not come under these Regulations. I suggest that fifty feet is too far a distance in respect of a person who is keeping three cows. I suggest that the distance should be made twenty-five feet. Many people cannot find a distance of fifty feet away from their dwelling-houses and that is the only hardship in this Regulation. A person does not like to leave his cow too far from his house because he may lose it during the night. (Laughter). I beg to move that the word "fifty" be deleted, and the word "thirty" be inserted in place thereof.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that. This matter was discussed during the last Election. On several occasions I have come across people who own three cows, and they are unable to get their cow-sheds fifty feet away from their dwelling houses. I do not think that it would make much difference if the distance is made thirty feet instead of fifty feet.

Mr. TALMA: I, too, would like to join in expressing similar sentiments in this matter. An agricultural undertaking does not necessarily mean a large lot of land, but it may be a four-acre lot which the average peasant owns. Although this provision only applies in respect of an agricultural undertaking, in truth and in fact there is a great dearth of land where peasants are concerned. We have to bear in mind that where a peasant has a very small holding, probably not more than an acre, if he wants to engage in dairy business, it stands to reason that he will suffer a hardship to a certain extent. I have been approached by small dairy keepers in this connection; they may suffer a certain amount of hardship because they have to divide up their land at great expense. If you read paragraph (b) carefully—it says that such cow-pen must be at least fifty feet from any dwelling-house; that means not only the dwelling house of the owner of the holding, but also the dwelling-house of a tenant. I am thoroughly in support of this amendment and will vote for it when the time comes.

Mr. SPRINGER: We all have the same feeling in this matter. As I said this morning, I was exercised in my mind about the matter before I came into the House, and I discussed it with the C.M.O. who gave me a professional opinion on it. All of us as laymen, looking at the convenience of people, would say "Let us make the distance ten feet". There are those who would like to keep these cow-pens just in their back-yards; but let us be statesmanlike. I suggest that we postpone the further consideration of this Regulation, and let the General Board of Health consider it on the basis of the objection which has been made. I ask leave that the further consideration of this Regulation be postponed.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member and the further consideration of the Regulation was postponed.

Regulations 6 to 8 inclusive were read and passed.

Regulation 9 was read as follows:—

9. (1) Should the Commissioners

(a) refuse to grant a Certificate of Registration or

(b) fail to come to a decision on any application for registration of a dairy within thirty days after such application shall have been received by them the applicant may appeal to the Board, whose decision in the matter shall be final, and who, in the event of the appeal succeeding, shall direct the Commissioners to register the dairy and to issue a Certificate of Registration in respect thereof, which direction such Commissioners are hereby required to carry out.

(2) If sent to the Commissioners by post, an application shall be deemed to have been received by them on the day on which it would have reached them in the ordinary course of post.

(3) Every appeal under this Regulation shall be lodged with the Clerk of the Board not later than ten days after the refusal or failure to come to a decision of the Commissioners as set out in paragraph (1) of this Regulation.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 9 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: As regards Sub-clause (2), an application for the registration of a dairy sent to the Commissioners of Health may be misplaced if sent by ordinary post, and I think that it would be well to have it sent by registered post. In other words, the Commissioners have to give a receipt that they have received the application.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member asking leave to insert the word "registered" before the word "post" occurring in line 1 of the Sub-clause?

Mr. SPRINGER: I am quite easy in the matter; it is a matter for the honourable member. It is not a big point, because after the thirty days have passed and no decision has been taken, the applicant finds out what has happened: if he proves that the application has been posted, he can tell whether the Commissioners have received it or not. I do not see that any hardship can be worked on anybody by this Sub-clause. If you say that the application should be sent by registered post, you should say what must happen if it is sent by ordinary post. I think that it is better to leave the Sub-clause as it is.

The question that Regulation 9 stand part of these Regulations was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Regulation was passed.

Regulations 10 to 13 inclusive were read and passed.

Regulation 14 was read as follows:—

14. Subject to the provisions of Regulation 15 of these Regulations, no dairy may be registered under these Regulations unless

(a) there shall have been provided for use in connection therewith a milk room constructed with an impermeable floor and ventilation and lighting which shall appear to the Commissioners or the Board, as the case may be, to be adequate; which shall be effectively fly-proofed, and which shall not open upon or communicate directly with any cow-shed or cow-pen, or with any sleeping apartment, water-closet or latrine; and

(b) if the dairy contains a cow-shed it complies in addition with the following provisions, namely:—

(i) it shall be situated wholly outside the limits of the City of Bridgetown as defined in the Bridgetown, Speightstown and Hole Town Act, 1891 and wholly outside the area lying between those limits and the following boundaries, that is to say, the boundary line which divided the parishes of Saint Michael and Christ Church extending from the beach on the south-eastern side of Anns Fort to the point at which it meets the boundary wall of the military properties on the north-eastern side of the Garrison, from there following the said boundary wall to the North Gate, along Dalkeith Road to the junction of that road with Beckles Road, along the portion of Beckles Road lying between Dalkeith Road and Culloden Road, along Culloden Road, Pine Road, Welches Road, Condemned Road, the portion of Glendairy Road lying between Condemned Road and Bridge Road, the said Bridge Road, Bank Hall Cross Road to Eagle Hall Corner and from thence in a straight line to the point of Westbury Road where that road meets

Westbury New Road, along Westbury New Road to Fontabelle Road and from thence in a straight line to the beach; and

(ii) its situation shall be approved by the Commissioners or by the Board, as the case may be; and

(iii) the floor of the cow-shed shall be made of impermeable material; and

(iv) there shall be provided for each cow in the cow-shed a stall floor space of not less than forty square feet; and

(v) there shall be provided in respect of each stall in the cow-shed a half-channel drain with a fall of not less than 1 in 60 leading from the stall into a sink made of impermeable material and the outflow from which shall be away from the milk-room; and

(vi) the superstructure of the cow-shed shall be constructed so as to permit of thorough and adequate ventilation and the roof thereof shall be made so that it slopes downwards towards the back or sides of the cow-shed and shall be carried beyond the edge of the cow-shed for a distance of not less than one foot; and

(vii) there shall be provided in connection therewith a dungstead the floor and walls of which shall be constructed of impermeable material and which shall be situated not less than ten feet from the cow-shed and twenty feet from any dwelling house and which shall be sufficient in size to contain the dung of the animals for a period of not less than three days; and

(viii) there shall be attached to the dairy for use in connection therewith pasturage or open space sufficient to permit the cows housed in the cow-shed to be kept in the open as required by these Regulations.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 14 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: Sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph (b) of this Regulation says "there shall be provided for each cow in the cow-shed a stall floor space of not less than forty square feet." In modern dairies this space is recognised as being too much space in which a cow can be kept clean, and I would move that this Regulation be amended or postponed and referred to the General Board of Health for further consideration. My reason for making this motion is that if a cow is standing in a stall which is ten feet long, the stall must have a drop in respect of the manure. I think that if the space were less, there would be better sanitation in the dairies. You either get the cow standing too far back or standing at an angle. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Regulation be postponed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is perfectly correct, if there is too much space, the cow will be kept insanitary.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second the honourable member's motion.

The question that the further consideration of this Regulation be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The further consideration of the Regulation was postponed.

Mr. SPRINGER: I would be very grateful if honourable members, who wish the consideration of any Regulation postponed, would give me a clear idea of the particular points in connection with it so that I can refer them to the General Board of Health.

Regulations 15 and 16 were read and passed.

Regulation 17 was read as follows:—

17. (1) No owner of a dairy may employ any person to milk cows or to handle milk unless such person produces to such owner prior to his employment and at the expiration of every twelve months a medical certificate as in Form "C" in the Schedule hereto to the effect that he is not suffering from any infectious disease.

(2) Every person employed to milk cows or to handle milk at a dairy shall produce to the owner of such dairy every twelve months a new medical certificate to the effect that he is not suffering from any infectious disease.

(3) Every medical certificate produced to the owner of a dairy under this Regulation, shall be kept by such owner while the person to whom it relates is in his employ and shall be produced for inspection on demand by any person authorised by or under these Regulations to inspect the same.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 17 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable junior member for St. Philip wanted to make some remarks in connection with this Regulation.

Mr. GARNER: Since I spoke with you, Mr. Chairman, I have been told that the doctors have agreed to take a fee of one dollar instead of sixty cents. Since they have agreed to take one dollar, I have no further remarks to make.

The question that Regulation 17 stand part of these Regulations was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Regulation was passed.

Regulations 18 and 19 were read and passed.

Regulation 20 was read as follows:—

20. (1) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this Regulation, no person, whether employed at a dairy or not, shall be a milk vendor unless he shall have obtained from the Commissioners, in addition to any other licence which he may possess, a licence as in Form "D" in the Schedule to these Regulations and a badge as in Form "E" in the said Schedule.

(2) For the purposes of this Regulation the expression "milk vendor" shall be construed as including every person who performs the physical act of transferring milk on sale.

(3) This Regulation shall not apply in respect of persons who sell milk in locked or sealed containers.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 20 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: With regard to sub-clause 2 of this Regulation, I think that the milk vendor should have the same medical certificate as the milker; I do not see very much difference between the two of them. I think that this Regulation should be amended. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Regulation be postponed.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPRINGER: What is the object of postponing the Regulation? What has this Regulation got to do with any medical certificate?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not follow it myself.

Mr. SPRINGER: The question of medical certificates does not arise in this Regulation at all. Regulation 17 (1) says: "No owner of a dairy may employ any person to milk cows or to handle milk", it does not say at a dairy, "unless such person produces to such owner prior to his employment and at the expiration of every twelve months, a medical certificate as in Form 'C' in the schedule hereto to the effect that he is not suffering from any infectious disease". I take it that the only sort of milk vendor who would be left out would be a person who is a retailer, so to speak,

who buys milk to sell again. This would not be a question of amending Regulation 20; a fresh Regulation would have to be drafted. You would either have to amend Regulation 17, which I think would be the most efficient way of dealing with the matter, or draft a fresh Regulation. I cannot undertake to complete these Regulations until all the points have been cleared up, but there is no point in postponing Regulation 20.

Mr. GALE: I think that Regulation 17 covers all persons who are handling milk. If you want to include milk vendors now, to carry that to its logical conclusion, it would mean that everybody who is handling milk for sale would have to get a medical certificate. These Regulations deal with dairies, not with people who are selling milk. If we go on like this, we would have to set out that if a person buys milk for the purpose of making ice-cream, the person who is making the ice-cream must have a medical certificate. This matter would have to be dealt with under the Public Health Regulations.

Mr. SPRINGER: I suggest that we leave the matter over until we have a chance to make up our minds about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I shall have to leave the Chair because I do not understand what is being proposed. Sub-clause 2 of this Regulation says that "the expression 'milk vendor' shall be construed as including every person who performs the physical act of transferring milk on sale." According to the honourable junior member for St. Michael, if this is amended, it will come to this; that as long as you are removing milk you must have a medical certificate. If you sent home milk by somebody the person must have a medical certificate.

At this stage, it being now 3.30 p.m. of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair, and stated that it was now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).:

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest to honourable members that they agree to the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to continue Government Business. Honourable members are aware that we have to begin consideration of the Estimates next Tuesday, and if I am in order to say this, the members of the Other Place are already commenting on the fact that we are sending the Estimates up to them only a week before the end of March, and they are not given any time to consider them. I am hoping that honourable members will agree to the suspension of the Rule in order that we may get on with the Dairy Regulations. I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business. If there is no objection, the honourable member will be granted leave to make the motion.

Mr. HAYNES: I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: An objection having been taken, I shall have to put the question. The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue Government Business. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Dr. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, MOTTLEY, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD.—15.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA and HAYNES.—4.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, fifteen honourable members voting "Aye" and four honourable members voting "No". The honourable member may make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended for the purpose of continuing Government Business.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE ON DAIRIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: When Government Business was last being considered, the House was in Committee on the Dairy Regulations.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Regulations, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee on these Regulations, we were considering Regulation 20.

Mr. SPRINGER: I agree to the postponement of this Regulation.

The Regulation was postponed.

Regulations 21 to 25 inclusive were read and passed.

Regulation 26 was read as follows:—

26. (1) No person who keeps a milch cow or milch cows for the purpose of supplying his household with milk may sell or otherwise dispose of for profit any surplus of such milk except he shall have obtained the written permission of the Commissioners so to do.

(2) No permission shall be granted under this Regulation unless the applicant

(a) keeps not more than two milch cows;

(b) does not obtain milk from any source other than his two milch cows;

(c) shall have complied with the provisions of paragraph (a) of Regulation 14 of these Regulations.

Regulation 14 of these Regulations.

(3) It shall be a good ground for immediate withdrawal of any permission granted under this Regulation if any infringement or failure to comply with any relevant provision of these Regulations or of the bye-laws made under section twelve of the Public Health Act, 1908 and in force for the time being shall occur in respect of the premises to which such permission relates.

(4) Except as provided in this Regulation the provisions of Regulations 9 (a), 10, 12 and of paragraphs (1) and (2) of Regulation 13 of these Regulations shall apply so far as the same shall be relevant in respect of every permission granted or to be granted under this Regulation as they apply in respect of a registration.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 26 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD: I would like to get some information on this point. I know that sometimes an estate has more than two milch cows and the manager of the estate sells milk to the labourers. I, too, have

more milk than I can use sometimes. Under these Regulations you cannot keep more than two milch cows, and I have five of them. (A MEMBER: You have a dairy). Under this Regulation, I cannot sell any more milk to the labourers; I will have to give it to the pigs. I sell milk to my labourers at six or seven cents per pint because they have asked me to do that, but under this Regulation I cannot sell them any more.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am glad that the honourable member made that little passionate outburst. Sometimes it is very good to see people as they are. However, I pass that over. The purpose of these Regulations is to encourage a pure supply of milk. There must be some limit in this matter, and the limit taken is the number of cows which a person would normally need to supply his household with milk. He is allowed two cows—one and one to spare—and permission is given in case that there is a surplus of milk, to sell that surplus with the permission of the Sanitary Authorities and without conforming to the requirements in the case of dairies. The honourable member says that he has five cows, which are obviously more than his household requires, but he does not think that he should conform to the requirements of the Regulation. You cannot legislate for special cases; if the honourable member is really interested in the labourers as he professes to be, and he does not wish to conform to the requirements of the law, he has enough land so that he can divide the cows and let the labourers have the milk, or feed his pigs with it if he wants to do so. The honourable member's argument is not a good argument for condemning the Regulations or for amending them drastically.

Mr. WARD: I am not condemning the Regulations; I want some more information on the point, because I know that there are many estates where cattle are kept in pens. On many occasions or, in many instances, labourers buy milk at a reduced price from the estates. I can also start a dairy and sell milk at eleven cents per pint, but I am interested in easing the people. I feel that it is a great ease to the people to sell them milk at a reduced price, and that is why I am asking for information.

Mr. SPRINGER: What information do you want?

Mr. WARD: This Regulation says that you must not keep more than two cows; anyone who keeps more than two cows would not be conforming to the Regulation.

Mr. TALMA: I take it that these Regulations are Regulations which have been made under the Dairies Act, 1941. If we are dealing with dairies, let us keep to dairies. This Regulation does not apply to dairies at all; it applies to individual households, and, in my view, it discourages thrift. This is trying to control each man's movements whether he is a dairy keeper or not. It is not for the encouragement of thrift, but it is causing much red tape. If this is the only means whereby cows can be kept, it is better not to keep a cow at all. With regard to the disposal of surplus milk not produced for sale, that is dealing with something which is outside the Dairies Act. It is dealing with persons who have private cows. I beg to move that this Regulation be deleted.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: In connection with an agricultural dairy, you can have twenty-five cattle or you can have fifty cattle under Part II of these Regulations.

Mr. GARNER: I feel that this Regulation should be deleted. Any person who is keeping more than two cows is doing the right thing, especially in the case of a plantation. The plantations should keep as many cows as they wish to keep because the milk as well as the meat supply is very scarce. If they do not keep any cows or cattle, this island would be in a very pitiable plight for a long time to come. As the position is now, the butchers cannot get any cattle to purchase, and Regulations must not be drafted in such a way that the plantation owner will say that is an uneconomic proposition to keep more than one cow for himself and his household. We want to encourage the meat situation in this island; we should insist that cows be kept at the plantations because the meat supply is too lean. I say that the plantations should be allowed to keep cows.

Mr. SPRINGER: The Government is not only encouraging agriculturists in this island to keep cows, but they have spent a lot of money in importing thoroughbred animals. There are seven Agricultural Stations in the island one of them being situated near to where the honourable member lives. Where is the hardship in this Regulation? We have made the concession that where a person has a plantation or agricultural holding, he is not required to have his cow-pen with a cemented floor. He is allowed to put his cow-pen in the ordinary place, but he has to put it at a distance of fifty feet from the milk room. How can that work a hardship on a plantation owner where the plantation has about ten, fifteen or twenty cattle? All he has to do is to provide a milk room. Any person who is keeping more than two cows should keep more than a dozen. If the honourable member is keeping a dozen cows he only has to provide a milk room.

Mr. DOWDING: I quite agree that there is a need for more stock in this island, and legislation should be passed to the effect that a certain number of milch cows should be kept at the plantations. The dairymen, of which regrettably I happen to be one, need assistance in every direction. No consideration whatsoever is ever given to the dairymen; the Government raises the price of stock feed, the cost of living goes up and everything happens, but no consideration is given to the dairy keeper. (A MEMBER: What about the price of milk?) What will happen if this Regulation is deleted? The man who owns two or three cows will be able to compete at a much lower price as against a dairy which has to stick to the Regulations. I cannot agree with this Regulation as it stands, and I agree that it should be deleted. It will throw open the door to everything, and the whole aim of the Regulations will be defeated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to put the question: those honourable members who agree that the Regulation should be deleted can vote against it. The question is that Regulation 26 stand part of these Regulations. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The Regulation was passed.

Regulations 27 to 30 inclusive were read and passed.

Regulation 31 was read as follows:—

31. (1) If any person shall desire to use any special designation for the purpose of selling or advertising any milk he shall apply to the Board in writing for a licence to use such special designation stating the conditions of such special designation.

(2) Any licence issued by the Board under this Regulation may be withdrawn at any time by

the Board for any cause which appears to them to be sufficient.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 31 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. DOWDING: I would be grateful for an explanation as to the meaning of this special designation for the purpose of selling or advertising milk.

Mr. SPRINGER: I take it that that means the trade mark or special name like "Peronne" or "Green Pastures" which a person might wish to use.

The question that Regulation 31 stand part of these Regulations was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Regulation was passed.

Regulation 32 was read and passed.

Regulation 33 was read as follows:—

33. (1) The Commissioners shall give the owner of every dairy or premises which they intend to inspect or to have inspected reasonable notice of such inspection.

(2) Upon receipt of any notice under paragraph (1) of this Regulation, the owner of the dairy or of the premises shall not allow any cow to be removed from such dairy or premises without the consent of the Inspecting Officer until the inspection has been made or a period of forty-eight hours has elapsed after the receipt of the notice.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Regulation 33 stand part of these Regulations.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot see that this Regulation can serve any useful purpose. Imagine telling the owner of a dairy that you are coming to inspect the dairy for T.B. cattle and broken-down pens! Obviously, all the T.B. cattle will be removed and the broken down pens destroyed. The cattle will be removed and brought back again. I ask the honourable senior member for St. George to give us some explanation of this Regulation, otherwise I am bound to vote against it. The Commissioners of Health are put in a very difficult position by this Regulation; they cannot pay any surprise visit because they must give reasonable notice of any inspection which they intend to make. If you are trying to prevent a crime you cannot give any reasonable notice. I cannot see how the public can really benefit from this Regulation.

Mr. MAPP: I agree wholeheartedly with what the honourable senior member for the City has said. This Regulation reminds me of the days when I was at school. The teachers will always tell you the day on which the Inspector will inspect the schools, and on that day everything will be quite all right.

Mr. SPRINGER: There is something in that. His Excellency the Governor recently made a tour of inspection of Government Offices, including one which we know, because of its congestion, cannot be kept in order. However, all the books were fixed in order—something which has not happened for the last three years—so that when the Governor went through, everything was in order and the Clerks looked happy. I ask leave to postpone further consideration of this Regulation.

There being no objection, the further consideration of the Regulation was postponed.

Regulations 34 to 40 inclusive were read and passed.

At this point, on the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the consideration of these Regulations in Committee

and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

The House resumed.

ORDER NOT PROCEEDED WITH.

Mr. SPEAKER: When Private Members' Business was being considered on the last occasion, the House was considering the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor requesting him to take steps to nationalise the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation Limited. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew had moved the passing of the Address, the honourable junior member for St. Philip seconded the motion and was speaking and moved that the further consideration of the Address be postponed. That motion was seconded by the honourable junior member for St. Michael and agreed to.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think that it is a late hour now and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 4th day of March, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am quite willing to go on with this Order, but the majority of honourable members are evidently anxious that we should adjourn at this stage, and therefore I think that we should adjourn. I am asking honourable members to arrange their business in such a way that we can sit twice a week and get through with the Estimates. Already honourable members of the Order Place are complaining that the Estimates are not sent up to them within a reasonable time so that they can consider them. In fairness to everybody I should like to say that very little time was left before February for the consideration of the Estimates by the new Executive Committee. I know that it will be difficult for the planters who have to see after the reaping of their crop to attend the House, but in fairness to the Other Place I think that we should sit twice a week. I know that during next week there will be a big engagement which will attract honourable members, and we shall not be able to sit normally as we have been doing. I hope that during the course of next week honourable members will give

some indication, either to the Clerk of the House or to me, of the day next week in addition to Tuesday which is most convenient for them to attend the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: You did not mention the point about having time to prepare the replies to any questions that might be asked.

Mr. ADAMS: I am glad for that, Mr. Speaker. If there are any questions which honourable members want to ask arising out of the Estimates, I am asking that they give me the necessary time to prepare the replies to the questions. The Order Paper will remain as it is.

THE ORDER PAPER.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask that the Bills of which I gave notice and which were read a first time to-day be placed Nos. 1, 2 and 3 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. They affect a good number of people of this parish and they have to be considered in time for the laying of the rates. There is the Bill to provide for the payment of a Cost of Living Bonus to Parochial Employees, the Bill affecting the Pensioners and the Bill to make provision for an additional number of scholarships.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking that these Bills be placed Nos. 1, 2 and 3 on the Order Paper—

Mr. HAYNES: Order No. 1 is under discussion already and that should be finished.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask that they be made Orders Nos. 2, 3 and 4.

There being no objection, the Bills were made the respective Orders.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 4th day of March, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House was accordingly adjourned to meet on Tuesday next, the 4th day of March, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.