

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th June, 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*), Messrs. A. E. S. LEWIS, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., G. H. ADAMS, B.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and Dr. H. G. CUMMINS.

After prayers, Mr. HAYNES and Dr. WILSON enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 17th June, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable the Legislative Council a Message returning a Bill intituled an Act to impose a levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this Island, to create funds for the benefit of the sugar industry of this Island, and to provide for the administration of such funds, with certain amendments.

Messrs. MOTTLEY and F. L. WALCOTT 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. 21/1947 from His Excellency the Governor informing the House, with reference to the Acting Governor's Message No. 3/1947, on the subject of emigration to countries in Central and South America, that he has been advised by the Secretary of State that enquiries made indicate that there is no possibility of emigration from the West Indies to Argentine and Brazil.

Interim Report on the Fiscal Survey of Barbados by Professor C. G. Beasley.

Statement of Accounts of the West Indies Schooner Pool Authority to 23rd February, 1946; and Statement of Accounts of the B.W.I. Schooner Owners Association (Inc.) from 24th February to 31st December, 1946.

Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies for the half-year ended 30th June, 1945, and for the half-year ended 31st December, 1945.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of £56,034 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the following purposes:—

- (a) to supplement resolution No. 48 of the 30th April, 1947, by £815 to meet the cost of subsidising the commodities mentioned in the Schedule to that resolution; and
- (b) to provide for the subsidisation of flour, salt fish, and salt pork from the 1st July to the 30th September, 1947, at a cost of £55,219, in order that the prices of these Commodities may be stabilised at such prices as may be fixed by the Competent Authority.

Mr. ADAMS: (On behalf of Mr. Crawford): Resolution for £37. 10/- to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1947-48 under Head XXXII, Department of Highways and Transport, Item 8, Foreman Mechanic.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Resolution to grant the sum of £78 to the Estate of the late Walter Hall, a former employee of the Waterworks Dept., in consideration of his 9 years' service in that Department.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to ratify the Agreement made between the British Guiana Rice Marketing Board of British Guiana and the Executive Committee for the supply of rice to Barbados.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to authorise the payment of Gratuities and Pensions to John Richard Jordan and George Rudolph McComie.

Mr. SPRINGER: Bill to make provision as to the immunities, privileges and capacities of international organizations of which His Majesty's Gov-

ernment in the United Kingdom and foreign governments are members, etc.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD gives notice of a Bill to authorize the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to grant to the legal representative of the late Mr. Norman Lisle Roach a gratuity of an amount not exceeding one year's salary.

PETITION.

Mr. CRAWFORD asks for and is granted leave to present a petition from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to pay a gratuity to the legal representative of the late Mr. Norman Lisle Roach. He says that the petition is respectfully worded and he asks that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorize the payment of Gratuities and Pensions to John Richard Jordan and George Rudolph Mc Comie is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to make provisions as to the immunities, privileges and capacities of international organizations of which His Majesty's Government, in the U.K. and foreign Governments are members etc., is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to authorize the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to pay a gratuity to the legal representative of the late Mr. Norman Lisle Roach is read a first time.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION PRICE STABILIZATION AND LABOUR WELFARE) BILL.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Before the Orders of the day are called, I ask leave to deal with the amendments of the Other Place to the Bill to impose a levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this Island, to create funds for the benefit of the sugar industry of this Island, and to provide for the administration of such funds.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be considered forthwith. They are merely the substitution of the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" for the words "Executive Committee" where these occur in Clause 4 and 19 respectively of the Bill.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

The question that these amendments be considered forthwith is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be read a first time.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that these amendments be read a first time is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be read a second time.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the question is put I should like to say that I think the honourable senior member for St. Joseph might, for the enlightenment of other honourable members, state exactly what is the significance of these amendments.

Mr. ADAMS: As far as I can understand, it is a technical, clerical correction. Strictly speaking, the Executive Committee is the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Executive Committee does not exist apart from the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Executive Committee consists of the Executive Council, four members of this House, and one member of the Other Place. If you say "Executive Committee" you mean Governor-in-Executive Committee, and it is better to give it its proper title. The Executive Committee cannot sit without the Governor or somebody acting in his place. It is really a slip on our part by using "Executive Committee" instead of Governor-in-Executive Committee.

The question that these amendments be read a second time is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be now agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that these amendments be now agreed to is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION REGULATIONS, 1946.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to take Order No. 16 as the first Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave is granted the honourable member to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable Legislative Council to the Resolution approving the Workmen's Compensation Regulations, 1946.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The first of these amendments is merely a correction of the year 1945 in the first of these Regulations. This Regulation reads as follows:—"These Regulations shall be read together with the Workmen's Compensation Regulations, 1945....." It should be "1946" instead. The other amendment is a changing of the words "twenty-one" in line one of Regulation 3 to the words "twenty-two"; so that this Regulation now reads:—"Whenever in accordance with the provisions of section twenty-two of the Workmen's Compensation Act....." I beg to move that the amendments be read a first time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that these amendments be read a first time is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motions by Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, these amendments are read a second time and are agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 17 as the next Order of the day.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the consideration of the amendments of

the Honourable Legislative Council to the Resolution approving the Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Regulations, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I would ask Your Honour's direction as to the proper procedure in respect of the proposal I am about to make in connection with these amendments. It seems feasible to refer the amendments to a Select Committee but it does not appear in the actual words of the Rule relating to amendments which come from the Other Place to this Assembly whether a Select Committee can be appointed for the purpose. There is nothing in the Rule against it because it speaks only of agreeing or disagreeing to or postponing amendments which come from the Other Place.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does seem to me that before agreeing or disagreeing to amendments from the Other Place, there is nothing to prevent the House from referring them to a Select Committee.

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: In that case, I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider these amendments of the Other Place.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that a Select Committee be appointed to consider these amendments of the Other Place is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I appoint, as members of the Select Committee for the purpose, the following:— The junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Branker), the junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Gale), the senior member for St. George (Mr. Springer), the junior member for the City (Mr. Lewis), and the senior member for St. Peter (Mr. F. L. Walcott).

THE BARBADOS GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume Committee on a Bill to make provision in relation to the Barbados General Hospital.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 6—

Mr. SPRINGER: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, honourable members will have noted that there was some discussion in other quarters about the method of appointment of these servants and I am making a motion now for an amendment to Clause 6 to this effect: by deleting the words "as may from time to time be necessary at such salaries as shall be provided by the Legislature" occurring in lines 4, 5, and 6 of sub-clause 1 and substituting therefor the words "at such salaries as shall be approved from time to time by special Resolution of the Legislature." The effect of the amendment will be merely to ensure that offices which are created for the first time are created by special Resolution and not by means of inclusion in the Estimates. Obviously after they are created they will be put in the Estimates like all other offices.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I do not accept from general hearsay what may be in the minds of the members of the Other Place so as to cause the honourable member on my immediate right to move an amendment to this particular Bill along those lines but I wish to say this. Anyone who has made even a casual study of parliamentary history in Great Britain knows that as far as the supplies of money to the Crown for the administration of Government are concerned, it is the Lower House, the people's

representatives, who alone have the right to say what supplies are to be voted and for what objects. If the intention of the Other Place is to say that we are to exclude from the possibility of including in the Estimates the appointment of any servants or offices to a Government department, then I give public notice in no unmistakable terms that I, as a member of the Government, shall fight to maintain, at all times, the right of this Assembly to vote supplies and to say how those supplies are to be allotted. In short, it may be advisable to-day, for the purposes of this Bill, to agree to this amendment but that is not to say, speaking for myself, that I shall ever be a party to the Government so agreeing to any amendment of the Other Place as to prevent it, if needs be, from including in the Estimates or by way of special Resolution any money to be voted for any appointments. It is a most fundamental principle of Government. It is a matter on which the House of Commons has fought the House of Lords over and over again for three or four centuries—certainly three centuries—and I wish to say that agreeing to any amendment of this sort is not to be taken as agreeing that the Other Place has the right that it claims. It can, if it likes, throw out Estimates; it may perhaps, if it likes, throw out money Resolutions but I have noticed, as a member of this House the claim made by the Other Place that it has the right to be consulted and that it has the equal right with this House to say how money is to be spent. It has no such right and as long as we follow English parliamentary procedure I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this declaration, this challenge, as I take it, by the Other Place that it has the right to do more than agree or disagree in general principle, that it has the right to say how money that is supplied is to be spent, I am perfectly prepared to accept and fight in the open if the occasion in the future should arise. I think we are too apt in this country to forget that any concession we make, however trivial it may appear, will be a precedent which it is almost impossible to overcome in the future and that as long as we are the representatives of the people, as long as we have the right to say how supplies are to be voted, so long we should be careful to see that not even by a mere suggestion is that right being infringed in any way. We have been careful in this House to make it a matter of legislation. We have been careful in this colony to do more than even the House of Commons has done and because of that, I wish to state that it is our bounden duty to examine carefully anything that comes down from the Other Place to see whether it is not, perhaps unwittingly, perhaps wilfully, an infringement of our peculiar rights and power to say what supplies are to be granted and how those supplies are to be allocated.

Mr. SPRINGER: Before the question is put, I should like to say that the senior member for St. Joseph, who in this instance I have to liken to Don Quixote, has delivered to us a lecture which, however enlightened it may be on the subject he has chosen, has little reference to the point before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is quite in order in giving us the lecture he has given. The Committee is to decide whether it is irrelevant or not.

Mr. SPRINGER: And I am quite in order to speak on it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is at liberty to say whether or not the Committee should give a decision on the matter.

Mr. SPRINGER: May I proceed?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER: It becomes extremely difficult if members of the Executive Committee are going to get up and say that they do not know about an amendment introduced by a member of the Executive Committee. The position, as far as this is concerned, is this. It is never necessary and can never be necessary for any new post to be created in the Estimates. I challenge anyone to deny that. We had a simple example of it during March when an attempt was made, and I think rightly as far as procedure is concerned, to include items of capital expenditure in the Annual Estimates. The decision of the House by a majority was that that should not be so but no one can get up and say that that is the only way in which items of expenditure can be introduced in this House. The Committee of Supply will consider those very items in the near future, I hope, as special Resolutions and it will have no less right, in relation to the Other Place, on that occasion than it had during the consideration of the Estimates which is in the form of a Resolution in Committee of Supply. But there is this difference. The Other Place has, up to now, the right to say whether they agree with the creation of an office or not and they feel, I understand, that it would be wrong to put them in the unfortunate position, if they disagreed with the creation of an office, to have to reject the Estimates as a whole. Without doing ourselves any injury I think we can make this reasonable concession as long as we continue to recognize the existence of a second Chamber and give it the opportunity to pass judgment upon the creation of an office; that is the basis upon which this amendment proceeds. I may say that it is no fault of mine if the honourable member is not aware of the amendment because the proposal has been discussed in the proper quarters where it should be discussed.

Mr. ADAMS: The last thing I would do is to have any dispute with a member of the Government, let alone a member of my Party but if there is one fundamental thing this House has to safeguard, it is the right to give supplies and to say how those supplies are to be allotted. It is not my fault if honourable members are too busy in any particular sphere as not to make a study of this particular issue. Anyone who has read parliamentary history will remember how that great liberal statesman and constitutionalist, Gladstone, in order to assert the powers of the House of Commons, tacked on to the Appropriation Bill; a Bill affecting Paper Duties which he knew the House of Lords disliked and would by itself throw out. It is not my fault if the honourable member has never read or has forgotten it if he read it. It is a well-known tactic of the House of Commons to assert its authority to maintain forever its right to say what supplies should be allotted. As I have said, we have gone further and made it not only a Rule of this House but a law. I do not ask the honourable member to take my word for it.

Mr. SPRINGER: I have not disputed any statement that has been made by the honourable member. I merely said that his remarks are irrelevant to this issue.

The CHAIRMAN: Any irrelevancy will have to be considered by the Committee.

Mr. SPRINGER: The honourable member has misquoted me and I will not have it. He cannot say that I have attacked anything he said.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that this discussion is going to take us any further. I do not

say that it is irrelevant but I feel that it is going to do us no good.

Mr. ADAMS: All I have said is that amendments to Bills may easily pass this House or the Other Place or both Houses of the Legislature without a certain knowledge of their implications; that is all I am saying. I say that when I pass this amendment I am not going to have it quoted against me in future that I passed something which is, in effect, an admission that the Other Place has some right to qualify a vote of supplies to the Crown. The combination of Section 6 of the Executive Committee Act and Rule 272 of the Rules of the House make it crystal clear that the Other Place has no right to say anything which will modify our right to vote supplies. Rule 272 says:—"All aids and supplies and aids to the Governor are the sole gift of the General Assembly; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies are to begin with the General Assembly; and it is the undoubted and sole right of the Assembly to direct, limit and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which may not be changed or altered by the Council." The House of Commons over a period of 300 years, I repeat, was careful to safeguard this right. It is not for the Other Place to say whether we should have two Visiting Surgeons at the Hospital or one. They can agree to the principle of Visiting Surgeons but if we implicitly agree to any claim on their account that they have the right to say, in the voting of supplies, what qualifications should be attached, we are abandoning the fundamental difference between this House and the Other Place; that is all I am saying. Therefore, if we sit here to-day and say nothing about this particular matter and let it be said later on that we agreed that the Other Place has a right to say what is to be done when we vote money for the creation of an office or offices, if we do that, we may as well cease to exist as the people's representatives. I am not opposing this as a matter of tactics. Let it pass but I sound the warning that I am not agreeing to limit the right of the House to say what supplies should be granted and what qualifications should be attached to those supplies. £10,000 is voted, let us say, for the Leper Asylum or the Hospital. It is for the House to say whether that £10,000 is to be paid to 5 or 10 people. That is the principle to which we should stick and stick to for ever. I have said what I have said, Mr. Chairman, because from time to time it is necessary for this branch of the Legislature to give this reminder. We have very often to swallow things we do not want to swallow and if we swallow this in the feeling that half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, let us at the same time protest against the necessity of being compelled to swallow certain things.

The CHAIRMAN: Before any other honourable member speaks I should like to say that while this academic discussion may be illuminating, the Chair can see no useful purpose to be served by carrying it on. I, therefore, ask honourable members to speak on the amendment and agree or disagree to it. I shall not permit any continuance of the academic discussion between the senior member for St. Joseph and the senior member for St. George.

Mr. LEWIS: I myself will say that I thought it a rather innocent amendment but since I have heard the senior member for St. Joseph I am a little doubtful as to whether I will accept it to-day myself. I am a little sceptical about it for this reason. The

departure from having the titles of offices and the emoluments set out in our laws started, I think, Sir, with the Department of Highways and Transport Bill and I well remember the Leader of the House at the time saying that they would name the Director of Highways and Transport and that when it decided on the formation of the Department, the Government was coming back here and place the offices and emoluments in the Bill by amendment. It would seem as if the Other Place did not care very much about the employees of the Highways and Transport Department but now that we have the Education (Amendment) Bill and this Bill to change the Hospital into a Government institution, the members of the Other Place are very careful to preserve their rights; there are no unestablished staff and cantonniers and people of that sort to be considered in this Bill. In the circumstances, Sir, I would be very unwilling to accept this amendment. I should like to ask the senior member for St Joseph if this proposal is any different from the passing of an Act in which the offices and emoluments are mentioned and whether it conflicts with what has been done in the past because it would seem as if what we are doing to-day, if we accept this amendment, is really what was done before. There is an Act dealing with the Civil Establishment and previously we added or took away from the Establishment by means of amendment to the Act but we have recently followed the practice of doing so by Resolution,—a practice which I do not think is approved by the Other Place. There is a Resolution before this House now to add to the Clerical Service otherwise than amending the Act to say that there should not be so many Cadets or that there should be so many more. I would just like the senior member for St. Joseph to address himself to that point because what he tells me has simply frightened me away from freely accepting this amendment. If this is going to strike a blow at our fundamental rights I am not going to agree to it.

Mr. TALMA: I rise on a different point altogether. I consider it a most essential point, as far as this Clause is concerned. Under the present law, the Hospital Board appoints the Medical Superintendent. In this Clause it is stated that the Governor may appoint to the Hospital a Medical Superintendent. Well, Sir, I hardly feel that this is a step in the right direction. I hardly feel that we are making a progressive step. I regard it as a retrograde step whereby the Governor may make this appointment, the Governor being one individual as compared with a number of individuals on the Board. It is all well and good to quibble on constitutional issues but the most important point—the method by which the Medical Superintendent is to be appointed—has not been touched up to now. I am speaking about the appointment of the Medical Superintendent himself. I am not suggesting that he should appoint anyone. I see no reason why the power to make this appointment should be placed in the hands of the Governor alone. They have gone two steps in the wrong direction. They propose to take the appointment out of the hands of the Board which includes representatives of the people and to put it in the hands of the Governor alone, not even in the hands of the Executive Committee. I certainly do not agree with that. If the Board is merely to be advisory, well let the power to appoint be given to the Governor-in-Executive Committee and not to the Governor alone. It is a question of creating dictatorial powers—to put the power of appointment in one individual's hands whereas it is in the hands

of 12 to 15 persons now. I have nothing whatever against the present Head of the Administration but I am thinking of future Heads of the Administration who may not be as magnanimous as the present one. With that in view I beg to move that the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" be substituted for the word "Governor" occurring in line 1 of sub-clause 1 of Clause 6.

Mr. ADAMS: I am afraid that I shall have to detain the Committee a little until I get certain information which I have sent for. As regards the amendment of the honourable member who has just sat down, let me remind him that the word "Governor" is purely technical. Obviously the Secretary of State for the Colonies will make this appointment. The word "Governor" is used because he may appoint people at a salary of £200 or under a year but obviously the Governor does not appoint the Medical Superintendent; he is appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. As regards the question of the junior member for the City, it is better for the honourable member in charge of the Bill to deal with that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I agree very largely with the junior member for the City. I fail to understand why we should not enumerate the officers in this Bill as is done in the Act of 1910-2. At present the Board appoints these officers but it is proposed in this Bill that the Government shall appoint them and I really do not understand why we are departing from the present method of appointment. In my opinion the right way is to put the officers and their salaries in this Bill. If that is done, an officer who is appointed will have security of office and if we wish at any time to increase or decrease the salary we can amend the Act as we have done for many years in the past. I will move the postponement of this Clause of the Bill, purely for the purpose of having inserted in this Bill the officers as is the case in the Act of 1910. Of course, the salaries will be different from what they are in the present Act. I beg to move that Clause 6 be postponed.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 6 be postponed is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. MOTTLEY, Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, F. L. WALCOTT, MAPP, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD—9.

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, COX, FOSTER, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, TALMA, HAYNES, and Mr. SPEAKER—11.

Mr. BLACKMAN: For the information of the Committee, I would like to read just a part of a Minute by the Chief Medical Officer. He writes *inter alia*:—"I consider that in due course it would be advisable and to the advantage of the people of this Island to make a new appointment, namely, that of Surgeon Specialist, but this would be superimposed on the present organization and would not affect the Visiting Staff. The post of Surgeon Specialist would be held by a highly qualified and experienced Surgeon who would be capable of performing operations beyond the scope of the present surgical staff. I may mention that in formal discussions with the Visiting Staff concerning this matter they expressed approval of such an appointment."

Mr. LEWIS: Since we have that information I would just like to call to the attention of honourable members that there is not really going to be any fundamental change at the Hospital. It would

seem that what is really going to happen is that the Board will be changed. Instead of an administrative Board, as it is at present, there will be an Advisory Committee to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee or as the Legislature may decide. For the benefit of honourable members I would like to state that from my experience on the Board, whatever is wrong with the Hospital from the point of view of medical services to patients, the doctors, whether they be Visiting or Resident Surgeons, are solely to be blamed for it. I know of no instance when a change has been suggested to the Board by the medical staff, in which the Board has not accepted the suggestion. I know of none and if there was any I would have heard of it. All appointments are referred to the Staff Committee, so that if honourable members expect any great change because they are merely getting rid of the Board, it is a matter entirely for them. I merely mention that to let them know that it is incorrect, from experience, to say, outside or inside, that it is the Board that runs the medical side of the Hospital. Whatever is wrong, so far as the medical side is concerned, can be laid absolutely at the door of the Visiting and the Resident Staffs, the Medical Superintendent notwithstanding; they get whatever they ask for.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted from Clause 6 stand part of the Clause is put and resolved in the negative, the Chairman declaring the "Noes" have it.

The question that the words proposed by the senior member for St. George be inserted in the blank is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SPRINGER, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and Mr. Speaker—13.

Noes: Mr. LEWIS, Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, ADAMS, CRAWFORD, TALMA and WARD—7.

The question that Clause 6, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 7. (1) If the Governor shall appoint to any office in the service of the Crown in this Island any person who immediately prior to the coming into operation of this Act was an officer or servant of the Hospital Board such person

- (a) shall receive salary at a rate not less than the rate of salary which he was receiving prior to such appointment;
- (b) shall be deemed to have been in the service of the Crown in this Island as from the date of his appointment as an officer or servant of the said Hospital Board and shall be eligible for pension, reduced pension and gratuity, or a gratuity, as the case may be, in accordance with the provisions of the Pension Act, 1925 and any Acts amending the same.

Provided that no person shall receive salary at a higher rate than the maximum salary of the office to which he is appointed.

(2) Where any person who, by virtue of the provisions of subsection (1) of this section is deemed to be in the service of the Crown, has exercised the option relating to the payment of reduced pension and gratuity under the provisions of the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1910, the exercise of such option shall have force and effect as if such option had been exercised for the purposes of the Pension Act, 1925 and any Acts amending the same.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that that be Clause 7 of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to raise a point which I consider relevant at this stage. It has been the very bad practice in the past, and still is at present at the Hospital, that only a select few medical practitioners—very often the ones who are less medically qualified—are granted the right and privilege to utilize government funds to their personal advantage. I consider this an opportune time—

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to know from the honourable member on what part of the Clause he is speaking.

Mr. TALMA: I am speaking on sub-clause 1 of Clause 7.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, I wish the honourable member would speak on it.

Mr. TALMA: I was saying that I consider this an opportune time to refer to the practice whereby only a few medical practitioners are allowed to use government funds to their personal advantage at the Hospital.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no such provision in sub-clause 1 of this Clause.

Mr. TALMA: I consider this is the time to speak on it.

The CHAIRMAN: This is not the time. The honourable member would have to insert some Clause in the proper place to carry out his intention.

Mr. TALMA: Sub-Clause 1 says:—"If the Governor shall appoint to any office in the service of the Crown in this Island any person who immediately prior to the coming into operation of this Act was an officer or servant of the Hospital Board.....". I am saying that this is the time to adjust the Act properly.

The CHAIRMAN: The Act has been adjusted but not in the manner which the honourable member is suggesting. The honourable member might insert a Clause to carry out his intention but this is not the proper place to do so.

The question that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 8 and 9 are read and agreed to.

Clause 10. The Medical Superintendent and all other officers servants and agents employed at the Hospital, in the performance of the duties required of them by or under this Act, shall act under the general superintendence and direction of the Chief Medical Officer.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that that be Clause 10 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GALE: We passed a Bill a short while ago providing for a Director of Medical Services and we are saying in this Clause that the Medical Superintendent and all other officers and servants employed at the Hospital shall perform their duties under the general superintendence and direction of the Chief Medical Officer. I think that the words "Chief Medical Officer" should be altered to the words "Director of Medical Services."

Mr. LEWIS: I really intended to raise that point myself but it was pointed out to me that the Act providing for the appointment of a Director of Medical Services has not yet become law; so that the Chief Medical Officer still exists. What I would like to know is whether we cannot insert "Director of Medical Services" in this Bill in anticipation of the passing of that Act. (MEMBERS: We cannot do that). It will only mean that there will be con-

sequential amendments to this Act after the other Act becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN: Certain honourable members seem to want to insert something in this Clause that is impossible at the moment. There is no such officer at present as the Director of Medical Services.

The question that Clause 10 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 11. (1) There shall be established a Committee to be styled the Barbados General Hospital Advisory Committee (hereinafter referred to as the Advisory Committee) which shall consist of a Chairman and four other members, all of whom shall be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Each of such members shall hold office for a period of two years from the date of appointment.

(2) All members of the Advisory Committee shall be eligible for re-appointment, and any casual vacancy occurring in the office of any member by death, resignation or otherwise shall be filled by the Governor-in-Executive Committee but the member so appointed shall hold office only so long as the member whose office is vacant would have held office.

(3) Should any member of the Advisory Committee decline to act or unless absent on leave from the Island absent himself without sufficient excuse from three consecutive meetings of the Advisory Committee, a vacancy shall be deemed to have occurred and the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall thereupon appoint some person to fill the vacancy thereby created.

(4) Three members of the Advisory Committee shall form a quorum.

(5) The Chairman shall have a casting as well as an original vote.

(6) The Advisory Committee shall keep a minute book in which their proceedings shall be recorded.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that that be Clause 11 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—I think this is the place where the amendment which I was endeavouring to make a few moments ago should be inserted. I beg to move, in place of Clause 11 which has just been read, the following:—“Every registered medical practitioner of this island who is practising his profession in this island shall have the right to utilize all of the facilities of the General Hospital in so far as any patient of his is concerned at the said hospital.” Well, Sir, from time immemorial only a special few medical practitioners have been granted the right to attend the hospital and have patients in there. Lots of deaths have taken place that way because a doctor has not been able to follow his patients in many cases and very often through negligence or through the fact that the Hospital has a number of laymen handling scientific affairs, other hardships occur on the part of many patients in there. One would expect that now the Hospital is about to undergo a change, this Labour House would do something tangible in this respect. One would expect that doctors throughout the island who are medically qualified and duly registered would be granted the right to go in there and use the taxpayers' money in the same very way as three or four special ones now do. When I say “taxpayers' money” I mean the facilities granted by the taxpayers' money. But what do we find? There is no question of bringing things up-to-date. This Bill would practically make things worse than they are. It may be good to have a Director of Medical Services, to have everything centralized and organized properly but I feel that

all the doctors of this island who are duly registered and qualified should be granted the right to go in there and attend to their patients and should be given the opportunity to use all the instruments and all the modern facilities, so that everybody whether they be from St. Philip or Christ Church or St. Peter would be granted the privilege of being attended to in there and not to confine it to just a special four practitioners with another four as juniors who will take their places in time. All doctors should be granted that right. If we are here to improve conditions at the hospital, let each and every doctor who practices his profession in this island and who pays all types of taxes have the right to go in there and follow his patients and not confine it to a favoured few as has been the practice in the past.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—We hear all sorts of allegations and accusations concerning the Hospital to-day. I want to say something about the question of extending the facilities at the Hospital so that those facilities may be enjoyed by more people than is the case to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member seconding the motion of the honourable senior member for Christ Church?

Dr. CUMMINS: Yes, Sir, for the sake of discussion. I mentioned what I am about to say at the Hospital Board and I mentioned it also to the Chief Medical Officer. I envisage the day when the Hospital will be divided into departments and not being run as it is run at present. Every practitioner there, at present, is supposed to be a specialist on all diseases; that is wrong. Hospitals to-day exist to give the best medical services to the communities in which they are situated and medicine has advanced so rapidly that no longer is the general practitioner considered to be a specialist on every malady under the sun. I envisage the time when we will have, for example, a cardiac department, a pediatrics department, and a gynaecology department at the Hospital. This Government must be prepared to assist the younger medical practitioners in this community to qualify so that they will be able to take charge of these several departments, so that it will no longer be said that every registered medical practitioner can go to the Hospital and be a specialist on every disease under the sun.

Mr. LEWIS: I fear that we are getting into a difficulty. We have two Clauses numbered 11 before us and I want to be clear on what I am doing. Am I going to be given the opportunity to agree to or disagree to the Clause proposed by the senior member for Christ Church as Clause 11 and then proceed to Clause 11 as is printed in the Bill?

The CHAIRMAN: I shall put the Clause proposed by the senior member for Christ Church first.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am apprehensive about our getting ourselves tied in a knot. I beg to move that Clause 11 as printed be now postponed. The motion by the senior member for Christ Church may be more appropriately put before Clause 11 as printed is considered.

Mr. TALMA: I accept that proposal.

The question that the words proposed by the senior member for Christ Church be Clause 11 of the Bill is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, TALMA, and MOTTLEY—5.

Noes: Messrs. SPRINGER, LEWIS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. ADAMS, BLACKMAN, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD, and Mr. SPEAKER—15.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Clause 11 as printed be now considered.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—With regard to Clause 11, I think that the suggestion contained herein is, perhaps, the most controversial point in the whole Bill. It goes back to the old question as to who should have the right to appoint the members of these Advisory Boards. Most of the honourable members who were here during the last session will recall the considerable amount of discussion which took place in this Chamber last year on the suggestion that the Governor should be allowed to appoint the members of an Advisory Board. Well now, I do not propose to-day to go into the old argument of the necessity or the advisability of separating the Legislature from the Administration and I note, in this Clause, that there has been some attempt at a compromise, in that it is not suggested that the Governor should appoint the members of this Advisory Committee but that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should appoint them. My attitude on this matter is well-known and needs no labouring now. Until such time as we get Responsible Government in this country, the Legislature, in my opinion, should retain in its hands the power and the right to appoint the members of these Advisory Boards and for several reasons. In the majority of cases, honourable members will appoint members of the Legislature to these Boards and it is a useful thing that members of the House should get an opportunity to see at first-hand how these Departments operate; no one will deny that the experience gained must be of considerable advantage. There are other reasons which have been enunciated very clearly and at great length from time to time in this Chamber. I hope that there will be a majority of honourable members to agree that we should not make the mistake of giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee the right to appoint the members of these Boards. Sometime ago, Sir, the Chief Medical Officer in his Report actually suggested something else in reference to the appointment of this Board. I know that there is at least one honourable member who has some remarks to make on this matter and before I move any amendment to this Clause I shall wait and see what course will be pursued as a result of the discussion on it.

The question that Clause 11 as printed be now considered is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—The first thing I would like to say for the edification of honourable members and the Press and the public is that the Bill, as introduced, does not, in this particular and fundamental instance, follow the recommendation of the Chief Medical Officer. I merely say that because the Chief Medical Officer recommended that of the members to be appointed by the Governor, one should be chosen from the Legislative Council and two from the House of Assembly; that is the recommendation of the Chief Medical Officer but this Bill sets out otherwise. Having taken part in the discussion on the principle of appointment of Boards by the Legislature last time, I am going to say that I am willing on this occasion to modify my views and to accept this proposal in the spirit in which I think the colony as a whole, at least the majority of the inhabitants, has accepted the experiment in Responsible Government. Taking it altogether I am willing to accept this, although the experiment, I must say, is not actually law. If we have a Minister in this House responsible for the Medical Department I take it that

the Governor-in-Executive Committee will not make the blunder of not appointing him on this Advisory Committee, so that he will be in this House in a twofold capacity to answer questions from members of the House. I do not agree with the all-year life of this Committee, as is stated in this Clause. I should like their period of office to run with the legislative session and I understand that an amendment will be proposed to that effect. The next thing, Sir, is that I find it strange that the Education Act of 1943-3 is quoted to this House as an instance in which this House agreed on the principle of the appointment of these Advisory Boards by the Governor and still a very necessary provision applying to that principle is left out in this Bill. It would seem that this Advisory Committee is to have prescribed functions and that matters which come within their functions as an Advisory Committee may be done without reference to them, whereas in the Education Act, it is provided that in the absence of such reference the Advisory or Consultative Body may draw to the attention of the Governor any aspects of educational policy or administration which, in its opinion, requires attention; that has been left out in this Bill. I understand also that an attempt will be made during this debate, by one who is more capable than I am in drafting amendments, to put that right. If it is an Advisory Committee you need not take its advice; you can keep everything from it. It should be possible not to ask it a question about anything—the appointment of a doctor nor anything at all. It is not to be treated with that courtesy which should be extended to such a body. Its members are to be like office boys to the Medical Superintendent, just to tell him whether to buy provisions from a particular merchant or not. I do not think the members of the Advisory Committee should be put in that position. Any matter pertaining to the Hospital should be referred to it and if it becomes apprised of any matter that affects the Hospital it should have the right to tell the Governor-in-Executive Committee that such and such a thing has been done at the Hospital; that it has not been asked about it; that it thinks the action is detrimental to the institution and let the decision come from on high. There are one or two other provisions in the Education Act that are not in this Bill, such as the time for summoning meetings, for instance. If the Medical Superintendent decide not to call meetings, no meetings will be held. If the Director of Education would not call a meeting, two members of the Education Board can compel him to hold a meeting. The Education Board is in that position and I think the Hospital Committee should be in that position also. I understand that we are going to get the assistance of the senior member for St. George and his concurrence, as far as these amendments are concerned, and I am very glad for that. I am not prepared to impede the progress of the experiment to which I have already referred. I am willing to give it a fair trial and if the powers-that-be let me down and I have the power and privilege to deal with them, then they can take all they get.

Mr. ADAMS: I intervene at this stage of the debate because what I am about to say may possibly shorten the debate. I agree with the junior member for the City who has just spoken, whatever may be the outcome—and I personally think and have no doubt that the outcome will be successful. When Cabinet Government began in England there were more attacks on it by members of the House of Commons than we have to-day in this place on this ex-

perimental form of government, yet Cabinet Government in England is a shining example to the world. So I have no fear about what is called the "Bushe Experiment"; it is bound to succeed. If we are to attain Responsible Government, surely this elementary step towards that Responsible Government is absolutely essential. We have, so far, acquiesced in a member of this House nominating members to the Executive Committee, the Cabinet of this Island. Are we going to swallow that camel and strain at the gnat of leaving to the Governor-in-Executive Committee—not one person but four who *ex hypothesi* are members of this House—the appointment of Advisory Boards? I have been authorized to say that as far as the Governor is concerned, he has no intention of appointing a single person to any single body unless advised by a majority of the Executive Committee which in practice will be the members of the House of Assembly who are members of his Executive Committee. That, to my mind, is the greatest step towards Responsible Government that has ever taken place in any group of colonies in the British Empire at any time. This is only an Advisory Committee—it is true—and we have not reached the stage which we shall, of course, reach. Members of the Executive Committee will have ministerial status and the senior member for St. Philip, for instance, will be referred to as the Minister for Highways and Transport while the senior member for St. George will be referred to as the Minister for Education. In that way, the British Empire has been built up and there is no reason why Barbadians cannot do what the Canadians and the Australians have done. I repeat that I have been authorized to say that in the appointment of Boards, the Governor will be advised by the four members of this House who are members of the Executive Committee and we cannot do anything more than that. I am asking honourable members to see that they are not giving up any power; they are merely saying that the four members who have their confidence shall say who are to be members of this Advisory Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I intended saying just now, in reply to the junior member for the City, that either he was playing with the word "responsible" and the words "new experiment in government" or he failed to properly understand either what is the full nature of the experiment or the full meaning of the word "responsibility" as applied to government. To begin with, Sir, when you talk about "Responsible Government" you mean a people who are in control of that Government and are absolutely responsible for the formulation of the policy of the Government; the ultimate responsibility is theirs. If you are going to claim that the fundamental experiment is in the nature of Responsible Government, as the junior member for the City has claimed, how, Sir, can you reconcile that with the statement by the Head of the Administration himself that his is the ultimate responsibility for the Government of the country? I say that, only to emphasise that if the junior member for the City is assuming that in this experiment we have Responsible Government then both himself and the Governor are at logger-heads and in this case I prefer to err with the Governor than be right with the junior member for the City. The junior member for the City says that he accepts this experiment as a step towards Responsible Government and even goes farther. He gave the impression, definitely from his remarks, that this experiment was a sort of Responsible Government. That is the impression that his remarks conveyed. If I misquote him I should like him to correct me at this stage.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to say that I said that I am perfectly willing not to impede the progress of the experiment. I accept it in the spirit in which the majority of the people of the colony accepts it. I do not look upon it as Responsible Government so far as the law is concerned but as an opportunity for the training of the members of the House for it. (Cheers).

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).

REPLIES LAID.

On re-assembling,

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 23 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

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

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment for lunch took place, the House was in Committee on the Hospital Bill.

THE HOSPITAL BILL

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee on this Bill before the adjournment, Clause 11 was under consideration.

Mr. SPRINGER: This morning the honourable junior member for the City indicated that he desired, if it found favour with the Committee, that Sub-clause 1 of this Clause should be amended in order to make the tenure of office of the members of the Advisory Committee co-extensive with the session of the Legislature. The honourable member intimated to me before then that that was his desire and I have framed an amendment, which should have that effect, to put before the Committee. I beg to move therefore that after the word "Committee" in line 6 of Sub-clause 1, the following words be added: "Immediately after the coming into operation of this Act and thereafter within one month after the opening of each legislative session. They shall hold office until the expiration of one month after the commencement of the ensuing legislative session;" and that the words from "Each of such members" to the end of the Sub-clause be deleted. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that that conforms with the procedure adopted for many years now in respect of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. I think that it conforms well with the principle on which the Clause is based, and there is no objection on the part of the Government to the honourable member's point being carried out.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to propose another amendment to Sub-clause 1 of this Clause

to the effect that after the word "Committee" in the penultimate line of the Sub-clause, the following words be added: "Two of whom shall be members of the House of Assembly and one a member of the Legislative Council." Before the House adjourned I was making a few observations in reply to the honourable junior member for the City. I pointed out that while we endorse the "Bushe experiment" and wish it God speed, we must not read into it more than what was intended. To pass from that, let us accept the principle that the present Head of the Administration has decided that although he claims, and rightly so, that the ultimate responsibility for the administration of the colony is his, yet he is willing to allow the members of any Advisory Board which is to be appointed in this colony, to be appointed by the four members of the Executive Committee nominated from this Chamber. That is what we were told that the Head of the Administration has expressed himself in favour of doing. I want to say this; normally I doubt whether there is a single person either within or without this Chamber who is more in sympathy with the constitutional experiment promulgated by Sir Grattan Bushe than myself. I was surprised to read in a section of the Press a few weeks ago that the President of the Electors' Association—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hate to interrupt the honourable member—

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is just in passing, Mr. Chairman. A letter which I read in the Press was to the effect that the President of the Electors' Association claims that my Party is opposed to the experiment. I do not know whence the writer of the letter got his information and I did not bother to correct it because I did not think that it was so material at this particular stage. Sir, while some of us may be accused of endeavouring to amend legislation of this sort or of wrecking the experiment, there are many other ways of wrecking it. Naturally, since I am a member of the Executive Committee myself and it is to be assumed that I should be more or less in agreement with the policy of the Executive Committee, I can have no objection to putting into the hands of the Executive Committee the power of nominating the members of a Board of this sort; but, unfortunately Sir, I am not even satisfied with the appointment of the members of the Executive Committee itself, so therefore I am not going to be a party to putting into the hands of the present Executive Committee the power to appoint the members of any Board. I sincerely hope that other members of this Committee or the majority of the Committee feel that way. There are other members who, I know, agree with me, members who are not here to-day. I am sorry that they are not here. The fact remains that if we are going to end up right, we have to start off right; and if we are experimenting with responsible Government and have gone so far as to allow a member of this Chamber to nominate the members of the Executive Committee, in consequence, we should be willing to back down to the position last year that the House should appoint the members of the Advisory Boards. Now that the House is selecting the Executive Committee, so to speak, we feel that we are quite justified in allowing the Executive Committee or the House to appoint the members of this Advisory Board; but in the carrying out of the experiment a certain wreckage has taken place even before we have got a chance to put it into operation, and that must interfere with the experiment so long as the present session lasts. It is very unfortunate that this false step which has been made at the start

of the experiment will actually have to interfere with the type of legislation that is going to be placed on the Statute Book this year. Can anybody expect me or the members who think like me to sit here to-day and agree that the Executive Committee should appoint the members of this Advisory Board or any other Board when we ourselves claim that the present members of the Executive Committee were not nominated on a proper basis? I go even further; it is well known that the present Government or the present Executive Committee is comprised of members drawn from different groups in this House and it is also well known that in the nomination of the members of the Executive Committee, the wishes of one group were not carried out. Therefore, nobody who is in his right senses would suggest, for instance, if there were three Labour groups in this Assembly or three Parties possessing a similar policy, that some of the present members of the present Executive Committee would remain there. When people talk about wrecking the experiment or not supporting it, it must be borne in mind that the Party with which I am associated has, I think, done more towards making the experiment a success than any other Party in the island: because at the beginning of the session in order to make the experiment a success, in order to ensure that it got off to a good start despite all the provocation and all the obstacles which existed to prevent co-operation between the two Labour groups, we forget all that. If the experiment falls down at any stage of its operation, it can be fairly easily seen who are responsible for sabotaging it, so to speak. I repeat that if under the new experiment you cannot even have on the Executive Committee the members of the constituent parts of the Government whom you want there how much more dangerous it would be to put into the hands of the present Executive Committee the right to appoint Boards or any other Bodies whether they be advisory, executive or otherwise? You have to begin right if you want to end right, and when it comes to the question of claiming that this Chamber or that the present Executive Committee enjoys the confidence of this Chamber, that, Sir is taking a lot for granted. That may be assumed because the position remains unchanged, but I am absolutely sure that in actual fact, it is not so, most decidedly it is not so, and I hope that honourable members will agree to the amendment which was originally suggested by the Chief Medical Officer himself. With our type of Government, experiment or no experiment, the members of this Advisory Board should be appointed as I have suggested—two from the House of Assembly and one from the Other Place. I could go on for a long time to quote from remarks made in this Chamber by those who are in it to-day, pointing out the advisability for having members of this Chamber on Boards of this sort under our present system of Government. I submit that nothing fundamental has occurred since those remarks have been made which would lead members to any material change in their previously expressed opinion.

Mr. WILKINSON: We have had considerable discussion over this principle and I do not see that anything is to be gained by repeating the previous arguments. I, Sir, am going to move an amendment to Sub-Clause 1 of this clause as follows: that after the words "and four other members" in the fourth line, all the words in the fifth line and the words in the sixth line to the word "Committee" be deleted in order to substitute the words "two of whom shall be appointed by the Governor, one by the Legislative

Council and two by the House Assembly." I think that that is a compromise to the motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and it does not tie us down to appointing members of the House. There are Boards of Management which are appointed by the House and by the Legislative Council but it does not necessarily mean that the members of these Boards are bound to be members of the House of Assembly or of the Legislative Council. This gives you a wider scope; this House has exercised that right in the past and, in my opinion, very wisely so. I think that the Boards have been, on the whole, very successful Boards, and I think that we should follow the example set by those Boards. That is not giving up our rights entirely.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second the motion of the honourable junior member for St. James. I feel that this House should not relinquish all their powers and give them to the Executive Committee. It has always been the policy of former Houses to try and keep as much power as possible in the hands of the representatives of the people. From the arguments adduced not very long ago it would seem that if we give all this power to the Executive Committee, as it is at present constituted, the representatives of the people in this colony will lose some of their right. I feel that if we agree to this amendment we will still be leaving it to the representatives of the people to appoint some of the members of this Advisory Committee.

Mr. GALE: We have heard several amendments proposed to this Clause. We are considering a Bill to put the Hospital in charge of the Government. Well, the Government is the Governor-in-Executive Committee and therefore as soon as we change the administration of the Hospital from what it is at present and put it in the hands of the Government, we have put the Governor-in-Executive Committee in charge of the Hospital whether we intended to do so or not. This Advisory Board will not be administering the Hospital; this Board is there to give advice and it seems to me that if you can give the power to run the whole Hospital to the Governor-in-Executive Committee it would certainly follow that you can give them the power to appoint the Advisory Board. In this Bill we are giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee the power to run the Hospital; we are asking the Government to run it. Who is the Government?—The Government is the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I do not see that all these reservations which certain members are trying to put in have any merit because you have taken the administration of the Hospital out of the hands of the present Board and put it in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We have heard quite a lot in connection with this Bill. At the outset let me say that I am seconding the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I am doing so because I feel that it is a necessary compromise. I have heard a lot about allowing the "Bushe experiment" to work, but, in my opinion, no experiment will ever work unless we are willing to accept a compromise. I say that, without the spirit of compromise, we will never get anything done. I have studied this question very very carefully; I recall during the last session that the appointment of Boards was the real contention and so very important Bills reached the stage of a deadlock. This Bill, to my mind, is an equally important Bill; the changes which it seeks to make in respect of the Hospital seem to be very necessary, but nevertheless this particular Clause, even with the present change, seems to make a big difference. As I understand the position, at one time the idea was to allow the Governor to make this

appointment. I can quite see that a compromise has been suggested in having the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make the appointment, and that makes some difference. I cannot see that there is anything wrong if it is agreed that the Governor-in-Executive Committee must make the appointment. We have gone a step further and have suggested that these appointments by the Executive Committee shall be made from this House and from the Other Place, and if you read the Clause carefully, you will see that it still gives the right to the Executive Committee to make other selections from elsewhere. Now, Sir, I suppose, as has been stated in one section of the Press, that it would be a very good thing to keep away from these Boards people who are politically-minded; but I find that in order to be able to appoint anyone who is not politically-minded to a Board, you would have to appoint somebody from the Mental Hospital or from the Cemetery. It would be impossible in Barbados to appoint to any Board anybody who is not politically-minded. I am making this appeal whether it falls on deaf ears or not. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has assured us that the Head of the Administration will not make any appointment unless he consults the members of the Executive Committee in this House and takes their opinion, and I cannot see that there is anything wrong if a compromise is made in agreeing that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall make this appointment and that two of the members of this Advisory Committee shall be members of this House. It must follow that the experiment continues; if the Head of the Administration has never been told that he can only make appointments as recommended by the members selected from this House by whoever is the Leader of the House, then I see that there is absolutely nothing wrong. Those members will have a voice in saying exactly who should be appointed from this Chamber and from the Other Place. Mr. Chairman, I feel that in supporting this amendment I am doing the correct thing. Like the honourable junior member for the City, at one time I felt that there would be some infringement or giving away of the rights of the members of this House in passing any statute which would not allow them to appoint members of various Boards, but I am convinced that with the present experiment no harm can be done in allowing the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make the appointment, for the time being at least, until you are satisfied that we are no more at the experimental stage. It has been admitted on all sides that this is an experiment, and until you are satisfied that you have ceased to experiment, then you should not make such a radical change that might give cause for regret. I conclude by saying that while the Executive Committee will have the right to make the appointment and not the House, the Executive Committee should make their selection from this House and the Other Place. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the honourable senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I think that an explanation is due from me at this stage. The honourable junior member for St. James has moved an amendment to the effect that the House should appoint two of the members of this Board, and it may be regarded as peculiar that since last year my colleagues and I were emphasizing that point, and we are willing to accept a compromise this time. I want to make it perfectly plain that, as far as I am concerned, nothing would please me better than to see the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. James go through and allow the House to have a member on that Board.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member withdrawing his motion?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not withdrawing my motion; my only reason for not proposing that amendment myself is because I felt that the one which I have proposed had more chance of succeeding to-day with some honourable members being absent. It is not that I am not in sympathy with the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. James.

Mr. TALMA: I should like to say this; I appreciate the explanation which has been given by the honourable Leader of the House relative to the status or future status of members of the Executive Committee as having ministerial posts, but they have not got full power as yet. Unless and until those members have full power, unless and until these ministerial posts are in operation, I feel convinced that the members of the House of Assembly are the proper persons to appoint at least two members of this Advisory Board. I appreciate the point which has been made by the honourable junior member for St. James; I feel that the Governor should also have the right of appointing two members and the Other Place should appoint one of the members of this Board. I think that a correct compromise has been suggested.

Mr. LEWIS: I really feel that I should offer an explanation and something by way of a defence. I would like to let the honourable senior member for St. Philip know that he has not proposed anything that goes counter to what I said to-day. I am willing to support him in it. (A MEMBER: That is good). There is, however, one thing that I will say and it is this: I was bearing in mind all the time that I took up the stand that the House must appoint members of these Boards, especially Advisory Boards. I did not know then of any experiment; I heard about it afterwards. I am one of those who pointed out to the public of Barbados that the experiment, with our 300 years of British tutelage in Parliamentary procedure, should have warranted some greater confidence in us, that it should be made law and if we abuse it, then take it away from us. I said that. Since then, Mr. Chairman, I have been a party to trying out this experiment and I feel that I should be loyal to it. (Hear, hear). That is the position I occupy to-day and I do not see that the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Philip cuts across that at all. I was the person who got to this island a copy of the St. Lucia Bill as regards housing and pointed out that even in a Crown Colony like that the Governor has the right to appoint members: but the Bill also says in certain cases who and from where the members should be appointed. Whatever I am doing, I feel that it is a genuine attempt on my part to assist in the legislation of this colony, and if I am told that it is an evolutionary act for me to give up that right and maintain only the right to legislate and lay down policies and leave administration and details to others—when I find myself in a minority like that, I feel that I should criticise and that I should be heard, but there is a point on which I feel that I should back down. There is one thing that I should like to put before the honourable junior member for St. James—

At this point, it now being 3.30 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and stated that it was now time for the consideration of Private Members' business.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b) in order to continue 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 (b) be now suspended in order to continue Government Business.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. RAMSAY, LEWIS, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GALE and Dr. CUMMINS.—11

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—9.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye", and nine honourable members voting "No". The Rule cannot be suspended, however because twelve members must vote for the suspension of a Rule. It is now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ADDRESS RE PURCHASE OF BABBS PLANTATION

The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was called:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the purchase of Babbs Plantation, St. Lucy.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—In this Address I propose to make a slight change so far as paragraph 2 is concerned. At present the Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House begs to draw to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the fact that Babb's Plantation in the parish of St. Lucy in this Island is on the market for sale.

2. The House requests that His Excellency take appropriate steps in order that Government shall secure this Plantation for the purpose of:—

- (a) Land settlement or/and
- (b) Establishment of a collective farm, or/and
- (c) Erection of a model Housing Scheme, or/and
- (d) Any other community development scheme?

As regards the first two lines of paragraph 2, I desire to substitute this amendment for what appears in paragraph 2 of the Address as printed;

"The House requests that His Excellency take appropriate steps to explore the desirability of purchasing this Plantation or any other Plantation in in this area for the purpose of:" and then the paragraph continues as in the printed Address. This plantation, Sir, had been advertised as being for sale some weeks ago. I did not hear of any move being made by the Government to consider the question of purchasing or not purchasing it and I decided that it was appropriate for me to move the passing of an Address like this one. I take it, Sir, that honourable members of this House are all agreed on the necessity for the Government to own as much land as possible, not only in the City of Bridgetown or in the parish of St. Michael, but throughout the length and breadth of this island. This particular plantation contains,

I understand, 82 acres of which 70 acres 2 roods 36 perches are arable, and even if it may appear that at the present time the land is not in the very best possible condition on account of the prolonged drought, this state of affairs will easily be remedied with the advent of more favourable weather conditions. There are many arable acres in this island; there are nearly 60,000 arable acres of which 40,000 are owned by plantations and the remainder is owned by 18,000 peasants on an average of less than an acre per peasant. When the Government experts visit this plantation if the House decides that the Government should explore the desirability of purchasing it, they may decide that, in their opinion, it is suitable for land settlement, the establishment of a collective farm, the erection of a model Housing Scheme or any other community development scheme. That is a matter for the Government to decide and there are experts to advise them. It is for us as members of this House to decide whether we are in favour or not of the acquirement by the Government of this land in the parish of St. Lucy. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members will be as sympathetic towards the purchase of land outside the parish of St. Michael as they are in respect of the purchase of land in this parish. (Hear, hear.) It is perfectly true that the parish of St. Michael is really worse off for open spaces than any other parish, but that does not mean that we should, for one minute, regard the position in the rural areas with anything like equanimity. There is the question of providing playing fields in the country districts; it is only in the parish of St. Philip that there is any really recognized and fully-developed area for the people to recreate during their spare time, and if in this parish and in other parishes we had some land like that, it could not but redound to the health and happiness not only of the people who live in the particular parishes, but of the people of the island as a whole. It has been recommended by every Royal Commission which has ever visited these shores during the past many years, from the time of the Royal Commission in 1897, the Joseph Chamberlain Commission until the Royal Commission of 1939, that the state of affairs obtaining in this country is deplorable; that there are very few pieces of land available for the land-hungry people of this community, and that the Government should take steps to make as much land as possible available to the people. I understand that there are in this area other plantations which are, or may be, for sale and I commend to the attention of the Government not merely an exploration into the desirability of purchasing this particular plantation but others in the district. I have heard a rumour to the effect that a place called Barrows is, or may be, on the market. I do not know if that rumour is true, but I suggest that the Government make certain enquiries in that connection. On the border of St. Peter and St. Lucy there is a place called Hopeland of which I have learnt the proprietors may not be averse to discussing the sale. When therefore the matter of this Address is being investigated, if this Address commends itself to the House—I am sure that honourable members are interested not only in the welfare of the people of the metropolitan parish in this matter of finding spaces for various schemes, but also in the welfare of the people throughout the island—the Government might also make enquiries in respect of the sale of these other places so that these schemes may be brought to fruition. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into this question any more fully. As regards the

plantation which is specifically named in this Address, I gather that the highest offer is under consideration and the plantation has not been sold. It is a matter for the Government, if this Address is passed, to go into the potentialities and see if it is desirable for a reasonable price to purchase this plantation or any others in the surrounding area for the benefit of the people in the district.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member takes his seat, I think that he will have to get the permission of the House to alter the terms of the original Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: I ask leave to amend the Address in the manner I have indicated. My reason for proposing that amendment is that I gather that every honourable member may not have made up his mind that it is desirable to purchase this plantation; every honourable member may not have seen it, for instance, but I suggest that nobody would be averse to having the Government investigate the matter and have the findings of their experts as to whether they would advise us to purchase this plantation or not.

Mr. RAMSAY: I think that the proper procedure ought to be that the honourable member should have this amendment printed and circulated and on that ground I am objecting to leave being granted the honourable member. This is not a question of life and death as in the case of the Hospital Bill, for instance. I do not think that the island will run out of yams and potatoes and other things. I think that this amendment should be printed and circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER: An honourable member having objected, I will put the question. The question is that leave be granted the honourable member to substitute the words proposed in place of those appearing in paragraph 2 of the original Address. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I rise to second the motion made by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy as regards the purchase of this plantation. I take it that the sentiments expressed by the honourable member are in line with the sentiments of this House as a whole. I can hardly believe that anyone will see fit to oppose an Address of this nature which really goes to the crux of the matter, the means whereby land can be made available to the unfortunate people who have never been able to own a rood of land or any at all. The position is this: we are merely making sure that the policy which has been laid down by the Government when they bought the Pine Plantation is being maintained, and we take it that not only the people in the metropolitan area should be served but also those in the rural districts. The people in the rural districts probably need land more urgently than those who are in town. There is no gainsaying the fact that this Address is based on sound and good ground and it should not be controversial in any way. We should not only support this Address but we should try and see that in each parish a plantation is made available for the use and benefit of the people. It does not stand to reason that because this land is in another honourable member's constituency we should oppose this Address for the sake of opposing it. That reminds me of an Address of which I gave notice on the 14th of January this year with the same object, and for the benefit of honourable members who may have forgotten it I should like to read it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot refer to anything which is before the House this session.

Mr. TALMA: I am merely saying that this Address is nothing new. It is a question of this Labour Government buying estates when they are suitable and for reasonable prices so as to give the poor people especially in the country districts, some land where they can grow their own crops and so assist them in keeping life and limb together.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is almost unnecessary for me to add my quota of support in a matter like this. I think that I can say with some appreciation that for years—and the entire public knows—I have consistently endeavoured to impress upon the Government the necessity for making more of the land in this island available to the masses of the people. I make bold to say that that policy of mine is so well known that if I were to refrain from saying anything in this connection to-day, the general public would know that an Address of this nature would have my entire blessing and support.

Mr. COX: I myself am in wholehearted agreement with this Address. I say now, as I have said before, that whenever any land is to be sold, the Government ought first to see whether it would be advantageous to the people or not, and if it is advantageous to the people they should purchase it. I should like to repeat what I have said on other occasions that the suffering of many people in this country is as a result of the land being owned by a handful of people. I am therefore in wholehearted agreement with this Address and I hope that it will find favour in other quarters. I should just like to say in passing that I remember well when the Address was before the House asking the Government to purchase the Bay Estate, the honourable senior member for St. Philip said that instead of the House being asked to pass the Address, the introducer should have gone privately to His Excellency the Governor and apprised him of the fact that the estate was for sale, because as soon as people knew that the Government was considering purchasing it, they would have to pay a high price for it. Apparently, the honourable senior member for St. Philip is more sympathetic towards me, a stranger, than towards his friend; but I would like to say that I was fully conscious of the fact that an Address passed by this House would be of far more importance so far as the consideration of the administration is concerned than any little private member going and telling the Governor that some place is to be sold and you had better try and purchase it. Even if that were so, the Governor cannot buy anything in private; the House have to be in favour of it and they have to pass the money with which the land is to be purchased. I have just said that to let the honourable member know that he is contradicting what he said on the last occasion.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that every honourable member of this House knows that I am in favour of giving people who live in an agricultural community some land in the hope that they will make the best possible use of it, so that they will improve their standard of living and their living conditions generally. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to the passing of an Address like this which has been amended and the words "or any other plantation in this area" inserted. I am not prepared to give His Excellency the Governor *carte blanche* to look around for a plantation, enter negotiations to buy it and then come back and tell me that I told him to do

so. It is regrettable that this matter has to be discussed in public at all because the price of this plantation will go up. I think that the honourable member is entirely wrong in proposing this amendment, and I have to vote against this Address unless he agrees to the deletion of the words "or any other plantation in this area." I think that it is sufficient for us to deal with a specific case. If it was a question of passing an Address with respect to a Land Settlement Scheme throughout the island and we ask the Government to look around and buy land all over the island, that would be all right; but I think that this House would be extremely wrong to agree to buy one plantation in St. Lucy and then look around for another one and buy that also. I am not willing to vote for that to-day. The next point is this: can the honourable member assure this House that this plantation is for sale? He should have said so because sometime ago one honourable member asked the Government to buy a plantation that was not for sale. I think that when we are dealing with such fundamental questions as land settlement, we should know what we are doing. From the last occasion when the Government was asked to buy a plantation and the price went up, I say that if this plantation is definitely on the market for sale, the honourable member should know about the price of this land. He should be in a position to tell this House that this land can be bought for so much per acre; he should have made some enquiries about this plantation so that we could say that we are not paying too high a price for it. We should put a limit on the price which we are paying for this plantation and leave it at that. The honourable member is not only an old representative in this House, but he is a lawyer and he should have got that information and given it to this House to-day. I do not think that we should pass this Address as it is; I am not giving the Governor *carte blanche* to buy any other plantation in that area, and if the honourable member does not tell me that he knows something about the price per acre of this plantation, I shall have to vote against this Address.

Mr. MAPP: I also represent a rural constituency and I am very much in favour of this Address. The remarks of the honourable junior member for the City have certainly thrown some light on the matter and they cannot be ignored. I can well foresee about 40 plantations being set up for sale in various parishes, and do you mean to tell me that 40 different Addresses will have to be passed in this House asking the Government to buy those plantations? I feel that this matter should be dealt with in a different way. I feel that there should be a definite decision on the Government's part to buy as much land as possible for the benefit of the people—not in any piecemeal way. I think it is time that we go about this matter differently. Do not let us buy land that may be set up for sale to-day, tomorrow or next year by passing an Address every now and then. I feel that that is a very shortsighted way of dealing with this matter. As someone in another island has said, "Land is as essential to the people as air", and I heartily endorse that statement. To quote another speaker: "A landless proletariat surely breeds irresponsibility among the people." That is the worse thing that can happen to any country but the matter should not be attended to in this way. I think that it should be dealt with as in the case of other West Indian islands; a Sub-development Committee, if we should call it by that name of our Agricultural Department should deal with this matter of acquiring land, ex-

aming every area which is set up for sale and we would not have a private member of this House going into an area and assuring us that it is good for this or for that purpose. The Committee would do all that and then recommend to us that the land be purchased and we would then have a Resolution sent down to us for this purpose. It is a most ridiculous thing for every member of this House to set about getting land for the use of the people: you could not view that with equanimity. I think that the Government should set up a Sub-development Committee for the purpose of obtaining as much land as possible for furthering Development Schemes on a co-operative basis among the landless people of this colony. I am in entire agreement with that and I hope that the Government will set about dealing with the matter from that angle rather than having it dealt with as at present.

The question that this Address do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, COX, MAPP, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT and WARD—12.

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS and WILKINSON—2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, twelve honourable members voting "Aye" and two honourable members voting "No". I will ask the honourable junior member for St. Lucy to present this Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: As Your Honour pleases.

ST MICHAEL'S PARISH LOAN BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael in this island to raise a loan to enable them to purchase a property which adjoins the Parochial Buildings, Cheapside, Bridgetown, for parochial purposes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael to obtain a loan of £4,000 with a view to providing a Food Centre for the parish and also to provide further accommodation for the staff of the Sanitary Department. It is hardly necessary for me to point out to hon. members the great need for having the necessary accommodation to provide for feeding a number of people of this parish, people who are not qualified to receive Old Age Pensions or other pensions. For some time now this Food Centre has been carried on at Queen's Park; the number of people who are being fed has increased until now we have to provide for the accommodation of nearly 200 people. It has been found that at Queen's Park the accommodation is not very good for the number of old people who assemble there for a little ration. I do not think that it is necessary for me to say very much more in connection with this matter; I think that every honourable member of this House is acquainted with the facts as they exist today. I therefore have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. COX: Before the question is put, I regret to say that I cannot support this Bill. Of late we have been hearing quite a lot about the administration of the Vestry, and any individual who takes an interest in the working of that Department will realize that conditions existing there are far from what is satisfactory. It appears as if there is a lot of squandering of the taxpayers' money by this Department.

Everybody will have read in the Press quite recently that something like \$54,000 of the money of the taxpayers of this parish has been squandered and over-spent, and God knows what items the Vestry can show for it. I can say that it has been brought to my notice that a schute and half a dozen swings in Queen's Park cost the parish \$1,000. A little office at the Cemetery cost the taxpayers \$3,000 although they were not buying the land, and many other items which will prove in no uncertain way that there is something definitely wrong with the administration of this Department. I am speaking about this matter because, up to now, I am a representative of the people of this parish and I am a taxpayer myself. You will be surprised to know that in some respects this year taxes have been increased over 100% so as to make up for the deficit and for the squandering of the money by the last Vestry. I have been told that over \$10,000 which was budgeted for in the last Estimates to pay the Electric and Gas Companies has remained unpaid; I have also been told, I do not know if it is true, that very often when the end of the month comes, somebody has to beg some individuals to pay their taxes in order that the Vestry can pay their servants. The whole thing is in a bankrupt state at present and I cannot subscribe to this; I am not giving the Vestry any power to borrow any more money. What I want to see done is that this Government set up a Commission of Enquiry to find out where all these funds of the taxpayers have disappeared. That is what should have been done. I can remember that some months ago when we passed a Bill to allow them to purchase an old house with wood ants from a man in Black Rock, an honourable member of this House suggested that it would be a wise thing for the Vestry to appeal to the Central Government for the land and build a new place rather than buy this old house. Up to now the house is still there. Everything seems to be wrong there and I am not prepared to subscribe to this sort of thing. As I said before, I want the Government to go into this state of affairs before allowing the Vestry to go on increasing the taxes year by year and oppressing the taxpayers. For instance, people who have hired cars paid something like \$7.32 last year as trade tax and this year the tax is \$15. It is not to say that the bills have been paid; they still remain unpaid and every now and then the Vestry ask you to give them power to borrow money to buy something and the result is that the poor people of this parish are, I can almost say, blackmailed. Before I sit down, I am going to move that this Bill be rejected. I say that this is a disgrace and the schute of which I made mention is useless. When you take these facts into consideration, I am sure that if those members who happen to be responsible for the squandering of those funds were employed by private individuals, they would be in jail by now. That could not happen with any private firm: but it will happen in this case because here are a bunch of poor, foolish people who are given a shilling with one hand and twenty shillings are taken from them with the other. Anybody who has any idea of the administration of the Vestry will know that what I am saying is true. I am not saying anything more at this moment but I am hoping that the day will come when we will get honest, dignified and respectable men at the head of affairs.

Mr. ADAMS: As this debate is likely to be long and acrimonious, I am going to move the adjournment of the House. There are those of us who want to leave before five o'clock, those of us who would be glad to be here this afternoon, and I am in the same

category. It is now twenty minutes past four and I appeal to honourable members to let this debate be continued on Tuesday next. (Voices: Oh no). I beg to move the adjournment of this debate with a view to fixing the Order Paper (After a pause). I presume that I am in order to speak on the original motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot speak on the original motion. Rule 141 says this:

"A member who has already spoken to a question or has moved or seconded an amendment thereto, or a motion for the adjournment of the debate, may not rise again to move an amendment or the adjournment of the House, or of the debate, or any similar question, though he may speak to these new questions when proposed by other members."

Mr. ADAMS: I think that I can speak on the original motion, as there is no one who is willing to second my motion. The words that have fallen from the lips of the honourable senior member for St. Michael are of such grave importance and against the premier Parochial Body of this colony, that speaking for myself, I should take such steps as the honourable member has suggested if such facts are put before the Government as to warrant a Commission of Enquiry. I myself have a certain amount of information which makes me feel that there is a great deal in what the honourable member who has just sat down has said. It is easy when people are in public life to throw bricks at them; but there are occasions when those bricks are deserved. Whoever—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I shall have to interrupt the honourable member again. Rule 142 says this:

"A member who moves or seconds a motion for the adjournment of a debate which is negatived is not entitled to speak to the main question."

Mr. ADAMS: My motion has not been seconded and I did not sit down. The main question is now to be put to the vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion, it seems to me, has been negatived if there is no seconder.

Mr. ADAMS: When I found that nobody was willing to second my motion I did not want to stop speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member did not sit down and therefore he can go on speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member who has moved the second reading of this Bill is in the best position to defend the Vestry. I am also speaking as a taxpayer now and I say that I did not feel too happy when I saw my recent tax bill, to put it on a very personal basis, and I suppose that many people in low income groups would feel worse. I think that some explanation is due primarily to the ratepayers of St. Michael and beyond them, the public of Barbados as to this amazing over-expenditure. I remember remarking somewhat semi-jocularly in this House some years ago and pointing out that it was a serious matter when Vestries over-spend money. At that time there was a debate on a Bill to allow the Vestry to raise a loan to cover some over-expenditure by Mr John Beckles, the then Churchwarden, and to my great surprise, the House took it very seriously when I stood up and said semi-jocularly and not with any intention of voting on it but pointing out that people with the best of motives, must be careful not to over-spend public money. I was careful to say that it was an admirable project by Mr. Beckles, but he should be careful about spending money. There must be some explanation of this over-expenditure of over \$50,000; the newspapers do not give as full reports of public meetings as they might give be-

cause of the shortage of newsprint and no explanation has been forthcoming sufficient to justify this over-expenditure. I entirely agree with the honourable senior member for St. Michael that before this House can allow the Vestry of St. Michael to raise this loan to spend in acquiring property with these two glaring instances pointing to what seems to be mismanagement or recklessness as regards expenditure—I think that this House ought to protect the ratepayers of St. Michael. I do not know if this house is being eaten by wood ants as the honourable senior member for St. Michael has mentioned, but I do know that every single cent that was spent by the Vestry in purchasing the Children's Home could have been saved by application for a spot of land at the Pine. Any Body which is prepared to call upon the ratepayers to spend thousands of pounds when they can get a free gift is a Body that needs watching. There may be the best of reasons for this over-expenditure; there may be expenses, miscalculations, the cost of labour and materials may have gone up, there may be perfectly innocent explanations for this over-expenditure; but if there are such explanations, let them see the light of day. If the Hospital Board allows lumber to slip over the side of the wall, that Board should be criticized and if any criminal act can be discovered, that person who is responsible should be jailed. The same is true of any Vestry. If there is nothing to hide in this instance, they should welcome a Commission of Enquiry to show that their character has been clear; that there is no secret commission paid or things of that sort. If there is nothing to hide, they can easily clear themselves and show how this \$54,000 has been overspent. As long as I have a seat in this Assembly, no amount of fear of what people may think of any words of mine will stop me in instances of this sort from saying that the public duty must be performed with even greater rectitude and care than if a person is pursuing his own private interest. A man may waste money, but he is only hurting himself and possibly his family; but as soon as it is established that things of this sort can happen and people only smile and say "these things happen," which is often one of the reactions to this over-expenditure, there is no decent morality and we are as this in Mexico or some South American Republic. I ask the St. Michael's Vestry for the sake of their reputation for honesty to defend the charge which as I have said, is worthy of the fullest investigation. I hope that honourable members who have an explanation to make will make it to the House, one that will satisfy us all. I am not prepared to vote for this Bill for the reasons which I have given. I have never said one word to the honourable senior member for St. Michael in connection with this matter; I did not know that it would have come up to-day. What I have said came to me when I was hearing something of what has been made public, and there is no collaboration if the honourable member's speech and mine happen to be the same. I have independently come to the conclusion which I have reached because of what I heard outside as to this over-expenditure. If there is nothing to hide, let us have—

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you seconding the motion for the rejection of the Bill?

Mr. ADAMS: I am going to move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. This is a matter on which I think the ratepayers of the parish of St. Michael should have a chance of expressing their opinion. I am told, Mr. Speaker—and this is something on which I want an explanation—that the

Vestry have laid rates with a view to cover this over-expenditure. Nothing could be more illegal than that. No taxpayer has moved any injunction to stop it and it is too late to do that now. If what I have been told is true, the ratepayers are being asked to do something which the Vestry has no right to ask them to do. (A MEMBER: It is true). These are matters that are too important to be passed over lightly. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. LEWIS: I must say that from all I have heard, I am seconding the motion that this Bill be read a second time this day six months. I may have preferred a shorter period so that the members of the Vestry should have an opportunity of letting us know what the true position is, or that the Government should investigate the matter and clear the characters of the people concerned. I would like to say that quite recently a number of ratepayers of this parish have come to me and told me that their taxes have gone up; some of them told me that their taxes have gone up by 100%. I notice that in one year the rate has gone from 10½ cents in the dollar to 12 cents in the dollar—an increase of nearly 2 cents in the dollar in one year. I asked this Vestry at one time to accept a proposition that would have meant a ¼c. in the dollar—that was to abolish the Occupancy Tax and they turned it down. (A MEMBER: The House turned it down too). Of course, some people will be given off their taxes in the hope that they will vote for certain people to go back in the Vestry again. That is the method. I feel that this is an occasion on which the Government should step in as it stepped in in connection with a mere £350 which the Hospital Board themselves told them was gone. The honourable introducer of this Bill is one of those who encouraged the setting up of a Commission of Enquiry and said that there was scandalous over-expenditure. The Vestry have over-spent more than that. As a taxpayer, I should like to know something about this over-expenditure. I think that the honourable member should have brought in a definite statement as to the position of the Vestry and the commitments outstanding so that we could have an opportunity of reviewing the situation in respect of the loans which have been raised. There is, perhaps, a third loan and you are asking people to pay back this money at a time when the cost of living is increasing to them. There are people who pay taxes and who do not have an opportunity to objecting to them; those are the people who have to pay back this money. I feel that the parochial buildings in this metropolitan parish should be of the very best, and I am agreeing to the postponement of this Bill. I think that the Government or His Excellency the Governor should be more than willing and anxious to accept the suggestion that a Commission of Enquiry should be set up to go into the affairs of the St. Michael's Vestry at this particular stage. They accepted the suggestion to have a Commission of Enquiry in respect of the Hospital Board merely because that Board found that the money had been over-spent and was honest enough to tell this House. This Board is composed of such members as the President of the Legislative Council, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, His Lordship the Bishop, the Attorney General and a personal representative of His Excellency the Governor; people who will have to indict anybody who is found with lumber that has been stolen are being enquired into! Who has been chosen to carry out this Commission of Enquiry?—a man who may have to sit as Chief

Justice to try them. In my opinion this is a whole conglomeration of nonsense being carried on merely because you want to find out where £350 has gone.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not debating that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am merely saying that if in this instance you should have a Commission of Enquiry, how much more so is it warranted with respect to the position as disclosed by the Vestry? As a representative of the taxpayers all over the island, I cannot agree that the taxpayers of St. Michael should have to pay increased taxes even for this laudable purpose without some facts and figures being put before me as to the present position of the commitments of the Vestry and whether anything illegal has gone on. I understand that some bills which are owing to the Electric Company and other people have been included in the present rates. I think that that is illegal; if somebody else overspends money I do not think that it can be dealt with in this way. When you give the Vestry the power to raise taxes and borrow money, when you lose by a certain date the opportunity to object to the rates, I think that members have to be careful. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Philip who showed keenness to have an inquiry in connection with the Hospital Board for a mere £300 or £400, will lend his weight not only in the House but also in Executive Committee to show how keen he is in having the spending of public funds enquired into on all occasions. I think that it is wrong to have the members of the Vestry under any cloud or suspicion that they have done wrong; I think that this matter should be gone into before I can give them any permission to add to the commitments of the parish, even to have a statute for the purpose of housing themselves in more commodious buildings. I say that it is in the mind of the public that something is wrong and taxpayers have come and told me that they are unable to pay the taxes for which they have received bills. I can let the Vestry know in advance that I am unable to pay mine. (Laughter). For that reason, I cannot burden the taxpayers of this colony and even for the reason that I cannot burden myself with any more. I must get an enquiry into this matter; I must protect the taxpayers and I must protect myself as well. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in the hope that we will have a closer picture of what has taken place; and we will be able to come here and pass this Bill feeling sure and secure that all is well and that we are doing right.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before this debate ends, I must add my quota of objection to this indiscriminate over-expenditure of public funds. I would like to say, speaking on the second reading of this Bill, that public morality above anything else must be respected and maintained if democracy must mean anything. If people are going to be immoral in any respect, when it comes to a public institution such as the Vestry—I say that \$50,000 is a lot of money to over-spend anywhere in the world furthermore in a colony like Barbados. No statement can convince me that there can be any justification for over-spending to the tune of \$50,000 in one year; and then you come back and make the taxes go up 2c. in the dollar as compared with the previous year? This is not a question of there being some other source from which you can draw just as you can put a pump into the sea and the water comes out; this is a question of sweat and people are crying for more wages. I say that it is time that the Government should make some proper investigation into this matter and let the

people know something about it. There may be an old tradition that this matter has come before this House today. I must agree with all that the honourable junior member for the City has said with respect to the manner in which things are allowed to happen in the case of some of these Parochial Bodies, because, Mr. Speaker, if someone through his friendliness and his way of living with other persons — he may have admirable qualities but above all there must be a quality where you do not help a man because—

Mr. SPEAKER: There may be a perfect defence to spending more than you anticipated spending. I do not think that there should be any suggestion that any member of the Vestry has helped himself to any of that money.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not saying that, Mr. Speaker, but I say that sometimes people are helped in a manner so far as charging too much for work is concerned. I do not think, if the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Michael are correct—

Mr. SPEAKER: Your suggestion is that the superintendence is not good. (Laughter).

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Yes Sir, and the public has to pay for that superintendence. It is grievous to think that people who have to pay taxes are called upon to pay 2 cents more in the dollar this year. It is hard that you cannot call people thieves when you know that they are thieves.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has used an expression which he has no right to use.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Head of this administration from whom this Bill is seeking authority to make a loan, would have to investigate every aspect of the Vestry of St. Michael before I can agree to give them the authority to raise this loan. It is not fair to the people to ask them to pay increased taxation this year. Fortunately and unfortunately I happen to be one of those taxpayers who have to pay for the houses which they rent. I am called upon to pay more taxes this year. This is a matter — I am being somewhat personal now — in which I have the opportunity to raise an objection both on behalf of the public and on behalf of myself. The honourable junior member for the City has said that he cannot pay his taxes but we know that either by accident or by good fortune we are disqualified from getting tax relief. Therefore we cannot line up. I should like to say that the affairs of any public Body must be so run — I should like to put the best construction upon it — that they can see how they are spending their money. It is to be presumed that a Government Department or a Body like the St. Michael's Vestry should run their affairs in such an up-to-date manner that they can plan ahead as to what they are going to spend; and in times such as these we cannot lose \$5, \$50 or \$500 much more \$50,000. There are those who would suffer a heart attack in the case of 50 cents. This is a very serious matter; it is not a matter that should be pushed aside. Irrespective of who the persons are—if my father were a Vestryman he would

have to give me an account for the over-expenditure of money. There has been this amount of money being over-spent and it does not seem to be anybody's business. It seems to me that the Vestry want to hush down this matter quickly so that you cannot feel that it is as bad as it is. However, the cat is already out of the bag, and as the honourable junior member for the City has said, it is a matter to be enquired into. I have heard that a building has been erected in the Cemetery and a lot of money has been spent there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The whole point is whether there is such evidence of reckless spending of money that the House should not give the Vestry the power to borrow this money. I do not think that we can go into the details which the honourable member is going into.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I think that sufficient has been said to show that this money has been overspent and that this House is of the opinion that it should not pass this Bill to give the Vestry an opportunity to borrow more money until they have given a better account of what has been overspent. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: If the Order Paper remains as it is, we shall have to deal firstly with the Resolution in connection with the subsidisation of commodities and I hope that hon. members will bear that in mind and come prepared to deal with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I know that the hour is late and the day is far spent; but I doubt whether it would be strictly correct to give the prosecution a chance to establish a case of this sort without hearing one word in defence if a defence can be made out. There is a lot of difference in allowing one side of the story to appear in print for an entire week before the other side is allowed to appear. I am neither condemning nor defending now; I want to hear both sides of the story.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am opposing the motion for the adjournment of the House. I should like to take this opportunity to reply to honourable members, and I would like Your Honour to guide me in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will have to vote against the motion for the adjournment of the House.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day week at twelve o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs LEWIS, BRANCKER, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, ADAMS, MAPP and BLACKMAN—8.

Noes: Messrs CRAWFORD, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT and WARD—6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, eight honourable members voting "Aye" and six honourable members voting "No". This House now stands adjourned.