

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1946—1948

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 20th May, 1947.*

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

*Present:*

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, W. A. CRAWFORD, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., V. C. GALE, and E. L. WARD.

After prayers, MESSRS. MAPP, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and GARNER enter the House and take their seats.

### MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 13th May, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

### PAPERS LAID

Mr. SPRINGER : Mr. Speaker.—On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers :—

Statement showing gross Customs and Excise receipts for eleven months ended 28th February, 1947.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received from His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended 31st March, 1947, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Mr. Cox enters the House and takes his seat.

### NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows :—

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to grant the sum of £31. 1s. 1d. from the Public Treasury to the Commissioners of Health, St. Michael, as a refund of the Customs' import duty paid on 5 cases of tipping gear and one crate of wheels and axles imported in connection with the scavenging of the City of Bridgetown and its suburbs.

Resolution to place the sum of £78 2s. 6d. at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make an ex gratia grant to the Cashier in the G.P.O. in respect of a loss of cash as a result of a robbery from the Cashier's cage.

MR. CRAWFORD : Resolution to grant the sum of £112,600 from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded from loan funds) to meet the cost of the purchase, housing and installation of machinery, mains and apparatus in connection with the re-organisation of the public water supply of the Island.

MR. BLACKMAN : Bill to provide for a system of voluntary vaccination in this Island.

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

Other Notices are given as follows :—

Mr. BRANCKER: Of the following Address :—

*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?

### QUESTIONS

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

Whether the Department of Education has in contemplation a scheme or schemes for the teaching of Negro and West Indian History in the Government-aided Secondary and the Public Elementary Schools of this island?

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

What steps, if any, has Government taken to implement Superintendent Calver's Recommendations for the Barbados Police Force *re* the following :—

(1) Preparation and Publication of an up-to-date Book of Rules and Regulations, referred to in paragraphs 28, 33, of the Report on the Police Force?

(2) Creation of the rank of Sub-Inspector, referred to in paragraph 50 of the Report?

(3) Discontinuance of Practice at Central Police Station and Wharf Post of acting as "key holders to others than the Government Departments," referred to in paragraph 70 to 74 of the Report?

(4) Provision of a new and suitable Fire Station, referred to in paragraph 17 of the Report on the Fire Brigade?

Mr. TALMA and Mr. MOTTLEY enter the House and take their seats.

Mr. BRANCKER: Of my intention to move later in the day for the passing of the Address just given notice of by me.

#### BILL READ a FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to provide for a system of voluntary vaccination in this island is read a first time.

#### DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL SERVICES BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John,—Second reading of a Bill to establish a Department of Medical Services for this Island.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,— This Bill is intended to put the medical services of this island on a proper footing. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been introduced in this Chamber for some time and one which, I think, will have a beneficial effect on the population of this island if it is passed. I will deal with the Objects and Reasons just as they are. The first is that this Bill seeks to create a Department of Medical Services which will have at its head a Director of Medical Services responsible to the Governor generally for all matters affecting the public health and medical services of this island. As it says, the Head of the Medical Department will be the Director who is, at present, the Chief Medical Officer. He will be the Director of Medical Services in the Island and will be responsible to the Governor for everything relating to the public health and medical services of the island. The second object and reason is that in addition to the Director of Medical Services there shall be a staff for the Department including a Senior Medical Officer of Health and their job will be to work under the direction and control of the Director. Of course, other members of the staff will be appointed as the Director sees fit. The third object and reason is that the Director of Medical Services shall be given general powers of superintendence and direction over and responsibility for the public medical services, and such government institutions and establishments as the Governor may direct. The government institutions over which the Director shall have control are the General Hospital, the Mental Hospital, the Lazaretto and the Bacteriological and Pathological Department. The fourth object and reason is that the duties of visiting and inspecting such infirmaries, homes, almshouses and hospitals as receive public or parochial aid and of supervising generally the work of a medical practitioner receiving pay from the Public Treasury, which are at present imposed on the Chief Medical Officer under the provisions of the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer Act, 1928,

shall be imposed on the Director of Medical Services. The Director will have the right to visit and inspect all public institutions, almshouses and places of that sort. At the present moment, he does visit and inspect such institutions but he has no power whatever over them. He does write certain Minutes in the books kept for that purpose but the parochial authorities may or may not take notice of those Minutes and in many cases they undertake, although they are laymen, not to be guided by what the Chief Medical Officer has written. Further duties of the Director of Medical Services are provided for in Clause 4 of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member but what are you reading from?

Mr. BLACKMAN: I am reading the Objects and Reasons of the Bill. According to Clause 4 of the Bill, the Director of Medical Services shall investigate all complaints against any officer of the government medical services of this Island or reflecting upon the order, discipline and management of any institution or establishment to the general superintendence and direction of which he shall have been appointed under the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section or of any other law of this island, and enquire into and investigate all complaints of ill-treatment received from any inmate or inmates within any such institution or establishment. The same clause provides that the Director shall perform such other duties as may be required of him by the Governor or by any provision of law. What I am about to say is not in this Bill but I am hoping that the duties of the Director of Medical Services will include the fixing of the scale of salaries for all medical as well as sanitary employees. The reason why I say that is this: There are sanitary inspectors who are performing duties now in the several parishes and who receive different rates of pay and I feel that if men are performing the same duties they should receive the same pay, just as Police Magistrates, no matter in what district they may be, are in receipt of the same salary. That is one of the things which, I hope, the Director of Medical Services will have the power to do. Another thing which, I hope, he will have the power to do is to have control over the appointment, promotion and dismissal of sanitary inspectors. In my opinion, no appointment, promotion, or dismissal of sanitary inspectors should be done without reference to the Director of Medical Services. I am convinced that some of the people who are in authority over the Sanitary Inspectors in the several parishes deliberately set about to worry and annoy those employees if they do not do the things that please them or if their duties make them do anything that is displeasing to them and in that way victimize those men. I feel that the Director of Medical Services should have the power to remedy that condition of affairs; no man should be victimized because he does his work properly. I also feel that the Director should have the power to compute the pension of any medical or health employee who has served in more than one parish. What I mean by that is this. It is possible for a man to serve at a certain salary in a certain parish and then be promoted to another parish at a bigger salary. He may not serve the latter parish for three years and the greater part of his pension will be computed on the smaller salary he used to receive, the result being that the man would not get a pension equal to two-thirds of the emoluments attached to his office during the time he has been working. I feel that those are matters to be dealt with and I am confident that they will be dealt with by a Director of Medical Services. The next object and reason is to repeal the Chief Medical Officer and Sanitation Officer Act, 1928, so that in effect the offices of Chief

Medical Officer and Sanitation Officer will become those of Director of Medical Services and Senior Medical Officer of Health respectively; that requires no explanation whatever. The seventh reason and object is that the creation of a Department of Medical Services is a part of the scheme for the re-organization of the public health services, which was set out in the "Memorandum on the Medical Services of Barbados and Proposals for Re-organization" by the Chief Medical Officer, Dr. Weatherhead. This is the work of Dr. Weatherhead, our present Chief Medical Officer, and I think this country should be grateful to him for his steadfastness, purposefulness and tenacity to get it as far as it is to-day. Other Chief Medical Officers have made efforts but things remain as they are. I feel that Dr. Weatherhead deserves the praise and the gratitude of the community for this effort which he has made on their behalf. This may be called a parent Bill and the children of this parent Bill will be the General Hospital, the Mental Hospital, the Leper Asylum, the Public Health Act, the Bacteriological and Pathological Act, and the Quarantine Act, those are the six Departments and Acts which will come under the aegis of this Bill. But peculiarly enough all the laws affecting them are on the Statute Book; in other words, the children are working and the parent is not yet born. That is the position in Barbados to-day. I feel that a Bill of this description is absolutely necessary. It will enable a Director of Medical Services to assist in putting the health of this community on a sound footing. It is well known that the Royal Commission stated that malnutrition is rampant in the West Indies and I feel that this Bill is a genuine effort on the part of the Government to assist in putting an end to that condition of affairs in this island. It is the first shot which we are firing in the war against malnutrition and I feel that Dr. Weatherhead is the man who is capable of carrying it through to a successful issue. With those few remarks I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I do not believe that anyone in this House to-day—when I say "to-day" I mean in this year 1947—will disagree to a Bill of this nature which, among other things, has as its primary object the improvement of the health of this community. I feel that the health of a community is of greater importance than any other aspect of that community's life. This is to re-organize some of the medical services in the island and I may say that we have some very obsolete systems here; it is only by God's mercies that many of us are alive to-day because we enjoy an abundance of fresh air all the year round and we are not afflicted with epidemics. I would like to draw to the attention of the honourable introducer of the Bill—and more particularly to the attention of the Government—that it is high time that greater attention should be paid to the dreadful malady, tuberculosis. This disease, Mr. Speaker, is public enemy No. 1 in this community. It is one of the social diseases which people dislike to disclose; it is one of those diseases that can be easily contracted by other people and I would like, in any of these Acts for the re-organization of the medical services, to find that greater attention is paid to this most serious disease. I remember reading that there were 122 cases reported last year; those are cases which have been notified but there are numerous other cases which have not been notified because, as I have mentioned before, this is one of those diseases which people dislike to disclose to the public. No one in this House, no one in this community would like to be afflicted with it; it is not a disease from which you can really feel there is hope of recovery.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to interrupt the honourable member but this is a Bill dealing with the re-organization of the medical services. If every mem-

ber of this House has in mind some disease to which he would like to refer, we may have, as a result, a very protracted discussion on the second reading of this Bill. I do not mind the honourable member mentioning the disease, tuberculosis, but you should not dilate on it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The reason why I mentioned it, Mr. Speaker, is because in none of these Bills, not even in the Hospital Bill, is any mention made of it, although mention is made of it in the Chief Medical Officer's memorandum. I take it that these Bills are the outcome of that memorandum and I am drawing the attention of the Government to something that was stated in it in the hope that something will be done to implement it in the Acts of this island. There is no law nor is there any institution in this island to deal with tuberculosis.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Director of Medical Services will take all that into consideration.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I think it is important, Sir, that we should mention strongly anything that is not mentioned specifically in the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: That may be so but we do not want an unnecessarily long debate on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is something of great importance. I feel that there is too much hush-hush so far as this disease is concerned and if we have people running about with this dreadful disease and touching here and there, I consider that it is time that a halt should be made to that, in the interest of the community.

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

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 are read and agreed to.

Clause 3. (1) There shall be a Department of Medical Services in this island.

(2) The Governor may appoint as head of the Department a Director of Medical Services who shall be a duly qualified registered medical practitioner and shall receive salary at the rate of one thousand pounds per annum.

(3) In addition to the Director the Governor may appoint to the Department a Senior Medical Officer of Health, who shall be a duly qualified registered medical practitioner and shall receive salary at the rate of seven hundred and fifty pounds per annum, and such other officers and servants as may from time to time be necessary at such salaries as shall be provided by the Legislature.

(4) The salaries of all officers appointed under this Act shall be paid from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee by equal monthly instalments.

(5) Notwithstanding any of the provisions in respect of salaries hereinbefore contained in this section, if the Governor shall appoint to any office created by this Act any person, who immediately prior to the coming into operation of this Act was an officer in the service of the Crown, such person shall receive salary at a rate not less than the rate of salary which he was receiving prior to such appointment;

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

(6) Every person appointed as an officer under the provisions of this Act shall devote the whole of his time to the duties of his office and shall not engage in private practice.

Mr. BLACKMAN : I beg to move that that be Clause 3 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to second that.

Dr. CUMMINS : Before the question is put I want to make a few remarks on sub-clauses 2 and 3 of this Clause. I beg to move that after the word "shall" at the end of line 3 of sub-clause 2, the following words be inserted "hold a Degree or Diploma in Public Health Administration." The sub-clause will go on to read :—"He shall receive salary ....." and also in sub-clause 3, that after the word "shall" in line 4, there be inserted the following words "hold a Degree or Diploma in Public Health Administration." That sub-clause will go on to read :—"He shall receive salary....." My reason for proposing these amendments is that Public Health Administration is a specialized branch of medicine to-day. A registered medical practitioner does get practice in Sanitation but it is not what is expected from anyone who is to carry out efficiently the duties of Public Health Administrator and to pass this Clause as it stands would, in my opinion, be a retrograde step. The same remarks apply to the proposed office of Senior Medical Officer of Health; he also should be duly qualified in public health administration.

Mr. MAPP : I need hardly add much to what my colleague has said, in seconding his amendments. I think the emphasis, in any re-organization of our medical services to-day, should be laid on public health matters more so than on any other branch of Medicine. As far as our health services are concerned, we have only begun to touch the fringe of the problem. The senior member for St. Thomas is supposed to be an expert in this line and I do not think I can add to what he has said.

Mr. WILKINSON : Mr. Chairman,—It seems to me that this Clause 3 is quite a new departure. It seems as though we are going to give a bloc vote in future to this Department. As it is now in the Estimates, the name of every medical officer is not mentioned but his office and respective salary are mentioned and if I read this clause correctly it would appear that we are to have a block estimate in future. (Voices: No). If that is not correct I would like to have it explained.

Mr. ADAMS : It is not proposed to do that. Each of these officers will be appointed—and the Legislature will be notified—at a salary and it will be quite possible for the House to pass its opinion on the amount of the salary. After the salaries are approved and are put in the Estimates in the column "Fixed by law" we cannot touch them but in the case of every appointment the House will have the chance to say "we think you have given him too much or too little" and if the appointment is made with the approval of the Legislature then the salaries are put in the column of the Estimates "Fixed by law" and we cannot touch them. I may add that the Executive Committee fixed the salary of the Director of Medical Services at £1,000 per annum because that is the present salary and until all the salaries are revised and consolidated, that salary will remain, though it is felt that a Director of Medical Services should get more than £1,000 a year; similarly with the Senior Medical Officer of Health.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : I do not quite follow the argument of the senior member for St. Joseph. At present all these officers are appointed under the Act; their names are not mentioned but their offices and salaries are mentioned. This certainly appears to me as if there is going to be a bloc vote for the Medical Department. I cannot see that it looks like anything else. You will have to pass only a Resolution and a Resolution can be passed in this House without even

having been thoroughly discussed in Select Committee. But when an Act is to be amended, a Bill has to be brought to this House for the purpose and the House has the opportunity to discuss all the proposed changes in Committee before they can take place. This proposed method is purely the way in which Crown Colony business is done; this is just how the Crown Colonies deal with this matter. I do not think it is clear enough.

Mr. SPRINGER : I would like to add a word in further explanation of the point which is quite intelligible to everybody except probably the senior member for St. James. This is not without precedent; we have several Acts of its type on the Statute Book, one of which is the Act to establish a Department of Highways and Transport in which there is a similar clause providing for the appointment of officers. This procedure is no attempt to take away power from this House. Any appointment made by the Governor cannot be paid for unless the Legislature—and particularly this House—sanctions the creation of the office and the salary which is attached to it. An abstract Resolution is sent to this House for the purpose and it has to be approved both as regards the principle and the amount of the salary; hence our power is secured. But this has a great advantage. If you open your Statute Book at any particular Act it does not give you the true picture. In the case of the Education Act which we further amended last week I had to quote several different Acts over a period of ten years to show what the Staff of the Education Department actually was that day; it is a most unsatisfactory method. But if on the other hand you put only the principal officers in the Act you only have to open your Estimates to find the other officers on the particular staff or get the list from the Department concerned, and when you have to appoint an additional member to that staff you will not have to set about changing a number of Acts. There are two ways of doing this: one is by means of an abstract Resolution because the principle is involved and the other is by putting the officers and their respective salaries in the column "Fixed by Law" in the Estimates after those salaries have been approved by the Legislature. I do not think the House realizes how this procedure will expedite matters because at the present moment there is a lot of trouble and time expended in amending Acts relating to the appointment of officers. We will not be losing any power by this; we will be merely adopting a better procedure.

Mr. TALMA : The only thing that occurs to my mind is this. In view of the fact that the duties of the Director of Medical Services are being increased considerably I have not, at least up to now, been convinced that the salaries which are to be paid to this particular officer and his assistants will be commensurate, as far as living conditions are concerned. We shall be increasing the duties of the Chief Medical Officer who will be the Director of Medical Services in the not too distant future and, Sir, we envisage even better medical services for the entire island,—by that I mean every village, every large district in this island. You will excuse me if, in this connection, I refer to an Address which I have on the Order Paper relating to medical centres for all the larger districts in the entire island; so you can readily understand that the Director and his assistants will be supervising not only what are set out in the Objects and Reasons, not only the various institutions, not only the infirmaries and almshouses but also these medical centres which I am hoping will be instituted in the not too distant future. If we are increasing

the duties of the Director of Medical Services—and the Executive Committee has admitted that the cost of living has increased because it has seen fit to grant a cost of living bonus—I cannot see how anyone could suggest that the same salary should be fixed for that officer, especially in view of the fact that he is an outstanding officer; he has been one of the most outstanding ones in the last 20 or 30 years. It is no point in biting this Bill in this piecemeal way. More work will be placed on the Director of Medical Services and he should not be placed in the position of thinking that a Labour Government is unfair to him by giving him more work and the same pay.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the honourable member's attention to Clause 10 of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: But what does Clause 10 mean?

The CHAIRMAN: It means that the Director of Medical Services will be paid for the services he has to render after the coming into operation of this Act.

Mr. TALMA: If that is so, why introduce this Bill now? If this Bill was not urgent, the Government would not be introducing it to-day. In spite of that, Mr. Chairman, I have a perfect right to say that when the Government is thinking of re-organizing the medical services of the island it should see to it that it fixes proper salaries at the same time, otherwise it stands to lose the services of very valuable officers.

Mr. GALE: If we change the salaries of these officers, we will have to change all the salaries of all the other officers in the Civil Service. At present, officers are being paid a cost of living bonus and when the payment of that cost of living bonus ceases, I suppose the Government will put forward suggestions as to salary scales and all the salaries will have to be adjusted at the same time; I think it is unfortunate that any particular officer's name should have been mentioned in this debate. We want to get away from the old Barbadian habit of making the office to fit the man.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of explanation. Salary is mentioned in this Bill and it is for that reason I mentioned anything about salary at all.

Mr. GALE: I quite understand that but we have had an unfortunate way in the past of trying to fix the salary of the post to suit the man. We want, when we are considering Bills of this kind and making changes in the Service, to forget people and think of the offices. As far as the medical services of the island are concerned, the Chief Medical Officer does not have any power under the existing Act; that is the reason why we are seeking to-day to give him some power to enable him to carry out a more widespread supervision of the medical services in the whole island.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to accept the amendments proposed by the senior member for St. Thomas and I also beg to move that Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I think that the senior member for St. George explained very nicely indeed what I wanted to say and I am surprised that the Chairman did not make his speech, as usual, on this Bill before he went into the Chair, because he makes a speech on anything which interferes with the rights of this House before he takes the Chair. The whole argument of the senior member for St. George is that it will be easier to pass an abstract Resolution than to amend the Act. Well, Sir, that is my whole argument too. To amend an Act, the Executive Committee will have to come here and give us time to consider it but a Resolution affecting a man's salary

can be put before us and it would not even have to go before a Select Committee. I think he has argued my point very forcibly.

Mr. ADAMS: The junior member for St. James obviously did not understand the senior member for St. George or follow him carefully. It is more scientific to have a Resolution which specifically deals with a change than to go and alterate an Act every time a comparatively minor change is necessary; that is all I understand the senior for St. George to say: that is all he could have said. When the senior member for St. James is making suggestion about Crown Colony methods I presume that he has read the Bill before him and I presume that simple, ordinary English words mean something to the senior member for St. James as they mean to the rest of us. I believe that my failing in political life is to give credit for more intelligence than really exists; that is why I did not speak at greater length at an earlier stage of this debate. Every salary that is to be voted would be subjected to the votes of the House. I presumed that every member understood that the Government can appoint nobody and fix no salary, unless we agree that the person should be appointed and the salary fixed at what we wish it to be. What do these words mean? "In addition to the Director the Governor may appoint to the Department a senior Medical Officer of Health who shall be a duly qualified registered medical practitioner and shall receive a salary at the rate of seven hundred and fifty pounds per annum, and such other officers and servants as may from time to time be necessary at such salaries as shall be provided by the Legislature." There is no Crown Colony procedure in that. The Governor-in-Executive Committee will send a Resolution stating that he proposes to appoint these officers at such and such salaries and it will be for the Legislature to say whether they approve. I am amazed to hear the senior member for St. James say that if a Resolution comes before this House, it cannot be sent to a Select Committee as is done in the case of a Bill. We can thresh out thoroughly and spend as long a time on a Resolution as we can on a Bill. As regards our powers, the senior member for St. George has pointed out that we can say "No" whether a measure is in the form of a Resolution or in the form of a Bill. But surely this is a more expeditious and scientific way of dealing with matters of this sort than altering a Bill every time it is necessary to create a post, may be or alter some practice in some minor respect. You give people power to make by-laws and regulations which shall have the force of law instead of making it necessary to come back and ask the House to amend a Bill to say that a conductor's uniform should be blue instead of khaki when it can be done by means of a regulation. That is what the senior member for St. George means. Therefore, I appeal to the senior member for St. James to realize that the words "as provided by the Legislature" mean what they say. This House will say whether it agrees that such and such an office should be instituted and this House will say whether x or x+y or x-y pounds shall be attached to the office.

The question that Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, DR. CUMMINS, Messrs. SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, WARD, and Mr. SPEAKER. —16

Noes: Messrs. S. A. WALCOTT, and WILKINSON. —2.

Clause 4. The Director shall

(a) without prejudice and in addition to any other duties required of him by this Act or any

other Act of this Island, be responsible to the Governor generally for all matters affecting the public health and the medical services of this island;

(b) have general superintendence and direction of, and be responsible for, the public medical services of this Island and of such Government institutions and establishments as the Governor may from time to time direct;

(c) visit and inspect as often as he may consider necessary and whenever required to do so by order of the Governor-in-Executive Committee all infirmaries, homes, almshouses and hospitals at present in this Island, or which may hereafter be brought into existence, which shall in any way receive public or parochial aid, pecuniary or otherwise;

(d) exercise general supervision over the work performed for the government by any medical practitioner receiving pay from the Public Treasury for such work;

(e) investigate all complaints against any officer of the Government medical services of this Island or reflecting upon the order, discipline or management of any institution or establishment to the general superintendence and direction of which he shall have been appointed under the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section or of any other law of this Island, and enquire into and investigate all complaints of ill-treatment received from any inmate or inmates within any such institution or establishment;

(f) perform such other duties as may be required of him by the Governor or by any provision of law.

Mr. BLACKMAN : I beg to move that that be Clause 4 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, if I understood the junior member for St. John correctly in moving the second reading of this Bill I think he said that the Director of Medical Services would visit and inspect the institutions in the several parishes, would investigate any complaints and if salaries were insufficient and employees were dismissed would put them right. If that is correct, Sir, that undoubtedly would be taxation without representation. If a Director of Medical Services could go into a parish and interfere with the poor law machinery—

THE CHAIRMAN : I hate to interrupt the honourable member but I would like the honourable member to point out in Clause 4 where any such thing exists.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : I am only repeating what the junior member for St. John said.

THE CHAIRMAN : We are dealing with Clause 4. I would like the honourable member to finish Clause 4 and at some subsequent time he can bring up the point which he is raising.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : You didn't hear what he said?

THE CHAIRMAN : I may have heard but Clause 4 is the matter under discussion at present.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : I will have an opportunity then to speak on that point when we have come to the end of the Bill?

THE CHAIRMAN : I think so.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : All right, Sir. I will speak on that later.

Mr. TALMA : In view of the present-day conditions and of the new social schemes which are envisaged from now on—many of which have already been instituted—I beg to move that after the word "hospitals" in line 4 of sub-clause (c) of Clause 4, the following words be inserted:—"first-aid

and other medical centres and welfare bureaux island wide."

Mr. ADAMS : If the honourable member does not mind my interrupting him I would like to point out that there is provision in the Public Health Act which will cover his point.

Mr. TALMA : Despite the fact that the honourable member is the Leader of the House he does not seem to appreciate the effort I am making to have first-aid centres established in every district in the island as a whole. When one tries to do things in the appropriate way, all sorts of attempts are made to side-track one. Even if I stand alone I am moving my amendment. Whether it is in another Bill or not I want to get it in this Bill. We have centres where poor children are fed and I am referring particularly to the Goodwill League centre which is doing very good work. Why should the Director of Medical Services not visit and inspect this and other Centres like the one under the supervision of Madame Ifil? Why should these not be given assistance by way of medical inspection and instruction to nurses? I cannot see any harm being done by the inclusion of the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. GARNER : I beg to second the honourable member's amendment. I feel that no harm can be done by inserting those words in this Bill. Everybody knows that the Health Services in this island are not up-to-date; they are deplorable and if we are creating a medical Department now to bring Barbados into line with some of the civilized places in the world I see no reason why it should not be given this broader scope; so I hope that the honourable introducer of this Bill will accept what the senior member for Christ Church is adding by way of an amendment in order that everything that has to do with the medical services should be included in the Bill. I do not think that there is anyone with any responsibility in this island, whether parochial or otherwise, who will not say that this is a good Bill, a first-class Bill. Everything in this island, so far as health is concerned, should be under the jurisdiction of a Director of Medical Services and, as such, everything over which he should have jurisdiction, should be in this Bill; so I can do nothing else than second the amendment of the senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. WARD : Although I am in sympathy with the honourable member who moved the amendment, yet I feel that it is not necessary to have those words inserted in the Bill because the Bill provides for the appointment of the Director of Medical Services by the Governor and sub-clause (f) of Clause 4 provides that he shall perform such other duties as may be required of him by the Governor or by any provision of law. Therefore, I feel that if there is anything being done for the benefit of the community, the Governor could say to the Director "you will have to inspect this or that centre" as the case may be. With regard to certain remarks of the honourable introducer of the Bill, you ruled not long ago, Mr. Chairman, that the senior member for St. James will have the opportunity to speak on those remarks after the Bill is passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I do not think I ruled such a thing. I felt that it would come with better grace if the senior member for St. James had stuck to the Clause which is under discussion and not discuss the Bill in a general way.

Mr. WARD : In connection with Clause 4 the junior member for St. John made the statement that the Director of Medical Services would have the prerogative to fix the salaries and discharge the employees of the parochial institutions of the island but I do not see anything like that in Clause 4

and I do not think that it is possible to have that in the Bill. Sub-clause (c) of Clause 4 states:—"investigate all complaints against any officer of the Government Medical Services of this Island or reflecting upon the order, discipline or management of any institution or establishment to the general superintendence and discretion of which he shall have been appointed under the provision of paragraph (b) of this section or of any other law of this Island, and enquire into and investigate all complaints of ill-treatment received from any inmate or inmates within any such institution or establishment." Suppose for argument sake, a sanitary inspector who is employed under the parochial system had a grievance, would this clause mean that he would have the right to approach the Director of Medical Services to air his grievance? I would like to have that explained.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the junior member for St. John referred to sub-clause (b) of this Clause.

Mr. WARD: The honourable introducer of this Bill particularly mentioned parochial institutions.

The CHAIRMAN: It is unfortunate. I think honourable members are not doing justice to the introducer of the Bill. Probably when he said "parochial" he may have meant "governmental". (Laughter.)

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to speak now and I do not think you can stop me this time. I have read sub-clause (e) carefully; it refers to discipline and management and I consider that when the honourable introducer of this Bill was speaking he was referring to that particular part of the matter. (Mr. ADAMS: Government institutions.) Sub-clause (c) says he shall visit and inspect the almshouses and hospitals. (Mr. ADAMS: And do what?) Mr. Chairman, I would like you to ask the introducer of the Bill to clear up this point because he said the Director of Medical Services would be able to dismiss or re-appoint sanitary inspectors.

The CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask the honourable introducer of the Bill to clear up the point. It will do no harm because in making laws we have to be as broad as we possibly can. I do not see any reference in this Clause to the point in dispute but the junior member for St. John may explain or expatiate.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman,—It is impossible for me to say that the Bill meant anything but what is stated in it. (Laughter.) But I will say that I, personally, hope to see a scale of salaries for all medical and sanitary employees set out and that the Director of Medical Services will do that; also that the appointment, promotion and dismissal of sanitary inspectors will be subjected to confirmation by the Director.

Mr. TALMA: The senior member for St. Lucy said that what I am attempting to insert is already provided for in the Bill but if the honourable member will read sub-clause (c) carefully he will also realize that it is unnecessary to mention words like "homes" and "almshouses".

The question that the words proposed by the senior member for Christ Church be inserted in sub-clause (c) of Clause 4 is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, and MOTTLEY—4.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD, and Mr. SPEAKER—16.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 10 inclusive are read and agreed to. On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

#### THE BARBADOS GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John,—Second reading of a Bill to make provision in relation to the Barbados General Hospital.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—The object of this Bill is to make the Barbados General Hospital a Government institution. There is only one Clause, Sir, to which I need refer and that is Clause 11 which says, in part:—"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. . . ." That Advisory Committee will be appointed by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee consists of four members of this House and the members of the Executive Council who are the Governor's advisers. The policy of the Executive Committee is the policy given to the Governor by the members of this House and, therefore, if it is stated in this Bill that the five members of this Advisory Committee are to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, it means that the people's representatives in this Chamber will be appointing the Advisory Committee of the General Hospital. I think that is the only thing that needs any special reference. The other objects are quite clear; they are just to make the Barbados General Hospital a government institution instead of being run by what has always been called an emancipated Board. There is a great deal of difficulty right now in getting, at any rate, surgeons at the hospital because of the fact that the institution is run by a Board of laymen and professional men are not satisfied to be controlled by laymen. Many advertisements have been put in journals, magazines and papers in England for House Surgeons and we have been told that the difficulty is to get men to come here, owing to the hospital being run by laymen. Therefore, it is felt that the hospital should become a government institution under the Director of Medical Services with a Superintendent under him. I do not think I need say anything more and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second the motion for the second reading of this Bill. I know, Sir, that the Board of the General Hospital has come in for abuse from time to time and those people who always more or less felt that the hospital should be run by the Government instead of being run by a Board will unhesitatingly welcome this Bill. It is claimed that it will make for greater efficiency in the running of the hospital than formerly. I am not prepared to argue that but, Sir, from the public's point of view I feel that they will be more satisfied with the hospital being run by the Government than by a Board.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—I am thoroughly in agreement with the general terms and stipulations of this Bill. I feel, Sir, that if the hospital was a government institution, not only would the public benefit but also the several medical practitioners who are employed there, would feel more satisfied with having as their Head a Medical Superintendent. But, Sir, if that Bill which preceded this a few minutes ago does actually become law, it would appear that the Chief Medical Officer would not be the party to direct the Hospital be-

cause the Chief Medical Officer would automatically become the Director of Medical Services under that Bill and that will need to be amended in this Bill. I am merely drawing that to the attention of honourable members. There is just one knotty point which will arise and of which mention has been made by the honourable introducer of this Bill. It is a point which was taken up last session when the Education Bill and the Housing Bill were being dealt with and it relates to the appointment of the members of this Advisory Committee. Now, Sir, the honourable introducer of this Bill happened to be a member of the House at the time and to be a colleague of mine. We all fought tooth and nail to prevent the Governor from appointing the members of the Housing Board; we were accused of having delayed the passing of that Bill and things of that sort but we thought we were doing what was right for the public as a whole. To-day to my great disappointment, Sir, it would seem that because the members of the Executive Committee changed somewhat since the last session and because we are disposed to have a Coalition Government, it would be quite right and proper for the Governor of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to appoint the members of this Advisory Committee. The honourable member alleges that the members of this Advisory Committee will be appointed by the people's representatives. Well, we have to be fair and reasonable to all sides. In years past, the conservative members of the House formed the Executive Committee and conservative members are still elected representatives of the people. The principle for which we fought, in dealing with the proposal to appoint the Housing Board, was that all 24 members of the House should have a voice in appointing members of Advisory Boards, not only 4 members because these 4 members represent only their constituencies and no other. That being the case, I cannot see why it should be thought that this so-called Coalition Government or the Executive Committee should be the fit and proper body of persons to appoint this Advisory Committee. At this stage I shall not comment further on that point but will do so later on. However, there is a great flaw in this Bill; a great error has been made in this Bill and I can see that there will be a great deal of opposition to it later on unless the honourable introducer sees fit to move an amendment at an early stage. I am merely trying to assist him by throwing out an early warning. These are some of the things we fought in the last session and it is appalling to think that in the course of a few months, the entire view has been changed so radically and wrong.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT : I am sorry to see a Bill of this sort come before this House. It is plain proof that the Board which has been running the Hospital has been composed of men incapable of doing their work; it is a hit at the members of the Board. But I do not think that if we change the system and run the hospital as a government institution we are going to get much better results. The Hospital Board has been criticized from time to time but I still think that the results obtained at the Barbados General Hospital are better than those obtained at the Mental Hospital. I am surprised at the members of the Hospital Board giving up their rights as they are doing and coming here and agreeing to the Government taking over the hospital. Referring to what the senior member for Christ Church has said in respect of Clause 11 I certainly shall oppose that Clause as strongly as I can. I cannot see how four members of this House could be the representatives of all the people in this island.

Mr. GARNER : Mr. Speaker,—I do not share the same view as the honourable member who has just spoken. I feel that we do not know exactly who owns the Hospital now. Sometimes the Government owns it; at other times it is run by a Board; that is how it seems to me at present. If this change over will result in greater efficiency in the working of the hospital I am willing to vote for this Bill, with the exception of who should appoint the members of the Advisory Committee. You will remember that last session, the question arose and I happened to be a member of the Party who opposed this method of appointment. I still hold the same view. I do not care who constitute the Executive Committee. I have all respect for them as men but knowing how varied their views are I cannot say that this is an altruistic move and, therefore, I have to work on my own. Although one member of the Executive Committee happens to be a friend of mine or we have things in common, yet there comes a time when we differ. I do not agree with Clause 11 because I still believe that this Advisory Committee should be appointed from the House of Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER : Every honourable member who has spoken so far seems to be debating Clause 11. It seems to me that if that is the only objection to the Bill we may just as well wait until we come to the Committee stage and discuss it. You can mention that you are going to raise the point in Committee but do not argue it now.

Mr. GARNER : Well, Sir, that being so, I am hoping that the services at the hospital will be improved and that people will not find it hard to get things done as has been the case in the past. There is a lot of rumour that when the Government takes over any particular institution it is not properly run. I do not always share that view, Sir. I know they are very competent officers and servants in the Government's employ and I, for one, feel that this bit of legislation ought to give the inhabitants of this island a very good deal, with the exception, as I have said, of that particular clause. If the hospital is properly run and if we get proper practitioners and pay them well I see no reason why the people of this colony should not benefit by the change over. I hope that we will not have to regret in years to come because there is a lot of suspicion in certain quarters; but I feel that some of this suspicion is unfounded and if we were to see that what we do to-day carries out the spirit and the letter, as regards what people are anticipating by way of this change over, I think we will be doing the population a good turn.

Mr. SPEAKER : Is the honourable member going to speak much longer?

Mr. GARNER : Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER : Well, we will adjourn. It being after 2 o'clock, this House stands adjourned to a quarter to three o'clock in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

#### REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE PRESENTED.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPRINGER : Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft reply to His Excellency's Message No. 19/47 relating to an error in Resolution No 45 of 1947 in connection with the Cotton Spinning Plant.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to present the Report.

## SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business, namely the Bill with which we were dealing before the adjournment.

Mr. GARNER: I object.

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

A division was taken as follows:—

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

**Noes:** Messrs GARNER, CRAWFORD, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT and WILKINSON—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye" and five honourable members voting "No". The honourable member may therefore make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: When I asked leave to move for the suspension of the Rule and mentioned the Bill with which we were dealing before the adjournment, I might have added as I hoped we would have time to deal with it, that there is also the Vaccination Bill of which notice was given to-day and with which I intended to deal. If honourable members are in favour of that, I suggest that they should vote for the suspension of the Rule so as to deal with the Vaccination Bill alone. I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to second that. I want to ask honourable members to be a little indulgent. There is a Bill before us dealing with the General Hospital; there might be a case of illness or something might happen and then we will be blamed for it. Honourable members know what the Hospital is like and therefore let us deal with the Hospital Bill. Honourable members should "give us a break", if I am allowed to use that phrase.

Mr. GARNER: I have no objection to proceeding with the consideration of the Vaccination Bill but after all, the Order Paper is full and I think we should proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business at some time or other.

Mr. WILKINSON: I am quite willing to proceed with that Bill as I realise that it is a matter of some urgency.

Mr. ADAMS: If honourable members want to get through with important measures, surely they can allow the period devoted to Question Time to be given to the consideration of these measures. If we get through with the Vaccination Bill what harm is there in going on with the Hospital Bill until we come to the end of Question Time?

The question that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment for lunch took place, the House was considering the second reading of a Bill to make provision in relation to the Barbados General Hospital, and the honourable junior member for St. Philip was speaking.

## ORDER POSTPONED.

Mr. ADAMS: In place of the Order which Your Honour has just called, I ask that the Bill to provide for a system of voluntary vaccination in this island be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member will have to move that the further consideration of the Hospital Bill be postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move that the further consideration of the Hospital Bill be postponed.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

## SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended in order to deal with the Vaccination Bill in all its stages to-day.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

## VOLUNTARY VACCINATION BILL.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Bill to provide for a system of voluntary vaccination in this island be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that the Bill to provide for a system of voluntary vaccination in this island be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John:—Second reading of a Bill to provide for a system of voluntary vaccination in this island.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill has not been circulated among honourable members and therefore I shall read the "Objects and Reasons" as they are set out here. They are as follows:—

"This Bill seeks to establish a system of voluntary vaccination in this island.

Its provisions appear to be the more important and urgent in view of the reported occurrence in New York and other places of cases of small pox.

While it cannot yet be said that the Island is actually threatened by an epidemic of that disease common prudence would appear to require that swift and adequate action on a large scale should be taken to protect the Island against such an eventuality.

The Bill proposes that a number of public vaccinators should be appointed who would vaccinate free of any charge any person who desired to be vaccinated and who would issue certificates of vaccination.

The cost of vaccine lymph and any other expenses involved (including fees for the public vaccinators) would be paid from the Public Treasury."

The important thing about this Bill is that we are trying to make ourselves ready to resist an attack of the disease of small pox. It is a very serious disease; I happened to have suffered from it myself and therefore I know something about it. Persons who are suffering from this disease have to be isolated and no one is able to see them. That is a state of affairs which I would not like and I am certain that nobody else would like it. Therefore I feel all the more strongly in this matter. I think that it would be a very good thing indeed for us to be able to appoint these officers that are mentioned in the Bill and to provide the vaccine lymph so that everybody can have the opportunity of being vaccinated and so protect the island from being put under quarantine. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

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

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

The thirteen Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

On motions of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

#### BARBADOS GENERAL HOSPITAL BILL

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Hospital Bill be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: When this Bill was being considered, the House was debating the motion for the second reading of the Bill and the honourable junior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—As I was saying before the House went into recess, the public is divided in their opinion as to whether this change will bring them any better service than what they formerly received, or whether the Hospital will be run like the Waterworks Department or some other Department which has not stood up to the test. Personally, I feel that if the Institution is run along the right lines, the masses of the public ought to derive greater benefits than before. I said that I am willing to vote for this Bill with the exception of one of its Clauses to which I will refer when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. I feel, Mr. Speaker that everybody is in favour of the Government taking over this Institution. It has been stated not so long ago that some people there, the Radiologist and some other officers for instance, were dissatisfied either with their salaries or conditions of work and there was a continuous exit of surgeons from the place. If things are stabilised by the Government and the Government acts wisely in making proper rules and having the right sort of people on the Advisory Board, I do not see any reason why the people of this colony should not benefit by this change over.

Mr. WILKINSON: This is one of the few occasions when I do not agree with my colleague, the honourable senior member for St. James. He is not in favour of the Hospital Board being done away with. I feel that it is largely due to the Board which administers the affairs of the Hospital that it has become necessary for the Government to take steps to make the Hospital a Government Department. I take the view that things could not be worse than they are at the Hospital. I quite agree with the last speaker and I am hoping that when we get the new Department being run on proper and efficient lines we will be able to get proper medical men, a qualified radiologist and all the efficient staff which is necessary for the running of a modern hospital on such lines. We have heard a lot of criticism of the Hospital lately and the reason why I am voting for the second reading of this Bill is, as I have said before, that I cannot imagine that things could be worse there than they are to-day. I have every hope that under the new administration we shall have a vast improvement, and there is room undoubtedly for a lot of improvement. I do hope, Sir, that when it comes to the question of ap-

pointed an Advisory Board, the right people will be appointed to assist in the running of the Institution by the Medical Superintendent. I repeat that this is one of the few occasions when I do not agree with the honourable senior member for St. James; I intend to vote for the second reading of this Bill. I think that the present members of the Board are responsible for allowing things to reach the stage at which they are today. When people go there they have to wait for hours and hours before they can be attended and the place is terribly overcrowded. The honourable senior member for St. George will probably tell me that the extension of the Hospital is being carried out. Some weeks ago we voted money for the purpose but I do not see anything much being done. The anxiety of the present Board cannot be so great in this regard because they are not pressing forward with their work. There is ample room for improvement at the Hospital and it is with the hope that we will get this improvement that I intend to vote for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. RAMSAY: It is common knowledge that the building up of this place has been as a result of persons who have come forward in the past and offered their services and did work free, gratis and for nothing. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, as human beings they have made mistakes and the mistakes of these various and varied gentlemen have been magnified and thrown to the skies. I want to hint very quietly that they must have done some good. I take it that they did not go to the various Boards, and especially the Hospital Board, with any ulterior motives or any idea of self-aggrandizement, although they were ignorant they offered their services free. I want to thank those gentlemen who have served on the Hospital Board. I am probably doing a very peculiar thing, but that is how I feel about the matter. I must not speak about myself, but I am thanking all those gentlemen for having given of their time so as to do things in the interest of the community. I beg to thank them for their services and I exonerate them from any wrong which they may have done. I beg to thank them immensely for what they have done. (Cheers).

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before the question is put, I should like to say that I echo the hope that with the passing of this Bill we shall see ushered into being a far more satisfactory state of affairs with regard to the administration of the Hospital than formerly. Of course, we can console ourselves with the fact that things could hardly be worse at the Institution than they are now, and perhaps on that ground alone there might be justification for giving a trial to the proposal which is more or less suggested in the terms of this Bill. I know that various people in this colony view the proposed new department with mixed feelings; I know also that many people outside the colony feel that we are making a backward step. Some people in the neighbouring colonies have always viewed with longing eyes the administration of our Hospital and wished that their hospitals were conducted like ours. I have heard medical men who have served both in our Hospital and in hospitals in the neighbouring colonies which are Government Departments, entreating or rather beseeching us that we should be very careful as to how we embark upon any alteration to the system under which we conduct our Hospital which will bring it in line with the policy operating in the administration of the hospitals in some of the neighbouring colonies. Be that as it may, we have agreed to embark upon this experiment, and I repeat that I join the ranks of those who hope and pray that the future will record some justification for our optimism in this matter.

Honourable members who have spoken have already drawn attention to a section of this Bill which is going to cause some controversy; that is Section 11 which deals with the appointment of the Advisory Committee. I want to make it perfectly clear—as a matter of fact I have already made it clear—that I am not supporting the proposal contained in that Section. I cannot agree that the power for the appointment of this Advisory Committee should be vested in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. As I have said before, I feel that until we in this country have some sort of responsible Government, we must endeavour to keep in the hands of the elected representatives of the people some say in the administration of the various Boards and Committees of this sort. When we have gone further on the road to responsible Government then we can begin to talk about separating the Legislature from the administration of the Boards. Last year when we had the Housing Bill before us, I opposed the controversial Section for the same reason; I felt that there would not be any justification for allowing the Governor to appoint the members of the Advisory Committee. Now some sort of a compromise has been suggested and in the present Bill it is suggested that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall be responsible for the appointment of the members of this Advisory Committee. I see no reason for changing my opinion to-day; it remains the same as it was in 1946 when we discussed a matter of a similar nature. With regard to the compromise which has been suggested—a compromise which, perhaps, is the result of the new constitutional experiment—I think that there is even more reason for supporting the position which I assumed last year. I shall dilate upon this question when we go into Committee on the Bill and when we are dealing with the relative Section. I want to make it perfectly clear in the meantime that I am not supporting Section 11 as it now stands.

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

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were read and passed. Clause 6 was read as follows:—

6. (1) The Governor may appoint to the Hospital a Medical Superintendent who shall receive a salary at the rate of eight hundred pounds per annum, and such other officers servants and agents as may from time to time be necessary at such salaries as shall be provided by the Legislature.

(2) All salaries payable under this Act shall be paid from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee in equal monthly instalments.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Clause speaks about the payment of salaries, but what about the quarters? I do not see anything mentioned about quarters in this Bill at all.

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

#### SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B)

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know what the feeling of the House is, but in view of the importance of this Bill, I ask honourable members to vote for the

motion which I shall now ask leave to make, that is, for the suspension of Rule 61 (b). I suggest that when we get to Section 11 of the Bill which is going to be controversial we can report progress at that point. At any rate, let us get the non-controversial Sections of the Bill out of the way. I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Mr. GARNER: I object.

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

A division was taken as follows:—

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

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD.—8.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, eleven honourable members voting "Aye," and eight honourable members voting "No." The honourable member may therefore make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (b) be now suspended.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

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

The following division was taken:—

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

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD.—8.

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

#### ADDRESS RE RENT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: When Private Members' Business was being considered on the last occasion, the House was debating a motion for the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to rent restrictions and the honourable senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT did not continue to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Thomas who seconded the motion for the postponement of the debate on the last occasion has the right to speak now.

Dr. CUMMINS: I think that this matter has been well ventilated and it is known throughout the length and breadth of this island that there are cases, I may say very many cases, where landlords take the opportunity to extort money from their tenants. There are abundant cases which I could mention and I want to support the figures which have been quoted by the honourable senior member for St. Michael as regards the tenantry in Hindsbury Road, because it was said that those figures are incorrect. I myself have come in contact with people who live on that tenantry, and the figures as have been quoted by the honourable member and given to me independently are absolutely

correct. It is an urgent matter for the Government to try to improve the standard of living of the people of this colony, and while it is true that we are doing it in one way by increasing salaries and wages, on the other hand there are landlords who are taking away the benefits from the people. I say that for this reason: I have been told by two Civil Servants that immediately they got their increases their rent was increased when there was no justification for doing that. No money was spent on the houses and they could only conclude that the rent was increased because it was known that increases in salaries had been given them. One person told me that he must have a house for himself and his family to live in; his children are going to school and as he could not ask the Governing Body of the school to reduce the school fees for him, there was only one way in which he could balance his budget and that was by reducing the food. Well Sir, that is the serious part of it; the man told me that as a result of the increase in the rent he had to reduce the quantity of the milk supplied to his family by a pint and a half per day. I repeat that that is the serious part of it; we know of the conditions which have been brought about by the War: we also know that children must have an extra supply of food for the nourishment of their bodies and also for their growth and when they are going to school especially they need extra food so that their nervous system might be maintained. When we reflect on all that that is where I think that this business of increased rent demands an urgent enquiry by the Government. As I see the position, the people will be further starved unless this enquiry is conducted, because as the gentleman told me, he must have some place in which to live and the item on which the burden will fall will be the food. I will not say anything more on this matter because it is known that there are many, many cases of these increased rents. I will say this: until a few months ago I was a member of the St. Michael's Vestry and I know that within the last two years the assessors of the parish had a very difficult time to keep up with the landlords. A couple of years ago I happened to be Churchwarden of the parish and on more than one occasion the assessors came to me and mentioned cases where the increased rent was, in their opinion, unjustifiable. Therefore this matter is a serious one, and we are asking the Government to give it early consideration.

Mr. GARNER: I am placed in a very peculiar position inasmuch as I happen to be a businessman and yet I am in sympathy with those people who have to rent houses. I must preface my remarks by saying that there is not every landlord who is bad, but there are some very vicious landlords who will make it very necessary for the Government to do something so as to regiment the activities of all. I think I should say in fairness to the people who own and rent houses that the time when this action should have been taken was in 1939 and not in 1947; at least in 1941 when everything was being controlled they should have controlled rent and regimented more or less everything. I fear that this Address cannot serve much useful purpose although I will vote for it. With the advanced price of lumber, materials, labour and everything, there is a sad state of affairs. We have to view the matter as statesmen and not be sentimental. If a man owns a house and has to pay carpenters \$3 or \$4 a day and buy expensive material to repair it and he increases the rent, you have to sympathise with the renter and you also have to get the facts as to what the landlord had to pay so as to keep the house in order. While I am in sympathy with the tenant, you have to bear in mind that there are certain contributory facts. You cannot get away from that. As I have said, there are landlords who will

filch at any time and there are those who will add to their rent only when they have spent money to improve the comforts of the house. I feel that it is not so much a question of the houses; it is a question of the land and that is where I feel very strongly. There is one question that worries me most of the time and it is this: How did land come to fetch such a high price in Barbados? How did the price of land ever get to this height? Somebody has said that it is a question of supply and demand but the demand has never been met. None of the Governments in the past or even this present Government has made any attempt to bring the land within the scope of the masses of the people; therefore it will always remain that the supply cannot justify the demand. Hence, I think that the first thing which should be tackled is the proper redistribution of the land and not so much to go after the people who conduct their business by renting out houses, people whom we have missed since 1941. Since then things have sky-rocketed in price. I am speaking as a statesman, of the house, I think, therefore that you should start mainly today is the price of land and I ask again: How did it manage to soar so high? Small bits of land have been sold for £100 and £200; if you pay so much money for land and you are building on it a house for the purpose of renting it out, the price of the land has to be taken into account in the building of the house. I think, therefore, that you should start from the land. We need a proper system, we need legislation in relation to the land. Nothing is wrong with the landlords so much; they take advantage of the position in respect of the land. I think that we have missed the bus. This Rent Restriction Bill will be a very clumsy one to be drafted; when people have come to see how much it takes to keep a house in repair, they will be in sympathy with the landlords. Another point is this: I feel we will render a disservice to some of the people who rent houses. If a man spends money on his house and cannot increase the rent, the tenant will have to leave, because there is nothing to prevent a man from leaving his house in disrepair if he cannot get increased rent for it. The primary question is a new departure from what we thought was right in allowing a few people to own so many plantations. That is the burning question; too few people have all the land under their control and I see no reason why, instead of bringing forward an Address like this, a Bill could not have been introduced in respect of the re-distribution of the land. In St. George, Sir Laurie Pile has about 19 or 20 estates; each year he is making more money, piling up money when some people cannot get any houses to rent. The Government ought to have sent down to the House legislation as regards the re-distribution of the land and do not let us deal so much with the landlords because all landlords are not vagabonds. I feel that a re-distribution of the land is really necessary; let us give the people a little land and let them feel independent. When you have the plantations owning all this land and the people cannot feel a sense of independence, you will always have this vexed question. I counsel this Labour set-up to try and do something with regard to the land quickly because the people are looking forward for something being done along the lines which I have suggested. The people want to know that Sir Laurie Pile will sell some of his plantations so that they can have land on which to build their houses; they want to know that Mr. Chandler will give up some of the land in St. John. An honourable member who is not far from me should be brought into this matter. (Laughter). Honourable members are laughing, but this is a fundamental question. In the last analysis the State owns the land and I

see no reason why some people should hold on to it and others be left out. I repeat that unless this Labour set-up intends to do something along the lines which I have suggested, they are not doing anything; it is work along those lines that I anticipated from a Government like this. Here you get private members of this House asking that something be done to check the activities of landlords where rent is concerned. It is not so much a question about the landlords; they have to buy land and materials at a high price and they are trying to make as much money as they can. There is another type of person who invests money in a few houses and expects that money will be coming in from those houses; when he gets old he expects to get his living out of those houses. Some of the people are very unscrupulous and they are the ones who made the honourable member bring forward this Address. I am quite in sympathy with those who are fleeced, but on the whole the landlords are not all bad, because there are some of them who have not raised their rent since 1935. Some of them have decided to raise their rent. Of course, you will get speculators who will break the law; there are some lawyers who will plead a case for you according to your means, and there are others who will not plead a case for you unless you have the money to the last farthing. I want to impress upon this House that what we are doing now should have been done since 1941. The cost of material is too high to-day and so the people will have to pay more rent; another point is this; if you have to do any repairs, now is the time to do them. When the legislation asked for in this Address is being drafted people will have to show that their expenses have increased so that they have to charge more rent; the Boards will have to see to the interest of their friends and we shall have to be very careful as to what we do. As I have said, this Labour Government has to work towards giving the people the chance to own some land wherever it can be acquired—whether in St. Joseph, St. John, St. George or anywhere else; there are those who have been holding this land for too long. Whether we do what has been done in the Scandinavian places or not, we shall have to give land to the people so that they can keep stock, sheep, fowls, etc., perhaps with some Government aid, and let them develop themselves and feel independent. If we do that, we will be doing service to the people for having returned this Labour Government. I take it that the people of this colony are looking to the Labourites of this House and are expecting a panacea for their ills; I do not say that these things can be done overnight, but before any awakening which will condemn us comes, I feel that I should warn this Government that they have a moral obligation to the people of this colony, and to no small extent, to see that the land is more equitably divided among the masses. We have to see that the wealthy people do not get wealthier each year and that the wealth of this colony is more evenly distributed. If the land is the source of wealth—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has made the point that the increase in the rent has been due to the increase in the price of land. I do not want the honourable member to debate the point any further than that. I think the point is a good one and that you have a perfect right to make it, but I do not think that you should debate any question which is not really before the House.

Mr. GARNER: I think that the point is a very contributory one. I do not think that the passing of legislation to the effect that rent cannot be increased any further than is necessary will serve a very bad purpose. I repeat that the time has passed when this Address can really serve the purpose which the honourable mover really intends that it should serve. Quite recently the price of lumber has soared so high

that if anybody wants to repair his house he must have money. The onus is on this Labour Government to see that they bring forward a scheme very shortly. The Government will have to do these things so that we will really have to live up to our calling. If we are Socialists, we will have to make the whole island socialist. In other words, if the Government is going to embark upon a housing scheme, they will have to borrow money and they will have to tax very heavily the wealth of the rich so that everybody will be able to come a little nearer to each other and have a lot in common. When we have one person so far away from the other, that is where the wrong lies and superiority comes into the picture. I hope that the Government will bring down this housing scheme shortly so that the people will not have to depend upon renting houses but they will have their own houses. I feel that this question of increased rent is a very complicated one to-day and it shows where the weakness of the Government lies. They ought to embark upon a big programme for housing, redistribution of land and so forth and then I think that everything will work for the benefit of the masses and for the good and welfare of the people of this island. (Cheers).

Mr. TALMA: I rise to support the principle of this Address. There is only one deplorable feature of the whole matter and it is the fact that this Address relating to rent restriction has only now seen daylight in 1947, many months after the War has ceased and many years after such restriction has been introduced in almost all of the leading West Indian colonies. As far as I know, a Rent Restriction Bill was introduced in Trinidad, British Guiana and in Jamaica in 1942, and it is not until 1947 that we hear about a Bill being introduced in Barbados! Although I have great admiration for the mover of this Address, yet if one's memory serves him right, one will remember that an Address such as this was introduced during the last session of this House by the honourable junior member for the City, and with the Coalition of that day constituted as it was and of which the honourable mover was an active supporter, that Address met with opposition. In spite of that, we now have what I call a Rent Restriction Address which should have seen daylight at least about 1943 or 1944. I cannot see that this Address will serve any useful purpose now. I fully realise that the cost of all essential commodities, especially lumber, is still sky-high, and with Europe destroyed and devastated in the manner in which it has been destroyed and devastated, it is reasonable to expect that the price of lumber will remain high for some years to come. Although the honourable senior member for St. Michael is doing a service even at this stage, the price of lumber might remain high for another three or four years and I say that it is very deplorable that a Rent Restriction Bill is only now seeing the light of day. An Excess Profits Tax has not yet seen the light of day and the abolition of the Occupancy Tax would have served a useful purpose. I say that in passing. The honourable member who has moved the passing of this Address quite recently was an important figure in seeing that an Address of this nature was not granted the treatment which it deserved. Such an Address was more necessary then than now and it would have helped the people to a greater extent than it will help them to-day. As far as the landlords are concerned, I admit that there are some very unreasonable ones who are very oppressive and excessive in their rents. If the price of houses is high to-day—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members to stop talking. I find it very difficult to hear the hon. member on account of the conversation which is going on.

Mr. TALMA: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that although many landlords are unreasonable and they demand excessive rents and are very oppressive, yet there are many others who are fair-minded and are out merely to receive a fair dividend in return for their investment. When one takes into account the fact that the prices of properties are very high to-day—when you take into account purchases which have been made during the War period and even up to to-day, you will have to realise that if a landlord pays £2,000 for a property, if the rental value of that property before the War was \$40 or \$45 per month, to-day he will charge \$70 per month for it because he has to get a proper return for his money. I am not saying that a certain amount of control is not necessary; I am in thorough agreement with the proposal, but it is rather late to introduce an Address like this more especially in view of the fact that a similar Address was defeated at the last session of this House. The cost of living has increased and if a landlord is dependent upon his rent for his livelihood, it is reasonable to suggest that if the cost of everything has gone up 100%, the rents will be increased proportionately. What I fear and dread most of all is the constitution of that Body which, I hope, will soon be fixing the rents which should be paid for properties; because unless we select the proper type of individuals to fix the prices to be charged for the rent of houses, probably little or no advantage will be derived from the passing of this Address. There are quite a few other points which I think capital could be made of, but I am in sympathy and entire agreement with the principle of this Address and for that reason I shall not say anything more. I shall willingly support the Address when the time comes because I do not want to see any hon. member who happened to be in opposition to this measure two years ago, making capital out of it and fooling the people outside that he wishes to help them today.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member should dilate upon what happened two years ago.

Mr. SPRINGER: There was no such Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even if there was such an Address that is not the point of the debate to-day.

Mr. WARD: I do not think that any conscientious individual would oppose the principle of rent restriction, but I feel that unless we can get a proper Bill drafted so as to cover all the points which will arise, we will find that the people who rent houses will be in a more difficult position than they are at present. It is common knowledge that individuals invest money in houses so as to make a reasonable profit and with conditions as they are to-day—the cost of labour going up and the cost of materials increasing every two or three months—the people who own houses must increase their rent so as to be compensated for the repairs of the houses at a future date. A person cannot wait until it is time to repair his house to collect the money to repair it because at that time nobody will be living in the house and that person will have to go to his private income so as to replace the bill caused by the depreciation of the house. In my opinion, what happens in the case of some people who rent houses is that they begin to rent houses which are too expensive for them, and then they realise that they cannot balance their budget. It is common knowledge too that if a house is worth £2,000—and you can get very little property for that amount of money to-day—the owner of that house cannot ask less than \$60 per month as rent for it or he would be losing money. If a person invests his money, say £2,000 at 4%, he is able to get \$60 per month and I can tell you, that I can put money in some of the banks and get more than 4% interest on it. If you take into consideration that a

person has to pay the increased cost for labour and material, it is impossible for him to charge less than 4% for the depreciation of his building. That brings the figure, in my opinion, to approximately 8% of the value of the house, and 8% of £2,000 is £160 a year and any individual will be able to see what the owner would have to charge for his house and then taxes, etc., have to be taken into consideration. Now when we come to land, everybody knows that land is sold on demand and restriction on the price of land will not prevent it from being sold at \$1,000 per acre if an individual wants it. A person who is willing to buy the land will go behind anybody's back, be it Government or otherwise, and pay the owner of the land what he feels like paying for it. People who have not got any money to buy the land will borrow money so as to buy it. All the steps which are taken will not prevent land from being sold in the black market. The black market business runs all through the world; it goes on in spite of restrictions. When we are drafting a Rent Restriction Bill we have to be very careful; because I think that if this matter is not carefully handled the poor individual or middle-class man will be in a much worse plight than he was in before. As far as I know, in the country districts land is rented very cheaply. I do not know what the position is as regards land about the City, but I feel that if the Government wants to get land sold, they will have to amend the Public Health Act and remove the restriction about supplying water in the districts; they will then be surprised to see how much land will be sold overnight. You must shut your eyes; you must wink at certain things, relax certain restrictions and I am sure that over one-third of the island will be sold.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a question of the sale of land having regard to the rent which is collected afterwards.

Mr. WARD: As far as I know, the rent paid for land in the country districts is pretty low and no estate in the country refuses to rent out land. It is only in the case of people who want to get into the City, that difficulty is experienced. It is a recognized fact that this Government is trying its best to avoid using the best agricultural land for building sites. If that land is used for this purpose you will be killing the income of the island. There will be a decrease in production and a consequent decrease in income.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again the hon. member is straying from the point.

Mr. WARD: I am coming back to it. If the price of land goes up to-morrow the rent of land will also go up. I know that people bought land at 10/- per square foot in this City and now that land has been sold at £2 per square foot. When one person leaves, ten or fifteen persons come, and some of them work behind other people's back. They are buying the land for sport; they realise what can be done and therefore it is necessary in the first instance to control the price of land.

Mr. COX: I would like first of all to reply to the remarks made by the honourable senior member for Christ Church. The honourable member said that during the last session of this House an Address was introduced by the—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that there is any need to deal with that. I have already pointed out to the honourable senior member for Christ Church that it is not now a question of what happened then. The whole point of the debate to-day is whether this Address should be passed or not. Whether a similar Address was introduced in the House before or not does not make any difference to-day.

Mr. COX: I appreciate Your Honour's explanation, but the statement is a very damaging one and I hope that you will grant me some latitude to correct it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that it is damaging to the Address.

Mr. COX: It may not be damaging to the Address but it may be damaging to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I stopped the honourable senior member for Christ Church and I think that we had better leave it at that.

Mr. COX: The honourable member has charged me as one of the members of the Barbados Labour Party with coalescing with the Conservative group of this colony. The honourable member has said that during the last session of this House an Address was introduced by the then honourable senior member for the City and I joined with the Conservative group in opposing that Address. I have never known of any Address introduced by the then honourable senior member for the City relative to rent restriction. It was a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Having said that we will get on with this debate. I do not think that you should carry the matter any further. The hon. member made a statement, I stopped him and you have replied.

Mr. COX: I regret that very much, Mr. Speaker, but I must bow to your ruling. Since this matter was debated, I have read correspondence in the press in connection with it and I have heard from the lips of some people that I was making false statements against them. I have taken the trouble to go around to the various tenancies and find out things for myself and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will give me the privilege of just quoting a few cases. Before doing so, I should like to refer to Mr. H. O. Emtage of whom I made mention when I moved the passing of this Address. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Emtage and we went around and he showed me five houses. I would like to say here and now—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making an explanation now?

Mr. COX: Yes sir, five of the six houses which Mr. Emtage showed me were rented out at a reasonable price. In the case of the one in respect of which I made the accusation against him the increase in the rent could not be justified. He could not show any justification for the increase and agreed to reduce the rent from \$20 a month to \$15 a month. (Cheers). I would like to say here and now that if I have caused Mr. Emtage any inconvenience, I am sorry for it but it was a sincere attempt to do my duty to my constituents and I hope that other landlords will fall in line, even if they do no more than what was done in this case. I understand that Mr. Jones was very much annoyed—

Mr. SPEAKER: I see that you have made a correction in the Press and I think that you should also make a correction here so as to straighten the record.

Mr. COX: I said that the rent of the backspots of land at Hindsbury Road had been increased from 2/6 per week to 7/6 per week and that that of the front spots had been increased from 5/- per week to 10/- per week. In each case the word "month" should have been used instead of the word "week". I hold in my hand a notice addressed to Rhoda Payne. It reads: "This serves to notify you that from and after the first day of May, 1947, your rent will be 10/- per month" and there is a receipt from the same Rhoda Payne for 10/- as land rent. Before you increase the rent, you call for the spot; you know that the renter cannot do other than ask you to allow the house to remain on the spot and you say: "If you want it to remain there, you must pay 10/- per month." This poor woman used to pay 4/- per month as land rent and now she must pay 10/- per month. There is another case that of G. Sargeant. "This serves to notify you that from and after the 1st day of May, 1947, and onward, your rent

will be 12/- per month. This woman has paid 5/- per month up to March 3, 1947, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is necessary for me to go through all of them, but there are many cases in which land rents have been increased, and what is more, in the majority of cases the spots are within an area of 800 square feet. One spot is being made into three spots so to speak! I have been informed that this land was bought at 12 cts. a square foot, and the law requires that a spot should measure 2,400 square feet so that a spot of land would cost \$288. If you are allowed 6% interest on your money—the rate which the law allows unless you want to be charged with usury—you would receive a profit of \$17.28c. When you charge about \$3 per month for one of these spots I cannot see any justification for it. If anybody went to see these spots for himself he would be shocked at their disgraceful condition and at the increase in rent made by the landlords. I also went to Deane's Village and I find that people who used to pay 9/- and 10/- a quarter are now asked to pay 15/- a quarter. Since we were discussing this question, landlord Mr. Jones went back and increased his rent. The people who live on these spots are people of very slender means; they live in 8x12 houses and that does not interest Mr. Jones in the least. He says "If you do not want to pay me you can leave." I would like to say that an individual cannot do as he likes with what is his own. The State is in control and it is in the interest of the State to see that each individual is protected where these matters are concerned. If you assume that you must carry on untouched by law, that is the law of the jungle; if what is yours must not be touched by law, then you should not have any representation by law, because it would be a question of the survival of the fittest. In spite of all that is said, this is a very serious question. Now when we come to Carrington's Village, the individual, who has started this epidemic knows what it is to be renting. He calls, upon people to join him in a society, they pay 12c per week and when a lot of money has been collected he takes that same money and tries to force the people to live in the sea.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can make his point without specifying any person.

Mr. COX: I know what I am saying, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the same time I think that you can discuss the matter without pointing at any particular individual.

Mr. COX: Quite recently a poor woman living in Carrington's Village had her rent increased. One would have seen it stated in a letter to the Press that the rents have not been raised, but unfortunately, the person who wrote the letter has lost touch with local geography. Carrington's Village is Carrington's Village and the majority of the people of this island know it. I have here a receipt given to Leotta McIntosh which reads as follows: "Received from Leotta McIntosh the sum of \$4 as land rent for the month ending the 31st of August." This woman used to pay 8/- or 10/- a month. I have numerous examples which would take me too long to mention. At Kensington, a woman used to pay \$1.70c. and now she is paying \$3.60 and this land is a part of that which was sold recently. Wherever this corruption is going on, I say that it is time that something be done in the interest of these poor people. This question of increased rents will spread all over the island because it is an epidemic; individuals are planning to get money however they can. They will buy areas so that they can get the land rented under any condition and that has been going on for about

three years now. I know that land which was rented at 10/- per quarter in Carrington's Village is now rented at 10/- per month. Mention has been made about the Labour Government, but I would like to say that it is immaterial to me whether there is a Labour, Conservative, Liberal or any other Government, I feel that an individual should only be allowed to carry on private enterprise when it does not clash with the interest of the people. It is all right to have free enterprise, but as soon as you are prepared to blackmail and menace people and extort money from them, it is time that a stop be put to that. It is the duty of the Government to see that steps are taken to that end. The correspondent in the Press who signed "Sufferer" says that an individual can put furniture in a house and that does not come within the scope of rent restriction. I would like to say here and now that in England all that comes under rent restriction, and 20% is allowed for the value of the furniture whereby the individual can charge 10% or 20% on the rental of the house. In England and other parts of the world a Rent Restriction Bill has been introduced, and if this Government realise that landlords are able to get around the Act by putting furniture in their houses, it would be quite an easy matter to make certain adjustments in the act to meet that. As a matter of fact, I understand that in other places there is no restriction as regards land rent, but I am saying that in this colony we must have restriction as regards both land and house rent. I should like to point out that the laws are not made for the just. The honourable senior member for Christ Church and the honourable junior member for St. Philip have said that some landlords are honest, decent, sympathetic and dignified and are not prepared to blackmail anybody; well, I repeat that the laws are not made for the just, they are made for the wicked, the rogue and the vagabond. Therefore any individual who realises that he is working within reasonable bounds has not got anything to fear about rent restriction or anything at all. He has a sense of humanity and realises that each and every individual is part and parcel of the whole: he looks upon every individual as his brother and is not prepared to go out of his way to put him to any inconvenience. As I said before, something must be done in this matter of increased rents: the matter cannot be viewed in any light manner. The Government cannot allow these people to be forced off these houses. We have been told that the price of lumber has gone up, and it is a well-known fact that as soon as a house is taken down, the owner has to go to the lumber-yard and get lumber so as to effect repairs to the house, and very much more so if the house was on the spot for about 50 years. On account of the bad economic set-up, people were never in a position to repair their houses: those houses got into a very dilapidated condition but while they remained on the spots the holes could still be stopped. I would like to say to anybody who may attack what I am saying that as long as nobody can question your honesty or sincerity—that is what you have to be careful about. I will tell each and everyone that one of the things which are well worth living and dying for is that you are in a position to help somebody and make other people feel happy. I feel that the most miserable people in this world are those who did their worst for the people, and the most happy are those who did their best for them. If anybody cared to search the scriptures he would see that we have been told to open our mouths widely, judge righteously and plead the cause of the poor and needy. That is our duty here to-day and I am prepared to do that as long as I have breath in my body whether it is appreciated or not. Finally, I would like to say that I have never been associated with any organisation other than that which is in the interest

of the people so that I can always be able to help them. Probably I could have ended my remarks in a shorter time, but I am deeply incensed over this matter and since the conditions are so annoying and perplexing, since landlords are so unscrupulous, inhuman and wicked towards these unfortunate people, strong representations must be made in the interest of these people and I want the public to take up the matter. They must point out these landlords and show that disgraceful attitude or mentality which is being exhibited by their actions.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I apologize for entering the debate at this stage; at first, I did not intend entering it at all. I felt that everybody in this colony know so well that my Party and myself are in complete agreement with this question of rent restriction, that it was almost unnecessary for me to add anything to the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member thinks so, he should not be speaking for very long. (Laughter).

Mr. CRAWFORD: A remark made by the previous speaker has compelled me to take the floor. In the course of his remarks, the honourable senior member for St. Michael said that this matter of exploitation by landlords has been going on for three years and it is high time that a stop be put to it. I would like to remind the House that as far back as 1944 the honourable junior member for the City on the floor of this House tabled a question beseeching the then Government to take steps to introduce rent restriction. I hear an honourable member say that the question was not discussed. What is important is not the discussion but the Government's reply to the question. The honourable junior member for the City asked the Government to do something for the people so as to protect them from heartless landlords. He asked: "Does not the Government consider it necessary to take steps so as to fix, restrict and control the rental of dwelling-houses and business premises?" What was the reply to the question? The Government replied: "The Government has considered the desirability of introducing rent restriction legislation, but does not propose to do so at present." At that time the honourable senior member for St. Michael was a member of the Party which comprised the Government.

Mr. SPRINGER: On a question of fact. The honourable member has no right to say that; he knows that it is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that what happened in 1944 has nothing to do with the present debate. There is no object in debating that particular point.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to enquire on a question of fact if it is not true to say that when this question was replied to, there were on the Executive two members who were leaders of the Party to which the honourable senior member for St. Michael belongs.

Mr. SPEAKER: The constitution of the Government in 1944—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to know if the Government would send down an answer with which they did not agree.

Mr. SPRINGER: The answer to that question is "yes" it did not happen frequently.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is that a question was asked dealing with rent restriction whether it was debated or not, but I do not see any object in debating what happened in 1944.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is now a question of referring to history; it is—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not allowing any discussion on any historical matter in the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Except that it is necessary to allow people to understand—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see any object in that. The point is whether we should pass this Address relating to rent restriction or not.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We should have had legislation dealing with rent restriction six years ago, because the point is that on account of the conditions imposed by the War which began in 1939, you have these existing conditions to which honourable members have drawn attention. We have been unable to build houses; people were unable to repair their houses and when the materials were obtainable the price of them had increased by about 200% or 300%. Add these factors to our general housing congestion and you will see how it is and why it is that the poor people of this colony who have no land of their own have been exploited and are being exploited.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is quite in order to say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am glad that Your Honour thinks so. If we had done in 1944 what we are doing now, the situation could not have gone so far. In other words, we are locking the stable after the horse is out and so far away that we cannot see him to him back in the stable.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member suggesting that we should not pass this Address.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot imagine anything in my remarks which would suggest that. I am saying that the passing of this Address is so belated that the purpose to be served is almost completely dissipated. Supplies of material are coming in now, and people will necessarily be effecting repairs to their pose, we shelved it and now that conditions are almost approaching normalcy, we are making a rumpus about it! However, it is better late than never, and we are justified even in 1947 in taking steps to put an end to the vicious exploitation by landlords of the people of this colony. One other phase of the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Michael interests me. I am not defending anybody and I feel more strongly than the honourable member and for a longer period than he, with regard to this question of rent restriction. When the honourable junior member for the City tabled his question in 1944 I was in complete agreement with him that the question should have been tabled then, and I felt just as strongly as he did when the reply was received from the Government. I was amazed to hear the honourable senior member for St. Michael mention the fact that he allowed himself to be fooled so easily and cleverly by Mr. H. O. Emtage and he apologised to Mr. Emtage and backed down. I repeat, I am not defending anybody. If the honourable member allows the pleasure of meeting and going around with Mr. Emtage who has acquired one plantation after another and has suddenly decided with his christian-like spirit to form a limited liability company and transfer all these holdings to this company—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that anything to do with the debate?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Quite a lot. Let us find out how many places are owned by Mr. Emtage's Company and how many are owned by Mr. Emtage. If Mr. Emtage says that he owns five houses, find out how many the Company owns. If they own only five houses, then I own the whole of Bridgetown. It is really amazing how easily some people can be fooled when they allow themselves to be fooled and when they are instructed to allow themselves to be fooled. If people in 1947 are really serious about this question of rent restriction, let us bear in mind that there were others in 1944 who could see further than they and were more directly concerned with the

plight of the people than they were. If the people who are moving in this matter now were so minded as to have supported us in 1944 when we did not have the same numerical strength as we have now, we could have compelled the Government three years ago to introduce legislation to put an end to this evil.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry if it should appear unparliamentary that I should speak after the mover of the passing of this Address and I apologise for doing so. I was absent on the last occasion when the Address was being considered and I did not wish to keep to the newspaper report as an accurate account of what was actually said. I should like to make a few observations in connection with this matter. I am voting for this Address not because I, as an individual believe that it will do any good, but because I have discovered that it is the wish of the majority of my constituents. I have pledged myself that wherever my own personal affairs clash with those of my constituents, I will give in to them or I shall resign my seat. For those reasons I am voting for this Address. (A MEMBER: That is good). There are a few things which I should like to make plain. The passing of this Address has been moved by the honourable senior member for St. Michael and speeches as go forth from this House are reported. I think that it should be generally known that while I agree with the honourable senior member for St. Michael that there are a couple of unscrupulous landlords, (Mr. COX: A couple?) not only in this parish but in the island, as I understand the set-up of a Rent Restriction Board, the right is also given to those persons whose rents are very low to make application for an increase. That is what I should like people to know. I will make statements of fact and even you, Mr. Speaker, from the Chair can substantiate some of those statements. I will deal particularly with tenancies as I know them in St. Michael; I have gone outside my business activities in order to make a few facts known. Mr. Speaker, there are tenancies in this parish and you will forgive me if I mention just a few of them—Manning's Village, Kensington, Carrington's Village, Greenfield, Deane's Village, Skeete's Land and Hindsbury. The honourable senior member for St. Michael is quite right in saying that quite recently purchases have been made and rents have been increased; however, I make bold to say as a statement of fact that, with the exception of two recent purchases, the existing rents in the majority of tenancies in this parish have not been increased within the last 25 years, and the honourable member can prove that by just going to the people who collect rents. With respect to Kensington, it is true to say that the sale of the land—

Mr. SPEAKER: This debate is getting down to a question of personality, one side saying that rents have been increased and the other side saying that they have not been increased. At the beginning the honourable member said that he intends to vote for this Address and I do not think that it is a question now as to whether landlord "A" has increased his rent and landlord "B" has not increased his.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am trying to show honourable members that—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable member to be as brief as he can.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I want to make clear is this: while it is true to say that there are a few unscrupulous landlords, the majority of landlords have not increased their rent by one cent for the last 25 years. As the honourable mover of the passing of the Address has mentioned certain names, I hope

that I will be given the latitude to mention a few tenancies in which, I am sure, the rents have not been increased by one cent. I crave Your Honour's indulgence to point out that within recent months one or two people have been buying land with the object of getting the people off this land so that they can get it for their own use. I hope never to make any statement in this House which can be challenged by anyone. I say with authority that the original owners of the land have not increased their rents, but the people who have bought the land have increased them. The honourable senior member for St. Michael referred just now to what is an illegal action by landlords. In due course he will be told that they are dealing very illegally. Because somebody puts a notice in your hands telling you that your rent will be increased—

Mr. COX: I have more than 50 receipts here and I can show them to the honourable members if they want to see them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I say that this is an illegal action. I only want to say that while I am supporting the passing of this Address because it is the wish of the majority of my constituents, I definitely feel that it is bound to create some sort of hardship on the great majority of people whom the honourable senior member for St. Michael feels he will be helping. I agree that rent restriction legislation should have been in operation before. The position is that money became cheap in Trinidad and people who came to Barbados as a place of resort, offered very exorbitant prices for houses; there was also an influx of businessmen coming here and offering five and six times the price for business premises. If it is the wish of the people that there should be rent restriction legislation, none of their elected representatives could really have the temerity to oppose such a thing; but you must make it clear to people what they must expect. I suggest that there is plenty of money knocking about in the world. If the hon. senior member for St. Michael takes the same interest in his economics as in his politics, (Cheers), he will observe that as long as there is money knocking about, there is the tendency for the Barbadian to become independent. He will want to own something. That in itself must show that you must have something better than a mere Rent Restriction Bill. I suggest to honourable members of the Government that before any Rent Restriction Bill is introduced, there should be introduced an amendment to the Landlord and Tenant Act. Anybody who is acquainted with this Act will appreciate the fact that it is 95% if not 100% in favour of the landlord, and that makes it very difficult for the tenants to have an even "break". I would like honourable members to look at the matter in this way: a property in 1940 cost "X", but to-day the value of that property has increased. The cost of transportation has also increased; nobody would think that he could get a car to take him from Bridgetown to Bathsheba for \$6 as was the case before the War. To-day the cost of transportation to Bathsheba in the same car the prewar cost of which was only \$600, must be \$12 because the chauffeur must be paid more and the wear and tear is more. I am bound to support an Address of this nature; whenever a board is set up—I am saying this for the more serious-minded who will appreciate what I am saying—investigations are bound to be made and it will be discovered that not only will you have to restrict house rent but many other things as well.

I am supporting this Address with the fullest sense of responsibility because I have made the position clear to my constituents; they know exactly what the position is going to be. While the minority of rents have been increased the majority have not been touched. With respect to Carrington's Village, I am in the proud position to say that in dealing with sellers of land by virtue of my calling and going into the value of this tenantry, the present owners of Carrington's Village as Carrington's Village have not increased the rent by one cent.

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

The Address was passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Michael to present this Address.

Mr. COX: As your Honour pleases.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the House will take what I am saying now in the sense in which I am saying it. There does seem to be a certain amount of jealousy among honourable members if a proposition which has been put up some time ago does not see the light of day and one which subsequently comes from another direction is passed. The fact that an honourable member did not succeed in getting his proposition through on a previous occasion is taken as some reason for debate; but I think that it is rather for the good of the community to see that the proposition goes through without any difficulty.

#### THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 27th day of May, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think that honourable members would like a week's recess. I therefore beg to move that the word "week" be deleted in order to substitute the word "fortnight" and that the figures and words "27th day of May, 1947" be deleted in order to substitute the words and figures "3rd day of June, 1947."

Mr. WARD: I beg to second that.

The question that the words and figures proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. RAMSAY, F. L. WALCOTT, BRANCKER, SMITH, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, and ADAMS—8.

Noes: Messrs. BLACKMAN, CRAWFORD, GARNER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, eight honourable members voting "Aye", and ten honourable members voting "No". The question now is that the words and figures "3rd day of June, 1947," be inserted in the blank created. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day fortnight the 3rd day of June, 1947, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House was accordingly adjourned to meet on Tuesday, the 3rd day of June, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.