

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th December, 1950.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. O. T. ALLDER, R. G. MAPP, T. O. BRYAN, D. A. FOSTER, M. E. COX, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., E. D. MOTTLEY, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., L. E. R. GILL and F. E. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 21st November, 1950, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to provide for the establishment of a Corporation to be known as the Natural Gas Corporation and for purposes connected therewith, with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor the following Message:—

MESSAGE NO. 30/1950.

*His Excellency The Governor
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the Governments of Barbados, British Guiana, Trinidad, the Windward Islands and the Leeward Islands have been invited by the Comptroller of the Development and Welfare Organisation to participate in a scheme to establish a Farm Institute for the Eastern

Caribbean in Trinidad. The long term purpose of the Institute is to provide training in practical agriculture at a standard below "pass degree" level for middle rank agriculturists in the Eastern Caribbean with the objective that all the subordinate staff of Departments of Agriculture shall have received a good basic training before appointment, and that general training shall be available for the junior personnel of estates and big agricultural undertakings, farm managers and medium scale independent farmers.

2. It is estimated that the Institute will cost approximately \$408,000 and it is proposed that an application should be made to the Secretary of State for a free grant of \$240,000 towards the capital cost from the West Indies General Allocation under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act. Of the remaining capital expenditure, the Barbados Government has been asked to contribute \$14,668; the recurrent annual cost to this Government has been estimated at \$4,188. These figures are based on an allocation of four student places for Barbados.

3. The Honourable the House of Assembly is invited to approve of an intimation being made to the Comptroller of the Development and Welfare Organisation to the effect that the Barbados Government is prepared to participate in the scheme.

L. SAVAGE,

Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,

30th November, 1950.

PAPERS LAID

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

Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to 31st October, 1950.

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 provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended on the 30th September, 1950, in respect of the several Schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

The Therapeutic Substances Regulations, 1950.

PETITION

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to present a petition from the Vestry of the parish

of St. Michael. This Petition is respectfully worded and has been advertised according to the law. It prays the House to pass a Bill authorising the Vestry to borrow a sum not exceeding £10,000 to pay retrospective pay to the Parochial Employees of the said parish. (Cheers). I ask that the Petition be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

NOTICE

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the Parish of St. Michael to raise a loan to enable them to grant retrospective pay to all parochial employees of the said parish. This Bill is in respect of the Petition which I have just presented.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GILL, a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael to raise a loan to enable them to grant retrospective pay to all parochial employees of the said parish was read a first time.

TRADE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—On behalf of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, I am asking leave to take Order No. 5 on the Order Paper as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Trade Act, 1910.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,— This Bill seeks to amend the Trade Act, 1910, in order to give the same privilege in respect of cocoanut oil as obtains in respect of cotton seed oil as will be seen from the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill which are as follows:—

"Under the Oils and Fats Agreement, 1945, certain West Indian Islands agreed to supply Barbados with Copra and Barbados agreed to return oil and meal manufactured therefrom. Crude cocoanut oil is also imported from these Islands and in due course some of it is re-exported to them in a refined state.

In keeping with the spirit of the suggested Customs Union, it is reasonable that crude cocoanut oil and Copra should receive the same drawback of duty as is at present allowed in the case of crude cotton seed oil and cotton seed, and this Bill is intended to give effect thereto."

This is a request from the Barbados Co-operative Cotton Factory Limited; it has been agreed to by the Oils and Fats Conferences of 1945 and 1947 and I hardly think it is necessary for me to go into any further details. I think honourable members will agree that this substance falls into the same category as the substance from which we extract cotton seed oil, which is subject to a drawback. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: 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.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker—There is nothing further under Government Business with which we are prepared to go on to-day, and that being so, I ask leave to proceed with Private Members' Business.

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

ST. THOMAS PARISH (BARBADOS) MEDICAL OFFICER'S RESIDENCE BILL

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 49, standing in my name under Private Members' Business, as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member to proceed with the Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to confirm the power of the Vestry of St. Thomas to sell the house and land thereto attached at present used as a residence by the Parochial Medical Officer and to authorise the said Vestry to apply the proceeds of such sale in or towards the purchase of a parcel of land in the said parish and the erection thereon of a dwelling-house and outbuildings for use as a residence by the Parochial Medical Officer and to enter into a building contract in connection therewith and to give the said Vestry certain general powers in connection with the residence for the time being of the Parochial Medical Officer.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I think the necessary requirement as to the publication of this Bill has been fulfilled. By this Bill the Vestry of St. Thomas is seeking the authority of this House to sell the Parochial Medical Officer's residence and to purchase a piece of land somewhere else for the purpose of erecting a new residence for the Parochial Medical Officer, with the profits realised from the sale of the present residence. I understand, Sir, that the present residence is in a very bad state of repair, and it would take a tidy sum of money to put it in a proper condition. The Vestry thought that it would not be economical to repair this residence and has decided to sell it and with the proceeds of the sale, as I have already said, buy a piece of land in another part of the parish, and erect thereon a new residence. I know, Sir, that there are one or two honourable members who are not in favour of this proposal; they are not so much against the sale as the site on which the new residence is to be erected. I myself had some misgivings about it. I understand that at least a majority of the Vestry feel that this site is quite suitable for this residence because it would facilitate people who are travelling by bus and who are seeking the services of the Parochial Medical Officer; it would suit them better than the site on which the present building stands. This proposed site is almost at the extreme end of the parish. I have been approached by parishioners of St. Thomas who are not in favour of the present site, and they had quite enough time in which to prepare a petition asking the House not to pass this Bill in

view of what they consider to be the best site. No petition has been handed to me or to my junior colleague; and therefore I take it that the will of the majority of the parishioners is that this new site should be purchased. I think that that is the most salient point in connection with this Bill and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I am seconding the motion for the second reading of this Bill merely from the point of view of discussion. I intimated to the honourable mover when he introduced this Bill that I would not be supporting it inasmuch as I feel that the proposed site is most inconvenient for the majority of the people who live in the parish of St. Thomas. Fortunately or unfortunately I happen to be a product of the parish of St. Thomas, and I know the difficulty which will arise in the case of many people who live at the northern and eastern sides of the parish if the proposed site is used for the residence of the Parochial Medical Officer. In other words, people who live in districts such as Welchman Hall and Clifton Hill would have to wend their way down to the border of St. Michael or St. Thomas so as to get in touch with the Parochial Medical Officer. I agree that the present residence of the Parochial Medical Officer is more or less in a dilapidated condition and I agree it is time that a decent building be erected for him; but I still contend that the site on which this building is to be erected should be a more central one so that the many people in the parish can be served. I quite appreciate the fact that the Vestry did its best in the consideration of what it feels is a good site, but it cannot be taken that the views of the Vestry represent those of the majority of persons more particularly the paupers, who have to seek medical aid from the Parochial Medical Officer. As you know Mr. Speaker, no pauper who might have to call on the Parochial Medical Officer, has the right to vote for any member of the Vestry, and persons who are merely ratepayers who can elect the Vestry, cannot in any way claim to be representative of the parish as a whole. I feel that the consideration of this Bill should be postponed and the Vestry should be told that the House is not against their erecting a new building or against their borrowing money to erect a new building or against their disposing of the site which the Parochial Medical Officer's residence now occupies; but that inasmuch as we have some say in the matter and we are regarded as being truly representative of the people rather than any Vestry, we are quite willing to allow them to borrow this money but we do not agree to the proposed site for the Parochial Medical Officer's residence. This site is more towards St. Michael than it is in St. Thomas, and as I see the position, the parish of St. Michael has quite a number of doctors on whom the people can call at any moment, and the people of St. Thomas would only have one. The question as to whether the people appreciate the present Parochial Medical Officer or not is immaterial as far as I am concerned; I say that because someone hinted not long ago that it was because of the present Parochial Medical Officer that some members take certain views. As far as this Officer is concerned, I say that we are not building a place in which to house him; we are building a place in which to house the Parochial Medical Officer of St. Thomas. Although the proposed site would put the present Parochial Medical Officer closer to the Prisons which he has to visit every morning, we should have in view another Parochial Medical Officer who may not be the Medical Officer of the Prisons and who might be inconvenienced. Therefore, Sir, I feel that as the position is, we should not support the passing of this Bill to-day; we should allow the Vestry to know that the site proposed for the new residence

is more or less very inconvenient for the majority of the people who live in St. Thomas and who might have occasion to call on the Parochial Medical Officer.

Messrs. LEWIS and DOWDING entered the House and took their seats while Mr. Cox was speaking.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—As a rule these Vestry Bills and Measures concerning Vestries or parochial affairs are handled by the senior member of the particular constituency and seconded by the junior representative, but on this occasion I did not second the motion because I intend to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed. I am doing that for a number of reasons. In this petition signed by the Vestry of St. Thomas there are at least three signatures of members of the Vestry who did not agree to the site on which it is proposed to remove the residence of the Parochial Medical Officer, and they very vigorously opposed the proposal when it was considered by the Vestry. These three members are very closely associated with the views of the majority of the taxpayers of St. Thomas and they are quite capable of representing those views. Now, Sir, this Bill is quite necessary if we agree that the residence of the Parochial Medical Officer should be removed and that another residence should be erected for him. Therefore we agree to the principle of this Bill, and the motion which I will make is simply a mark of protest against the decision of the Vestry of St. Thomas to remove this residence as far out of the parish as it possibly can, or nearly out of the parish. As the honourable senior member for St. Michael has said, the site proposed for this residence is nearer the constituency which he represents than that which the honourable mover represents. I think that most of us will agree that there are certain services which people enjoy and which should be as central as possible, and one of those services is the medical service. Just as the Authorities have found that the number of Surgeons and Specialists in residence at the General Hospital was inadequate, I think we should agree when it comes to the parochial medical services that the residences of the Parochial Medical Officers should be as near the Almshouses and Dispensaries as possible. The Vestry of St. Thomas have a portion of land which is very near to the Almshouse and also to the Rectory; I do not know if they have it set aside for some particular purpose which they have not, so far, disclosed, but they have this land which, I understand on good authority, is very appropriate. I understand that from a vestryman. An honourable member has told me *sotto voce* that this land is Church property. I understand that the Vestry have bought this piece of land and, Sir, if there is one suitable place for the Parochial Medical Officer's residence it is this place. The only reason why they would put the present Parochial Medical Officer so near to the parish of St. Michael is because he wants to be near this parish. To my mind, wherever you put this residence, it would be inconvenient for some people; in fact, many people have told me that the proposed site is on the bus route, but in these days everybody cannot afford to pay bus fare especially when you are sick. There are many poor people who have to walk to the Parochial Medical Officer's residence, and from one point of view I think this House should agree, although the majority of members of the Vestry of St. Thomas say otherwise, that it is better for such a residence to be centrally situated. If the residence of the Rector of the parish is situated in a central spot, near the Church, is it not more necessary for the well-being of the parish that the residence of the person who is in charge of the medical service should also be centrally situated and as near the Dispensary or the Alms-

house as he possibly can be? I see absolutely no reason why we should place the Parochial Medical Officer on the border of St. Michael. I repeat that the Vestry have a site which is centrally situated; it is a better site than that which it is proposed to acquire. Of course we must always remember in putting forward our arguments that the Vestry are a very important body; they are supposed to know more about local matters than anybody else, they are supposed to have at their finger tips information and views of the local electorate and they are supposed to represent them faithfully. However, while all these things might be there in theory, in practice they do not work out. In this particular case, it has to be borne in mind that the proposal is not the unanimous wish of the Vestry, but that this site was decided upon against vigorous opposition; the three members of the Vestry, I am sure, having a full sense of their responsibility where this matter is concerned.

This Vestry is an out-going Vestry; they have only one month longer to go. I am not opposing this Bill; let them go to the electorate with it and let the electorate say whether they want it or not. There is no need to rush this Bill now; let it be put to the electorate and if they agree to it, we in this House will say: "Although a very small number of the electors have agreed to this proposal, yet we will take into account the fact that the Vestry have fully discussed the matter with the electors, and the electors have confirmed them in their decision." But, Sir, the most I can do now is to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed until this day two months. That will give the Vestry adequate time in which to face the electorate with this proposal, and if the electorate agree to it then they can obtain our sanction and authority in this matter. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with all that I have said, I beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed until this day two months.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I am supporting the passing of this Bill. I have listened carefully to hon. members and thought at first that the proposed site for the residence of the Parochial Medical Officer of St. Thomas would be most unsuitable for the parishioners; but if a vestryman does his job seriously and unselfishly and if he is really interested in the poor people, it matters not what part of the parish you put the Parochial Medical Officer to live. (A MEMBER: Shame!) The hon. member says "Shame", but he does not understand. The hon. member started off with a fine speech but he could not see the animosity in it.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—On a point of order. I would like you to ask the hon. member what he means by "animosity." Animosity towards what or towards whom? Certainly nobody could imply that I have any animosity against anybody in moving that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed. I was even opposing the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas would like to know from the hon. senior member for the City if he is implying that he, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, entertains any animosity against anybody. The hon. senior member for the City did make some reference to animosity in the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I heard the hon. member asking Your Honour to find out from me what I mean by "animosity". I am sure he appreciates that I am not a walking encyclopaedia. I said that the honourable member started off with a fine speech, but one could not help noticing the tone of animosity in it. There is nothing unparliamentary in that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—On a point of order again. I did not ask the honourable member if he knows what the word "animosity" means; I know he knows what it means. I am again asking him if he is implying that I have animosity against anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable senior member for the City to retract that word "animosity" because the use of that word might mean that he is attributing animosity to the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. It cannot be gainsaid that if an honourable member says that another honourable member's speech contains some animosity, he must be entertaining some animosity against whom or towards what, I do not know. The honourable senior member for the City finds himself interested in the opening remarks of the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas and the honourable member is, to a certain extent, justified in asking what the honourable senior member for the City means by "animosity". In my position I am asking the honourable senior member for the City to retract the word "animosity" lest the honourable junior member for St. Thomas think that his remarks have been misinterpreted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate Your Honour's request, and I should hate to do anything from the floor of this House to show any disrespect to the Chair; but to ask me to retract something before I had the opportunity to say what I wanted to say is asking me, as a man, to do too much. Mr. Speaker, I will never do anything from the floor of this House to disrespect your position in that Chair, but I do not think I should be asked to retract something when I had not finished my remarks. I shall proceed to show that the use of the word "animosity" is not unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a question of the honourable member saying something which is unparliamentary; it is a question of his casting a reflection on the honourable junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If Your Honour thinks that I have cast a reflection on the honourable member, I can only ask what will happen in this House if an honourable member gets up and says that after hearing another honourable member's speech, he cannot help seeing animosity. I have not said that there is animosity against anybody; the animosity might be against the Vestry system. Of course there are in this House many honourable members who have animosity against the Vestry system; look at the honourable senior member for St. Michael and you will see that he has animosity against the Vestry system.

Mr. SPEAKER: But if the honourable member is not implying animosity against the Vestry system he is imputing something against another honourable member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not want to be unduly hard against the honourable member, but he must remember that he represents a parish from which a Vestry Bill is before us; and it will not do the parish any good to allow it to be said here that he has animosity even against the Vestry system. The honourable member has animosity in him and I hope that he will calm himself.

Mr. MAPP: My point of order was made in accordance with Rule 129 of the Rules of this House. That Rule says:

"No member may use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House."

If the honourable member had said that the animosity is against the Vestry system, the matter

would have ended there; but he is implying more animosity than that.

Mr. GODDARD entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member never allowed me to finish my remarks; what is he catching at? If you, Mr. Speaker, feel that there is something unparliamentary about the use of the word "animosity" I will unhesitatingly withdraw that word, but the honourable member stupidly gets up and asks what I mean by "animosity". I said that in the honourable member's speech you could see "animosity". I did not say you could see animosity against anybody. Now Sir, in respect of this Bill by which the Vestry of St. Thomas is seeking permission to sell the Parochial Medical Officer's residence and erect another one, I want to say that it should not matter in this day in what position in the parish the Parochial Medical Officer lives; he has to attend to the poor and carry out the orders of the Poor Law Guardians. If you are paying the doctor his salary, then let him get up and do his work. It is inhuman for any Clerk to a Board of Guardians to make poor people walk for four or five miles so as to get to a doctor; the doctor is given a proper salary and he should be made to go to the people. If one does not like a job, he should give it up.

The Vestry of St. Thomas have made a decision in this matter; I should think that they were not merely mindful of the Parochial Medical Officer having to go to the poor people, but also of the poor people who would have to go to him. I do not pretend to know whether that is so or not. I have been assured that this proposed site for the new residence of the Parochial Medical Officer is a suitable one, and if somebody at Welchman Hall is ill, it seems to me that if I represent St. Thomas, my first duty would be to get the Parochial Medical Officer alive from the point of view of doing his duty. Where this Officer lives to-day is suitable only that it is near to people who would be coming from one end of the parish, but honourable members must agree that people coming from the other end of the parish would have to do a lot of walking. I accept the decision of the majority as to the proposed new site; at first I did not agree that that site was the best one, but on reflection I realised what the law under the Poor Relief Act is. If you are a pauper, you are entitled to free medical aid from the Parochial Medical Officer. I know that there was a case in which an Attorney General threatened to prosecute a member of a Board of Guardians or his Clerk for not doing what was his statutory duty. It is the duty of the Guardians to have the doctor go to people. I recall the hon. junior member for St. Thomas saying that the only reason why the Vestry of St. Thomas would put the Parochial Medical Officer's residence on the proposed site is because the present Officer wanted it put there; and I looked across at the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and wondered if, as a medical officer, he welcomed that. If the present Officer wanted the residence put on the proposed site, he would be able to get payment for travelling by the mile. The Officer has to go to the Almshouse and if you put him near that Institution, he can walk across to it; but if you put him on the proposed site, he still has to go to the Almshouse. I contend that it is the duty of the Board of Guardians to see that the Parochial Medical Officer attends on the people and not the people attend on him. I am going to support the Bill and I am supporting it because of my experience in parochial affairs; and if the honourable member says that I have been associated with a Vestry of conservative

views for many years, I do not think he can say that I have at any time forgotten whence I came and that I have not always tried to do my best for the underprivileged. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas is asking for a postponement of the consideration of this Bill; but the Vestry sat and discussed this matter and the majority agreed to it. It is true that on all occasions the majority might not be right; but however conservative the honourable member might feel the majority of the Vestry might be, he cannot very well say that they agreed on this site so as to spite the people of the parish. If some reason other than that which has been advanced, had been given by a member of this House as to why the proposal of the Vestry should not be carried out, that would have been a different matter. I am therefore supporting this Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat while Mr. MOTTLEY was speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member takes his seat, I should like to enquire of him if he still persists in saying that the use of the word "animosity" with reference to the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas was not unbecoming; that the word was not used in any unbecoming manner towards the honourable junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot see how any other interpretation could be put on it. In other words, I cannot see how the interpretation that the use of the word was unbecoming could be applied.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member now telling us that he never intended saying anything unbecoming of the honourable member?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I never say anything unbecoming of any honourable member of this House, and I never will.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member admit that it was not his intention to use the word in any unbecoming manner? Will he plainly admit that he had no such intention?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I had no such intention; if I use simple, everyday language and any honourable member chooses to misinterpret what I say, that is no fault of mine.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the honourable member used the word "animosity" in respect of the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, that might be taken as a reflection on that honourable member. But the honourable senior member for the City now says that he had no intention of reflecting on the honourable junior member for St. Thomas by the use of that word, and I consider the matter closed.

Mr. FOSTER: I beg to second the motion for the postponement; I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Thomas that there is no harm in postponing the consideration of this Bill so as to give the electors a chance of considering this matter. Another point is that the Maude Report will soon be coming into effect—a Report which does not recommend the services of so many Parochial Medical Officers—and I do not see any harm in postponing the consideration of the Bill for two months. That does not mean that when the Bill comes before the House again, it cannot be passed. I do not see any harm in the postponement and giving the electors the opportunity of expressing their opinion in regard to this matter.

Mr. ALLDER: I think that this matter can be clearly seen. We feel, and the Vestry of St. Thomas should also feel, that the parochial medical services are for the benefit of the people and those services

should be obtained from as central a spot as possible. To place the residence of the Parochial Medical Officer of St. Thomas so far to the end of the parish would be creating a hardship on the underprivileged who have to seek the services of this Officer. In view of our responsibility to the people, we cannot sit here and allow the residence of this Parochial Medical Officer to be placed at such a great distance from the majority of people who have to seek his services. Too long have we been allowing services to be set up for the sole benefit of the few who run them without any regard for the safety and convenience of the masses. The time has come when we must put a stop to that. I am not particularly interested in the parochial matters of St. Thomas, but I feel that as far as the people are concerned, the Parochial Medical Officer's residence should be centrally located. The same thing applies in the case of the Dispensary and other places where the people might have to go and transact business. I am obligated to lend my support to the motion for the postponement of the consideration of this Bill. I do not even agree to the postponement until after the Vestry Elections; regardless of whatever Vestry is putting forward this Bill, when it comes before us we should decide whether the erection of such a building is to the greatest advantage of the greatest number.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—I do not want to dictate to the St. Thomas Vestry what they should do in their affairs, but hearing the remarks of the various speakers has brought me to my feet. Now the honourable senior member for the City has said that the Parochial Medical Officer should go to the people; that might be so in St. Michael, but in the country districts if one has been taken ill, before he can get the Parochial Medical Officer to come to his assistance he has to get someone to find the Inspector of Poor wherever he is, and the Inspector of Poor has to come and see the position of the person who is ill before that person is given consent to go to the doctor. The people who are really and truly in need of the Parochial Medical Officer are those poor people who are unable to pay a doctor, because the person who is able to pay a doctor does not go to the Parochial Medical Officer. I am not calling any name, but if you go to a certain doctor's residence every day you will see motor cars from all over the island, and he scarcely has time to attend to the people in the particular parish. Now the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has said that the majority of the people of St. Thomas have not shown their disapproval of the proposed site for the Parochial Medical Officer's residence because they have not sent in any petition showing their disapproval of it; but those people who really and truly should show their disapproval do not know anything about the matter. They never see the *Official Gazette*, they do not follow the newspaper and there are some newspapers which you should not follow to-day. The people who should show their disapproval of this matter do not know what is happening; the only time they will know about it is at the next Vestry Election when the candidates will tell them. We should concern ourselves with those people who do not read the newspaper or who do not know anything about the *Official Gazette*.

The question is: why should the Vestry of St. Thomas be selling the building which is at present occupied by the Parochial Medical Officer and buying another? The answer should be that it is cheaper to do that. If they are going to economise, if they are going to save the parish something, if they want to change the site of the Parochial Medical Officer's residence, I think that this residence should be nearer to the Almshouse, not further away from it. The

Rector should live near to the Church and the Parochial Medical Officer should live near to the Almshouse. I feel that even now, the Almshouse is not in a central position, but we cannot think of centralising this particular place because we cannot get the position working out fairly and adequately; we are bound to have it near to some people and too far from others. I ask again: why should the Parochial Medical Officer's residence be removed? Why should it be sold? If the building is repaired, nobody is going to say anything about where it is now situated; but as soon as you remove it, you will get all this talk. If the Vestry were asking for permission to borrow money to repair the present building, nobody would say anything about that. Definitely the proposed site for the residence of the Parochial Medical Officer is not a proper site; I can remember that in this House I had to object to the site on which it was proposed to erect the present Post Office in St. Joseph. The matter was postponed until after the Vestry Election, but the same Vestrymen were re-elected and the Post Office has been erected on the same site. I could not say anything about it because the House gave the Vestry permission to erect the Post Office on that site. We are not rejecting this Bill, we are asking that the consideration of it be postponed. The present Vestry will soon be out of existence, and I feel that the people who do not know what is happening should have a chance of knowing what is happening. They will know at least on Nomination Day. I am in favour of the postponement because we have to consider the paupers. There are some people who prefer to die before they would call in the Inspector of Poor and there are others who do not like to go to the Almshouse; they prefer to remain at home and die; they would rather borrow money and go to a doctor other than the Parochial Medical Officer. It is not that they are able to go to another doctor, but they do not like to go to the Parochial Medical Officer.

Mr. ADAMS: It does appear to me—and I have pretty strong views on the matter—as if we waste time in debating matters sent down by Vestries. I, personally, feel that the St. Joseph Post Office should not be where it is now, but the hands of the Executive Committee were tied. After a new Vestry Election and the new Vestry put up the same proposal to the House as before what were we to do? I would like to appeal to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and to any other honourable member who might be dealing with Bills of this sort. The Maude Bill is on its way here, and I take it that this House approves of the principle of the Maude Report. We are going to make some change in the parochial set-up and it would be a waste of money to build a new residence for the Parochial Medical Officer when a re-organization of the health services is going to take place. Two or three parishes will be put together and this residence might not be needed at all. For that reason only I am suggesting to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas to agree to the motion for postponement. The parishes of St. James and St. Thomas might be put together under the new set-up and we might find ourselves in the position of having permitted the expenditure of a few thousand pounds in the erection of this building which might not be needed in St. Thomas. I think that anything which might possibly lead to our having a white elephant as far as any officer is concerned, should be avoided. I am not suggesting that this Bill should be rejected, but that the honourable member in charge of it should accept the motion for the postponement.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—Since I have been a member of this House, this is the second occasion on which a Bill dealing with the sale of a Parochial Medical Officer's residence has come before us, and I would just like to draw attention to the previous Bill which gives more ground for postponing the Bill which we are now discussing. I would like to say that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, as a representative of the parish of St. Thomas, has given rather cogent reasons for postponing the second reading of this Bill to-day: therefore I feel that there was no unworthy motive or animus which actuated him in making the motion he has made. He has the interest of the people of St. Thomas at heart, particularly the people to whom the Parochial Medical Officer has been specifically appointed to attend free of charge for the salary which he draws out of the parish. In so far as my colleague's remarks are concerned, I would like to say that there is on record an instance of which I am well aware—an instance in which someone who wanted to see the Parochial Medical Officer of St. Michael, had first to go to the Parochial Buildings and secure from the Board of Guardians or somebody like that, a ticket by which that person could approach the Parochial Medical Officer at his residence which, unfortunately, was at the top of Britton's Hill. So, Mr. Speaker, this facility whereby people can get medical attention free of charge is not as easy as I think it was made out to be. I know that the Vestry of St. Michael have at present under consideration the remodelling of their own building to provide a room so that the Parochial Medical Officer can go there and examine people, rather than have people from Cave Hill, for instance, going to the Almshouse for examination. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas as a person of responsibility has got up here and told us that at least three members of the Vestry of St. Thomas were very much opposed to the proposal contained in this Bill: I have asked him privately whether the names of those members of the Vestry are set out in the Petition in connection with this Bill, and he tells me that that is so. I think that it is peculiar for members of the Vestry to attend a meeting of the Vestry and strenuously oppose the sale of the Parochial Medical Officer's residence and then their names are found in the Petition agreeing to the sale of the residence. Mr. Speaker, there is something radically wrong with this Bill.

It is not that you can send the Parochial Medical Officer to poor people at once; you can only send him to them when you know that they want his services. You have to know when you want the Parochial Medical Officer and some rich people cannot get a telephone much less poor people. I want to make this point; there is something smart about this Bill. The title section says: "This Act may be cited as the 'Saint Thomas Parish (Barbados) Medical Officer's Residence Act, 1950' ", but it is nothing of the kind at all; it is the sale of the Parochial Medical Officer's residence. This Bill has been copied from a Bill which was cited as "The St. Andrew's Parish (Parochial Medical Officer's Residence) Act, 1942" and in that Act it distinctly says that Baxters House, the residence of the Parochial Medical Officer, was to be sold and the proceeds of the sale were to be applied in purchasing from the owners of Walkers Plantation an acre of land situated not in any part of Walkers, but near the Parish Church, and erecting a building thereon. If we pass this Bill in its present form we are giving the Vestry of St. Thomas permission to sell this residence and do what they like with the money; they can put the Parochial Medical Officer's residence in any part of the parish. I do not like

that, and as long as this House has a say in matters of this sort, the Vestry must not only be given permission to sell this residence, but they must tell me where they are going to erect the new building. They have not told us where they are going to erect the new building and I think they should tell us where they intend to erect it; they should not start to sell this property before they have made arrangements to purchase another one. This particular question has not been the subject of electioneering so let it be so now; that is a good reason for postponing the further consideration of this Bill. I hope that the ratepayers will ask these people where are they going to erect this new building and let the vicinity of the building be inserted in this Bill as was the case in a previous Bill, so that the House will know where the building will be erected. When you are buying a piece of land, you need not be so religious as to buy it near to the Church. That is my objection to this Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: On the advice of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, and in view of the remarks which he has made, I will accept the motion for the postponement. The honourable member's remarks have convinced me that I should accept the motion for postponement. His reasons are sound and it is true that I had not given any consideration to the point which he has made. Before I sit down, I want to reply to the hon. junior member for the City who pointed out that there are three members of the Vestry of St. Thomas, whose names appear in the Petition in connection with this Bill, although they were opposed to the site proposed for the erection of the new building. The hon. member should know in the first place that the matter was agreed to by a majority of the Vestry and in that case it was binding on the whole Vestry; and in the next place I am sure that those members who were opposed to this matter did not deliberately sign their names to the Petition. The matter was binding on the whole Vestry and the person who prepared the Petition subscribed the names of those three members along with the others. The hon. member also made the point that in the case of the St. Andrew Bill, the site for the proposed building was specifically mentioned in the Bill. It is true that the site for the new building is not mentioned in this Bill, but it is an open secret where it is intended to erect this building. I accept the motion for the postponement.

Mr. DOWDING: I do not want any honourable member to be under the misapprehension that I am in agreement with the postponement of the consideration of this Bill because of the reason given by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph; I would like to say that that reason is negligible. For us in this House to consider legislation at the moment on the possibility of future legislation, is, in my opinion, incorrect. The Maude Report may or may not come into force. This Bill which the Vestry of St. Thomas have put forward should be something of necessity to the poor people. It is possible that the Maude Report might never be implemented, or it might take five years before it is implemented. Therefore I would not like to say that I agree to the reason given by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph for the postponement of this Bill, which is no reason at all because it has not been based on fact. I would like to say that my reason for agreeing to the motion for postponement is the argument of the honourable junior member for the City that this Bill has not been correctly worded.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Thomas having accepted the motion for the postponement, the further consideration of this Bill is now postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to 5.30 p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

QUESTIONS

On re-assembling,

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—You promised earlier this afternoon that you would give me permission to give notice of some questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made that promise and if the hon. member is ready he may give notice of those questions.

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

Has the attention of the Government been drawn to reports that —

(a) construction work is scheduled to commence shortly on the new 17-billion dollar Panama Sea Level Canal project;

(b) during 1951 West Indians will be invited to work on the scheme and that contractors from the United States have already commenced immigration talks;

(c) Jamaica is likely to be the recruiting centre by reason of its proximity to Panama and the consequential lower transportation costs;

(d) it is claimed that the actual construction work will last for eleven years.

2. Is the Government aware —

(a) of the fine record already established by the 20,000 Barbadian workers who participated in the construction of the present Canal and the ready recognition in the past of this record by Panama Canal authorities.

(b) that emigration to Panama for work of this type is more or less of a permanent nature; and that the majority of B.W.I. workers who were contracted to construct the original Canal were retained in the country to do maintenance and other work.

(c) that Panama Canal authorities have on more than one occasion given pledges to consider the claims of Barbados in any extension work which is contemplated.

3. In view of the above and the fact that the difference in transportation costs need not necessarily be borne by the contractors, will the Government take immediate steps to ascertain the accuracy of these reports with the idea, if they are discovered to be correct, of taking steps to obtain some share in the work for the people of the colony? (Cheers).

THE BARBADOS BOXING BOARD OF CONTROL BILL, 1950

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Michael:—Second reading of a Bill to incorporate the Barbados Boxing Board of Control.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker,—I have no doubt that all hon. members are fully aware of the object of this Bill. A Bill of this sort has been on the Statute Book of the neighbouring colony of Trinidad for quite a long time, and my opinion is that it is long overdue in Barbados. I am somewhat surprised to see that in this respect something concrete has not been attempted here before. Barbados is indeed fortunate in having persons of such repute as those mentioned in this Bill—persons who are interested in boxing and who will eventually become the personnel of the Barbados Boxing Board of Control. Boxing

has always been referred to as a manly art; in my opinion it is a somewhat serious and exacting sport and I feel that boxers themselves should be protected from would-be promoters whose only aim in some cases is to raise money. I also feel that the good health and physical condition of participants should be assured even before they enter the ring. The general public also stand in need of protection from unscrupulous persons who have no intention of giving the spectators the best performance for their money, but who are only in quest of easy money and are prepared to use the ring as a means to that end. I do not feel it is necessary for me to make a long speech in order to convince honourable members of the necessity for having a Bill of this type placed on the Statute Book. The powers which are to be given to this Board, its duties and the penalties which may be imposed in some cases are all set out in this Bill. Honourable members will see that the powers to be given to this Board are fairly wide, but I feel that that is as it should be. We who are sitting around this Table are responsible for the good government of this colony and I take it that the Barbados Boxing Board of Control will be responsible for the good government of boxing in this colony. No useful purpose can be served if we create a Boxing Board of Control and then deny the Board the power of control. I feel that this Board would be placed in a very invidious position if full powers were not given to it so that it could adjust any grievances which might arise from time to time. I make reference to this question of powers being given to the Board deliberately and I hope I have said enough as to clear the atmosphere of any opposition that might have been forthcoming on that point. As far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, I do not anticipate a single dissentient voice. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SMITH: It gives me great pleasure to second the motion for the second reading of a Bill of this sort, not for the sake of discussion but in order to safeguard the pockets of the poor sporting fans in this colony. I use the word "safeguard" because I have been robbed of my money. You get people coming to this colony and asking somebody to advertise a fight in the Press and when people go to that fight with the hope of seeing something for their money, you see men making sport in the ring. There is nobody at all in authority to whom you can complain. If you want to promote boxing in this colony you have to go about it in the right way. I do not know whether it is the fighters or the promoters who are not doing their job; I have been told outside that the promoters get such a small pittance after a fight that the fighters are not encouraged to give of their best. That sort of thing should be stopped; I sincerely hope that the persons constituting this Board will do so with the sole intention of seeing that the public of this colony are not robbed any more. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Nobody gets robbed). People do get robbed. Mr. Speaker, I do not interrupt any honourable member while he is speaking and I hope that the honourable senior member for the City will allow me to speak without interruption whether what I say appeals to him or not.

Mr. ALLDER: I regret very much that I cannot see my way to support a Bill such as this one. I have taken some time to study this Bill and I cannot see the benefits which will accrue from the passing of it. I have always been studying the methods of boxing in this island and I say that boxing has not been what it should be here. What I observe is that this Bill proposes to create a kind of boxing monopoly in this colony, and I am definitely

opposed to it on that ground. It is not that I dislike sport in its true sense, but I do not want healthy sport to be treated in the manner in which I feel boxing will be treated if this Bill is agreed to. The names mentioned in the Preamble of this Bill are familiar to us all and it seems as if these persons want to incorporate themselves as a Board for the sole purpose of preventing any other persons in the colony from having healthy sport. I make special reference to Sub-clause (2) of Clause 7 of the Bill which says: "The Board may refuse to issue such permit at its discretion and without assigning any reason or may attach any conditions it thinks fit as to the holding of any boxing contest or may cancel any permit after issue."

There are several Boys' Clubs in this colony; there are many social functions held in this colony and sometimes a boxing match is added to programmes for the entertainment of the general public without any additional cost to the public. If this Bill is passed it will mean that social and cultural bodies will not be permitted in future to add anything like boxing or wrestling to the entertainment which they are providing. Instead of promoting the physical well-being of youth in this colony, the passing of this Bill will limit it; only the Boxing Board of Control will be able to provide this benefit. It is a fact that in many instances most of the funds derived from a boxing contest have been distributed among the few who did nothing at all to organize the contest. I wish that hon. members would be more serious in this matter. In Barbados we have been encouraging and fostering numerous games and social activities some of which have not been so beneficial to the real training of the youth of the colony. I would go further and say that there seems to be a common understanding or agreement between the authorities in the schools and those of the theatres—I hope it is not directly through the Government—that the schools will be closed down and the children taken to see pictures. I feel that if the parents of these children wanted them to see such pictures they would take the time and expense to carry them to the theatres to see these pictures. We are spending too much money on our educational set-up to afford school teachers to decide that they must close the schools so that the children can be taken to the theatres; that is only a question of swelling the funds of the theatre magnates. When children reach the stage where they can appreciate the pictures which are shown, they can go to the theatres; but the school hours should not be shortened by teachers who feel that they should patronize the theatres in this colony. Our youths are not sufficiently serious-minded to address themselves to problems. We should not permit a Bill to be passed in this House to add to the evils which are continuing to grow. I am not against the carrying on of sport in its true sense, and to pass this Bill as it stands is to say that people cannot have a little entertainment by way of boxing unless the Barbados Boxing Board of Control says that they can have it, or a penalty will be incurred; people will not be able to carry on sport in their backyards. I beg to move that the consideration of this Bill be deferred until this day six months.

Mr. MILLER: I feel that this Bill, if and when it is passed, will, to some extent, bring about a cessation of athletics as they exist in this island. I live near to a beach and it is refreshing to see young men engage in boxing on the beach. I would like to mention here that quite recently in Trinidad a case was brought by the Boxing Board of Control and it was thrown out as being frivolous. Clause 7 (1) of this Bill says:—

"No person shall hold, assist in holding, or take any part whatsoever in any boxing contest, whether held for prizes or otherwise unless a permit in writing has been first obtained from the Board authorizing the holding of such contest."

That provision will destroy the idea of amateur boxing in this colony. There are occasions when you will find young men on the beaches engaging in boxing and that should be encouraged. I feel that empowering a Boxing Board of Control to forbid the carrying on of boxing here and there is to destroy what should be encouraged. I understand that some honourable members are in favour of referring this Bill to a Select Committee and it is well that that should be done; but I do not think that any Board should be empowered to prohibit amateur boxing in this colony.

Mr. DOWDING: Seeing that my name is mentioned in the Preamble of this Bill, and it is a fact that for some time I have had an interest in boxing in this island, I have decided to say a few words. This Bill has been brought about so that boxing in Barbados can be given a status by which it can be recognized throughout the world. There is a similar state of affairs in every country where boxing has become an established sport. The fact that honourable members see certain names including mine at the top of this Bill does not in any way mean that this Board will continue to be a Board for ever and ever; the persons whose names honourable members see mentioned here, have been studying the situation as far as possible. (Mr. ALLDER: They have personal interests in it.) I agree that I have a personal interest in this matter: I was a heavyweight champion at one time. (Cheers). That is the only personal interest which I have in this Bill; I have no financial or any other interest in it. During its discussions this Body which is mentioned here expected what has happened this afternoon—there would be a certain amount of opposition to this Bill on account of certain names which are mentioned in it. There are hundreds of people in Barbados who are capable of going abroad if only boxing was placed on a status such that it could be recognized outside. As far as the phrasing of the Bill is concerned, if honourable members feel that there are phrases which need to be changed, the Bill can be referred to a Select Committee, and I am quite willing to make a motion to that effect. Let us take an instance of what has happened in this island; in Trinidad there is a recognized Boxing Board of Control and Trinidad has sent a team of boxers up here and they defeated our boxers because they are well organized. This Bill does not give any monopoly or try to stop anybody from having a game of boxing in his backyard; but it tries to stop the staging of faked matches, by which the public will be soaked, and so control the future of boxing in Barbados. Boxing must fail unless it has the support of the public; this Bill seeks to place boxing in this island on a footing such that it will be recognized by the public, that it will get the support of the public, and I hope, Sir, that some day we may have a Barbadian Joe Louis. That is what this Bill seeks to do. I appeal to honourable members not to hold up this Bill for six months and so prevent some honest young boxer from getting the recognition in this world as Joe Louis has got. Let us refer this Bill to a Select Committee, but do not let us postpone it for six months. The object of this Bill is far from creating a boxing monopoly in this island; this Board has been formed chiefly through Major Foster who is a very keen follower of boxing and who has made efforts to see that the game is recognized in Barbados. That is what

we want. I did not have the opportunity of studying the phraseology of the Bill—I did not think the Bill was coming up for consideration today—but I appeal to honourable members not to hold it up as that may be causing damage to boxing in Barbados.

Mr. LEWIS: When I got this Bill and read it through it struck me that we were being asked to give too wide powers to this proposed Board. I am still of that opinion and it was my intention to seek the assistance of someone who knows the Acts of this island to see whether any of these Associations which we have incorporated by Acts of Parliament have the powers which we are asked to confer on this Board in the making of by-laws, rules, regulations and things of that sort. I would like to say that the honourable junior member for St. George has admitted that without any Boxing Board of Control in Barbados, he has risen to the status of a heavyweight champion. (A MEMBER: Not in Barbados). The honourable member is a Barbadian and it is the amount of strength and discipline which was imparted to him here that helped him to go outside and rise to the status of a heavyweight champion. I would like to draw to the honourable member's attention the fact that in Barbados we have a Barbados Cricket Association; it is true that it is not called a Control Association, but while it is the Barbados Cricket Association still the Spartan or Pickwick Club can send and invite a club from St. Vincent or from Trinidad to come here and play matches entirely outside the Barbados Cricket Association. And the hon. member cannot say that we have not produced some very fine cricketers without preventing other people from playing cricket. That is the type of Boxing Board of Control which I would like to see here; they are going to be respected, not because they are incorporated but on account of the reputation which they have established. Sir, I do not think that the Barbados Boxing Board of Control or any Board of Control will eliminate faked matches; I understand that boxing matches are faked from high up, and even if we produced a Joe Louis, there is no guarantee that a certain number of matches will not be faked. I have listened to contests over the radio and I heard that one of them ended in the first round. The public can be disappointed where boxing and horse racing are concerned. I would like to assure the hon. senior member for St. John that he did not give any of us the opportunity to show how serious we were about this matter, and he should not have accused us of not being so serious about it. We have to be very careful about passing this Bill; I understand that this Bill has been copied from the Trinidad Act and one hon. member has said that several trivial cases are brought by the Boxing Board of Control in Trinidad. I see that in addition to the name of the heavyweight champion mentioned in the Preamble of this Bill there are the names of some lawyers, and there are not set out any objects and reasons so that it could be seen why this Bill should be brought forward. I feel that this is a Bill creating a Board which could be put alongside the Barbados Cricket Association; by all means let us have a Body which, as the hon. junior member for St. George says, will have the status of an incorporated Body so that it will have the responsibility of establishing a good reputation. There was a Committee in this island which looked after boxing and the people of Trinidad and other neighbouring islands used to recognise it and send boxers here because it had established a reputation for seeing that clean boxing went on. I am going to associate myself with this Bill with the distinct understanding that it will be referred to a Select Committee so that

we will establish a Boxing Board of Control and we will not deny people the opportunity of boxing when they want to do so.

Mr. MAPP: I think I am right in saying that most people in Barbados, who are interested in sport, will welcome the formation of a Boxing Board of Control. I think we have seen that boxing has been badly regulated and there is the need of some controlling Board which this Bill seeks to create. Barbados has never been noted for boxers in the same light as some other places have been noted for it. We had one or two well-known boxers and they went abroad. I do not agree that the passing of this Bill will necessarily mean that boxing will achieve any particular status in Barbados; it depends upon the boxers themselves and the manner in which people support boxing. I should like to say that in many avenues of sport Barbados has recently seen a re-awakening; more social activities are taking place now than before, but I cannot say that they are carried on along right lines. I am not against boxing; some people are against boxing, but it can be a manly form of sport. I am wondering if the Government would take the lead in encouraging the right kind of sport in Barbados and I am hoping that we will have the assurance that the right kind of sport will have the active support of the Government. I want to say that quite recently many theatres have sprung up about this island and I am wondering if the Government gets a sufficient draw back from them; these theatres seem to be making fantastic sums for second-rate entertainment. Pictures are gloriously advertised for three or four weeks and, to my mind, the Government does not tax these theatres sufficiently in order to devote the proceeds from the tax to further activities by way of cultural sport. Much of the profits from these theatres goes to Trinidad, but this Government should tax the theatres and get money to assist people better in the way of cultural activities. You will see pictures which have no uplift culturally, morally or otherwise and the theatre owners make fantastic sums out of them. I am in favour of this Bill because to my mind, it will encourage clean sport for people who are interested in this type of activity.

Mr. ADAMS: I think we will agree—even the honourable senior member for St. John—that this Bill should be given its second reading and referred to a Select Committee. It is notorious that boxing and horse racing should lead to fakes, gambling and all the evils appertaining to them from the time the world was a world. Although you cannot keep people from doping race-horses, it is well that you have a Turf Club with stewards who can warn off people who did so. It is therefore necessary to have some control. I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. John will vote against this Bill; but all of us will agree with what he has said about it. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas thinks that most of the films shown at the theatres are second-rate, but that is not the point. We need some control but we have to be very careful in the matter. I am glad that the honourable junior member for St. George assured the House that there is no intention of putting any ban on boxing. As regards the drafting of this Bill, with great respect to the Solicitors who drafted it, there is the need for a lot of improvement. There are one or two things which I would like to point out to the Select Committee which may be appointed to consider this Bill. In connection with the Trinidad case mentioned by the honourable senior member for St. George, that was a case in which some persons held some preliminary bouts without the consent of the Trinidad Boxing Board of Control, and the Magis-

trate dismissed it because he said that there was no definition of a boxing contest. We know what a boxing contest ought to be, but we will have to define a boxing contest by saying that it is a contest which is open to the public for payment. I must confess that I spent about half an hour in the Attorney General's Office earlier today trying with the Acting Attorney General's aid and with that of his Assistant to find a definition in legislation in this respect and we found none. The Select Committee will have to use its ingenuity and arrive at a definition of a boxing contest, otherwise we will have the same sort of thing happening in Barbados as has happened in Trinidad. The wording of Sub-clause (2) of Clause 5 might be improved. That Sub-clause says: "No member of the Board shall be interested in any promoter or receive payment of any kind from such promoter or promoting bodies". As an honourable member has mentioned it should be made clear as to what the interest of the member of the Board is. Clause 7 Sub-clause (1) is very wide and what is set out there could not have been intended. It says:

"No person shall hold, assist in holding, or take any part whatsoever in any boxing contest, whether held for prizes or otherwise unless a permit in writing has been first obtained from the Board authorizing the holding of such contest."

There is the necessity for a definition Clause as to what a boxing contest is. As regards Clause 8, I do not know if there is any reflection on promoters, but that Clause says:

"Members of the Board appointed for the purpose and any Officer or Member of the Police Force detailed for the purpose shall at all times have free access to any place in which any boxing contest is being or is about to be held. No member (save as aforesaid) shall have free access to any boxing contest."

I thought that that was bad drafting, but I am told that it is to prevent promoters from buying members of the Board by giving them free tickets. That is a matter of policy, but I want to say that no penalty is attached; nobody can do anything with any member of the Board unless the Attorney General indicts him. Then there is the proviso to Clause 9 Sub-clause (1) which says:

"Provided that until varied or revoked by any such rules or regulations the rules and regulations contained in the Schedule to this Act shall be in force." But when you look for the Schedule you will find that there is no Schedule. I suggest that this Bill will have a first-class chance of being passed by the House when it comes back from the Select Committee with the necessary changes having been made. In Clause 10 (c) the word "hereinafter" is used but the word should be "hereinbefore"; that Sub-paragraph refers to the penalty which can be imposed upon any person who refuses to grant to any Officer or Member of the Police Force free access to any premises in which any boxing contest is being, or is about to be held, or obstructs any Officer or Member of the Police Force in the course of his duty. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I seem to be a schoolmaster, but a lawyer spots these things better than a layman. It may prove very difficult for me to attend any meetings of the Select Committee and in case that happens, I will have made those points.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Although I did not hear everything which the honourable senior member for St. John has said, I anticipated what he would have said, having discussed Clause 7 of the Bill with him, and I am inclined to agree with him. I really cannot see that we should pass this Bill as it stands. I agree

that we should do something in order to protect professional boxing; but when it comes to amateur boxing in a backyard or on the beaches I cannot agree with this Bill. The honourable junior member for St. George seems to forget that there is a day called Civic Day and sometimes there is Labour Day when you have free boxing contests occasionally. Are you suggesting that there should not be any boxing on Civic Day? That is absurd. I am supporting this Bill on the understanding that it will be referred to a Select Committee. I should like to see a definition Clause put in this Bill and I should like the question of amateur boxing made perfectly clear. This Bill should apply to professional boxing where people pay money to see contests; that is a point for the Select Committee to consider. Even where people are amateur boxers nothing should prevent them from getting some consideration because in the United States Joe Louis started as an amateur. I should like some provision made in this Bill giving the right of appeal to some authority; there must be the right of appeal given in legislation such as this. I hope that this Bill will not be brought back before this House without provision being made giving the right of appeal to some authority, otherwise I will have to talk for a long time. Where you have amateur boxers I cannot see that there should be anything to prevent contests from taking place. I am not inclined to say that the Judiciary should be the best authority to whom the appeal should be made, but there must be some authority to whom an appeal can be made.

Mr. BRANCKER: I really see no objection to referring this Bill to a Select Committee. I should like to say that in respect of every Bill which has been drafted by a firm of Solicitors and brought before this House, members of another branch of the legal profession can find that the Bill is not perfect. I appreciate the point mentioned by the honourable senior member for the City as regards provision being made giving the right of appeal to some authority, because I never like to give any Board power which is not limited by the right of appeal; but I have not discovered in respect of legislation sanctioning the Boxing Board of Control in Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana or anywhere else, that there is the right of appeal to anybody. I am unable to find a precedent so far as the statutory creation of an authority to whom an appeal can be made is concerned, but I am prepared to do some further research to see if I can find one, since the right of appeal is something which should be dear to the heart of every individual. The other outstanding interesting point which has been raised is that in connection with the definition of a boxing contest. There again, in none of the Ordinances or Bills which I have seen is there any definition of a boxing contest, and in the absence of such a definition, a boxing contest is capable of a wide interpretation. Two persons may be amusing themselves in a backyard and some people may regard that as a boxing contest; while others may feel that there is no boxing contest unless there has been previous organization, and you have a referee, a panel of judges and so forth. It is a matter for the Select Committee to search and see if they can find any definition of a boxing contest; a boxing contest should be a contest which is open to the public on the payment of admission, and we are out to protect the members of the public who are frequently fleeced. Sometimes the public are asked to pay \$1.50 or \$2.00 in order to secure admission to a fight, and having paid that money, as the honourable junior member for St. Joseph has pointed out, they enter the stadium and see two people dancing around for a certain number of minutes

and that is where their money has gone. The protection of the public is the particular reason for having a Boxing Board of Control; if two persons amuse themselves in the ring to the disgust of the public, the Boxing Board of Control can disqualify them or do otherwise and people will recognize that there is some control in respect of boxing. I heard one or two names of persons mentioned *sotto voce* and it has been asked why the names of those persons have not appeared in the Preamble of this Bill. I would like to say that if those persons did not display any interest by attending meetings to which those who are interested in boxing were invited, that is their funeral. In so far as promoters are concerned, it is not contemplated that they should be members of the Boxing Board of Control, because they may have to sit in judgment on themselves; that is why there is a Sub-clause which says that no member of the Board shall be interested in the administration or executive of any promoting body of professional boxing. Promoters are not to stage fights if those promoters are known to be those who stage faked fights; the other day we had from Trinidad two men who went into the ring and just played around for a certain number of minutes until they felt that the public had been sufficiently fleeced. I should like to say that there is nobody more concerned or interested in encouraging amateur boxing than those who are sponsors: the Amateur Boxing Association have staged contests in which we have had school boys taking part—we have had Harrison College competing against the Lodge School—and boys from Second Grade Schools also participate in boxing from time to time. If the members of the Select Committee will get together in a co-operative spirit I am sure that we will be able to improve the draughtsmanship of the Bill. A distinguished member of this Chamber should be a member of the Select Committee so as to correct and improve on the work of his fellow Solicitor, and the Bill which will be returned to the House should meet with the approval of even the most critical member of the House.

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

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to move that this Bill be now referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now referred to a Select Committee. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. Subject to the approval of the House, I appoint the following honourable members to serve on that Committee:—The honourable senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Adams), the honourable senior member for the City (Mr. Mottley), the honourable junior member for St. George (Mr. Dowding), the honourable junior member for the City (Mr. Lewis), the honourable junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker), the honourable senior member for St. John (Mr. Alder), the honourable junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Bryan) and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew (Mr. Gill).

DISCHARGE FROM THE GENERAL HOSPITAL OF PERSONS SUFFERING FROM TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I know that I have not acquainted you about this matter beforehand, but I know you will allow me to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of public importance. Recently, on account of the congestion at

the General Hospital, it has become necessary to send out persons who are suffering from tuberculosis and who are thought to be incurable. In the parish of St. George we have, in the space of a few weeks, received three cases of tuberculosis and I believe that other parishes have also received some cases. The danger of the spread of this disease due to the sending out of these people from the central point is, in my opinion, very great and this matter should be brought at once to the notice of those who are in authority. The congestion in the Almshouses in the parishes is great; there is little or no room particularly in the St. George's Almshouse for housing these cases. Some time ago I suggested in this House that the Leper Hospital, which has only 34 cases at the moment, should be used as a sanatorium for cases of tuberculosis and the cases which are at the Leper Hospital could be sent to British Guiana. I would like to point out to the House the urgency of this matter because these cases of tuberculosis are being sent throughout the island. I would like to hear honourable members' point of view in connection with this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In seconding the motion for the adjournment I want to say that I do not want it to be felt that the honourable member is singing a solo in this matter which is of very great importance. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that some time ago I dealt with an Address asking for the erection of a sanatorium for housing cases of tuberculosis and now the honourable member has drawn the attention of the House to this matter. I can assure honourable members that, to the lay mind, the matter is rather disturbing at the moment. On the face of it, it would appear as if in sunny Barbados this disease of tuberculosis is on the increase, and some provision should be made to deal with it locally.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—It is true that the Government replied to my Address which was passed by this House and said that it does not see the necessity for building a T.B. sanatorium. I do not think that the erection of such a sanatorium within the precincts of an Almshouse is the correct thing to do. Even the suggestion of the honourable junior member for St. George is one with which I do not agree; there are several places in this island—there is a place in St. Peter called "Farrs"—which could be used as an isolation hospital for housing cases of tuberculosis. If the Government cannot at present establish a modern sanatorium they ought to provide some means of dealing with such cases which seem to baffle the local authorities. Only recently you had a case in St. Michael where a mother was placed in the T.B. Ward at the Almshouse and you had children who, on medical advice could be cared for, but it would be dangerous to put them among other children. You do not need any colossal building, but cannot the Government find some central building in which to place people who are suffering from tuberculosis? I strongly support this motion for the adjournment of the House in order to discuss this matter; as a Commissioner of Health I see the returns which are made. I come in contact with the people themselves and in many cases it is pathetic when you come across such cases and realise that neither the local authority nor the central authority can offer any aid. There are people who have lost their bread winners and they have to mix with other people or go into the Almshouse and just wait to die not even a clean death. The honourable junior

member for St. George has drawn to the attention of this House that persons who are suffering from tuberculosis have been sent out of the General Hospital because there is no room for them there; otherwise these people would have been kept at the Hospital with the idea of assisting them, and when they are sent out affected by this disease I am wondering what is going to happen. People who are in a better position than others and find their relatives suffering from this disease, send them to Trinidad; not long ago we supported a Resolution to pay for the treatment in Trinidad of a nurse who had contracted this disease. It is all well and good for those who can afford to pay for this treatment in Trinidad, but I am wondering if it is not the duty of this Government to get some understanding with Trinidad in respect of the treatment of those cases of tuberculosis which can be healed. I saw a notice in respect of admission to the T.B. sanatorium in Trinidad; there are several people who may be affected by this disease but they cannot afford to pay for the treatment at this institution. It is true that arrangements can be made for this treatment in Trinidad, but they can only be made for people who are able to pay for it. There are people whom the local authorities consider can be saved if something is done for them, and we cannot sit by negligently and watch these people go to their death when we know that we can save their lives. I think more especially of the children of those persons who are affected by this disease; there is no institution in which they can be put and they must go back home in little 2 x 4 houses and allow the disease to destroy them. I have discussed this matter with Sir Rupert Briercliffe and he pointed out that the establishment of a T.B. sanatorium is an expensive set-up; but you do not measure that in terms of £ s. d., you measure it in terms of the health of the people of the island. I say that if an institution can be set up to save the lives of the people in Trinidad, arrangements should be made not only for the treatment of those who can afford to pay for it, but for those who are being turned out of the General Hospital because there is no room for them in that Institution. I repeat that just as we supported the Government in sending out a nurse for treatment, there must be some other cases in which people's lives can be saved. Only to-day I discussed this matter with the honourable senior member for St. Thomas; there is the case of a boy from Chapman's Street whose mother had been placed in the T.B. Ward at the Almshouse and there is nobody to care for him. There is the report that this boy can be saved; he might grow up to assist in defending this colony. You cannot put these people among others in the Nightengale Home and you cannot put them at the Almshouse. I say; let the Government come down with a Resolution and send out this type of people which can be saved, to Trinidad for treatment. It is not only the lives of the well-to-do which should be saved; life is as sweet to the pauper as it is to the King. I think that every member of this House should lend his support to this matter; I am not addressing my remarks to an unsympathetic Government; I might be addressing them to a lazy Government. Let the Government wake up; this is a big issue which will catch the eyes of the general public. (A Member: I agree). If you agree with that, then, you should act quickly because the Hospital is turning out these people. Let the Government commandeer some place in which to put these people who are being turned out of the Hospital; it looks to me that the Parry-Coleridge School on which the Government has spent so much money is a good place in which to house these people. I appeal to the "Minister of Health" to act quickly in this matter. Can we sit back and do nothing when we

have it on medical authority that people's lives can be saved? We owe it to posterity to do something to save people's lives.

Mr. MILLER: This disease of tuberculosis is one of which I have always been afraid; it is wreaking havoc among the people. I have an Address on the Order Paper asking that legislation be sent down having for its object the modern treatment and prevention of this disease. We have quite a lot of land at the Leper Hospital and we have a lot of other places one of which might be used for erecting a separate institution for dealing with cases of tuberculosis. I have had a chat with the Chief Medical Officer in connection with this disease and he has promised to get some information for me. I feel that the Government should do something about restricting this disease.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The immediate matter of the motion is the turning out of cases of tuberculosis from the General Hospital. I allowed the honourable senior member for the City some latitude because I did not notice that a general Address in connection with the treatment and prevention of this disease is as high up on the Order Paper as Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business. I think that the honourable member should confine his remarks to the turning out of the Hospital of these cases of tuberculosis and not deal now with the Address which is on the Order Paper.

Mr. MILLER: I think that we should have a hospital catering to people who suffer from tuberculosis. If people who are suffering from this disease are being turned out of the General Hospital, what do we hope to do if we are not thinking of providing some place in which to accommodate them?

Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the "Minister of Health" who is absent, I will make a few remarks. As far as turning out people from the Hospital is concerned, after all, the Hospital is only a relieving station; it is already small, it is overcrowded and more beds are necessary as well as other things. We are hoping to come down with some scheme for the enlargement of the Hospital. If it is found that the Hospital can do no more for you there is no other alternative than to send you out. On the question of the erection of a sanatorium, that is a rather costly affair; it is far more costly than what the Government is doing, that is, carrying out the investigation of a new line of treatment for tuberculosis. The Government is investigating vaccine treatment, the only trouble with that being that the vaccine does not keep very well in the tropics. However, the Government is investigating that treatment. This Government is not a lazy Government and I will try to get it to move very speedily in this matter.

Mr. DOWDING: I would like to thank the House for its hearing in this matter. I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: As regards the Resolution in respect of the St. Leonard's Girls' School, the Chalky Mount and the Parry — Coleridge Schools and the Pine Houses, the Government has been unable to have cyclo-styled copies made in such time that honourable members would have had some days to consider it before to-day. I am repeating the warning which I gave last Tuesday; provided that honourable members have some days in which to study the figures, the Govern-

ment might ask that the Resolution be considered next Tuesday. There is the question of prorogation and also the adjournment of the House for the Christmas holidays to be considered; however I feel almost certain that it will be possible to deal with this Resolution next Tuesday if the House is granted leave to do so. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 12th day of December, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

ERRATUM

In the Debates of the House of Assembly of 21st November 1950, on the passing of a Resolution to purchase instruments for Control Tower at the Airport, in Mr. LEWIS' speech on page 402 from line 28 of right hand column to end of speech, please read: "I do not like the idea of spending \$600 to buy a second hand instrument when we could spend say \$1,000 and get a brand new instrument."