THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd May, 1955.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT O.B.E., Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of Opposition*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES B.A., Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mr. J. C. TUDOR M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a statement of accounts from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. George on Tenantry Roads for the year ended 31st March 1955; also a statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. George for the half year ended 31st March, 1955;

Also, a statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. Thomas on Tenantry Roads for the half year ended 31st March, 1955;

Also a statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of St. Thomas for the half year ended 31st March, 1955.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Chief Secretary:—

22nd April, 1955.

Sir,

I am directed to forward a copy of a letter from Mr. H. O. Emtage resigning his membership of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board.

As Mr. Emtage was appointed to the Board by the Hon. the House of Assembly, his letter of resignation is submitted for the information of His Honour the Speaker and for such further action as he may consider advisable.

I am,
Sir,
Your Obedient servant.
R. N. TURNER,
Chief Secretary.

The Clerk,
House of Assembly.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay the following Message:—

MESSAGE NO. 10/1955
His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable the House of Assembly

The Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the following Acts have been assented to in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen:—

The Immigration (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-1).
The Public Officers Housing Loans (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-2).
The Technical Assistance (Taxation Relief) Act, 1955 (1955-3).
The Limitation (Public Authorities) Act, 1955 (1955-4).
The Crown Proceedings Act, 1955 (1955-5).
The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-6).
The Fire Brigade (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-7).
The Registration of Deaths (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-7).
The Registration of (Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials) (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-8).
The Registration of Deaths (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-9).
The Local Loan Act, 1955 (1955-10).
The Expiring Laws Continuance Act, 1955 (1955-11).

The Appropriation Act, 1955 (1955-12).
The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) (Local Consumption) (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-13).
The Customs Tariff (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-14).
The Police (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-15).
The Income Tax (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-16).
The Rates of Income Tax Act, 1955 (1955-17).
The Trade (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955-18).

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
30th April, 1955.

REPLIES

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following reply:—

Reply to Question No. 14 regarding assistance for emigrants to the United Kingdom.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to place the sum of $8,900 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56 No. 4 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I should also say at this stage that it is my intention to move for the suspension of Rules 88, 89 and 60 at a later stage in order to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

I now beg to give notice of my intention to move the suspension of the Rules 88 & 89.

Mr. SPEAKER: Was that Resolution circulated.

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes sir, with your permission. It is in connection with provision for a station wagon for the General Hospital.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to place the sum of $45,660 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 5 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, Bill relating to terms of tenure in respect of small holdings and for providing reasonable security of tenure for tenants thereof and for purposes incidental thereto or connected therewith.

Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act, 1897.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. M. E. COX: Notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolution of which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries has just given notice.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. BRANCKER: Of the following Address:

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

1. The House of Assembly beg to point out to His Excellency the Governor the necessity for the establishment of the office of standing Counsel for the Speaker of this Chamber.

2. The House request that without any undue delay, Government shall transmit to the Legislature a Bill for the creation of such a post for consideration of this House.

QUESTIONS

Mr. LEWIS: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services:—

What were the circumstances that influenced His Excellency the Governor to renew the Contract of the Matron of the Barbados General Hospital?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To Enquire of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands, and Fisheries at the next meeting of the House:—

Is the Minister aware of the arduous difficulties, the great inconvenience and physical exertion involved on the part of fishermen and others in order to get fish brought in at Long Bay Beach, St. Philip transported to a public highway?

Will the Minister take the necessary steps to enable the parochial highway authorities to improve the hillside track and to convert it into a proper road way suitable for use by motor vehicles with the minimum delay?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing at the next meeting of the House:—

Is the Minister aware that the water main running from Long Bay corner to Sam Lord's Castle is a privately owned main?

Will the Minister take the necessary steps to acquire on behalf of Government the said main from the present owners in order that the Waterworks Department may be enabled to tap it and supply a water service to the householders in the area who desire to obtain it?

Mr. VAUGHAN entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. BRYAN: To enquire of the Minister of Social Services at the next meeting of this House:—

Will the Government when allocating funds under the Rural Amenities Scheme give favourable consideration to the setting aside of an appropriate amount for the erection of Communal Baths and Latrines in the Jackson Area, St. Michael?

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries at the next meeting of this House:—

1. Why has Government not yet replied to the Address which unanimously passed this Chamber on 15th June, 1954, relative to the acquisition by Government of Joes River Factory?

2. Whether Government will ascertain if it is true that action is threatened by the mortgagees of this factory whereby the machinery involved may be required in the very near future to be disposed of piecemeal?

3. Will Government take urgent action to allay the grave concern and anxiety of the smallholders in question and announce its decision relative to the acquisition of this property without further delay?

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister at the next meeting of this House:

Whether Government will sympathetically reconsider its decision not to grant a gratuity to the Widow of the late Clyde Springer of Graveyard, St. Lucy, who died last year in consideration of his many years' service with the Department of Highways & Transport and the Central Road Board, and take the

necessary steps to provide for such without further delay?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Notice of a Resolution to increase the salary of the Librarian and Secretary under the provision of the Officers of the Assembly (Salaries) (Amendment) Act, 1952.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am submitting that unless the Hon. Minister reads the Resolution he has only given notice of his intention to introduce it at another time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is quite in order.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention at the next meeting of the House to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss certain acting appointments of the Public Service Commission.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon'ble Member.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill relating to terms of tenure in respect of small holdings and for providing reasonable security of tenure for tenants thereof and for purposes incidental thereto or connected therewith was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act, 1897, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, was read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask for ten weeks leave of absence as from the 25th of May, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I ask for three weeks' leave of absence as from to-day, on behalf of the Hon. Premier.

There being no objection, leave was granted

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88, 89 AND 60

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 and Rule 60 be now suspended and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for $8,900 of which notice has just been given.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. I feel that before the House should be called upon to agree or disagree with the motion which has just been made, the House should know for what reason the Minister wants these Rules suspended.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I apologise to the honourable member. Apparently, the honourable member was not here when I gave notice of the Resolution and stated at the same time that I intended to ask leave for the suspension of the Rules in order to get the Resolution passed to-day. This is a Resolution for $8,900 to make provision for the purchase of a Station Wagon for the General Hospital; it is a very urgent matter and that is why I had it circulated to honourable members. In so far as the Rule 60 is concerned, Rule 60 permits for Orders of the Day to be disposed of in the order in which they stand upon the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

The question was put and agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and that this House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the money Resolution for which the Rule has just been suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now go into Committee of Supply, honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith in the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: The first Resolution is that for the sum of $2,793. The Addendum explains it fully:—

"The Cure of St. Simon has been vacant since 16th June, 1954, and in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Anglican Church Act, 1911, the salary paid in respect of the Cure lapsed into the Treasury on the expiration of six months after the Cure became vacant.

Sub-section (11) section 9 of the Anglican Church Act requires the Governor-in-Executive Committee in cases where a vacancy remains unfilled for over six months to nominate candidates and to ensure the filling of the vacancy.

In view of the proposal contained in the Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Bill to suspend sub-section (ii) of section 9 of the Act, this Resolution seeks to provide funds to pay a *locum tenens* for the period 16th December, 1954 to 31st March, 1956."

I think sir, honourable members are well aware of the fact that the Labour Government for years has had a policy on the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church; I think that this view is shared by other members outside this Government; and acting in accordance with these principles the Government has decided not to fill permanently the Cure at St. Simon's Chapel. This Resolution seeks to make temporary provision for the payment of a salary to an acting appointment until such time as a decision is taken one way or the other. Members will note (I am just really referring to it) a little lower down in the Order Paper there is a Bill dealing with an amendment to sub-section 11 of Section 9 of the Anglican Church Act. I hardly think there is any necessity for saying anything more at this stage, therefore I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

3.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution contains a very vital principle. I do think, Sir, that the honourable member should have asked this House to deal with the relevant Bill on the Order Paper before dealing with this Resolution.

I claim that if this House were to go ahead and pass this Resolution it would be in honour bound, as far as binding this Legislature is possible, to pass the Bill. This is the first time that a Resolution or a Bill has come here in connection with this question; and it is one that needs exhaustive investigation and explanation. I am very sorry that it has been discussed this way, because this means that I will have to discuss the principle of another Item on the Order Paper while dealing with this Resolution.

This matter is a very serious one. There are other Cures that were vacant and have been filled, and this needs very strong explanation as to why you cannot get somebody to fill this Cure. His Lordship the Bishop should have refused to nominate any man masquerading as clergymen to other Cures, because they can make something out of them; they will not come and minister to the

people of this Cure because it is unpopular. As you know, members of the House are involved in this. These people have no call; the only call they have is to the Treasury. I do not know the reason why Clergymen will not accept this Cure, but I suggest that maybe it is difficult to live there, or maybe the house is not as good as it should be, or maybe, the Cure has no land attached to it. The Government has fallen into a trap in this matter. The Government knows as well as the world that these Clergymen are Civil Servants and they will not qualify for a pension until they are in the service for ten years. Let me ask this question: is it fair to have this type of thing going on? If the Hon. Minister say that the question of disestablishment and disendowment is being actively considered, will you take ten years to do it? If you are going to have disendowment within 10 years then the Bill and Resolution are unnecessary and if you are not going to have disendowment in ten years then the appointee should have pension rights.

Sir, I am not at all justified over these two Items which you brought in on the Order Paper today. We have also a Resolution to give a man an *ex-gratia* payment because he has not been in the service for ten years and has retired on ill health. [A VOICE: We are abolishing that office.] You have not brought in that Bill yet. [A VOICE: The Bill is in here.]

Sir, I say this thing should go on in the normal way and if anybody is appointed now, he should know that disendowment and disestablishment of the Church is around the corner.

The Bill does not deal with St. Simon's alone. It is a stupid attempt to suspend indefinitely the operation of Subsection 11 of Section 9 of the Anglican Church Act, 1911. Are you going to pay these people on the same terms as you employ them on a pension basis? You did not give any indication of how you calculated this. Are you allowing His Lordship the Bishop to bring old retired clergymen back into service? If you are allowing that why did you not say so? Is there no age limit or anything like that now? If that is something which you want to do, say so; but it will surely have serious repercussions. You let His Lordship the Bishop import these people from England to fill all the nice jobs. Let them go and do the not so nice jobs somewhere else; that is something which should not come out of the actions of the Church.

Sir, this Resolution is absolute nonsense. You are either playing into the hands of somebody or you are blind to what you are doing. In any case it is wrong to ask us to vote this money before you get the Bill passed. This is like coming to ask this House to give a subsidy to the B.W.I.A. Airways and then enter into the agreement. You do not do things that way.

If you suspend Rule 60, why don't you get the Anglican Church Act right first? Let me ask again: do you intend to do anything within ten years? If you do not intend to do anything for ten years, is it right to take away the pension rights of somebody? Do not make it impossible for His Lordship the Bishop to bring young clergymen into the Church. All the old retired clergymen His Lordship will be able to bring back into the Church before you do anything about it. Can you say what will be the position of this Church in the next eight or nine years?

As I have said, this is something which we should be very critical about; it involves a serious principle. Instead of getting ahead with the work of disestablishment of the Anglican Church you are getting these piecemeal things very cleverly put before you, and by people who want to injure the Church; I may say not intentionally, but in a short-sighted manner. However, Sir, I do not know if Government has considered this question from this angle and I would like to hear something on it.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before any other honourable member speaks on this matter I would just like to say that the hon. junior member for the City did not follow the Act carefully. Sub-section 11 of Section 9, of the Anglican Church Act reads as follows:

"If any Rectory or Vicarage or Curacy shall be vacant for a period exceeding six months without being permanently filled the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall have power to nominate candidates and take all other necessary steps to fill the vacancy."

What the Execuitve Committee is saying, is that the Executive does not want to exercise that prerogative given them in the Act to appoint somebody, in view of the fact that at a later day the whole question of disestablishment and disendowment will be under active consideration in the House of Assembly. What we are asking the House to do is to vote this money to pay for the Cure up to the 31st March 1956 by which time it is expected that the Bill to disestablish and disendow will be in operation. If that does not happen then this Bill can be included in the expiring laws Continuance Act, 1955.

3.55 p.m.

In addition to that there is no money to pay an acting man; as you have heard Mr. Chairman, the money has lapsed. The Resolution is introduced first because in any case you will need the money if you want to pay somebody to act. The Bill is to give the Executive Committee the right to preserve the obligation to appoint permanently anyone to that Cure. We do not want to appoint anyone because if you appoint a person to a pensionable post, that person has a right of a pension. If you abolish the office before the individual reaches his retirement age you are obligated to pay him pension and abolition of office rights. The honourable member can find all that in the Pension Act and also in the Act of 1947 relating to Public Officers Pension.

If the House decides at a later stage not to disestablish the Church that is an end of the matter; the Church will go on as it has been going on and this Bill will cease to have any effect. It is not the intention of the Government to have the decision to disestablish the Church delayed for any ten years; I would say not even for ten days. I give the honourable member that assurance.

Mr. LEWIS: I want to assure the honourable member that I have read all of that. There is only one person who is confused about it, and that person is the honourable member. Absolutely nothing that I have said is any misconstruction of anything that has happened. I would like to refer the honourable member to the extreme end of line six of the second paragraph of the Act and he would see what he himself has said; the Act says Government Pension commitments. This abolishing of office will happen with all of them. What the Government is afraid of is the question of pension commitments and that is why they are introducing this Bill. However, I am saying that this matter should be postponed. I am moving that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. [A MEMBER: What for?] On the grounds that I would like to consider the Bill first. I would like to say that this bulldozing of legislation has got us to the point where a lot of amendments from the

Other Place have to be considered all the time. Even now Bills are on the Order Paper correcting mistakes in drafting; mistakes which have been pointed out in this very House. I am not very proud of all these amendments; and I think that in their own interest Government should have some kind of sense of scheme when they bring in things and it is patent that nobody should force them through or even introduce them in that form.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second the honourable member's motion. Like the honourable member I am not at all happy about this Resolution for more reasons than one. Although the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing has said that the Labour Party has initiated the idea of this disendowment of the Church, I would like them to refer to one or two things which took place on the matter before they got into power. Perhaps that is by itself. What worries me about this Resolution is that, as the honourable junior member for the City has put it, they are bringing down this Resolution before the Bill. That is the legal side of it; my point is the practical side of it. What is happening with this Cure? It has been vacant for nearly six months, no one will go to it. The House has been repaired, and a caretaker at the rate of £50 a year is being paid by the parish. Who gets the Glebe money no one knows; but the poor unfortunate parishioners are paying £50 a year for a watchman and care taker and they get no service beyond the service on Sundays. It is unfortunate for these people that nothing has been done; we are not told that somebody will be appointed to this Cure even temporarily so as to carry on the job. The parishioners are paying the expenses of the caretaker and some money must be coming in from the Glebe. We hear nothing whatever about these matters from the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Resolution; it does look to me as if he is not properly acquainted with the details, and I am trying to see if he knows anything about them. It appears to me that the money will be paid out to this Cure and after the service on Sundays the poor unfortunates will get nothing; we are paying money for a part time service. I would like to know if all these matters have been brought to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Cummunications before I gave him this information. That is why I am seconding the motion for the postponement until he has gone into matters more deeply.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can see the Resolution which we now have before us is not only a bit previous in its engaging of the attention of this House, but it is both inadequate and unsatisfactory. Now the position as far as I can understand it is this: in the cure of St. Simon in the parish of St. Andrew there has not been an acting appointment since 16th June 1954; the Resolution now before this House seeks to provide funds to pay a *locum tenens* for the period 16th December, 1954 to the 31st March, 1956. I wonder if members looked at this Resolution as closely as I have examined it before coming into this Chamber; it just does not make sense if there has been a vacancy since June 1954 which has not been filled. I fail to appreciate how we are going to pay any acting appointment from 16th December 1954 when he is not keeping the office, or he has not been keeping the office. Today in other words, we are going to pay a man for doing a job which he has not done. Is the Minister of Communications telling the House in this Addendum to the Resolution that there is somebody in the post? If he is already in the post then he is a *locum tenens* and therefore the repeal of Sub-section 11 of section 9 of the Anglican Church Act would be unnecessary. I do not understand why in Resolutions that are made in the way this one has been drawn up they should come before the House and insult the intelligence of members, and I have to look to the Minister of Communications for some further explanation to the Addendum which states, "in view of the proposal contained in the Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Bill to suspend sub-section 11 of Section 9 of the Act, this Resolution seeks to provide funds to pay a *locum tenens* for the period 16th December, 1954 to 31st March, 1956."

Mr. Chairman, the Addendum states that the Cure has been vacant since 16th June, 1954 and in accordance with the provisions of sub-section 15 of the Anglican Church Act, the salary paid in respect of the Cure lapsed in the Treasury on the expiration of six months after the Cure became vacant. Now is there a *locum tenens?* If there is a *locum tenens*, that *locum tenens* must have been appointed by the Board; appointed before the expiration of six months from the date on which the Cure became vacant, and therefore sub-section 11 of Section 9, Mr. Chairman, will not comply with the present situation. Without in any way dealing with matters which are not actively engaging the attention of the House, (since the same amending Act has been referred to both by the Minister of Communications and in the Addendum to the present Resolution) I would like to point out that the amending Act is entirely misleading; it states that whenever the office falls vacant the vacancy shall be filled by appointment by a Board comprising of the Bishop and certain other designative persons. Sub-section 11 of Section 9 states that where a vacancy remains unfilled for over six months, the vacancy is filled by the Governor-in-Executive Committee; that is not correct. Sub-section 11 of the Anglican Church Act makes no mention of responsibility ever passing from the Board to the Executive Committee or anyone else particularly; and that is why I say that this amending Act is completely unnecessary. Sub-section 11 states that if the Cure shall be vacant for a period exceeding six months without being filled the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall have power to nominate candidates and take all other necessary steps to fill the vacancy. In other words, Mr. Chairman, Sub-section 11 says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee has a right of designation. The Governor-in-Executive Committee shall have power to appoint; but not that they shall appoint in the mandatory sense of the word; therefore I would submit that it is partly a matter for the discretion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In the interest of the public and the community they have the feeling that the Anglican Church Board is dragging its feet or dallying or refusing to fill a vacancy. But nowhere does the Act pass the designation over to the Executive Committee to fill a vacancy. If they have power to do it and it gives the designation, then the Board will have power to nominate and take other steps to fill the vacancy; otherwise the alleged "other steps" may be a matter of the Church waiting and asking to appoint a person to this vacancy at the Church. Far from absolving the Governor-in-Executive Committee from the responsibility of committing themselves to pension commitments the present Resolution before the House places the Government in the position of committing itself to additional pensions. I do not know what are the motives and the whys and wherefores behind the present manoeuvre (not using it in the bad sense, Mr. Chairman) on the part of the persons most directly concerned. But I certainly must agree with the honourable junior member for the City that the

Resolution now before us may accomplish the opposite of what is really intended.
4.15 p.m.

If, therefore, the Hon. Minister says that there is no *locum tenens* and we want that to go on until 1956, all the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have to do if they approve of the action of the Anglican Church Board, is to do nothing about it because they are under no duty or obligation to do those things which the Anglican Church Board has left undone or to do those things which they ought to have done. I am going to deal with the amendment to the Anglican Church Act in due course when the House is called upon to deal with it; but at this moment I would like to advise the Hon. Minister of Communications that the Government should better sort its ideas out on this issue at point, because he is going to find out that this is the first of similar Resolutions to follow to provide money for vacancies which the Anglican Church Board does not have the desire to fill, and which due to the way in which the matter is handled, or mishandled may possibly cause further charges on the public purse of this island. In view of these misapprehensions which I feel are not of the subject matter but the way of how it is handled. I will join with those who favour that this matter should be postponed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, in this matter I do not agree with the Government nor with the honourable members who spoke on it. I do not agree with the postponement nor do I agree with dealing with it at this stage. I do not agree with dealing with a Resolution that seeks to provide that you are amending a Bill to give you authority when the same Bill to give you that authority is on the Order Paper. In short I do not agree with this procedure. If you are amending an Act so as to give you authority to provide this money, I see no reason why you should not proceed to amend that Act first

Hon. M. E. COX: If the honourable member will give way, I will accept the motion for the postponement in order to deal with the Bill first.

The question that the Resolution be postponed was put and agreed to.

Supplementary Estimates 1955—56, No. 2.
Head XXI—Science and Agriculture

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of $14,431. As you will see it is made up of Items under different Heads; what we call an Omnibus Resolution. I beg to move that Item No. 3,/$4,625, stand part of this Resolution under Head XXI—Science & Agriculture.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion. Hon. members will see that as the Addendum sets out, "The Fordson Major Tractor hitherto used at the Central Livestock Station and Pine Plantation, which is over eight years old and was bought second hand in 1950, has broken down beyond repair and has been condemned by a Standing Board of Survey. A replacement is urgently required for the transportation of canes and other purposes. Supplementary provision of $4,625 is accordingly required for the purchase of a new 45 h.p. Massey-Harris wheel tractor. This expenditure will be offset by revenue due to the Pine Plantation from the Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund."

I must apologise to honourable members for not being able to bring in this Resolution before the Estimates; I certainly feel that a Resolution like this coming so soon after the Estimates is nothing to be desired; but this is a question of an old tractor which was bought in 1950 and which has served the purchase for which it was bought and is now beyond the stage where it is serviceable.

Although this Committee is called on to vote this sum of $4,625 for this purpose, yet I want to say that this expenditure will be offset by revenue due to the Pine Plantation from the Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The sum of $2,676 has been received already and has been paid into the Treasury. The Pine Plantation had requested the Rehabilitation Board to earmark the sum of $3,080 for the replacement of this tractor and that Board approved of the expenditure of that amount for the purpose.
4.25 p.m.

In another few years this amount which we are asking for will be repaid by the Rehabilitation Board, but it is necessary at this stage to bring down a Resolution for the entire amount until all the money paid in by the Rehabilitiation Board has been paid into general revenue.

Hon. members will probably want to know how much is paid in by the Rehabilitation Board to the Pine Plantation out of General revenue. The average annual tonnage of canes sold by the Pine is between 3,500 and 4,000 tons and the Rehabilitation payment amounts to an average of between $350 and $360. I think that that is all the information which honourable members will need; this amount will be recoverable from the Rehabilitation Board.

Mr. LEWIS: I suppose that this tractor has cost a lot in repairs, otherwise the Government certainly did make a good purchase eight years ago. Of course you cannot go by these notes which the Government gives. It is clearly put down here that this tractor is over eight years old and it was bought second-hand by the Government in 1950, therefore, the Government has only had it for five years. If they get five years service out of this tractor for $1,000 I hope they will get twenty years service for this new one for $4,625. I would like to know when the Board of Survey met and condemned this tractor; was it used during the 1955 crop? If it was not used during the 1955 crop it would appear that the Board of Survey should have been held before it was held so that the Pine could have the tractor for use during the present crop year. I would like to know when the Survey Board was held; it is unfortunate that at the very end of the reaping season we should be asked to provide this tractor. Did they borrow one or is it really not necessary at all? I would like to know if they were deprived of the use of this tractor; otherwise the Board of Survey should have been held earlier.

Mr. ALLDER: It is a fact that a tractor is a very massive mechanism and there are plantations which had vehicles similar to the one which we are now speaking of, but which are older than this. I am wondering if it is necessary to discard this tractor at the Pine and purchase a new one; I am wondering if the Minister of Agriculture knows much about this matter, because if a part has broken down and becomes outworn a new part can be imported and attached to the existing tractor. That is what I see other plantations do; the life of a tractor is longer than eight years however hard it might have to work; and I am wondering if it has been recommended that a new tractor should be acquired because it is the Government. It should be guaranteed that this tractor is so bad that we must purchase a new one. Vehicles such as this one are made to undergo very hard work and they last for more than eight years This Board of Survey has reported that this tractor is in need of replacement, but sir, from what we know of tractors and ploughs and implements of that

sort especially the ones which are brought down to the colonies today, certainly the life of one of these implements is longer than eight years. If one of these tractors is not working as well as it is expected to work at the age of eight years, certainly the various parts which might be needed can be acquired and installed.

Mr. MILLER: I am familiar with the tractor at the Station even when it was bought second-hand, and I wonder what prevailed on the Department to decide to buy this tractor. I know that it has not seen any service at all this year for the Department; and at no time has it given any effective service to the Department. Why that second-hand tractor was bought I do not think the Minister can explain; however I think the department has been in a pretty good position since it has been working in conjunction with the Pine Breeding Station. I think that probably mere shame is the reason why this tractor is still at the Pine. It could have been thrown out years ago; the money used in the purchase was wasted. I am wondering why they have elected to buy this Massey-Harris wheel tractor when they could use a smaller machine for ploughing.

4.35 p.m.

I am going to support the Resolution. I certainly do not agree with the idea that you should have a light tractor. I understand at the moment and I believe, Sir, that if you decide to buy a heavier type like the D2 or if you wish to buy the Caterpillar and you are satisfied, you should take care of the other as well rather than find yourself in exactly the same position. I do not know, sir, it has been rather awkward. why should you buy an unfortunate unit? However, I am first asking the Minister to make a note. I am prepared to support it, but I am concerned as to whether or not the Department should decide on a 44 h.p. Massey-Harris. Government should buy a type of Unit that could serve a dual purpose.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this is recommended as follows: at present this vehicle is unfit for use and will require immediate overhaul. The parts of this unit have been examined and it is expected that the unit will expire particularly in the face of its age. It is recommended that it be disposed of before further depreciation takes place. This unit was purchased second hand from Frere Pilgrim and it has since been operated by the Department of Agriculture. It was recommended that they should dispense with this tractor and purchase a new tractor. This time it would be paid for entirely out of the funds which we are receiving from the Rehabilitation Board. It was felt that sufficient provision had been made in the Item No. 102 of the Estimates; but this has been held to be the wrong procedure in spending money. So it is for this reason particularly that we are now coming to the House with this Resolution; we could not spend money which was put down for contingencies on Capital expenditure.

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

Head XXIII (2) General Hospital

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman,—in moving that Item No. 17a of Head XXIII (2) $5,280 stand part, you will note that it has been drawn to the attention of the Government that for sometime there has been the necessity for an anaesthetist. It is true, that at present there is no anaesthetist-specialist at the Hospital; but it is hoped that in the very near future one will turn up. It has been pointed out by the Medical Superintendent that there is a necessity for having, (even when that post is filled), an additional anaesthetist; and on that recommendation the Government have decided to come to the House for the sum of $5,280 to pay for the services of a part-time anaesthetist as required in the Supplementary Note. The Note also points out that the officer will be paid at ordinary rates. I beg to move, sir, that Head 23 (2) stand part of this Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things which I should like to point out. I appreciate the Minister of Communications difficulty today; he is now in charge of this Resolution that properly concerns the Minister of Social Services. But time and time again, I find that they come here and insult the intelligence of members of this House. In the first place: Item 17a Head XXIII (2), a Visiting Anaesthetist. Now, is that correct? Does that mean that you are going to wheel around an oxygen bottle all over the country parishes? I understand that they say that the work which they have at the General Hospital now is too much for one man, and therefore they want a man to come in at $480 a month to do the work of the anaesthetist. If you work it out, $5,280 is $480 a month. In the first place the Minister of Communications has admitted that there is not an anaesthetist at the General Hospital. I do not see how you can calculate that there is no one performing the duties of the anaesthetist. It is in accordance with the high standard required that the work of the Hospital will expand rather than contract; at any rate, in the foreseeable future. If the Government is satisfied that the work of the Hospital is too much for one anaesthetist to perform, I suggest if you are going to pay a part-time officer, that you appoint another man, even if you have to pay him a salary of six or seven hundred dollars a month. But I am sure that this House would be satisfied, and that you would be having a qualified man; because there is no guarantee that the part-time officer will necessarily be a qualified man.

This work will be fanned out amongst a lot of amateur doctors, (I do not mean that as doctors they are amateurs; but amateurs in the field of anaesthetics) who would be getting experience at the expense of the Government. I say this without fear of contradiction; before a doctor can achieve a diploma in anaesthetics, he has to perform not less than twelve hundred operations. [VOICES: What?] Well over a thousand! And we know that there is not a doctor in Barbados who has got it.

4.45 p.m.

Sir, when we vote $480 a month for a part-time anaesthetist what you are going to find out is that this work which is now performed by a favoured few, those persons will in a couple of years' time tell the Government that they have performed that work and they want a course to take out a diploma on it. What you find is that they are now experimenting in this study at the expense of the patients.

I suggest that the Government take what is done at the Hospital seriously; it would be better to have two full-time qualified anaesthetists at the Hospital because this is a highly qualified job and not one in which you should have a 'G.P.' or a jack-of-all-trades. At present we do not have an anaesthetist at the General Hospital. Let me ask how do you know that that work is too much now? Let us get two full-time anaesthetists and let us add a little more to the salary; the work will thus be

reduced. Apparently, it is not enough work to have two full-time men; but it is better to have two than to have one and then an odd-bob walking in assisting with operations, you may find that this is the kind of circumstances in which you may have two and three doctors at an operation. They have to go there anyhow, and while one is manipulating the valve to the oxygen or watching the metres he will claim fees of the part-time anaesthetist. It may be one of the resident surgeons who may be assisting in the operating theatre. All that we are seeking to do under these conditions is to pay additional emoluments to unqualified people for doing something which they are already doing as part of their normal duties. Sir, if we want an anaesthetist let us have an additional one, but let him be qualified and let us pay him a proper salary.

Sir, I would like to return to what I originally said. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Communications whether the visiting anaesthetic service means an ambulatory service going all over the country administering to all and sundry (even doctors in private offices) and in all the by-ways and hedges. If that is not so I suggest that the Hon. Minister strike out visiting anaesthetic service, because it is not a visiting anaesthetic service; it is a part-time service. This Resolution is for the sum of $5,280 for part-time anaesthetic charges; I know well enough why the Government has refrained from calling it a part-time anaesthetic service because that would become law and they will have to appoint an anaesthetist and that is what they do not want to do.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not know whether I said this, but it is Government's intention to engage the services of Dr. Skinner who has been doing this job for over two years. Let me say that it is not easy as the honourable member said to get someone qualified. I am convinced even if we paid the salary which the honourable member suggested that we still would not be able to recruit these officers. Sir, when you upgrade the salaries in a particular branch of the Service you will find that you will have to increase the salaries of all the other branches; and that is one of the reasons why Government has decided to keep the salaries at the present level and to try and get a part-time doctor to carry on the service. [A VOICE: That is a wrong principle.] An honourable member says that is a wrong principle; time will prove whether it is wrong or right. Let me say again that Dr. Skinner has been doing the work for all the years and has been paid at hourly rates; and calculating the hours he has put in throughout the years, the amount which is paid him per hour squares with the amount to be voted in this Resolution. I have already pointed out that there is someone appointed to fill the post of anaesthetist but the individual has not yet arrived in the island.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Anyone in our position can appreciate the difficulty with which we are faced as regards this matter. I do regret that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is not in his place to deal with this matter. One of the difficulties under our constitutional development is that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is still a practising doctor and he knows that this is one of those convenient arrangements which are made that have no basis or principle attached to it. I am going to ask the Minister in charge of this Resolution to take what I say seriously.

Now, you have said that as regards this post of anaesthetist, you are trying to get someone to fill it. You are now giving a doctor a specialist's salary to do this work. A specialist is employed at the rate of $4,800 rising by annual increments to $6,240. You have put this doctor into a grade which is the specialist's grade; therefore you have accepted the principle that you want an anaesthetist specialist, whether the post is part-time or not.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sorry, I did not say that. This salary is at the rate of $5,280 per annum.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: What I was saying is that a specialist salary is at the rate of $4,800 rising by increments to $6,240; that is the range of a Specialist's salary. What I am suggesting is that if you appoint an anaesthetist specialist, his beginning salary would be $4,800 per annum, therefore there can be no question as to whether or not you are paying out what would be the equivalent of your employing an anaesthetist specialist.

"As a result of the increased number of patients there is now more work than one anaesthetist can cope with and it will be necessary to employ the service of an additional anaesthtist on a part time basis in the administration of anaesthetics;" that is what is stated in the Note; let us admit that we do not need the Medical Superintendent to tell us that. With an increased population there will be a greater demand on the social services because more people will have to use these services, if more people are living on this planet. If you are facing that problem, what is the use of adopting a patch-work method in approaching a problem which you see will continue? You are extending the Hospital and spending a lot of money, and what is the point of saying that you will carry on a part-time system which eats out as much money as the system of employing anaesthetists? If you want two anaesthetists then say so; you have to work a system to suit the system which you have, and you are working on an hourly basis because the individual will only accept this job on an hourly basis. You are not telling the public what are the rates per hour or the number of years you can have this officer at the Hospital. The Hospital has been built for the patients not for the doctors, and that matter must be faced. There is too much in the idea that these people are rendering a service to mankind when they are not any part of mankind at all. Mr. Chairman, if you do not have sick people you do not want any doctors; and if you do not have dead people you do not want any undertakers. [*Laughter*].

I do not know who is Dr. Skinner. You have done other foolishness at Government House which you will hear about. You are now paying this $5,280 and the Hon. Minister has not said what are the rates per hour which they intend to pay. The Hon. Minister must tell me the rates per hour which they are paying this Anaesthetist, the conditions of employment, and how many hours he must put in per day. Is this officer only there when it suits him to attend to the business of the Hospital? Honourable members will find that in respect of the Medical Department, the salaries have been more tampered with than those in respect of any other Department in this colony. On the Order Paper there is another Resolution in which the Government is entering an Agreement with somebody else. You are paying this $5,280 to a part-time man and that is the same thing that you are paying a permanent man; you are asking the Secretary of State for the Colonies to bring down a man who will say that you are paying another man a salary who is working on a part-time basis and this part-time man will be getting a higher salary than what he is going to get. I ask the Hon. Minister if he does not see that with all these things

they will be forced to increase salaries whether there is oil or not, whether there is a War or not.

When you object to these things you get this stupid propaganda that you are preventing people at the Hospital from getting the services of a doctor; but you cannot carry on things like this. If you want two anaesthetists, then say so. There is too much in the idea of the Administration finding out from Mr. So-and-So what he will work for first and then coming down and making provision for that. That happened at Government House too; you are making arrangements outside and then asking the public to pay for these private arrangements which the Legislature and the Ministers themselves do not know anything about. You will be told that you are not working for progress when things are dealt with on a level about which you do not know. If this man dies tomorrow the Government will say that this is not the best arrangement; but we now find that it is necessary to increase the staff to two anaesthetists.

If the services are so small that you do not need a permanent man then you cannot claim that you want a part-time man to perform the duties of a permanent man if it will cost you the same amount If Dr. Skinner takes this job you will still have to get somebody else to do the work because it will be claimed that the work is not being done. I will tell the Hon. Minister this: I must draw to his attention the error of this basis; the position here is like a tree which is not getting sustenance from all its roots. That is because four or five men will think that God has blessed them with everything in the world and not anybody else. This position here is as a result of that. How can we ask for a part-time salary which is nearly as much as a permanent salary and which is not part-time anymore. 5.05 p.m.

To my mind, if you want another man, have another man. I am just drawing this to your attention: if the Minister of Social Services were here now, he would read a lot of stuff from medical journals; but as the honourable senior member for St. George was saying, you do not want the patients to suffer; because you realise that the Hospital is not there for poor people; it is there for paying people. I want to draw that to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Communications. Do not regard this as any grand scheme; do not regard it as a logical scheme. I will support this partly on the basis of finance. You have a man already. If Dr. Skinner is doing this job, then you must have money to pay him. You said you have enough work for another man; therefore appoint another man.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if the honourable member got the wrong impression.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the job is a fulltime one. It is dishonesty.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I must object to those rude remarks. What is there of dishonesty in that? You cannot speak like that. Sir, as I said before, this gentleman will be paid at hourly rates. If he puts in an hour, he will be paid for an hour, if he puts in ten hours, he will be paid for ten hours. The hours are from 8 a.m., to 8 p.m. The first hour is fifteen dollars, the other hours five dollars per hour; and after 8 p.m. the first hour is twenty dollars and the other hours five dollars. Those are the rates that have been paid. We have been paying ten dollars an hour and then five dollars for all succeeding hours from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. But recently there has been a request for a slight variation or change; and this has now been increased to fifteen dollars and then twenty dollars for the first hour after eight o'clock. After that, each succeeding hour is five dollars per hour. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has been a member of the Government for years, and he knows how difficult it is at times to get people recruited here; not only in the medical profession but in other Government Departments. He knows that on many occasions you have got to agree to some make-shift system which we ourselves do not highly favour. It is for that reason that I am appealing to him; he knows how difficult it is to keep the machinery of government going especially when you are faced with the appointment of certain officers in the Government Departments. I pointed out that the office was vacant for over two years and that this gentleman was performing the services for the two past years; we could not get anybody to do the job.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister of Communications whether the salaries were not revised, (the present Scale is now $4,800 to $ 6,240,) and whether they have not got a man with that salary scale now; and whether a qualified anaesthetist is not due to come down somewhere between that scale. The present Resolution is asking us to pay a part-time man. I do not know whether he is qualified or not; I should like to make sure about that; but the present Resolution is asking us to pay a part-time man $80 a month less than the maximum salary of the qualified anaesthetist. The Minister himself said that the present Resolution is not something in mid-air; it is a token in the sense that it may be more.

Hon. M. E. COX: I never said that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if he thinks he in on the Pond Side. There must be some order in this august Assembly. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can carry on without these unnecessary interruptions.

The Minister of Communications said that it is a token amount; and once it is a token amount you are permitted to pay more, if necessary.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I never said that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, he said it was a token amount. It is down in the Debates here: he said it here within the last ten minutes. He went further. He said that this man has had what he calls a small increase, and that is based on what they have been paying a part-time man during the past few years; therefore, it is likely that the whole of this vote will be swallowed up within the next eleven months and possibly before. It is not based on speculation, but upon actual figures and on the number of hours which the part time officer has been working in this capacity in the Barbados General Hospital.

Well, the Minister of Communications, I really pity him today; he is more out of his depth than he is usually because he is dealing with this portfolio which properly is not his. But if his assumptions are correct that the volume of work which the part-time man had has increased, and that the proposed rate is higher than the new scale which you have laid down for the qualified anaesthetist, then he must give us these figures. But this salary is based on what the part-time man has been doing during the past two years. We do not owe him anything as far as I know. As the honourable junior member for St. Peter has pointed out, you must have two anaesthetists; or you only need but one anaesthetist and not a part-time man. But what I want the Minister of Communications to consider is this: you cannot consider paying Dr. Skinner this particular

sum in recognition of past services; because if you did, it would in truth and in fact amount to a pension of four hundred dollars a month because he held on during the rough years. I am sure that if he were willing to take the job the Government would have given it to him at whatever salary he was willing to stipulate. But in this case you are now getting a qualified anaesthetist for the first time; and you are now paying the part-time man almost the maximum rate at which the full-time anaesthetist is going to be paid.

If the Hon. Minister of Communications has not the time to consider the proposition which I have just put forward to him, so that the Hon. Minister of Social Services should become acquainted with the feelings of the House on this matter, I am prepared to move that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed. I think in all fairness to the officers who occupy the posts, the public of Barbados and the Minister of Social Services, a better explanation should be forthcoming than the one which has been provided in this Resolution.

5.15 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: The one thing which I should say is that the honourable senior member for St. George has either inadvertently or wilfully neglected to give the House the whole truth of the anaesthetist at the General Hospital.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want the honourable member to withdraw the remarks he made about my untruthfulness. The person who is to provide that information is not a backbencher; he should be a member of the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member failed to tell the House that the Specialist at the Hospital draws fees. The Specialist gets half of the fees charged at the Hospital in addition to the $6,240 and other perquisites. He, therefore, may draw $12,000 a year. All that the honourable member is saying is that the Specialist gets $6,240 per annum; that is not all that he gets.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister made remarks about my untruthfulness or my neglect, or words to that effect. I cannot remember the precise phraseology which he used but I am asking him to withdraw those remarks. The information which I gave about salary is in the Estimates. If they conceal profits elsewhere I am not a Sherlock Holmes to know that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear the words. Let me hear the words which the Hon. Minister used in reference to you.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister used words to the effect that I was not truthful about the Surgeon Specialist at the General Hospital. He probably meant the anaesthetist. I am asking him to withdraw those words which he made and about my withholding information because I am not here to give information.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that the honourable senior member for St. George either inadvertently or wilfully failed to tell the House the true position of the anaesthetist at the General Hospital as regards the salary perquisites. What is wrong with that statement?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister has said that he has not used the remarks of which the honourable senior member for St. George complained.

Mr. BARROW: He has admitted it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, I can only ask the Reporter to read what he said. If any honourable member heard those remarks let him say so. I would like to hear another honourable member on those remarks.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister has just said that I inadvertently or wilfully withheld the true position; I am asking him to withdraw those remarks; that is all I am asking. In other words, he meant to say that I inadvertently or wilfully omitted to tell the House the truth about the anaesthetist at the General Hospital.

Hon. M. E. COX: You can only withdraw remarks which are offensive. I said that the honourable senior member for St. George either inadvertently of wilfully failed to tell the House the true position of the anaesthetist at the General Hospital in respect of the salary and perquisite I have never heard anything more stupid than that which the honourable member is saying.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am asking you finally to ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw those remarks about my inadvertently or wilfully withholding the true position of the anaesthetist at the General Hospital.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you in a position to judge?

Mr. BARROW: I am asking you to ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw those remarks and let us get on with the debate. Let him withdraw what he himself admits that he said. I accept what he said finally and I am asking him to withdraw that. If Your Honour does not feel constrained to ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw those remarks, then I will ask that the words be taken down and send for His Honour the Speaker.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, you said that you would like to hear some honourable member on those remarks as you did not hear them. The true fact is that the Hon. Minister of Communications did say that the honourable senior member for St. George either inadvertently or wilfully withheld the information about the Specialist at the General Hospital. The honourable junior member for St. Peter dealt more within the proximity of the salaries of these specialist than the honourable senior member for St. Gorge, and he was not told that by the Hon Minister of Communications. To say that the honourable senior member for St. George withheld information for the purpose of misleading the House is certainly not right. The Hon. Minister is certainly directing those remarks to the wrong member

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, you say that you have not heard the particular remarks, nor has any honourable member said anything to put you in a position different from where you were before. The honourable junior member for the City should not use those remarks about me, because the information which I gave is in the Estimates. So far as what has been said with respect to the withdrawal of those remarks, I think we have come to the stage where each side has ventilated its point of view; therefore I would suggest that we get on with the Business with which we are dealing.

Mr. LEWIS: I cannot allow the honourable member to get away with that joke. Whether you heard or not is not the point. I got up and explained what I heard in order to assist you, Mr. Chairman. It is not a matter as to whether you have heard the remarks or not. I was speaking on the merits of the case.

5.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I withdraw, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is———

Mr. LEWIS: The matter cannot be finished like that. Are you putting the question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: Well I desire to make some further remarks on this matter.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking whether you are inviting him———

Mr.CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has withdrawn the remarks.

Mr. BARROW: You must say that.

Mr. LEWIS: I want to ask two simple questions and they are these: how did Government come to the conclusion that more than one anaesthetist is necessary at the Hospital? There must have been some performance by which you were able to come to that conclusion . The next thing is this: if the particular doctor has been helping you out for two years, from what vote has he been paid? Is this another manipulation of the Estimates? Those are just two simple questions; I want them to prove their genius today by answering these questions; and I am not allowing the matter to pass until the questions have been answered. Have they tried out two anaestehtists at the Hospital? I want to know from what vote this particular doctor who has been good enough to help them out has been paid. You have someone who is not a specialist and you persist in having a specialist; have you killed anybody? How many people have died as the result of the specialist? Let us have a few of these facts.

I am going to make this remark: the Minister of Communications seems to be getting very mad when certain things are put to him. [Hon. M. E. Cox: Mad?] Yes. He gets up and says he did not say this or he did not say that. If you are providing for a rate how can you say you will not exceed the vote? You come for a travelling allowance at 10c. a mile and you come back and say you want more money to pay out because there has been some excessive travelling; can you regulate the number of people who will need the services of this officer Do you think that if the services are increasing you will not come back for more money? We are providing for a rate not for a stated salary, and it can be too much. I want the third question answered; that is that if during the past two years there has been more than one doctor administering the anaesthetics at the Hospital. If the Hon. Minister cannot answer these simple questions he has no right with this Resolution at all.

Mr. MILLER: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. That will give the Minister a chance to answer the questions and we can adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that motion and I invite the Minister to answer the questions which have been asked on behalf of the taxpayers of this colony; not on my behalf. These are simple questions arising out of the particular matter. The Minister's brain ceases to function the moment he has his salary in his hand! I say that any Minister who is worth his salt would answer these questions; not only that, he would have got the breakdown and give us the whole truth about the matter.

5.35 p.m.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Chairman left the Chair and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

5.40 p.m.

On re-assembling:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY—Cont'd

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply relative to a Resolution for the sum of $14,431.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for the City asked from what vote the anaesthetist is being paid. This officer is being paid from Item No. 5, Anaesthetist Specialist. That post as I have already pointed out has not been filled for over two years.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to reply to that yet. What I would like to know is how many doctors have been drawing that money.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is a difficult question. I will try to get the information for the hon. member; but what I do want to assure him is that it is not as easy job to recruit a Specialist. Not long ago I had a talk with the Medical Superintendent and he says it is very difficult to get someone other than Dr. Skinner to do this work. As a matter of fact, I have been informed that he knows and does this job well.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am willing to be lenient with the Minister of Communications because this is not his portfolio; but his attitude is not in keeping with that leniency given him, at least by me. Now, I know that it is not his fault sir, but as a member of the Government can the hon. member feel comfortable where you have a post of Anaesthetist Specialist in your Estimates, and the authorities can undertake to pay somebody who is not a Specialist but a part-time officer out of that vote; the only person you can pay from that vote is the person appointed to that post. There are too many instances in which this has happened. I know what the situation is. They feel that it is better to have two doctors to give anaesthetics rather than to have one doing it all alone. They do not give anaesthetics at the Barbados General Hospital only; it is given outside as well, and they have to get a qualified medical man but not a qualified anaesthetist. It is very disconcerting to think that all this time we have been taking money from a particular vote and paying it out to people not appointed to the post, without letting the House know. The House could have been told that this officer had been acting and that you would need a vote put in the Estimates separately, so as to provide not for a part-time person, but at a special rate so that any doctor who felt disposed and is as capable as you can get, would come and assist you; I think that that is the situation. Perhaps we do not need a Specialist for this job. As a matter of fact, I believe that most Departments have a special Head from which they pay acting appointments; I cannot remember exactly.

If this Specialist was appointed and the time came around for his holiday, there is a vote to pay for someone to act for him; this acting allowance does not come out of his salary. I would counsel the hon. member outside of this information, that owing to the present state of things at the General Hospital: do not allow any tampering with funds up there; do

not allow people to tamper with items on Pay Sheets that are not true; because you will find yourself in a very difficult position; the hon. junior member for St. Thomas will have to account to this House for this money.

When the House is in Committee and a member is doing business that is not directly his, it is no use getting up in here and giving us the impression that you can take charge of any portfolio in the world and treat members in a way which they do not regard to be right and proper. I shall like to make it plain that this is not the right way in which these people make up the Addendum which these Ministers bring in here.

Do you remember that a Resolution was introduced sometime back for $14,000? Now, we are asked to appoint two or three; that is what you are saying. That means that you want somebody to help until the regular man comes.

6 15 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I did not join in the debate earlier because I wanted to hear what other hon. members said about it. What I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister in charge is, how long has the post of anaesthetist been vacant? What efforts are being made to fill the post? It is that the salary is not attractive enough that you cannot get anybody to fill it? I say that because it is difficult to see why the explanatory Note should read as it is, that is, that it is beyond the ability of one person to do the work at the Hospital when the Government has not got an appointment for the post.

I would also ask if the Hon. Minister in charge has anything in his files with respect to it and how many posts other than that of the anaesthetist are vacant at the Hospital. I understand that they are yet to appoint an Assistant Visiting Surgeon. There are one or two vacant posts there. There are a few young doctors around; is it that not one of them is qualified to fill those jobs? I understand that they are qualified. I know that those jobs are held for local persons and if that is so, let us know now at this stage if there are any posts at the Hosknow who is holding up these appointments. That is the crux of the whole matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I do not have those replies to hand; I will promise the hon. member to get the information and pass it on to him as early as possible.

Mr. LEWIS: I have a point which I would like to get absolutely clear. The way the explanatory Note to this matter is worded, it might mean that Dr. Skinner will continue to draw money voted for this specialist and this money will be paid to anybody besides him.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not so, sir. We are expecting the anaesthetist in the very near future and this money is to pay the part-time Assistant.

The question that Head XXIII—stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. M. E. COX: With your permission, I should like to withdraw Item 101, (New) Electrical Equipment for which the sum of $2,146 is to be voted. The necessity for this no longer exists.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Hon. Minister must be asking that Head XXIII be recommitted. I understood Your Honour to say that the question is that Head XXIII stand part and it was agreed to. If the Hon. Minister is withdrawing Item 101 from that Head, he will first have to ask that the Head be recommitted. It will have to be recommitted and honourable members would be entitled to debate the whole Head again. On my part I feel that I would be entitled to discuss any part of Head XXIII.

Head XXVI — Pensions

Head XXVI—Pensions was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the Item under this Head is for the purpose of giving an *ex gratia* grant to Mr. Donald Lacey; the sum is $413. As the Note to it reads, Donald Lacey was an employee of the Highways & Transport Department for nine years from January 1946 to January 1955. He elected to remain under the provisions of the Pension Act, 1925—2, but was forced to retire on grounds of ill-health before completing ten years' service. He does not therefore qualify for the grant of a gratuity or a pension under the Pension's Act, 1925. If he had been subjected however to the provisions of the Pension's Act 1947—20, he would have been eligible for a gratuity of $412.50 in respect of his nine years' service.

This Resolution Mr. Chairman, seeks to provide a gratuity for this gentleman though he did not come under the 1947 Pension Act. Inasmuch as there are previous cases which have been considered in similar light and those persons have been given a grant, the Government feels that case has been made out in this respect on behalf of Mr. Lacey.

I beg to move that the sum of $413 be voted under Head XXVI—Pensions.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr Chairman, I am readily supporting this vote but I want to throw something out to Government: there is the tendency of making flesh of one and stone of another. I want to warn the Government that there are other cases which should be treated in similar manner but which are side-stepped. There are cases which have been brought to my notice and which have been brought to Government's notice; but because those cases did not come under the Pension Act of 1947 and because they did not put in the ten years service under the Pension Act, 1925, they have not been brought down here. I have raised the question inside here already with respect to a woman who worked at the Agricultural Station. There are other people who worked at the Highways & Transport Department who are in the same position.

I have raised the question of the women who worked at the Agricultural Station, and about people who worked at the Department of Highways and Transport. People like members of the Government should not allow it to be said that they take sides with employees of a certain political leaning. I know of what I speak; I know that there are cases in which they have refused to bring down the necessary provision here. I am supporting this matter but I ask them to take stock.

6.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: The remarks which have been made by the honourable senior member for th City are fairly strong. I invite him to let us know of any case or cases similar to this which the Government has refused to give a grant.

Mr. E. D.MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister is inviting me to tell the Government something which they know well. I make bold statements, I do not make any apologies in here. But the Minister is adopting the attitude of the Premier; that is, put it in writing or bring somebody to his office. I have not accused the honourable member of anything; I say I have raised the question about people having done everything to prevent representation from being made to get matters dealt with. The Parochial

Board had to support somebody who was sent to the Almshouse to die, and you did not hear anything about any gratuity. You cannot make flesh of one and stone of the other; and do not let the Minister say: "I invite you to do anything" What is he inviting somebody to do?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not challenging any thing which has been said by the last speaker, but in so far as this man is concerned, I want to assure honourable members that he has not been selected for any special treatment; far from it. This man has worked on the highways of this country for over thirty years and it is rather unfortunate that owing to the conditions of his employment during the major portion of that time, he is only entitled to a gratuity in respect of nine years' service. While I am not suggesting that there are not cases in which people are given special treatment, I am sure that this is not one of those cases. On the contrary it is a matter of regret that so much of this man's service will go unrewarded.

Mr. LEWIS: On the last occasion when a matter of this sort came up you were interested, Mr. Chairman, in enquiring as to how the gratuity and pension were arrived at. I have since heard that they were arrived at on the basis of the Parochial rate rather than the Government's rate. I know the honourable member was reasonably sure that that was not so; I would just like to tell him that that is what I have heard since.

The question that Head 26 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head XXIX — Miscellaneous Services

Head XXIX — Miscellaneous Services was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the motion, I would like to point out that in so far as this $47 in respect of the Lord Mayor's Show is concerned, this amount has been brought down because of an under-estimate by the Trade Commissioner in London. He first sent down the figures of $2,400 of which we paid 12.9%. We have already voted that sum; the actual expenditure amounted to $2,767.32, which would increase our share by $47. This balance is to complete our share of the total expenses incurred in participating in this Show; and I do not think that there will be any difficulty in our accepting that.

With regard to item 62, "British Industries Fair," most of the West Indian Territories are participating in this Fair this year; there is only one Territory which is not taking part in it, but all the others are doing so. We have agreed to take part in this Fair on the basis of the advertisement which would come to this island both on account of tourism and of the investment abroad which we would offer, so as to induce investors to invest in Barbados. The total cost to the Government is $19,022.40 In previous years each territory had its own little stand; this year there is one complete stand for all the colonies and the contributions are apportioned on the basis of the R.E.C. Our share of the cost is $1,920 and this is the amount which the Committee is being asked to vote.

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

6.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution which is for the sum of $14,431 be now passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move that Head XXIII be recommitted for this reason: after the passing of this Resolution was undertaken in this Committee, the Hon. Minister of Communications got up and indicated to members of the House that the sum of $2,146 was no longer needed, but I do not think that it is fair to the taxpayers of this country that we should be asked to vote the sum which is no longer required.

The Minister of Communications is afraid to put back this Item because of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; I heard him with my own ears to say this. I do not think that we should try to stifle the debate at the expense of the taxpayers to the extent of $2,146; therefore if what the Minister of Communications has said just now is true that they do not any longer need Item 101, then I suggest that the Head be recommitted and the Item taken out of the vote. You and I have a class to which we have the joyful privilege of belonging; and it is our duty to see that their rights are preserved, therefore. I am arguing that the Head be recommitted.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Head XXIII be recommitted. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" hon. members against will please say "No" I think the "Ayes" have it.

The question that Head XXIII be recommitted was put and resolved on a division as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. CRAWFORD—8.

Noes: Mr. SPEAKER, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. MILLER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN—7.

Electrical Equipment

General Hospital

Mr. BARROW: I should like to ask the Minister of Communications whether he did not state in this House today that the Government no longer need Item 101, $2,146. At that juncture I got up and pointed out to him that he could not get up and stampede this House like that. I did not accuse him of anything illegal on his part at this stage. Time after time we have expressed our grave concern in this House over votes which have been passed for a particular purpose having been appropriated by Government to Items for other purposes, I do not want to go into the sad and dismal history of a particular vote. One particular vote was $80,000 for undertaking to remove dangerous corners on highways.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant.

Mr. BARROW: When the Minister said under Item No. 5 under Medical Services that the present acting Anaesthetist at the Hospital was paid out of a vote for an Anaesthetic Specialist, I pointed out that that was a gross mis-appropriation of public funds. It is a cardinal principle of Constitutional Law that once the Assembly voted money for a particular purpose, that money should be spent for that purpose and that purpose alone. I must express my grave concern as regards our dissatisfaction after this has already been brought home to the Minister's mind. It has been pointed out time and again that it not only illegal but immoral to spend money in a way like that. I am very surprised that they should still continue to indulge in wrong doing.

The Government does not need this $2,146 for electrical equipment if you read the Electric

Board Act. You will see that the Electric Company of the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation is not doing their duty in supplying current to the consumer at a certain voltage; and if they fail to do that they are guilty of a breach of statute apart from the breach of contract; but the Government is being instructed to buy a transformer in order to enable the Electric Company to do what they should have been doing all the time. Unless a Corporation in supplying a service of that description can guarantee that electrical equipment will not be burnt out by fluctuatings in voltage, or that important institutions like the General Hospital cannot suffer for want of equipment, they are guilty of a breach of contract. I was glad to hear the Minister of Communications say that the Government no longer needed this money unless the situation has changed drastically within the last fifteen minutes. I am inviting him to get up and ask to have this vote taken out.

Do not ask for money which you do not want.

6.45 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is what I exactly did in the first place. I asked for leave to withdraw Item 101 and the honourable member objected.

Mr. BARROW: I rise on a point of Order, Sir. What I pointed out to you was that we could not give him leave at that stage because the Head was passed already. I said he would have to recommit it if he wanted that Item to be taken out; I did not object to his taking it out.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You could have avoided debate on it if you had given us a little information. You put something in the Resolution with respect to it and you have an explanatory Note to it which draws to our attention some very startling conditions, and which would cause one to be very interested in the electrical power at the General Hospital and other things pertaining to it. One will never think that the Government has anything to hide relative to the conditions at the Electric Company. Will the Hon. Minister give the reason why they do not want this money now? He gave the reason why they wanted it in this Resolution. I take it that the reason why they do not want it now is above board. If this reason is above board, state it.

There is one point which the honourable senior member for St. George said was correct; and that is with respect to voltage. Surely if the reasons why you wanted this money no longer exist or are no longer correct, the Hon. Minister should say something about it.

Hon. M. E. COX: All I have to say about it is that the necessity does not exist any longer and I am authorised to withdraw it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, you came in here and asked for $3,146 for Electrical Equipment and you stated that in October, 1954 the United Kingdom engineer who installed the new Watson Diagnostic X-Ray Unit at the General Hospital drew attention to the excessive voltage drop at the input terminals of the Unit, which necessarily limited the output to approximately half the maximum possible, thus depriving the X-Ray Department of the advantage of its high-powered Unit. That is what the Government said and that is serious statement to make; it is here in black and white. It is not good enough for the Hon. Minister to say now that the necessity no longer exists and that he is authorised to withdraw it. I do not know why the Hon. Minister should adopt that attitude. After making that strong statement, he is saying that he has been instructed to withdraw it as the necessity for it no longer exists. I know that he knows something about this matter. If he did not know, he would ask; it is not like him not to ask. I therefore want to ask him again why are they withdrawing it.

The Note to the Item goes on to say:—"Consultations were held between the United Kingdom Engineer, the Government Electrical Engineer, the Director of Medical Services, the Hospital Authorities concerned and the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation. It was agreed that this adverse condition would be corrected by extending a high-tension overhead cable on existing poles to a point near the X-Ray room and by placing a 30 K.V.A. Transformer on a pole from which the low-tension cables would be brought into the X-Ray room to supply the single phase 200/300 volts necessary for the proper operation of the Unit with the minimum voltage drop."

The Hon. Minister comes into this House today and withdraws the Item and says "I have nothing more to tell you." Does the Hon. Minister realise that because he came in here for money for a particular thing and because he has the right to withdraw it, that surely it is not of sufficient importance that he should give some further explanation on it? You are telling this House that the Engineer told you something was going wrong with the X-Ray equipment at the Hospital as a result of which people were getting cooked and you could not take proper X-Ray pictures; and now you do not need the money for the purpose, you are not giving any explanation as to why you do not now need it. It seems as if power has gone to the heads of the Ministers and they are getting drunk with it. If they were not getting drunk with it, they would come in with a reasonable reply. They would probably say that the trouble has been rectified and that it was the duty of the Electric Company to do it; or, they would say that they have installed a better motor.

The honourable junior member for St. George would bear me out when I say that if you are not getting the voltage required for the proper performance of an electrical unit, that you will burn it out. The honourable member runs an Ice Factory and he will tell you that if he cannot get the amount of power necessary to run his electrical equipment there, that the low voltage would damage his unit.

Do not tell me that the Hon. Minister in charge did not ask anything about it. After telling us of the conditions which prevailed at the General Hospital with the X-Ray Department he has asked leave to withdraw the Item from the Resolution; and all that he is saying in respect of that is that it is no longer necessary. Do tell us why. Either he was wrong or they have decided on the advice of the Attorney General that what the honourable senior member for St. George is saying is correct. Do you think that all the people in here are fools? Under the Act we do not have to spend one red farthing to put this right. It is the duty of the Electric Company to put it right. The Hon. Minister should tell us that this vote was wrong.

I say this: if the Minister merely explained that to us——

6.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to hon. members in front of me to keep quiet because the Reporter cannot hear what the member is saying.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This is what is stated in the Note:—

Consultations were held between the United Kingdom Engineer, the Government Electrical Engineer, the Director of Medical Services, the Hospital Authorities concerned and the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation. It was agreed that this adverse condition would be corrected by extending

a high tension overhead cable on existing poles to a point near the X-ray room and by placing a 30 K.V.A. Transformer on a pole from which the low tension cables would be brought into the X-RAY room to supply the single phase 200/230 volts necessary for the proper operation of the Unit with the minimum voltage drop.

The sum of $2,146.00 is required to meet the costs as follows:—

(a) materials — transformer, cables dividing boxes and catenary etc.	$1,637.00
(b) Labour for installation — approximately	509.00
	$2,146.00

What I am saying is that I am bound to agree with the hon. senior member for St. George; what is happening is that the Government is not responsible for one farthing of this money. Nobody wants to put the Government in any embarrassing position, because this is dealing with a matter which is of great importance to the community; this is dealing with a Department which has been causing some dissatisfaction to the community. The Government has been trying to put right what has been wrong; you came for a sum of money and you gave reasons why you wanted this money; now you say; "let me withdraw it". We do not want to spend money which is unnecessary, but I am bound to agree with the hon. senior member for St. George. Having given all these facts you should tell us now why you do not want this money. In this case where there has been so much dissatisfaction at the Hospital, everybody knows what happens at the X-ray department and the Government admits that part of the fault is due to bad wiring and the voltage. Is the Hon. Minister saying that we are condoning these wrong conditions and that we should let them go on as they are going on? Is the Hon. Minister condoning the fact that our X-Ray Department will go "bum" because he cannot tell us what is going to be the position? Surely the Minister could avoid all this talk by saying that the Electric Company will stand all these expenses. The Hon. Minister is not an authority in this matter and he is bound to be guided by the Electrical Engineer who is the Government's authority. The Engineer says that this thing is necessary; everybody concerned says that it is necessary. The Government asks for this money and we would readily grant it because of the conditions prevailing up there, but the Government says: "Don't worry with this money today; we are condoning these conditions." All we are asking you to say is: why are you taking this action? If something is going wrong to the credit of the consumers of electricity in this island, then it is the business of the Government to explain it. I want to know what is the position at the X-ray Department to-day; surely what the hon. senior member for St. George has said is correct, and we are entitled to know the facts. The Hon. Minister does not tell us that they do not want this money because everything is working well; he does not tell us that the entire matter has been settled and that the conditions are all right. He is only saying: "We do not want this money now". It is a matter for members of this House; surely he should not merely tell us that we do not need this money.

Hon. M. E. COX: From the time I have been in this House it has been customary for me to give explanations. From what I said, namely, that the necessity for this money no longer existed, one would have concluded that the conditions now existing are all satisfactory. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You have not said so.] Anybody would have understood that; any intelligent man would have come to the conclusion that everything is all right now.

Mr. Chairman, all I was trying to say is this: the Government Electrical Engineer has reported on the Item; he said the voltage has been rectified and the agreement made between the Medical Superintendent——

Mr. Mottley rises to speak Hon. M. E. COX sits. 7.05 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Man you can sit until Sunday. I can talk as I like.

Mr. LEWIS : There can be no further explanation to this Addendum as you have heard. We have an Electrical Inspector and an Electrical Engineer and they are supposed to tell you what you are getting and what you are not getting from the Company. They went and examined the Hospital's equipment and said that it wanted rewiring. Evidently they have not been taking the interest that they are being paid for. I will tell the honourable senior member for St. Michael that with the Vestry of the parish of St. Michael, the late Mr. Walter Bailey exposed the situation that was there. The Electrical Inspector of Barbados is supposed to go and see that the cable pole is right. If they put in a pole in the street you go on paying for it and that situation was discovered and exposed by the late Walter Bailey.

The Electrical Engineer should have discerned this thing and brought it to the attention of the Government. Take what has happened to our Cold Storage Plant; they are coming now for hundreds and thousands of dollars to put up a Cold Storage Plant We have an Act on the Statute Book in which these people are compelled to pay. After they wrote this down and somebody saw it, that somebody said, "Do you know that we can be actioned?" I hope the Electrical Engineer is not covering up something for the Electric Company, because these electrical and oil people seem to say that the current runs through them and makes them warm. It is on that score that I think a little explanation might have been necessary; if you ask for a tractor well, you may say that the tractor is no longer necessary. Get behind your Electrical Engineer and tell him to work for his money. We only use to have an Electrical Inspector now we have an Electrical Engineer; and he was brought out here. Until somebody is interested in seeing that their equipment is not given a bad name, in that way we all will see that something is wrong. But this will be forever a very serious condemnation of the Company; and I am sorry to see that the Director of Medical Services and the Hospital authorities should be mentioned because they do not know anything about it. I would not like to think that the Director of Medical Services or any other individual should have been actioned. I hope that they (the Electrical Engineer and the Electrical Inspector) are doing their work and seeing that the cable poles are kept up to scratch.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to see that the honourable member has drawn the attention of the people to what has been going on for a long time; I was asking the Minister of Communications to withdraw this motion. The taxpayers of the colony must be safeguarded. Now, as far back Mr. Chairman, as 1899 the Barbados Government gave to the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation, (a Company registered in London having two advisers in Barbados in the persons of Mr. A. S. Bryden and Mr. Cuke but having all its shareholders in the United Kingdom,) a monopoly for 42 years for the supply of electric current in a definite area of Bar-

bados; a monopoly I understand, which would have brought them up to 1941. Now, Mr. Chairman, amongst the conditions which were stipulated was that there must be a satisfactory supply of current at a pre-determined voltage as might be demanded by anyone within a reasonable distance of their mains. The distance has also been set out in the Act, and under subsequent Regulations and Orders made in the 1899 Electric Light and Power Act.

Now, at a very early stage in the political development of the party system in this country, the present Government made it plain that the anomolous position under which a public utility like the Electric Company was, should no longer exist; and that it was their intention as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and present Premier has said to nationalise the Electric Company within six months of their getting into office. Due to the growth of the Metropolitan district and the rapidity of communications and the increasing demands of the public, thousands of applications were made by the citizens of this country to the Electric Company for the supply of current and energy; and the people of this island are still waiting for an adequate and sufficient supply of electricity. In 1941 their agreement with the Government of Barbados came to an end; and forever thereafter up to 1954 or 1953 the Government of Barbados according to the provisions of Section 28 of the Electric Light & Power Act should have bought over the Electric Company for less than $500,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you are straying from the subject.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the electrical equipment according to the Addendum.—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You mentioned the electrical equipment already.

Mr. BARROW: The Resolution says this: the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation were consulted and they were supplying voltage which was substantially below that which was bargained for. That is the explanatory Note to the Resolution and I am trying to find out whether the fault actually lies in this low voltage.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to draw to your attention that is customary that when a member asks that an Item be withdrawn, there should not be any debate. It has never been done as it is being done this afternoon.

7.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: If even the honourable senior member for St. Michael can show me any argument for this I am still entitled to debate the issue. I must stick to my constitutional rights.

I have said that the reason why the Hon. Minister is asking for the withdrawal of this item is as I have said, under Section 28 of the Electricity Act the Government from 1941——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you still going to talk of the buying over of the Electric Company by the Government?

Mr. BARROW: That is bound up with the drop in voltage. They did offer Government the chance of buying the Electric Company, but Government did not buy it. The Directors of that Company would not install proper equipment to ensure that the voltage was kept up to a proper level, because they were expecting the Government to take over the Company. On the other hand, they were trying to blackmail the Government, (as they are now doing) into subsidising them for doing nothing for the 42 years which they were in operation. They kept these run down generators at the Electric Company so that if one or two things happened, they would be in a good position. If Government had bought it over, Government would have been buying decrepit machinery; and if Government did not buy it they would say that they could not expand unless they were given an enormous subvention. Energy in sufficient quanity and according to the specific voltage is demanded by the consumer; that was the understanding. They are going to come to the public this year for $500,000——

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to desist from making that statement.

Mr. BARROW: I do know that there are some people in this island who do not like to hear things on public corporations.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It depends from whom the information is coming. [*laughter.*]

Mr. BARROW: It seems to me that there are a lot of people who only accept information from the directors of firms, because those people have the same mentality as plantation owners. Mr. Chairman, if I may pass on I would say that there are still a few unfortunate Uncle Toms in Barbados who only accept information from plantation owners and directors of firms like the Electric Company. As I have said, the Electric Company had always been in duty bound to supply us with adequate electrical current at a pre-determined voltage. They have burnt up a lot of electrical equipment belonging to people all along the Maxwell Coast as well as down the St. James Coast, because of the inadequacy of their electrical current. Along Bay Street is the most efficient area, because the General Hospital is in that area; and I am sure although that is so, the residents in that area do not wish to learn that they have fluctuations in voltage as substantial as a 50% drop; therefore, it seems to me that no matter what the Hon. Minister of Communications may say, the real reason behind this thing is that they have discovered that the Resolution itself is an embarrassment to the Electricity Company; because it is the statutory duty of that Company to supply the people with electrical energy at a pre-determined voltage. They would not like the public to know what is going on. I did not expect any Labour Government would condone inefficiency and incompetence; I do not want to use stronger language than that on this issue. When you think you are giving a patient at the Hospital treatment in X-Ray at a certain voltage which the Medical authorities say will cure certain diseases, what do you find? They are getting less than 50% of the treatment which they are to get; yet they are paying for that treatment. That is the whole tragedy of this Resolution which is before us. This is an admission that the Electric Company has not been as vigilant as it should have been; and it is also indicative of the fact that the Government is still prepared to be blackmailed by that Company so that the inevitability of nationalisation would be forever averted.

The question that the Item be withdrawn from the Resolution was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

7.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that this Resolution for the sum of $12,285 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Additional Typist, House of Assembly

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of $60 to pay

an additional typist for work done during the consideration of the Estimates. It was originally recommended by the Debates Committee that this individual be taken on for one month to assist in the publication of the debates during the Estimates, but since then it has been found necessary to continue this employment for another month; and the Debates Committee have asked that this amount be increased from $60 to $120. The Government has agreed with that, and I am therefore asking leave that this amount be amended to $120.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: I now beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of $120 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I did not know that this amendment was coming forward and I was prepared to ask a question. I know I was not in the House all the time during the consideration of the Estimates, but I think that if the House passed an Address in a matter like this, some intimation should be given to the House that the amount would have to be increased. I think that at some time or the other the Debates Committee should have informed the House that provision for one month would not cover the case. I just say that because here we are confronted with the fact that the House has asked the Executive for one thing and the Debates Committee has now asked them to make provision for two months instead of one, and I see no record of the House having been appraised of the fact that the Debates Committee has asked for this increase.

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

Motor Vehicles for the General Hospital

Hon. M. E. COX: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for $8,900 to provide for the improvement of the transport facilities at the General Hospital. Some time ago this House voted an amount of money to provide for two engines for units at the Hospital and a new station wagon. As the Addendum points out: "An amount of $5,000.00 was provided in Supplementary Estimates, 1954-55, No. 29 for the improvement of the transport facilities at the General Hospital as follows:—

New Station Waggon	$3,000.00
New engines for the Ambulance and the then existing station wagon	1,824.00
Contingencies	176.00
	$5,000.00

By the end of March, 1955, the two new engines had arrived and were paid for at a cost of $1,775.00 but the new station wagon which had been ordered in January had not reached the island.

On the 17th February, 1955, after the new engine for the old station wagon had arrived, the Director of Highways and Transport reported on the station wagon to the Medical Superintendent, General Hospital that a survey had been carried out on the steering mechanism of the vehicle and this had been to be in extremely poor condition. Furthermore, a general overall survey of the entire unit led the Director of Highways and Transport to report that the vehicle, which had done 75,000 miles, was unroadworthy. Subsequently, the Standing Board of Survey for motor vehicles endorsed this opinion and expressed the view that the vehicle was unserviceable, should be taken off the road immediately and sold by public auction. The Standing Board of Survey also recommended that the new engine should be laid in stock as a spare for one of the other vehicles of identical make which are operated by the Department of Medical Services."

I must say that when we had this second report, the Government was not quite happy at all in view of the fact that it was not long that a report was made from the Department of Highways and Transport on this vehicle; and it was recommended at the time that we should either get a new wagon or a new engine. It was felt then and expressed that it a new engine were installed, the life of the vehicle would be approximately three years longer. On that report the Government decided to have a new engine installed. After the vehicle had done 7,000 miles it was re-inspected and it was reported that certain parts of the chassis had developed small cracks which apparently had not been seen when the first survey was made.

As the Addendum points out, the Government was advised to take the vehicle off the road and get this new vehicle. This new vehicle costs more than what was originally estimated; it is in the vicinity of $5,600. The Government could have bought a cheaper vehicle but the Director of Highways and Transport has pointed out that we need a different type of vehicle, in view of the fact that with the present units, people who are being transported have to sit very inconveniently with their backs bent and there is not sufficient height in the roofs in these vehicles. It is very uncomfortable for persons to be so transported; more particularly those who have to travel for long distances like from St. Lucy or St. Andrew. On this recommendation the Government has agreed to purchase a better type of vehicle particularly because it is a question of perambulation.

If there is any more information which hon. members would like to have I am quite willing in so far as I have it before me, to give it; but there is the absolute necessity for getting this unit. Transportation has been at its minimum during the past week. That is why I am asking hon. members to deal with this Resolution to-day in order that we can get this vehicle as quickly as possible. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

7.35 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: This is a matter that I should like to vote for. Because the Hospital has done without this service for many years, I do not like the idea of the Government having any spare engines put aside; if they are going to have a Government repair shop it might be alright. I suppose that they will use this engine in a vacancy or emergency, it being an engine of that sort; it means also that these things are going to deteriorate if they remain there.

I wonder if it is possible to substitute an engine like that. I understand that there is a standard machine where you just take the odd engine out and you put in a new one and go along; but that is if this is an engine of that type.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is another case under which this survey was made. It was made at a time when the station wagon had arrived; and now you come and say that the steering gear is useless; the station wagon could not have done 75,000 miles as it is stated.

Hon. M. E. COX: That 75,000 miles are the miles done by that engine.

Mr. LEWIS: You do not go and tell anybody when you have an accident. You get down a new engine and then you go back and say that the steer-

ing is no good. Have a general overhaul and say that this steering will undoubtedly last long enough if you get down an engine and put it in; the same officer of the Survey Board going to the machine and picking parts, and stating they are no good is nonsense, that is not a sensible thing; it does not happen at other places. A private individual will tell you examine my whole vehicle and tell me what you find. I am sorry if there is no information other than what is put in the Addendum.

Hon. M. E. COX: That 75,000 miles is the miles done by that engine.

Mr. LEWIS: I apologise; there was an interruption and I did not hear. As I was saying just now that is all wrong; this vehicle met with an accident, or the people who surveyed it do not know anything about surveying a vehicle. No man in his senses would tell you to get down an engine and before the engine comes down, say this vehicle does not worth an engine; and it should not happen in the Government.

That survey was not properly done in the first instance; and if, after you had gone to the trouble and expense to bring down a new engine for that vehicle and then afterwards subsequently discovered that the steering was faulty, there was nothing more to do than to put in a new steering; but the Government feel that they could easily get equipment and can come here for it. I think it is because they find that the Government is very benevolent and that it is easy to get new equipment that they say let us have a new one today. We are going to have an expansion of the Highways & Transport and Government will be repairing their own vehicles shortly; but things will have to be watched to see that proper repairs are done, proper maintenance at frequent intervals; and these repairing bills have got to be cut down. It is not that you can replace a vehicle every two or three months, but if they are properly maintained they can run for a long time. I feel that something went radically wrong here. I would tell the Government to sell that new engine too.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I want to say—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, when I said that the vehicle had done 75,000 miles, I thought that the hon. member had corrected me and said that that was what it could do. The 75,000 miles was pertaining to what the engine had done.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, There is only one point I can see in the argument of the hon. junior member for the City. This survey was carried out sometime in November, and in February we were faced with this situation. The Highways & Transport did that survey. Apparently, one was done by one officer in the first case and the other by another officer; and this is what we are faced with.

In reply to what the hon. member said relative to the engine being kept as a spare, I can tell you Mr. Chairman, that I endorse the same views. I myself feel that if that engine is kept for a long time it will deteriorate, and we may find that it will be of little or no use to us.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I just want to thank the hon. member for the attitude which he has adopted in this matter. I will go a little further and say———

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Address the Chairman please.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Minister of Communications should bear in mind that with the modern engineers mechanism changes so rapidly, that it would be well for the Government to sell or send back that engine; for this reason: you are going to get that engine and by the time it has done a 1,000 miles the whole system will be changed; so changed that it would be hardly much good to you. I think that is the feeling of the House. I quite agree with the Minister that you should really not keep that engine. 7.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and then agreed to.

RESOLUTION AUTHORISING GOVERNOR TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENT WITH PRESENT MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 14 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications: to move the passing of the Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with the present holder of the office of Medical Superintendent of the General Hospital to undertake Plastic Surgery.

Hon. M. E. COX: As honourable members will see, this Resolution seeks to change the terms of agreement between the Government and the Medical Superintendent at the General Hospital. As far as has been reported to the Government, this gentleman is skilled in Plastic Surgery and I hardly think that there is anyone in this island who can do this type of work. This gentleman has represented to Government that this field of surgery is sadly lacking in this island; and he has asked for permission to do that type of work in his spare moments without further cost to the Government.

The matter has been gone into thoroughly by the Director of Medical Services and also by the Minister of Social Services; and it has been agreed that this gentleman should be allowed to carry on this plastic surgery and be paid half of the fees as is done in similar cases with the Physician Specialist, the Surgeon Specialist and the Anaesthetist Specialist.

We have been assured, Mr. Speaker, that this arrangement will not at all interfere with his substantive duties. The Government feels that we are fortunate indeed to have the services of a gentleman who is skilled in this type of work; and with that assurance, I want to appeal to honourable members to support this Resolution. I believe even the honourable junior member for the City will agree that since this gentleman came to the General Hospital it has undergone a complete change; and although I am not as intimately connected with the Hospital as the honourable junior member for the City, and perhaps the honourable senior member for the City, I have been reliably informed——

Mr. LEWIS: I have no special connections with the General Hospital. I have no connections with that institution that the Hon. Minister does not share.

Hon. M. E. COX: As I was saying, Sir, I have been reliably informed by members of the staff of

that institution that the present Medical Superintendent is a very efficient gentleman and they think very highly of him. Again I give the House the assurance that this work by the gentleman would not interfere with his normal duties; the assurance having been given to the Director of Medical Services and the Minister of Social Services. With that assurance, I feel honourable members will support this Resolution and I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

7.55 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we should do anything to hinder our getting the skill of any super-medical expert in any particular line.

I, too, have been told that this gentleman is a plastic surgeon, insomuch that I have been reliably informed that there is an instrument known to plastic surgeons, which bears his name. I have been told that since this gentleman came here we have had a great change at the Hospital in its administration. As you will recall, Sir, I said here during the debate on the building of a house for this gentleman, (which I still criticise) that you are spending too much money and I do hope that this gentleman will not be like the last officer who sat in a wheel-chair all day long not knowing how the Hospital was being run. You must say these things and let people know that whether they are doctors or not, they are just other men, and they should do something for the money they draw.

I have been reliably informed that this gentleman has been asking to be allowed to do plastic work. I am supporting this Resolution; and I will recall that the Hon. Minister has said that these duties will not interfere with this gentleman's work in connection with the administration at the Hospital. The Hon. Minister has mentioned the Director of Medical Services, the Minister of Social Services and the Medical Superintendent himself in this connection. I said at the outset that we should not prevent the inhabitants of this colony from getting the skill of plastic surgeons, but the Hon. Minister has said something which worries me. You have arranged for a man to be a Medical Superintendent and you are now saying that he is doing plastic surgery for one half of the fees; but what about the use of our equipment which is being used for nothing? I am here not to protect this gentleman, but to protect the people of this island. You are paying this man a salary and now because of his skill, you say that he is skilled in this particular field and therefore we should not allow Barbadians to lose the benefit of that skill by pinning him down to do a particular job. I am not supporting this Resolution if you are allowing this gentleman to use our Hospital, our Nurses, our implements and so on with a full salary, and only doing jobs which must be paid for. I say first; in return for what we are giving him. we would like to see done what is done in the case of all visiting surgeons. We allow surgeons to charge Mr. "A" or Mr. "B" so much but you must help people who cannot pay for themselves.

I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that we postpone the consideration of this Resolution. We pay a Physician Specialist to do work for all and sundry; people go to him and pay him. Those who go to the Surgeon Specialist pay him. Here you are allowing a man to work as a Specialist in his field for one half of the fees; I am not satisfied with that. This is not a case where the average man is suffering from appendicitis; I cannot allow a man who is working in a specialised field only to undertake the cases of those who can pay and others who cannot pay cannot get the benefit of his help. That is why I am suggesting that we postpone the consideration of this matter. This is not the portfolio of this particular Minister, and the Minister has said that the Government has gone into this matter with this officer and he has agreed not only to work in our time, in our Hospital, with our implements, but on the rich and those who can pay; but he should also agree to work on people like waterfront workers and the like. They know that this man will not put his hand on one of these waterfront workers who cannot pay for his services. I want to say this: unless he is prepared to say that he will also work for this type of people, I am not voting for this Resolution. I therefore beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed and let the Government get these facts and engage in an agreement with this gentleman. Nothing which the Hon. Minister of Communications will say now can definitely convince me that they have gone into this matter with this gentleman. These cases are such that one of them might take months to bring to perfection; but they must not only be the cases of those who can afford to pay.

8.05 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am going to say what I said earlier to-day. So far as the postponement is concerned I do not agree with it. I can tell the Government this: the hon. senior member for the City has said that he is not a socialist; I am not a window-dressing socialist either; I am not a socialist who says, "Well I can pay and the other cannot pay." I say this: the Hospital is built for the people of Barbados. I saw a man this week; they sent him out of the Hospital with a hand still looking raw; still needing treatment; they chased him out of the Hospital People who can pay $4.00 a day go into the Tercentenary Ward; the Hospital is not for these people only. I want to say this: if this man can do Plastic Surgery he has to do Plastic Surgery for all the people of Barbados; and I agree with the honourable member because I intended to make that clear myself. I want to say this: this Resolution to-day, Mr. Speaker, is not the end of time. This Resolution does not mean that if you pass it the Government is free and therefore honourable members cannot make enquiries. If this doctor is here now and we know that he is not attending to or treating cases for Plastic Surgery in the free wards but is only treating people who can afford to pay, then we can deal with that; and if the Minister of Social Services were here I would tell him this: if you really want to institute something in Barbados, the time has come that when a man goes into the Hospital you should find out the amount of his salary and see if he can pay; because in the United Kingdom there is no privilege ward we are still perpetuating snobbery and class distinction even with people who are sick.

My objection is to what the Government is paying for the Tercentenary Ward; it is a waste of public funds. You have two people sick; one is sick with appendicitis and is getting better food if he is paying; why should you have a diet-sheet for one patient which is different from the other? You go to the Tercentenary and you find somebody in a room which is often better than some people's own private bedrooms; that is the sort of thing the old conservative people followed. $4.80 a day could provide privileges; but you should remember that the masses of this colony are paying for the upkeep of this Hospital. I have to commend a remark of the honourable senior member for the City, that in hospitalisation you should take the cue from the United Kingdom Socialist Government where, if a man is sick, (and sickness is not for only one type of individual) he should

have care. If you have doctors about here, see that the doctors are well-trained and that they will be able to look after all. We are paying too much money for these about here anyhow. I have to commend that point; and I hope the Minister of Communications will really give the answer; I do not know what sort of system is obtaining now. I hope the Minister of Communications will not come back and say: "Well I am not responsible for that. The Government should see to it that the same way that Dr. Leacock attends to people of all classes, that this gentleman in Plastic Surgery should attend to all classes too. I do not subscribe to the idea, that because I can pay for something therefore, the public of Barbados must pay for the privilege of having something that the masses cannot enjoy.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say from the outset how much I regret that the honourable senior member for the City holds the view that only persons who are able to pay for surgery would be given treatment at the Hospital. As the honourable junior member for St. Peter rightly said this is Government's Hospital and that being so, I believe that even if the Government were not constituted as it is presently constituted, everybody would agree that these services should be extended to one and all. It has always been the policy of this Government to see that the services of specialists be available to persons who cannot pay in the same way as those who can pay.

We have a Surgeon Specialist at the Hospital, and people who cannot pay for his services receive his services as well as those who can pay. You have the said Superintendent; in addition to his administering the Hospital he does his duties and his hours like any other medical man at the Hospital, and so on. No one would countenance the view that any doctor or Specialist should be allowed to practise at the Hospital only for those who can afford to pay for his services.

The terms and conditions governing the specialist officers apply with equal force to the Medical Superintendent.

I should like to allay the fears of the honourable member; and I go further: I want to give him the assurance that the Government will see to it that these services are extended to the poor people.

I want to assure this House that the Government will see to it that this service is extended to people of all classes. [A VOICE: How can you do that?] This is a Socialist Government; the hon. member thinks he is talking of a Conservative Government. I am sure this service will be extended to people of all classes. We know that everybody will not be in a position to pay for it. I profoundly disagree with the statement made by the hon. senior member for the City who said that he knows that under the terms of agreement which this gentleman and the Government have entered into this service will not be extended to everybody.

8.15 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All of us know that Plastic Surgery is not a condition of the duties of the Medical Superintendent at the General Hospital. Paragraph 2 reads as follows:—

"In addition to the duties prescribed in Paragraph 1, the Officer may perform Plastic Surgery within the Hospital and may be called in consultation within and without the Hospital."

That means, he may do something to you and me but it does not necessarily mean that he is going to do it to Tom. The Hon. Minister is saying that this gentleman shall do this. Don't fool people with that nonsense.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Resolution says he may do so and so; that means allowed to do so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You are wrong.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member says that "may" means if he cares to do it to "A" he may do it, but he may not do it to "Z". That is not the the case. If the hon. member. reads the Addendum to the Resolution he will see for himself that this officer was never allowed to do this type of work. That was not part of his duties; his work is that of Medical Superintendent and there are no extra duties attached to it. Now, all the Government is doing is varying those terms to allow him to do this type of work in which he specialised.

It is not a question of if he likes to do it to "A" and not to "Z"; 'may' means permission to do it; and and this Resolution seeks to give him that permission.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is no part of our policy. Our policy is that all services should be extended to each and every individual, more particularly when it comes to cases of hospitalisation. The hon. member has misconstrued the meaning of "may" in this particular sense. As I have said, "may" means that he may have permission to do, and we are giving him that permission to do the type of work which he hitherto did not have, or will not have until this Resolution is passed. All we are doing is varying the terms of his contract to allow him to do it.

Mr. LEWIS: I believe the Hon. Minister will see a little light if he follows the argument which I am going to put forward. First of all, I want to say that the Schedule should be put in this Resolution. Now, let us examine the terms of agreement of the Medical Officers. We are told that this gentleman will be on all fours with specialists at the General Hospital. As you know, you employ someone as a Surgeon Specialist at the Hospital to operate on everybody that goes there. If the Hon. Minister wants what he says to be done, he should put it in the terms of the agreement. This is not a case in which the Government can guarantee that something will be done; they cannot go behind this.

As I was saying, the Surgeon Specialist is employed to be a Surgeon at the Hospital for everybody. In cases where people are able to pay, they pay; and you know that there are wards for paying patients at the Hospital and if the Surgeon Specialist operates on somebody in a Pay Ward he can get half of the fees. We have the Anaesthetist Specialist who has to give anaesthetics to the people in the non-paying wards; but when patients come from the Pay Wards he can get a fee for administering it; so too, with the Physician Specialist. This gentleman is Medical Superintendent of the Hospital for everybody and he is not entitled to anything else. He can do nothing else but occupy his chair and draw his salary. If he is an active man, he will do something; and I venture to say that if he has this skill in Plastic Surgery he should do it without asking for anything at all. He should demonstrate it first. [A VOICE: Why should he?]

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member follows me he will see the light of what I am saying. It is not that they cannot see the light but they are putting up their hands to hide their eyes from the glare. I am going to show the Hon. Minister step by step that they are mistaken. You are giving this gentleman the opportunity to occupy himself in his skill at the General Hospital, but you cannot compel him. If you tell him he may do it, he may do it to "A" but not to "B".

Let us Mr. Chairman, look at the Addendum to the Resolution. The first paragraph says: "The Officer shall be responsible generally for the supervision and management of the General Hospital and will be required to perform such other departmental duties as the Governor may from time to time direct."

We had a Medical Superintendent doing that ever since. We had a Medical Superintendent who would spend all day in the Casualty, and we had another Medical Superintendent (this gentleman's immediate predecessor) who would spend all day in his chair; and if a West Indian doctor was supposed to be on duty but was not on duty, everybody would die and when you got hold of the Medical Superintendent and ask him about it he would tell you that he is not doing anything at all. The hon. junior member for St. Michael had an admirable case to bring in here to get him charged with murder; that is by the way. The Government is in an awkward position in this matter; and I believe the Hon. Minister knows what I am going to tell him now. My colleague referred sometime ago to a five-bedroom house for this Medical Superintendent.

I will tell the Government something which they know; this gentleman came out here through the Secretary of State for the Colonies who guaranteed him that the terms of his employment included private practice. Mr. Speaker, this is as true as the gospel; this man Dr. Humby———I hope that there might be more than one Dr. Humby. He was sent here by the present Secretary of State for the Colonies with the distinct understanding that he would enjoy private practice. I tell you if you write the Secretary of State for the Colonies or ask Dr. Humby about it, he would tell you that that is true; or he would be telling lies. I am inviting honourable members to read paragraph one of the Schedule to this Resolution and tell me if they can advise on the reason for putting it there. It has nothing to do with plastic surgery; it is a condition in a contract which was signed already; and why has it been put in here? Here is a man signing a contract at the General Hospital and when you ask him to do plastic surgery look at what this Addendum says:—

"The officer will be responsible generally for the supervision and management of the General Hospital and will be required to perform such other departmental duties as the Government may from time to time direct."

He should have agreed to that clause before he left England. [Hon. M. E. COX: That was already signed.] This Government is trying to safeguard itself against something which has happened already. If this condition is there already, then it is superfluous here; why are you repeating it here? I invite you, Mr. Speaker, to read this paragraph. I am sure you will come to the conclusion that there is something wrong in the contract of this man who is coming out here; but they had to put it down that in addition to his duties, this gentleman has to do so and so. I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, on the highest authority that this gentleman came out here guaranteed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that he would have private practice, and it has agitated his mind to find out that that is not so.

The next paragraph of the Addendum to this Resolution says this:—

"In addition to the duties prescribed in paragraph 1 the officer may perform Plastic Surgery within the Hospital and may be called in consultation within and without the Hospital."

Does that belong to Plastic Surgery? If you take this out of its context, do you not see that this man is getting private practice? What should be set out here is that he may be called in consultation for Plastic Surgery within and without the Hospital; he should be tied down to that. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph will later come in here and say, pulling up his pants all the while, "Any little boy will say that this House solemnly sat down here and said that this gentleman would have private practise and now you come in here and question it?" Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be any party to that.

This is the place where you can amend this provision. Paragraph four of this Preamble says this:—

"Shall receive in addition to the substantive salary of his office a non-pensionable allowance equal to one half of the fees paid into the Public Treasury in respect of his plastic surgical work." Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that if they really wanted to pin down this gentleman they would add after the patients" the words "fees collected from paying patients" so that he would give his services to other people free. It is not now any part of his duty to perform plastic surgery on people who are not paying. So far as I am concerned, I would like to see Paragraph 1 cut out of these terms; the gentleman has already signed the contract to perform these duties; therefore do not repeat it here because it gives rise to suspicion. [Hon. M. E. COX: We are making it doubly sure.] Are you making it doubly sure for this Medical Superintendent? This matter will probably be amended in the Other Place just like the hundreds of Bills which have been amended, and we will be told that we have not got the interest of the people at heart.

If the Hon. Minister is willing to postpone the consideration of this Resolution I am in agreement with that; if you are putting in that he will perform operations on people who cannot pay any fees free, then we will pay him half of the fees of paying patients. Why should we not pin him down to consultation on Plastic Surgery? And I would pin him down to performing surgery on everybody who needs it at the Hospital; and those who come in and are able to pay must pay him. I do not want to deny him that but there is too much of a loop-hole here; this gentleman has a full-time job already; he can perform his operations on the patients in the Wards and he cannot neglect his duties of Medical Superintendent. You are told by this Government not to make amendments on your feet, but the people who have drafted this Resolution have not got the interest of the people at heart. After some people have been here for a little while they have said "Let us look up the contract; we might find that we might have been doing something out of the goodness of our heart."

8.35 p.m.

If that is done the time has come to stop it. He has to do his Medical Superintendent's work and then he has time now to perform Plastic Surgery. [A MEMBER: Hey, Mr. Speaker, what was the last fellow doing?] He was blowing a comb and the Government could not even call the tune. This is a little too serious; the scale of fees set out for this gentleman—

[*Asides*]

Mr. Speaker, will you help to assist me with the interruptions? [A MEMBER: Ask them not to interrupt you.] Mr. Speaker, as I was saying this gentleman is not employed at the Hospital for Plastic Surgery, and if I were in his position I would not

have done Plastic Surgery free of charge. He is not ar. amateur; he is a specialist and he wants money for what he does.

Mr. Speaker, what do you think is going tc follow this: a resolution for a couple of thousand pounds merely for instruments! He has his own instruments and he is going to sell them when he is going to leave. Government knows the history of these things. The worst thing a member of the Govern ment could talk of is that they know the history of that; they should try to keep that quiet. I am waiting for some intimation as to why these gentlemen should pin us down to this; this is not enough. I would like the Minister of Communications to get it out of his head entirely that this gentleman is under the same conditions as the others who were engaged by the Government to perform certain duties. This gentleman is a Medical Superintendent, and so long as he carries out the duties of the Superintendent he is in the right; he has not under taken to do Plastic Surgery for the Hospital; they give him permission to do that.

Mr. Speaker, Paragraphs 1 and 2 are unnecessary and has nothing whatever to do with Plastic Surgery. The Resolution states that in the performance of his duties the officer will act; but it does not say in the performance of his duties as a Plastic Surgeon.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the truth; you can talk this matter over with any person under the age of 21 years and he will tell you that you have a point there; it is written down there. Go to the Government and hand them a piece of paper; they cannot read anything on it; other Ministers have copies of this Resolution before me, and I am saying in the interest of the people of this colony who may go there and find that this gentleman having said that he is to have private practice is unable to attend them free.

The Minister of Communications must get it out of his head that he can go contrary to the law. They have a Bill now—a type of Bill pointing out that they were wrong, they cannot ask this gentleman to perform duties that he did not sign a contract for. I am going to second the motion that further consideration of the matter be postponed; because I feel that is to the interest not only to the Ministers themselves but to everyone; and after all the Minister responsible is not here and he might see it in a different light.

I would like to warn this House that if they wish to postpone this and have an opportunity to hear something better when it comes back they had better postpone it now.

Mr. MILLER: At this stage I have a little point which I believe would assist Government to a little extent. It is true that the Minister in charge of this particular portfolio is not here at the moment, and it is asking the Minister of Communications to go a bit out of his orbit to concentrate not only on this but on the other items. What I should like to say of this particular officer is this: although this legislation has not yet been passed, a couple of plastic cases have already been done by this officer upon people in the Hospital; and he has attended consultations with Mr. Leacock (I have to say Mr. Leacock because he does not favour being called Dr. Leacock).

8.45 p.m.

Sir, I am only asking a question. I want to be fair about this affair. I knew long before this gentleman came here that he was a specialist in this particular field of surgery. If there is the faintest element of doubt. I think the least which the Hon. Minister should do is to postpone this Resolution until next Tuesday. He should see to it that what he says is made crystal clear; and if it may mean the revamping of this document to do so, he should do it in the interest of the people of this country. This is no reflection on his office. I know that this medical officer has handled a couple of cases in plastic surgery since he was here. I do not know if he was paid for them.

Sir, I am only asking the Government in its wisdom either to postpone or withdraw this Resolution in order to give the matter a closer examination. I think it deserves further examination and the least the Hon. Minister should do is to postpone it so as to give it that further examination.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am agreeing to the postponement of the Resolution, but I want to assure the honourable member who has just sat down that I am not in any difficulty whatsoever.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, — I rise on a point of explanation. I did not say or even insinuate that the Hon. Minister was in difficulty.

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

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORISE THE AGREEMENT WITH A MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH

HON. M. E COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking honourable members to stay a little longer so as to give consideration to the next Item on the Order Paper — Item No. 15. We have the opportunity for the first time to fill the post of Medical Officer of Health at the Enmore Health Centre and if this item is not dealt with speedily, the chance of our filling that post might go. Let us pass this Resolution and then adjourn for two or three weeks for cricket.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications: to move the passing of a Resolution to authorise the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve in the Department of Medical Services in the office of Medical Officer of Health.

HON. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to employ the services of a Medical Officer of Health. The Addendum to the Resolution explains the matter fully. It is as follows:—

On the completion of the Health Centre for St. Michael in July, 1954, recruitment action was taken within the Caribbean Area to fill the vacant post of Medical Officer of Health ($5,280 x 240—6,240 per annum). As no suitable applicants were forthcoming the Secretary of State was asked in September 1954 to take steps to fill the vacancy. He reported in November that the vacancy had been advertised but that it was very rare to find candidates with the Diploma in Public Health offering themselves for appointment and that he was very doubtful if it would be possible to find a suitable candidate at all. It was further learnt in February this year that no applicants had been received in response to the advertisement. The post has been readvertised in current editions of various medical journals but so far without response.

In a recent telegram the Secretary of State has intimated that it may be possible to secure the services of a former Director of Medical Services who is regarded as being of outstanding ability and experience and who was specially interested in tuberculosis, on agreement for three years at a salary of $6,720 per annum.

As it will not be possible to open the Health Centre until the services of a Medical Officer of Health are obtained, it is considered that the opportunity should be taken to engage the services of this officer.

Provision of the necessary additional emoluments at the rate of $480 per annum will be sought in supplementary Estimates.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, we all agree with this Resolution. There is only one thing which I want to put to the Government. I see that you are increasing the salary of this post; and I want to say that you have an excellent officer here filling the position of Medical Officer of Health at the Speightstown Health Centre who is good enough to be Director of Medical Services. If there were ever an efficient medico to come to Barbados, that person is Dr. Byer.

I will go on record to say that the only thing which grieves me about this Resolution is that the doctor who is going to the Health Centre at St. Michael is going to receive a higher salary than Dr. Byer. The salary attached to this post is $5,280 x 240—6,240. Dr. Byer is performing his duties efficiently at the Health Centre at Speightstown and I believe that his excellence has made the Government increase its tempo in building Health Centres throughout the island.

Dr. Byer is an excellent officer and he would not have applied for this job only for a few dollars more. If from the point of view of convenience and expediency you find that you have to increase this salary, do you not see the disadvantage which the other fellow who has accepted the post is suffering? Dr. Byer is an excellent man and I hope the day will soon come when we will find a man like that filling the post of Director of Medical Services without having to play up to people.

8.55 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: I want to associate myself with the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Peter. I was perfectly sure that when the Government found itself in a position of having to find an officer for this Health Centre this transfer would have taken place. Dr. Byer is a great soul; and I have every reason to believe that he will rise to the top position in any part of the world. I feel that he should be given an opportunity in Barbados. I have had to work with him in Committees and I have had the opportunities of studying this man. I say that for the purpose which this Health Centre is expected to serve, honourable members have in Dr. Byer a man one who has more than mercenary considerations. Considering what is required at this Department, this man's skill cannot be converted into dollars, so to speak. I would be grieved, Mr. Speaker, if I did not have an opportunity of supporting the remarks of the honourable junior member for St. Peter. [A MEMBER: Don't cry]. If I am capable of a soul that can be wounded and equally be hurt, if I happen to be a soul capable of thought, that is my minimum requirement. If you fail to appreciate suffering, if you just pay lip service and turn away and smile, I am capable of expressing my feelings and I might be reduced to ridicule; but you get people of the mercenary type who will spend all night in rehearsing the speeches which they will make tomorrow.

Mr. BARROW: I do not think it would be inappropriate if we sang "Rock of Ages Cleft for Me" at this stage.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not think the honourable member will feel that he is singing a solo. It is not how a man (doctor or otherwise) treats me because of my position; it is how I understand from the most unfortunate people how he treats them. It is a question of how this gentleman has treated people with whom I have come into contact. I just want to throw this hint out to the attention of the Hon. Minister. Some years ago we had a similar Resolution when Mr. Coppin resigned as Government Analyst. I drew to the Government's attention that we had a man who could do this job; the result was that the Resolution was postponed, (thanks to the Minister of Social Services) and Mr. Carmichael was appointed to the post. In the Schedule to the Resolution it was pointed out that it was difficult to get a man for this post. Now this officer will be in my constituency. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has expressed his view and the honourable junior member for St. George has added his quota; but I feel that Dr. Byer is at a disadvantage in taking this job. I think it is because of the qualities of this man; he is a humane man; besides being a Medical Practitioner I do not think the Government could have gone to any part of the West Indies and found a more capable man — a lover of underprivileged human beings. When you have an officer like this, it strikes me that something similar should have taken place as in the case when Mr. Coppin resigned, when the Government said that they could not get a man who is suitably qualified for the post. I think that the least that could have been done was to offer Dr. Byer this job.

9.05 p.m.

Beside being an M.R.C.P.S. or whatever doctors are, and beside being a Public Health Officer, he is not a mercenary man. There are some doctors who cannot stand the look of unwashed and unwanted black people.

I want Government to know this is the view of the House: Dr. Byer should have been offered this job; now should we feel that because this man has to be so efficient that we cannot get a man. Any Medical Practitioner here should make more than £1,500 a year. I have come into contact with them and it is for this reason that I wish this House to see that because Dr. Byer is an able man and a West Indian why should we give him a £100 less than somebody whom we do not know. I support this Resolution with the full knowledge that the Government will bear our wishes in mind, and that in the not too distant future they will come down with the Resolution making the necessary adjustments retrospective.

Mr. BARROW: I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to the Addendum to the Resolution; it states that as no suitable applicants were forthcoming and the Secretary of State was asked to take steps to fill the vacancy.

[*Mr. E. D. Mottley goes behind Mr. Speaker's chair*]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am drawing the attention of members of this House provided, of course that the honourable senior member for the City has finished his speech——

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an impertinence.

Mr. BARROW: I was only asking if the hon. member has finished his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any hon. member has a right to come to the back of my Chair.

Mr. BARROW: I only wanted to know that. To my limited experience I can find no support for it in May's Procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: I say that the hon. member— [A VOICE: Man sit down.] I rule the hon. member to desist from his speech telling me "Man sit down." I distinctly heard him myself.

Mr. LEWIS: I have listened very attentively to all that has been said——

[*Asides*].

Mr. BARROW: [*Sitting*] Mr. Speaker, can I rise on a point of Order

Mr. SPEAKER: What point of order? You have been insulting to the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I think I have listened attentively to all that has been said, and I must say I know that Dr. Byer who is doing this particular work is not only known in Barbados, he is known for his work outside as well; I would not like this to be a reflection on any doctor outside of Barbados. I would not like anyone to be given the impression that I feel he would not be a man full of humanity.

In a part of the Addendum it has been said that the gentleman who has been secured was a former Director of Medical Services. I would like to hear more of him; that bit of information would be useful to me; and if the Minister has it I would be grateful for it. I think I am entitled to ask the Minister for it. Since I read this, I have the impression that he was a former Director of Medical Services of Barbados; it merely says that he is a former Director of Medical Services without any further explanation. I do not know who he is. I should like it to be said that we know where this doctor is coming from, so that we may be able to say something about it. I do not know whether the Hospital wanted somebody for the upper classes and whether this gentleman is interested only in upper classes.

Perhaps, the time should be stated as to how long he will be here; how long the Government is going to enter the contract for his services.

Mr. Speaker, those are the points which I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister. Let him tell us how long the Government wishes to enter into a contract with this gentleman, whether it is for two months or three years; I mean in the initial stage, of course, because if he proves to be a valuable man he may go on for over three years.

The next point——

9.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am hearing insulting, offensive and vulgar language in this House and it is coming from the hon. member for St. George.

A VOICE: Which member?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. George. If that hon. member intends to be offensive, I will have to name him. I am warning the hon. senior member for St. George. [*A Pause*].

The hon. member is not paying any attention to me. I am Speaker of this House and if that hon. member persists in making offensive and rude language to the Chair I will name him. and I will call on the hon. senior member for the City with whom he is conversing to vouch for what I have heard.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Sir,—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not called on the hon. member yet.

Mr. BARROW: Since my name has been called, I rise to say that I think it is most unfair that Your Honour should be judge and jury in your own case. The hon. senior member for the City can vouch for the fact that I have not mentioned Your Honour's name or used insulting language or anything of the kind. If Your Honour wants to prove to the House what I have said, you can call on the hon. senior member for the City. Just to say what you have said is most unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for the City say that the hon. senior member for St. George has not used the threat to the Chair: that he is going to move a motion of censure on the Chair

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Will Your Honour tell me what is the unparliamentary, vulgar and offensive language? What he said, if Your Honour wants to hear is—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing before the House yet: I have only given a warning. The hon. member is speaking on nothing. I have heard what the hon. senior member for St. George said and you have heard him also. He did use unparliamentary language. Has the hon. junior member for the City finished speaking?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: As Your Honour called on me, I would like——

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not called on you yet.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given you a warning.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, can I rise on a point of Order?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The hon. junior member for the City may continue.

Mr. LEWIS: I am very sorry that the remarks which I have to make should be made in this atmosphere, I am appealing to honourable members concerned to let us take a serious view of what we are doing in the interest of the people of this colony. Has the Government considered that while they are getting similar duties performed in this colony for a similar salary they are increasing this particular post of Medical Officer of Health for St. Michael and at the same time raising the salary above that of the Senior Medical Officer of Health in this colony? This is a matter which I should like the Government to assure us that they have given consideration to because on a previous occasion, after an investigation at the General Hospital, the entire medical setup became dissatisfied as a result of the raising of the salaries of a particular section of the Service; and it meant that you had to go through the whole Service and make a raise in salary again.

While I sympathise with the Government for having to go to this length to secure a Medical Officer of Health for this very necessary and beneficial institution at Enmore, I would like to know whether they considered those things of which I made mention.

The next thing which I want to say is I hope that the Hon. Minister would not take advantage of the fact that we have to discuss a matter of this sort in the House. All money matters should be the concern of a Standing Committee or automatically a Committee of Supply but that is not done in this House. I do hope that the Hon. Minister would not penalise honourable members over the fact that they can only speak once on this question should they wish to add something further to what they said. I also hope that the simple questions which I have asked will be answered.

Hon. M. E. COX: The honourable member has asked for how long the services of this gentleman will be engaged? Paragraph 3 of the Schedule states that the term of engagement shall be for a period of three years in the first instance.

On the question of salary the Government tried without success to engage the services of a Medical Officer of Health for St. Michael on the same salary scale as the Medical Officer of Health for Speightstown. And in agreeing

to pay more we realised that the post which Dr. Byer is appointed to is a permanent post while this post to which we are giving consideration is a temporary post. It is always known that when we have persons engaged on contract, in view of the fact that the individual does not have pension rights, you have to pay out a higher salary than if it were a pensionable post. That represents this difference of $40 a month in salary to which we were forced to agree.

I am sure everybody will endorse the remarks made by those honourable members who have spoken in such glowing terms of the services rendered by Dr. Byer.

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

9.25 p.m.

STATEMENT *RE* ERECTION OF THE DEEP WATER HARBOUR

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement———

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether the Hon. Minister is going to make a statement on the matter on which I am rising now. If that is so I shall not desist———

Mr. SPEAKER: I prefer to hear the statement from the Government and then the honourable member will carry on with his motion.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not mind granting your request, but you must take into consideration that if the Hon. Minister were handling a matter of Government business, however urgent the case might be, I could not get up at the same time as he and insist that I be given preference.

Mr. SPEAKER: Priority is given to a statement, and there cannot be any debate on a statement. My ruling is ———— Will the honourable member take his seat?

Mr. ALLDER: I am quite willing to do what Your Honour says.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have told the honourable member that the statement will be made, and as soon as that statement has been made the honourable member may proceed with his motion. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

Hon. M. E. COX: The statement is as follows:—

Honourable members will no doubt be aware that Sir Eric Millbourn, Honorary Adviser on shipping in Port to the Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation, Commander A. M. Hughes of the Port Planning Staff of the Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation, and Mr. D. C. Coode of Messrs. Coode and Partners, Consulting Engineers, visited the Island from 9th to 17th April to make "on the spot" investigations in connection with the building of the Deep Water Harbour. The Advisers have promised to submit a report on a revised plan, which it is confidently anticipated will be less costly both as regards capital and annually recurrent costs than the plan previously envisaged.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of public importance. I am sure that the Government's Bench is already aware of my intention in making this motion for the adjournment; it is for the purpose of considering a matter of grave importance.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention that there is not a quorum present in the House and I will ask the Clerk to ring the Bell.

On the bell having been rung, a quorum was again obtained.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.————

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if the Government has nothing else to do, I want to move the adjournment of the House to discuss the Report of Professor Richardson on Social Security. I am quite serious about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member ask leave to deal with that Order?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am asking leave to deal with the Report of Professor Richardson on the question of Social Security.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my notice that there is not a quorum present in the House. I will ask the Clerk to have the bell rung.

On the bell having been rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no quorum present, I adjourn this House until this day week at three o'clock p.m. in accordance with the Rules.

9.40 p.m.