

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 26th May, 1955.

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

PRESENT:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); 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*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*) and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings held on the 4th, 8th, 10th and 15th March, 1955 respectively have been circulated amongst honourable members, and unless there be any objection these Minutes will be now taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection these Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Statement of revenue and expenditure for the half year ended the 31st March this year from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. John in connection with tenantry roads.

Also Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended the 31st March this year from the Commissioners of the parish of St. John.

ACTING DEPUTY CLERK APPOINTED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the

Clerk informing me that he is ill at the moment. He is asking for leave of absence for today's meeting of the House and that Mr. D. A. Banfield, Solicitor, be allowed to act for him.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Clerk be granted leave of absence for today's meeting.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor Papers were laid as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Premier I beg to lay Message No 12/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House of the terms of reference of the Commission which Her Majesty's Government has appointed for the purpose of making judicial arrangements for the British Caribbean Federation

The Message is as follows—

Message No. 12/1955.

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable the House of Assembly

With reference to Message No. 6/1955 dated the 22nd of March, His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the terms of reference of the Commission which Her Majesty's Government has appointed for the purpose of making judicial arrangements for the British Caribbean Federation are as follows:—

- (1) To consider in the light of the proposals in the Plan for a British Caribbean Federation (Cmd. 8895), particularly Chapter VII thereof:—

- (i) the constitution of the Federal Supreme Court;

- (ii) the original and appellate jurisdiction of the Federal Supreme Court in civil and criminal matters, including the extent, if any, to which the Federal Supreme Court should assume the appellate functions at present exercised by local courts in the respective member territories;
 - (iii) appeals from decisions of the Federal Supreme Court;
 - (iv) the legislative authority of the Legislatures of the Federation and of the member territories respectively in relation to the jurisdiction of the Federal Supreme Court;
 - (v) the method by which Rules of Court should be made for the Federal Supreme Court; and to make recommendations.
- (2) To consider the proposals contained in subparagraph (2) of paragraph 80 of the Plan for a British Caribbean Federation (Cmd. 8895) in the light of the recommendations concerning qualifications for appointment as a Judge of a permanent West Indian Court of Appeal that were adopted by the Conference of Barristers of the British Caribbean held at Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, from 25th to 29th August, 1952; and to make recommendations.
- (3) To consider whether the Federal Supreme Court should have jurisdiction to hear appeals from the courts of British Guiana, British Honduras and the Bahamas (or of any of those territories) if those territories (or any of them) so desire; and to make recommendations.
- (4) If it is recommended that the Federal Supreme Court should have jurisdiction to hear appeals from the courts of any of the territories referred to in Head (3) above, to consider—
- (i) What that appellate jurisdiction should be, including the extent, if any, to which the Federal Supreme Court should assume appellate functions at present exercised by local courts in such territory.
 - (ii) appeals from decisions of the Federal Supreme Court in any case originating in the courts of such territory;
 - (iii) the legislative authority of the legislatures of the Federation and of such territory respectively in relation to the jurisdiction of the Federal Supreme Court to hear appeals from the courts of such territory;
 - (iv) the apportionment to such territory of a share of the cost of the Federal Supreme Court;
- and to make recommendations.

2. Sir Allan Chalmers Smith, M.C., the Chairman of the Commission, is expected to take up his duties in Barbados on the 24th June.

3. Mr. W. H. Swaby, Resident Magistrate, Jamaica, who has been appointed Secretary of the Commission, is expected to arrive in Barbados about the 12th June.

4. The names of the West Indian members of the Commission are as follows:—

Barbados—Mr. F. E. Field, Acting Attorney General.

Jamaica—Mr. J. L. Cundall, Q.C. Attorney General.

Leeward Islands—Mr. W. A. Date, Puisne Judge, Windward and Leeward Islands.

Trinidad—Mr. C. DeL. Inniss, Attorney General

Windward Islands—Mr. K. H. C. Alleyne, Acting Attorney General.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.

24th May, 1955.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I also beg to lay on behalf of the Premier, Message No. 13/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House of the terms of reference of the Commission appointed for the purpose of making fiscal arrangements for the British Caribbean Commission.

The Message is as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 13/1955

His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable The House of Assembly

With reference to Message No. 6/1955 dated the 22nd of March, His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the terms of reference of the Commission which Her Majesty's Government has appointed for the purpose of making fiscal arrangements for the British Caribbean Federation are as follows:—

In the light of the Report by the Conference on West Indian Federation (Cmd. 8837), in particular paragraphs 25, 26, 30, 33 to 41 thereof, of the Plan for a British Caribbean Federation (Cmd. 8895), of the reports of the parallel Commissions established to examine the Federal Civil Service and the Federal Judiciary, and on the assumption that the Federation will provide for the establishment of a Customs Union for the West Indies on the lines recommended by the Commission on the establishment of a Customs Union in the British Caribbean area (Colonial No. 268);

And, further, bearing in mind British Guiana and British Honduras should be enabled to continue their participation in the various regional organisations and to join Federation later on if they should wish to do so;

- (i) To examine and report on the cost of:
 - (a) the net capital services required by Federation;
 - (b) the net recurrent services connected with Federation, including the cost of providing the salaries of civil servants on the scales determined by the Civil Service Preparatory Commission, together with the cost of salaries of members of the Council of State and members of the Legislature;

- (c) any other services which it may have been decided should be met from Federal finances;
- (d) any regional service or establishment which upon the establishment of Federation should be maintained or created by the Federal Government;
- (e) the establishment of a reserve which shall be adequate to ensure the ability of the Federation to meet its obligation despite fluctuations of revenue, with due regard to the need for long term viability;
- (ii) To examine and report on:
 - (a) The Federal revenues which will be available on the principles laid down;
 - (b) the implications, from the point of view of ensuring that adequate Federal revenue is maintained, of the system in force, or likely to be adopted under Customs Union, for fixing and levying customs duties.
- (iii) to examine and report on the adequacy of the expected Federal revenue to meet expected Federal costs.
- (iv) in the event of revenue appearing inadequate to meet costs, to make such recommendations for maintaining solvency as would be consistent with the principles already laid down.
- (v) to consider the nature of the financial arrangements between the Federal Government and unit Governments, as referred to in paragraph 42 of the Report by the Conference on West Indian Federation (Cmd. 8837), and to make recommendations as to the context of such agreements.
- (vi) to consider with reference to existing control and make recommendations regarding the nature and extent of control to be exercised by the Federal Government and Colonial Office over the expenditure out of the grant-in-aid received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

2. Sir Sydney Caine, K.C.M.G., the Chairman of the Commission is expected to arrive in Jamaica about the middle of June for a meeting of the Principals of Colonial Universities, and will, thereafter, be free to begin work in connection with the Commission. The date of his arrival in Barbados is not yet known.

3. Mr. G. I. Phillips, Assistant Secretary, Jamaica, and Mr. C. D. Smith, Principal in the United Kingdom Treasury, have been appointed Joint Secretaries of the Commission. Mr. Phillips is expected to arrive in Barbados within the course of the next few days.

4. The names of the representatives of the West Indian Governments on the Commission are as follows:—

BARBADOS—Mr. E. S. S. Burrowes, Financial Secretary.

JAMAICA—Mr. F. D. C. Williams, Financial Secretary.

LEEWARD ISLANDS

Antigua — Mr. J. R. A. McDonald, M.B.E., Chief Accountant.

St. Kitts — Mr. C. A. Jacobs, Accountant Treasurer.

Montserrat — Mr. O. E. Henry, Treasurer.
TRINIDAD—Mr. L. N. Blache Fraser, Financial Secretary.

WINDWARD ISLANDS—Mr D. J. Kirkness, Financial and Economic Adviser.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,

Governor.

Government House,
Barbados,
26th May, 1955.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (For the Premier) Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th September, 1954.

Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 31st December, 1954.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the twelve months ended 31st March, 1955.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for the month ended 30th April, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: Expenditure of the Housing Board for the year 1954-55.

The Public Wharves (Control) (Amendment) Regulations, 1955.

The Public Officers' Housing Loans Regulations, 1955.

Hon. M. E. COX: (For the Premier) Reply to Question No. 44 regarding the granting of a gratuity to the estate of the late Clyde Springer of the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. VAUGHAN entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows—

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution in connection with the taking over of the Barbados Gas Company Ltd. by the Natural Gas Corporation.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to approve the transfer by the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation Limited to the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited of the Orders contained in the Schedule to the Electric Light and Power (Provisional Orders Confirmation) Act 1907.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (For the Premier): Bill to amend the General Loan and Stock Act, 1935.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (For the Premier): Bill to amend the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the General Loan and Stock Act, 1935 be read a first time.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

There being no objection the Bill was read a first time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: (On behalf of the Premier) I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities Act, 1902, be read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

There being no objection the Bill was read a first time.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, be read a first time.

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

There being no objection the Bill was read a first time.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, things are a bit irregular; the Order Paper not being very well arranged, I am asking leave to take Order No. 7, as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to take Order No. 7 as the first Order of the day. Unless there is any objection—

Mr. LEWIS: I am not taking objection. This is a most important order on the Order Paper, and to set it down as No. 7 seems to me not to give members the right to conclude that Government intended to proceed with it today.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the junior member for the City that with an Order Paper as big as this it is not to be expected that honourable members would be able to go through this Bill and be familiar with all the details; and I would ask the Leader of the House more or less to confine himself to the smaller items of the Order Paper. We have just come back from cricket and a Bankholiday; and as one member said to me, it seems like a schoolboy's Monday. I am sure we were not prepared for big issues today, and if the Hon. Leader of the House can confine himself to the smaller items of the Order Paper it would be greatly appreciated on this side.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, as I have just said I was not there for a few weeks; and I understand that the House on one occasion adjourned for the want of a quorum, and on the other occasion the Order Paper was not fixed since everybody was in a hurry to get down to cricket. This particular Order, Order No. 7, was read a first time on 7th March. I am sure honourable members must have read through this Bill if they give any attention to their work. If the honourable member has no knowledge of this Bill and he wants the Hon. Minister in charge of the Bill to make the second reading speech on it in order that the Minister might get away, then say so.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I quite sympathise with some members who would allow certain things like cricket to interfere with their duties in the House. This Bill has been given notice of quite a long time and it is a very important Bill; that is why we are in a hurry to get ahead with it; I therefore hope that the House will at least debate the second reading. If the members of the Opposition have not gone through this Bill section by section then after the second reading the Bill could be postponed to another date, so that Hon. members could make their points in Committee without having to send the Bill to a Select Committee. The object of this Bill —[A VOICE: Permission has not been granted to proceed with the Bill].

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: One hon. member has said that permission to proceed with this Bill has not been granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Permission has been granted. When the hon. junior member for the City was speaking I hinted to him that permission would

be granted if he did not take objection to the Hon. Minister asking for leave.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to establish a Development Board for the purpose of encouraging the development of industry and the agriculture of the island. Members will recall that the Government stated its intention to establish such a Board in the Five Year Plan. In that plan the Government said: "To encourage and foster the development of industries of the island it is proposed to set up a Board on the lines of the Industrial Development Corporation which has been recently established in Jamaica. An Executive will be appointed by the Board and there will be a Secretary and a Stenotypist. The Board will encourage the exploration and development of the existing industries in this island."

That, sir, would be the broad outline of the policy for promoting industry and the setting up of this Board as envisaged in the Five Year Plan. In that Plan an amount of \$1m was set aside towards the financing of this Board. Members no doubt will question the long delay in the Government bringing down this Bill. That is due to several factors.

3.35 p.m.

First there was the need to examine this matter most carefully and to see how far or how closely we could afford to follow the legislation enacted and the corporation which has been set up in the sister island of Jamaica. It has been found necessary of course, to revise and to reshape that particular legislation, (which we stated we would follow) in order to suit local conditions and to adapt it in the light of the experiences of Jamaica from whom we have got advice. Let me say that Jamaica has set up two bodies—an Industrial Development Board and an Agricultural Development Board. We have avoided such elaborate procedure and have combined the best features of both; we feel there is no need to go into such an elaborate and ambitious a scheme as that of Jamaica. We are content to have a Barbados Development Board making provisions for new industries and the fields of agriculture not yet established.

Another thing which delayed us from bringing down this Bill earlier, was that since the Five Year Plan was formulated, there were such agencies visiting the West Indies as the World Bank Mission which visited Jamaica and reported on the industrial and agricultural corporation; also there has been the Report of the British Industrialists which visited these parts and had something to say on legislation of this sort. If I may delve a little more into the history behind this Bill, I think the House will remember that in July 1953 the Government decided to set up a Committee under the Chairmanship of Sir John Saint.

This Committee reported towards the end of that year and early in the following year Ministerial Status was instituted, and I found on taking up office that I had all the various matters to consider most carefully. As a matter of fact, we in the Ministry went through the various matters very carefully. There were some aspects with which I was not satisfied, and we got in touch with the Jamaica Government in order to find out what the results had been on those matters. It was due to all those various reasons that this Bill has been delayed to this extent.

Let me start off at this point by saying that I think the House will agree that when the idea of this Development Board was first mooted in the Five Year Plan, the general picture facing industrial development in Barbados was pretty bleak.

We can take one example; the lack of electric power and fuel in this island. Members would hardly have to be reminded that it is useless to talk of Industrial Development unless sources of power are available and also cheaply at that. Around that time we were faced with the break down of the Barbados Electric Corporation; since then there has been an improvement. Within recent weeks we have been able to report substantial progress in this concern. I am very glad to say that the picture is much rosier today through the loan which the Electric Corporation has been able to obtain from C.D.C. With the advent of this recent improvement, this island is now faced within a brighter picture of future industrial development. I think the House will agree that instead of the gloomy picture surrounding industrial development there is a silver lining to it today.

I may say that even in the matter of shipping facilities (which were very poor in 1952) there has been a measure of improvement; and today the *S.S. West Indian* is running a subsidised service between these islands, and as a result difficulties in this respect have been relieved to a great extent. We can say that although we have had a delay with this Bill, the surrounding circumstances are such that its coming at this time has opened up new hope for industries. We can say today that the electric power is there and shipping facilities are not as difficult as in the past. Then there is the Natural Gas Corporation. As members would have seen from the Resolution which I have given notice of today, Government will be taking over the Barbados Gas Company if sanctioned by the Legislature, and that will provide an additional source of power. Under these circumstances this Bill could not have come at a better time than this. There is every reason to hope that this island will benefit from the operation of this Development Board. And from the increased facilities that will be made available to industries, we hope that we will attract new industries to this island.

Now, Sir, the functions of this Board are set out in the Objects and Reasons to this Bill generally. The Board is principally charged with the duties of stimulating, facilitating and encouraging the development of such agricultural undertakings as are not well established in this island.

Under Clause 8, hon. members will see that other general powers are sought to be conferred on the Board. Clause 8 reads as follows:—

"The Board shall have power to do anything and to enter into any transaction (whether or not involving expenditure, borrowing, grating of loans, the guarantee of and undertaking given in relation to the financing of anybody or person, or investment of money in accordance with the provisions of this Act in that behalf, the acquisition of any property or rights, or, subject to the provisions of Section 18 of this Act, the disposal of any property or rights) which in its opinion is calculated to facilitate the proper discharge of its functions or is incidental or conducive thereto."

Under those powers, the Board is given the authority to carry on:

- (a) any activity which appears to the Board to be advantageous or convenient in connection with the discharge of its duties;
- (b) to promote the carrying on of such activities by other persons; and
- (c) to carry on such activities in association with other persons, including Government authorities.

3.45 p.m.

Those are the powers and functions of this Board. Hon. members will note the words "stimulate", "facilitate" and "undertake". These are not meant to be alliterative only. Where the Board finds it possible, it is its duty to stimulate and facilitate development of industries either by making loans, or even undertake the development of industries. I would like to stress the word "undertake". There is a school of thought in this island which holds the view that a Government Agency of this nature should not itself undertake industrial development. Anything which might have relationship in some form or other with the Government is anathema to those persons when it comes to taking or setting up industries. Now, sir, unfortunately it is true that certain reports recently have lent encouragement to this school of thought; but I think the House will agree that wherever private enterprise itself for reasons best known to itself falls down on the job or does not come into a colony and explore possible avenues of development, it is the duty of a Government or a Board like this to begin and make a start in industrial development with the financial resources at its disposal. There is absolutely no argument that I can see in the view that because this Board is a semi-Government authority, therefore it should not undertake development on its own. Advice from Jamaica has been sought; because there is a school of thought that we should not follow Jamaica in that respect. We sought this advice from Jamaica because the Jamaica Bill contains these words "stimulate, undertake and facilitate"; and I have been told by Jamaica representatives that the Development Corporation has been very successful in starting Agricultural Development Schemes in that territory. The advice sent us from the Jamaica Government is that it would be unwise and silly not to invest this Board with the power to undertake these industries where the Board deems it necessary to do so, and that we should not go ahead and do it. In the future this Board should only stimulate industrial development but wherever possible, it should undertake any industrial development.

In 1952 an Industrial Development Conference was held in Puerto Rico and this Conference was attended by representatives from Barbados. Among the things recommended by this Conference were these: that territorial Governments should examine the suitability of establishing development authorities whose functions might include the planning of industrial sites; initiating and financing public corporations where necessary; the administration of legislation relating to the promotions of industries; examining the possibilities for industrial development and bringing them to the attention of foreign and local prospective industrialists; seeking investment capital from external and local sources; assisting new industries with regard to building sites, transfer of assets, legislation and regulations, and to all other matters arising from local conditions; providing or promoting industrial research and advisory services; providing, where necessary, industrial services such as the selection and training of labour and technical assistance; providing liaison between industrialists on the one hand, and local agencies, institutions, and Government services on the other; working for the understanding and support of the industrial programme through the whole community.

The Report went on: "The Conference considered that, where public funds have been made available for investment in industry, it may be desirable that the Development Authority should be responsible for their investment. In special circumstances, it may be desirable that the Authority

should operate a particular "key" industry on its own account if private risk capital was not available."

A Conference such as this has come down most strongly in support of Government or Boards operating industries on their own where they deem it necessary to do so. Generally this Board will follow the lines recommended by this Conference is encouraging industries and stimulating their endeavours.

Honourable members will see that these are very wide objects; they are absolutely fundamental to any successful industrialisation programme. Honourable members will agree that this Board should be comprised of very able men, men with wide experience in practical, commercial and other affairs; and of course, with the interests of the community at heart.

If honourable members will examine the Objects and Reasons of this Bill carefully, they will see that it is the intention so to speak to get the best out of both worlds—the world of Government and that of private enterprise. This Board will be subject to the overall policy of the Government. Since it will be backed up by Government's funds, it has to be worked and operated in accordance with Government's policy, and the policy laid down by the elected representatives of the people, who ultimately control the Government. At the same time, if honourable members examine this Bill very carefully, they will see that in the day to day functioning of the Board there will be as little interference as possible by the Government in the affairs of this Board.

3.55 p.m.

The Board will comprise men of practical experience in these matters. It is a Board which we will want to attain the utmost initiative in these matters; therefore we say; while you have to act in accordance with Government's policy, we are not going to tie you down by making matters difficult for you as you will have to go into industrial matters of every kind. Members will see that from Clause 17 of the Bill which states "the Governor-in-Executive Committee may after consultation with the Chairman, or in the event of the Chairman being absent abroad the Deputy Chairman, give to the Board directions of a general character as to the policy to be followed in the exercise and performance of their functions in relation to matters appearing to him to concern the public interest, and the Board shall give effect to any such directions."

That in effect is the equivalent to saying that Government will have ultimate control as regards the overall policy of the Board, but in all other matters there will be as little interference as possible; so that the Board will have a free hand, not only to act swiftly, but to assist and take the initiative in all such matters.

As regard the composition of the Board, members will see from Clause 3 that members will be appointed by the Executive Committee. Provision will be made for not less than seven members. Members will be appointed for a time not exceeding three years; there will be only one official member of the Board. Clause 4 makes the Board a corporate body, and Clause 6, deals with the procedure and meetings of the Board. Power is given to the Chairman to co-opt one or more persons to attend any particular meeting of the Board at which it is dealing with the needs of a particular industry or agricultural undertaking for the purpose of assisting or advising the Board. The Board has also been given power to appoint committees; and these committees shall in-

clude at least two members of the Board together with such other persons whether members of the Board or not, whose assistance or advice the Board may desire. In clause 10 the Board is given power to delegate certain duties to any members or Committee of the Board. Clause 16 makes it incumbent for a member to disclose to the Board any interest he may have in any transaction into which the Board is entering. Failure on the part of the member to disclose such information to the Board makes him guilty of an offence. The sources of capital of the Board are set out in clause 19. These will consist of the sums voted by the Legislature from time to time. This year we have voted under the Estimates the sum of \$250,000 to be allocated to this Board. Clause 21 enables the Governor-in-Executive Committee to guarantee borrowing by the Board. But the extent to which this may be done is limited to such an amount as may be approved by the Legislature. The House will see that by Clauses 29 and 30 power is given to the corporation to examine the accounts of any industry or body asking for financial assistance or anybody which may actually obtain assistance from the Board; so that provision is made to protect, as closely as possible, any loans or financial backing given by the Government to be used by the Board to assist any industrial undertaking. There is a penalty provided in Clause 36 against any misapplication of loans or against any person obtaining a loan through misrepresentation; that is to say he has said one thing, that the loan will be applied for one purpose, and he may go and apply it for another. The House will thus see that every effort is made to safeguard public funds. Clause 33 provides for the keeping of accounts of the Board and for an annual audit thereof by the Auditor General.

Mr. Speaker, those are the most important Clauses which I have read from the Objects and Reasons. As I have already said, the setting up of this Board could not have come at a more auspicious time. The House will soon have before it legislation to provide for carrying out further assistance to industry which the Hon. Premier promised when making his budget speech. All these things, the improvement in our electric supply, further assistance to industry, the opening of the Technical Institute which will train youths for work of a technical nature—all these things are conducive to a climate of development of industries which we hope will take place in the very near future at an accelerated rate in this island.

This Board too will pay special attention to small industries which may find it difficult to obtain capital from the usual private sources. Every precaution will of course be taken. Risk capital will be subscribed only to an industry which gives promise of being run efficiently but no industry which makes it an under risk to invest in it will be assisted simply because it is asking the Board for a loan. That industry must show every chance of making a success. It is known that small people who would like to start industries are not in a position to do so simply because it is very difficult for them to get capital. That is where this Board would come in. This Board will be able to help the small entrepreneur as well as the medium sized entrepreneur.

I do not think I can say very much more on this Bill. It is a fact that honourable members had it in their hands for only a few weeks and I do not think they have had the chance to go into it as thoroughly as they would like. However I hope there will be no motion to send it to a Select Committee because that would purely be a waste of time. If honourable members have not studied it

as carefully as they would like I would agree to the postponement of the second reading to a later stage. 4.05 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I am seconding the motion of the Hon. Minister of Trade for the second reading of this Bill. In recent years the Indian Governments have recognised the necessity for further development of these colonies, and they have come to realise from that time that such development would be slow indeed unless they take an active interest in doing it themselves. A classic example of such an awareness is the Government of Puerto Rico. The public corporation has become the recognised feature of such development. Again I must say that the classic example of the success of such a public corporation has been amply demonstrated in the colony of Puerto Rico.

Sir, I am very glad to see that at long last this Government has come to appreciate the necessity for launching such a public corporation as its direct agency for the further development of our colony, a development which we so sadly need and which we can so dangerously neglect. However, it is well if all of us realise that such a corporation, though an agency of Government, must be independent in its decisions and functions and that no political attractions or influence should interfere with it. We should all realise that where the Governor-in-Executive Committee will come into this matter in this most important function is in recommending the personnel to form such a Development Board. We in this island have the dangerous tendency of concentrating on a few pet officials in the establishment of any and all important agencies; and in the conservatism which prevails amongst such pet officials, there is the danger that such conservatism in its outlook will retard development. Let us take for an example the many years now that there were the discussions going on for the establishment of a Pastuerization Plant. I for one can well imagine that if certain diehards are placed on that Development Board whose general convictions are what they are, there will be no further developments for agriculture in this colony. I know that there are many people in high places who are likely to be placed on that Board, but whose general convictions are that there is no further development for agriculture in this colony. It would be a disaster to place such people on that Board. They are also people who are likely to be placed on that Board who would shrink from and would be seriously opposed to giving aid to certain industries, because such industries may not be carried on by the type of personnel which traditionally meet with their approval. When it comes to the personnel of that Board, such things are positive dangers in the establishment of that Board; that is the first snag against the success of this Board. It is a real snag which the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have to be constantly aware of. I say again, that we have some existing industries whose expansion have been retarded through lack of further capitalization. Let us take for instance the infant industry for the production of building material.

4.15 p.m.

There may be industries which from all angles would be a valuable asset to this country especially by the rapid expansion of housing which is so sadly needed, and of which the Government is so very well aware. What could be a better need than aid from this Board to such an industry? The market is local and it is assured. We could think of another thing: the development of a condensary plant to aid our

agricultural development, a substantial dairy industry. Those are two instances which I visualise that certain types of Boards would be unalterably prejudiced to giving such aid. We cannot afford at this initial stage of our attempt, to nominate such personnel whose prejudices will be very effective in retarding such developments as is undoubtedly possible in our island. I know the island of which I speak; Mr. Speaker, you know the island of which I speak. You know that there is no exaggeration in saying that share traditional prejudice can be a great stumbling block to the advancement of the progress we are attempting to make; and it is the duty of the Minister to see that diehards, regardless how eminent their position in this colony is, are not placed as the ruling personnel in that set-up. They are not the only ones with brains; you have some young business men here who are entirely unnoticed by the Government. When they are about to set-up some Board or the other, they are some of them who have far more brains than the old conventional recognised foggies.

There are some young men to be found who are not afraid to venture at something else besides sugar. We do not want sugar diehards who cannot see more than sugar and molasses; we want them to know that there is something which this island can produce in addition to sugar and can be successful as an industry. I am fed up and sick unto death from hearing from people that we cannot grow anything more than sugar. I am not saying that we should stop growing sugar, but there are other things which we can grow and which would give this country greater development. There are those who have a sincere conviction that the only people who can carry on business are people like themselves; and therefore they would be prejudiced to giving aid to those who do not look like themselves. I hope that when they are assisting industries which cannot expand because of the lack of industrialisation, such industries will be picked out by this Board and given the opportunity to expand their production in the way which is necessary, and which will give great promise of great success.

I have already mentioned the building material industries. Mr. Speaker, none of us have really studied this Bill, but I believe that there is a Clause in the Bill by which the corporation will have the power to contract loans. The corporations founded by the Puerto Rican Government have such powers; they have the power to contract loans in foreign countries. You must not set up the corporation and then put such binding conditions on its functions that you make it incapable of reaching the success which is possible by such a corporation. As I have said, the most important part of this matter is the type of personnel which will form this Board. I want the Minister and his colleagues to sleep and wake on these words, because in this island they can easily appoint such personnel that will make the venture a still-born concern. If they do that then this Bill becomes a farce; we do not want this Bill to become a farce. We want it to be a living document easing the minds of the people who are now walking about unemployed; we want it to be a document which we can see translated into industrial and agricultural activity. We want it to be a document which in some years to come others can look back and say that the day when the House of Assembly considered this Bill it was indeed a red letter day in the history of the colony. Every possible form of development which this Board can undertake, whether it is in a small way or in a big way, once they have any promise and the ability to

see that this may be a success they should not hesitate to undertake it. There is such a thing as a handicraft industry which should be included by this proposed Development Board.

Many home industries which may be developed should come under the notice and concern of this Board; there is none too small or unworthy of such notice and concern. If we can have many hundreds of homes employing a worker or two, these workers should be able at home to produce an increase in the smaller industries, such as the tourist industry. There is nothing too small to consider so long as there is the possibility of a market. I will now sit down by reiterating my earlier point; that is, that the composition of the Board is an all-important matter in this entire document.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, When I rose on the first occasion to ask the Hon. Leader not to pursue this Bill tonight since we were not quite prepared to consider it, I did not mean that we did not have enough time to study it. Most of us on this side of the table have been through this Bill, but it is such an important Bill, that we would like to have the opportunity of discussing its details in order that we might do greater justice to it. I do not wish at this stage to embark on its merits, inasmuch as I have sounded the feelings of honourable members of the House, and I am going to make a motion for the postponement of the Bill.

I appreciate very much the attitude of the Minister of Labour in introducing this Bill today from one point of view; he is going away soon and may be away for three or four weeks. We all realise the importance and necessity of having this Bill passed by the Legislature, because many of us feel that it is late already. Therefore, with these remarks, I am going to formerly move the postponement of this Bill for further consideration; and we will pay attention to it, I hope, at a very early date.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I accept the postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has accepted the postponement.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; and I am asking leave that it might be taken charge of by the Hon. Minister for Agriculture.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker I am asking leave to postpone orders No. 1 and 2 in Committee of Supply and to proceed with Order No. 3.

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

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The Chairman took the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE

Pig Breeding Inspection

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution to place the sum of \$2,831 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. 6 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

The first Item is Head 21, Science and Agriculture, Pig-Breeding Inspection. As the Note sets out in the Addendum, it has been found necessary on the recommendation of the Director of Agriculture that three temporary inspectors should assist the present Peasant Agricultural Inspectors in the inspection required for the Pig Subsidy Scheme and it is proposed to appoint three temporary Inspectors who will be employed at the rate of \$72.00 per month, which will make a total of \$2,472 to be made up as follows:

Salaries: 3 Inspectors @ \$72.00	
a month from 1st June,	
1955	\$2,160
Cost of Living Allowance	312
	\$2,472

Funds for meeting the cost of travelling in connection with the scheme, at the rate of \$40 per month per Inspector, are available under Head 21, Item 41. That is the proposal, in so far as travelling allowance is concerned.

Honourable members will remember that when the Estimates were being considered in this House, there was a vote of \$60,000 to subsidise a Pig Subsidy Scheme. It was mentioned then that attempts had been made to see whether it could be possible to enlist the co-operation of the Sanitary Inspectors of the parishes in carrying out these necessary inspections. We have communicated with the various sanitary authorities of the respective parishes and have got a reply from only one parish, the parish of St. Philip. None of the other parishes have replied, with the result that we have to fall back on the original programme, which is the only workable programme; because it is very essential to have this staff of inspectors to assist the Department of Agriculture.

I hardly think there is anything more to add, and I am moving that the sum of \$2,472 stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is not usual for the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to make mistakes so I can say this mistake which he has made may be due to the Head of the Department who has misinformed him. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture made the statement that he has not been able to get the co-operation of the Sanitary Inspectors of the island in this matter, and that only one parish has replied to the Director. I am absolutely sure that the parish of St. Michael sent a reply to the Director with respect to this matter. If the letter has been withheld from the Hon. Minister it shows you what can happen. I am going further by saying that not only did the Commissioners of Health for St. Michael send a reply, but on the behalf of the Sanitary Inspectors, an appointment was made for the Chief Sanitary Inspector to discuss the matter with the Director. I want to let the Hon. Minister know that the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael actually agreed that the Sanitary Inspectors could do this job for this Government; because it did not interfere with their work, and they wrote a letter to the Government in reply to that effect. But the Director of Agriculture or whoever it was that was responsible actually dic-

tated to the Board how much Government was going to pay the Inspectors for doing the job. The letter from the Government stated that they would be prepared to pay not more than 20 cents per inspection.

Now, sir, here it is that you have a set-up of professional young men and they resented rightly so, that attitude of the Government. The Sanitary Commissioners were asked to help in this inspection but on top of that they were told that Government was not paying Sanitary Inspectors more than 20 cents per inspection, and not more than \$1 for anything they did in a day.

As is known generally, (and I think the Hon. Leader of the House knows it too) it is compulsory for every Sanitary Inspector to report on pig-sties; and such statistics are kept by the General Board of Health; so those statistics are in the hands of the Government although they may be in a different department from that of the Department of Agriculture. Again, I am going to say that I do not think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was correctly informed; I know that he is not the type of Minister who would misinform the House. He said that only the Commissioners of Health in the parish of St. Philip sent in a reply, but if the Hon. Minister were to look into the matter he would see that the St. Michael Commissioners of Health also sent in their reply.

Let me say that the attitude adopted by the St. Michael Sanitary Inspectors was also adopted by Sanitary Inspectors of the various parishes. Let me say that it is rather scant courtesy, (or to put it more bluntly) it was rather discourteous for any Government Department not to have kept the appointment which was asked for by the St. Michael Sanitary Inspectors.

I am not opposing the Resolution, but I think those facts should be made known. After all, Sanitary Inspectors are professional men. The Commissioners of Health cannot make Sanitary Inspectors do this job for you; but we gave them permission to do it. Sir, the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael have not been paid the common courtesy of a reply to their letter. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would agree that if what I say is true, then he has been misinformed. If that is so this Resolution should not be passed on these conditions; it should be postponed for the Director of Agriculture to tell him the facts. I am in a position to say that a letter was received from the Director of Agriculture about this matter by the Commissioners of Health for St. Michael, and that this Board granted permission to its Sanitary Inspectors to do this work. I also saw the letter in which the Sanitary Inspectors asked the Commissioners of Health to take up the matter with the Director of Agriculture relative to the price to be paid for inspection. I think the Hon. Minister should be able to give further light on this matter; if he has not the documents to hand he should postpone this matter. I do not think it is right that they should withhold this information from the Hon. Minister.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: While the Hon. Minister is doing some research in his file, I will add a word. The price offered the Sanitary Inspectors was scandalously inadequate; and one could not expect the Inspectors to be in any way enthusiastic about that very poor remuneration. It was definitely insulting. The feeling of the Director of Agriculture is that you can offer a Sanitary Inspector anything and he would be satisfied with it; but it is time that that sort of thing be got out of the head of the Director

of Agriculture and out of the heads of others too. There is the feeling that if you have any little thing to do you can call upon the Sanitary Inspectors to do it; it is these same Sanitary Inspectors who are insisted upon to take the local Examination and the Examination of the Royal Sanitary Institute and yet when it is a question of any little job to be done around the place, they are expected to accept an offer like this one for 20 cents. I am quite sure that was done without the knowledge or connivance of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture; we know how much attention the Hon. Minister pays to his work; and he cannot be watching everything at the same time. I see no objection to this counter proposal because it will provide employment for these people. The proposed salary of \$72.00 a month with a Cost of Living Allowance does not seem to be handsome, but it is certainly better to provide employment for these people than to expect the Sanitary Inspectors to do this work for the small remuneration which was at first offered. A circular was sent around; they stipulated the price which they were recommending and that price was less than an insult to these very hard-working and very highly-qualified gentlemen who comprise the Sanitary Staff of this island.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I think I should add that the facts are already at the disposal of the Government as to the number of piglets in any part of the island, because these facts have to be reported to the Director of Agriculture. I should like to say this: if you are providing work for people, you are providing work for people. The reasons given as to why you have to do this, I personally resent. Under the set-up of this island, you already have the facts which you can get monthly and which you would really want. I should really like to know from the Hon. Minister whether they are withholding the facts from him; if that is so, he should let Heads of Departments know that they should not withhold anything from him. I know they actually thought in this Department that the Inspectors were rude in discussing the matter when they were offered this 20 cents..

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I certainly appreciate the remarks of honourable members who have spoken, but my information is just as I have given it. However, I will enquire further as to the points which have been raised by the honourable senior member for the City and by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy; but I am asking honourable members in the interest of this Pig Subsidy Scheme, to allow this Resolution to go through, in that a great hardship is being experienced with the present staff of Agricultural Instructors. There is very little more that I can add at this stage.

Mr. MILLER: It is a real pity that the Government has failed to employ the Sanitary Inspectors. You are now thinking of employing three new Inspectors but this will be a tremendous job, and it certainly will involve a lot more transportation being done than is envisaged at the moment. At the figure of 30 cents, 35 cents or even 40 cents for an inspection, an Inspector would get an average of \$10.00 or \$12.00 a month and it would be a question of efficiency in seeing that you provide the necessary encouragement so as to make this scheme a success. The Hon. Minister does not seem to have all the information. The Inspectors in the St. Michael area would not handle the Scheme because the amount offered them was too small. However, if you press for the employment of these three Inspectors, we have no other alternative than to go along with it. In all these things you have to get reports; and where there is an individual who has a pig and who would

care to have an inspection to satisfy the authorities so as to be given this subsidy, he would have to go out of the way and that will involve time, transportation and other incidental costs. You will have this individual coming say, from St. Andrew to the City to make an arrangement for a single pig; whereas if the Scheme is arranged whereby you could get the Sanitary Inspectors island wide to handle it, that would be an easy job.

At the moment you have your Housing Welfare Scheme going on; there are two Inspectors but they have never been able to catch up with the inspections, with the results that there are many files lying down for a long period because the Inspectors have been unable to cope with the requirements of the people. You will certainly have more requests for inspections than what the Inspectors of the Housing Board now handle, which involves a tremendous amount of transportation; and people will be denied the facilities of this Scheme. These three people cannot really do the job which you want to do. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister would not agree to the amount of 30 cents for the Sanitary Inspectors and no Inspector would get more than \$10.00 or \$12.00 a month. Obviously, there would be a check made with the pig breeders themselves as to the requirements.

4.55 p.m.

It is a tremendous job; and what I said earlier is not by way of criticism at all. It must not be regarded as a criticism. I am just thinking of the efficiency of the Scheme.

With the three inspectors, they will have to cover the inspection of the whole island. Obviously, you will have other people from some other districts. Weeks will lapse. That is not just wild anticipation of the difficulties in the three inspectors handling the Subsidy. Perhaps it would be of better benefit to the Government if it had put twice as much on the Scheme.

Various figures might have to be returned to the Department of Science and Agriculture. It is different from inspecting a pig and giving some note for delivery. I am going to support the Resolution, if the Minister of Agriculture thinks that he can make another effort with the Sanitary Inspectors.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the honourable member who has just sat down, I will say that the inspection at present is being conducted by the other Peasant Agricultural Instructors. This is a question of three additional inspectors to assist the present staff of inspectors.

There are three areas at present not being served by the Peasant Agricultural Instructors. It is not that these three inspectors will be doing the inspectors' work for the entire island; it is just that we need three additional inspectors to be tacked on the present staff who are at present performing the duties. These three inspectors will form a full complement with the understanding that three inspectors will be sent to the Eastern Caribbean Institute shortly to pursue further studies; so that the three inspectors mentioned in the Addendum to the Resolution will be put to work plus four more who will be appointed shortly, and together they will form a full complement.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to apologise to the Minister of Agriculture for speaking after he has spoken on two occasions; but this is not a matter which I can pass over lightly.

When the Scheme was being considered in here, some of us made the suggestion about the Sanitary Inspectors; even reminded the Government that the inspectors must see to it that people must keep

their pig places clean, etc. When I heard my colleague say that this is a work that has already been done, and when I know that there are lots of inspectors of the various parishes, (the Board of Health itself must have inspectors going all over the whole island) I was feeling quite assured that this Scheme could be worked with the assistance of the Commissioners of Health and the Government's Inspectors. It looks so easy to me, sir.

A remark was made that the Department of Science and Agriculture which is dispensing this Subsidy would have no control over these people; but I do not think that these people should be able to tell lies because of that.

My colleague says that these figures are available in the ordinary inspection of the island. Unless the Director of Agriculture wanted the Scheme to offer these difficulties to him, he should have sent to the various Commissioners for help even telling them what he had proposed. Personally, I would have offered them no fee at all; I would have relied upon them to look upon it as a bit of a duty. I would also have said: "Mr. Chairman of the Commissioners of Health, would you send your Chief Sanitary Inspector to the Department of Science and Agriculture on such and such a date to discuss this Scheme with me?" or something to that effect. Then the inspectors could instruct their Chiefs saying to themselves: "since we are getting the pig-feed free," or something like that "we will do this for what we think is a reasonable inducement: 20 cents or 40 cents whatever it is."

To me the Department should have discussed the matter with them. Do not tell me that these people do not come down into Bridgetown and these people should have met the Director of Agriculture on some appointed date. I am suggesting that these people should have met the Director of Agriculture and discussed the matter with him. Is this the result you get when you just write to people and suggest that you are going to pay 20 cents for doing something in the way in which you have suggested it? You cannot tell me that if you cannot find all the pigs having piglets in a day that you would not pay 20 cents for each inspection; laymen do not insult professional men like that. You cannot do that and then expect that they will get enthusiastic and write back. It would have been better if you had offered nothing; some of them might have done it for nothing. But for you to have put 20 cents down as a professional man's labour and say that it amounts to more than a dollar, is like saying: "I still would not pay you a dollar." Should the Director of Agriculture tell people that? It does not seem right to me. This is definitely an attitude to cause the Scheme to fail, because you know you are going to insult them and then you are going to come back and say that you have jurisdiction over them. That to me is not co-operation. I have already commended the attempt to employ more people from the vast army of the unemployed, but you should not do stupidity. This is a Department that likes to dismiss people all the time; this is a Department that should try to avoid doing this kind of thing, because it has a reputation for this getting rid of its army of inspectors at the whim of people in that Department.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Minister of Agriculture should go back and insist that a proper attempt should be made to approach these Sanitary Inspectors. I have read the Note to this Resolution and I myself do not understand it. The junior member for St. George said that these temporary inspectors were in addition to the Peasant Instructors. What

has worried me a bit, is to know that there are three areas of this island in which you do not have any Agricultural Instructors at all, or the three in these particular areas are so overworked that they cannot do this pig-breeding inspecting. All we have heard today is that the St. Philip people have replied.

5.05 p.m.

When the Hon. Minister is giving information of that nature and I am in the House, I would like him to say what they said. In this case, I would have liked to hear that not only the Commissioners of St. Philip had replied, but also what they said. The Commissioners of St. Philip might have put up an excellent proposition but I have not heard anything about it. If a Head of a Department, or a sub-Head, or any kind of Head, discovers when he has given information which should later be supplemented, I think that any such further facts should be telephoned to the Minister by the Head of the Department up to the eleventh hour. Do not say that the Commissioners of St. Michael replied after the file had been sent in to you, and so far as you know, the Commissioners of St. Philip were the only people that replied. I think my colleague is right in what he said, and that the Sanitary Inspectors of St. Michael have held certain discussions and were not prepared to accept the small fee that was offered.

My idea about this thing is that all the Chief Sanitary Inspectors should have come to you to bring the views of their Sanitary Inspectors and their Boards. I would not even include the Chairmen of the various Boards. The various Boards should have been asked whether they were willing to do it and if so to send along their Chief Sanitary Inspector to arrange the terms. That is the type of letter which should have been sent out to the various Boards. The Boards should have asked their Sanitary Inspectors to do it as a public duty as they have done already on similar occasions. If they say that they would like a little remuneration for doing it, you should agree to give them something; they might have come to you and suggested that you give them 12 cents per inspection. But when you took the liberty to offer them 20 cents per inspection, it should be expected that they would take it as an insult.

Sir, I think it is time that this pig-breeding Scheme be handled in an intelligent way. I hope that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture by now has come to the conclusion that somebody is out to make this Scheme a failure. You cannot come to the House every two or three months with the same lamentable story that there is another form of bungling. I never had it in mind that we would have to offer those people any thing for doing this job; I thought that you would have only got to ask those people to assist you. If you had sent to the General Board of Health and asked the Board to check up on this matter, they would have done it for you because that is what they have to do now. The Inspectors of that Board have to go through the various parishes and see that the Sanitary Inspectors of the various parishes are doing their work. These Inspectors have motor vans and motor cars to take them around the country. You are now going to hire more motor cars to take other people around to do the same thing. Sir, this is one of the things which appear to me not to be properly handled by the Department concerned; and I hope that the Hon. Minister will let that statement come from the lips of hon. members of this House for the last time. It is not good enough to come in here every other day for more and more money to put into this Scheme. You now have three sets of people doing this thing and you now come to augment that force. Do you mean to tell me that if a

Police Sergeant of a district sent to tell you that there were 15 parts of an inch of rainfall at the district that you are going to check on that again? I am asking the Hon. Minister to take that Department seriously. It is the most vital Department in this colony because whenever you have to think of the economy of this colony, you have to think of the sugar cane and the food crops of the island. Now that this Department is starting up a little scheme for pig breeding, it is bungling at every single point.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in reply to remarks made by the hon. member, I just want to say that there is nothing in this Resolution to indicate that the three temporary inspectors to do this work are being taken on to fill the posts of other inspectors who have gone on training at the Farm Institute. The statement here is that the Director of Agriculture is recommending that these inspectors be taken on to assist in this work; there is nothing in this Resolution stating that you are just replacing them.

5.15 p.m.

At first I could not imagine why it was superimposed at the top of these Notes that you are appointing these temporary inspectors to assist the Agricultural Instructors. I want to say that stories of grief and dismay have been coming from this department in connection with the dissatisfaction over this matter. One particular individual has made several attempts, in fact the pigs were grown and sold before the inspector arrived to inspect them. Whatever has to be done is the concern of the Minister; I want to assure him that I will support this Scheme but I believe that there is a lot of unnecessary juggling with it. I said that when the Scheme first came up, and it has been so every inch of the way. The idea is to put the Scheme over and make it work; I believe that the Minister is as anxious as any other hon. member to make a success of the Scheme. All I am asking him is whether he is using these inspectors and he will terminate their services when these people return from the course in Trinidad; but the people who should undertake this Scheme are the Sanitary Inspectors. The individual with four pigs who cannot qualify for 200 pounds of feed will borrow from his neighbour. The very reason that you have changed the approach to the Scheme is to make it work, but it would be difficult for an individual with piglets not to receive assistance from the Scheme. These temporary inspectors will only replace those who are leaving the colony to attend the course in Trinidad at the Farm Institute so that the exact position will remain. I hope that the Minister will pay regard to what is said on the matter as something which is worthwhile. It is a question of the correct approach to the matter; it is a purely simple matter.

Mr. LEWIS: At least I would like to know what the people of St. Philip replied to the Director or the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: We had a meeting in connection with this matter on the 2nd April, 1955, when the Director of Agriculture stated that the proposal to employ Sanitary Inspectors to carry out this inspection under the Pig Subsidy Scheme did not appear to be workable. Only the Commissioners of Health of the parish of St. Philip were willing to co-operate and he had only received a reply from the Commissioners of St. Philip. That is the information which I have.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not intend to speak again, but that statement is an absolute and wicked lie. I do not care who made that statement, it is a lie. It is misleading. In the circumstances I will vote for this Scheme, but I will move that this

matter be postponed, if I vote for the postponement alone. I did not know that such a vicious statement was made; not only have we replied to the Department of Agriculture, but as Chairman of the Commissioners of Health of St. Michael I say that there was a meeting with the Chief Sanitary Inspector of the parish of St. Michael when the matter was discussed, and the Commissioners had given the inspectors permission to do the work; but the question of the price was a matter for the Inspectors. The Chief Sanitary Inspector reported to me that the Director of Agriculture said he would write him; it was reported by the Chief Sanitary Inspector that the Director of Agriculture had said "this is all the Government is prepared to pay them". I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed, this statement is a wicked one, it is a calculated lie directed at the Sanitary Inspectors. I wondered myself at the offer of 20 cents; it was the easiest thing to write saying that under the law you have to get these statistics, but it was not my business to tell them what to do. When we were taking a census did the Sanitary Inspectors not co-operate with the Government? The answer is "Yes." I repeat: the letter from the Director saying that he had one reply from one set of Commissioners is a wicked lie. Let the Hon. Minister contradict my statement; I will bring the file and let him see what went on between the Inspectors and the Directors. If the Government wants 10 men to do this job rather than the Inspectors, then that is the Government's business; but I will not be a party to something which I know is incorrect, not to say that the Director has misinformed the Minister. It was his duty to telephone the honourable member who is the Minister. The Civil Servants have no right to be rude to members of the public; they must consider the public. You must be civil; and the public have no right to be abusive to Civil Servants. Apparently it seems that all you need to do is to get in the Civil Service and you think you are from Oxford University; you change automatically from a human being to something else. I beg to move that the further consideration of this matter be postponed.

5.25 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be very clear that the Hon. Minister for Agriculture is not properly briefed. We all know that throughout the Caribbean no one has performed his duties as the Hon. Minister has. It is rumoured throughout this island that the Director of Agriculture does not appreciate the present system in which he is being subjected to the over-riding guidance of a Minister; and I think that the sooner we let the Director of Agriculture understand that he is subordinate to the Minister and that the Minister has the confidence of this House behind him, the better. It is time that we allowed the Director to know that the Minister of Agriculture should be receiving all that the other Ministers are receiving from the other Heads of their Departments.

When we are dealing with Sanitary Inspectors, it is felt that you can call upon them to do anything and they will usually respond and respond efficiently. (When that letter came from the Commissioners of St. Michael they at once proposed the list and it was said by the Head of the Department too, "that is enough." If the Minister of Agriculture decides in the interest of his Department that he wants to go through with the Resolution, I will certainly have to give him my vote; but he will have to make the Head of that Department understand that he is subordinate to the Minister. It is clear that the honourable senior member for Christ Church, as

Head of the Ministry, is not getting the loyal co-operation he is entitled to.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it is incumbent upon the representatives of this House to be told something of this matter; but it is best to hear it at a time when it is suitable to members to hear it. I beg to second the motion that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed. At least we will be able to hear if the Minister of Agriculture has been able to find out all about this matter. I beg to second that motion.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, a remark has just reached me from a member for St. Joseph that a reply was sent in from the Commissioner for St. Joseph. The Post Office Department has been functioning properly, and one can assume that that letter should have reached the Minister of Agriculture if the Department had any desire to assist the Minister. But that has not been brought to his knowledge.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman as a member of the Sanitary Commissioners of Christ Church, I can assure you that we also gave permission to our Sanitary Inspectors. As another honourable member has said, if every scheme Government comes down with, we have to take on special inspectors, then the Sanitary Inspectors might fill this job. It is their job to keep records of the cleanliness of every household. The House should be given more information as to why they did not pursue that Scheme and what that Scheme would cost. I want to support the motion for the postponement of further consideration of this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to say this, but a Sanitary Inspector is a loyal man in any position. What we have been trying to get Government to see is that representation might be made for a pig with so many piglets, and therefore a person may want to get some free feed and so on. The Sanitary Inspectors know more about that; they know about the pig affairs. That statement (the one referring to the sanitary authorities except St. Philip not replying) is calculated and designed to sow a seed of discontent between local Government and Central Government. I can say, (unlike other members I can swear) that the Chief Sanitary Inspector of St. Michael had a meeting with the Director; but they said that 20c. was what the Government intended to pay to the inspectors and no more. What my colleague said was right. I suggest this to you: as Minister you are entitled to have information given to you to give to this House. If I were in your place I would jump down in the Director's neck and tell him something, and if he did not like it he could resign. He should not put that information in your hand to come in here and to be blasted by members of the House. Accept a postponement; I suggest it to you. Do not try to press this. When you come in here misleading the House by accident, because you have been misled by design, then it is sufficient time to withdraw a Resolution. Apparently you have been misled; and anybody who is trying to sow a seed of discontent is not doing a service to the Colony.

I feel that the sting in this was in the letter in which you suggested 'twenty cents and no more'. If we say: we are asking you to do this and to keep the statistics for us, well. But instead of doing that, they put in another question and another and send it to us. But when you say just twenty cents and no more, and tell you either take it or leave it, that is not co-operation; I say, it is wicked.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the honourable members who are also members of the Vestries and holding prominent positions; and I will certainly investigate this matter further. It has always been the policy of this Government to see that in an inspection of this nature there should be a proper staff of inspectors who would be accountable to the Department.

5.35 p.m.

Invitations were sent to the Parochial Authorities to find out from them whether the Agricultural Department could receive their co-operation, but as I have said already, I have been instructed that only one authority replied. As the honourable senior member for the City has mentioned that the St. Michael Commissioners also replied, I will investigate that matter further; and on a future occasion, probably next week, I will give the honourable member the information which he needs.

I am asking honourable members, in the interest of the pig breeding scheme, not to hold up the passing of this Item because from the very first inspection, I have been attempting to have at least half-dozen inspectors appointed for this purpose. Far from requiring only three inspectors, I am giving the House the assurance that the time is not far distant when at least six would be required. I do think that that number should be in the Resolution before us. Owing to the shortage of staff, more Peasant Agricultural Instructors will soon be leaving the island; we do need these three temporary inspectors so that this Scheme would function properly. It must also be borne in mind that this is not the regular duty of the Peasant Agricultural Inspectors.

I am asking honourable members who I know are interested in the success of the pig-breeding scheme to desist from any attacks. I will in future see to it that copies of all letters sent to the Director of Agriculture are forwarded to my Ministry and put on the files. I am sorry to remark that it was not done in this case. I was told that the only one who replied was that of St. Philip. Mr. Chairman, I am now asking that this Head of the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. LEWIS: Does the Hon. Minister realise what he said? It is not a question of having copies of the correspondence; this is a case of this Committee being denied certain knowledge. It is not a case where we want to know what is in the letters and he does not have them; it is more serious than that. It is a case that honourable members who have been more intimately connected with the correspondence have come in here and said something of which the Minister is completely in the dark.

The next thing is that the existence of further correspondence on the matter was unknown to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and probably to the Government as a whole. The Hon. Minister should have been telephoned and told that since the file came to him, certain letters had come in to the Department and from whom they had come; or he should have been told they had received no further correspondence. This Committee should not have heard from its members that there was further correspondence on the matter.

It seems to me that the Hon. Minister is not too hopeful that the Sanitary Inspectors of the various parishes would succeed in doing the work; and because of that, the Department wants its own inspectors for that purpose; so he could have cut out this Note and said that the Department did not want the Sanitary Inspectors to do the job, it wanted

its own inspectors for that purpose. That is to what it has boiled down.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am making one other appeal to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. Let him postpone this matter until after the tea interval so that he can communicate with the Director of Agriculture as to the correspondence. Let me say that as far as I am concerned, he need not postpone it at all. I am watching the Hon. Minister and I see that he is being tutored by other Ministers. However, I suggest to him to check our statements; and he can have the opportunity to do so by postponing this item until after the tea interval. I think that is a reasonable suggestion.

The honourable senior member for St. Lucy who is Chairman of the Sanitary Board of St. Lucy has said that statement which the Hon. Minister made is incorrect; so too has the honourable junior member for Christ Church and other honourable members of this Chamber. If members of the Government on the face of all that are still insisting in putting this Resolution through, I will say that there is an ulterior motive. Have you a job for somebody? Be honest about things. I do not want to hold up things in this Chamber. If you feel that your policy should be one to do so and so, do so; but do not adopt the attitude that because you have something coming from a Head of a Department and because members of the House say that it is incorrect, you are saying "I am still going to pass it." That is unlike the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. The Opposition of this House is always reasonable in doing things. Why should the Hon. Minister be insisting to pass this Resolution after hearing from honourable members that the information he has given is incorrect, and he has the opportunity of putting the alternative motion of reporting progress and asking for leave to sit again? He can come back and say that the information which he was given was incorrect; they did receive more correspondence on the matter but their policy is to do so and so.

According to the Note, you say that the Director of Agriculture has recommended the appointment of three temporary inspectors to assist the Peasant Agricultural Instructors with the inspection required for the Pig Subsidy Scheme. If that is your policy, we have no kick.

5.45 p.m.

The statement that the Commissioners of Health offered no co-operation and that the Director of Agriculture only received one letter and that was from the Commissioners of Health for St. Philip is a direct lie. If you are joining with people and you want to put something through, then that is an ulterior motive on the part of the Ministers. If honourable members suggest to you that you should check on this information and see if it is correct and you will insist on this, well then, insist upon it; but I say it is rank dishonesty. It is not true to say that the Commissioners of Health offered no co-operation; I go further and say I know as a fact that the men were offered 20 cents and representations were made. What the idiots want to insist upon is that because you bring something here and you have a bunch of nitwits to bring it here—I would be the last person to offer opposition to a scheme of this sort, but this is wrong. If I were in your position tonight whether it is the Director of Agriculture or anybody else—And I will say here that in the matter of Foursquare there was dishonesty in that too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with Foursquare now.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We are not dealing with Foursquare but it comes to your mind. I say

that a motion should be made that the Chairman should report progress and let the Minister get the facts after tea. If the Director of Agriculture is treating you like that, well you should get up and assert your individuality. He is withholding information from you and trying to stir up ill feeling between the Minister and the Local Government. I say and I have every reason to believe, that you are not misleading this House by design; but I have every reason to believe that you are being misled by design; and this is not the first occasion on which you have been misled by the Department. You should not adopt an attitude like that of some other Ministers who, because an official says so and so, because he says it, it is right. You should adopt the attitude of the Leader of the House; if something is wrong, then it is wrong.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am quite willing to accept the honourable member's motion for postponement until after tea in order to provide an opportunity of checking on the information as the honourable member has said. If the Chairman reports progress we can communicate with the Director of Agriculture and get further information relative to the correspondence between the Director of Agriculture and the Commissioners of Health of the various parishes.

Mr. ALLDER: The reason for the postponement of this Resolution until after the tea interval is not very important, and I am surprised to see that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is binding himself to the wishes of the honourable senior member for the City. The fact is that in connection with this Scheme it was first proposed to have Sanitary Inspectors.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the honourable member is speaking on the motion for postponement.

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Sir. I do not see the necessity for the postponement. I prefer to know that three or six additional people are being employed to see the Scheme carried out instead of using Sanitary Inspectors, and I can see the honourable member's eagerness in defending the august body of which he is a member. I sympathise with him, but because there is a difference of opinion— [Mr. CRAWFORD: It is a misstatement.] It is not important even if it is a misstatement; it is not sufficient to cause the postponement of this Resolution. The Scheme is wanted and what is more, if you are giving people work then give it to those who have not got jobs as yet. If the Sanitary Inspectors can do this work and do it effectively, then it shows that they have not got sufficient work to do at present and this means keeping somebody out of a job. The Sanitary Inspectors are given travelling allowance and this Resolution provides for a full \$40 a month allowance. Are you giving that plus additional salaries to Sanitary Inspectors who are already getting a reasonable salary in some people's opinion? I want to impress upon the Minister of Agriculture that he is not doing anything wrong if he refuses to employ Sanitary Inspectors and employ special inspectors to see that this Scheme is carried out.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, one is at a loss to understand the attitude of the last member who has just spoken. All that he can say on his behalf is that you are employing three additional people; every member who has spoken said so. He, as a responsible member of this House can get up in this House and say that you are going to send these

three men to inspect these pig pens. The Board of Health goes; the Sanitary Authority goes; and now he is going to say that this is an excellent way to do this thing. If this is the way, then he may as well say: let us employ ten more people and pay out money for it. It is not even a case where these people are going to do something entirely new. They are special Inspectors, it is said. Have you got to do something special to be able to inspect a pen? That is stupidity. He wants to get up in here and say that members do not want the Department to employ three more people.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of Order. I object to that statement. It is not stupid. He has his views as well as I am entitled to my own.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, that is the type of argument that he has offered. His idea is to extend employment by paying \$72.00 a month to inspectors to inspect pig-pens that have already been inspected. Why does he not do it in his own business? If the Head of a Department has misled a Minister, that is beside the point. When a member of this House hears it said that the Department has misled a Minister do not come on the pretext and say there is nothing to the fact.

This is the type of thing I would like to hear: here is a Minister saying, on the second of April a meeting was held and it was reported to him that St. Philip alone had replied. This Resolution was given notice of on the 10th of May (more than a month after) and not one word is in this Addendum to the effect that the Sanitary Commissioners of the island have been consulted; and it was a suggestion from the House when this Scheme was last considered that you should enlist the assistance of the Sanitary Inspectors; not because you want to keep people out of employment, but because you want to get the work done properly.

That is the responsible type of information that you should get; instead of that, you see that no information of it was given. Set it down in writing. I feel they did not want to give the information in the Note; they wanted to give it as supplementary information. At least, in such a circumstance, the argument might be like this: it is not written down by anybody, and we are speaking from notes; therefore, it might not be taken down correctly. The suggestion was not a suggestion from the Minister or the Director of Agriculture; it was a suggestion from the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw it to the attention of honourable members of this Chamber that investigation relative to the enlisting of the co-operation of the Sanitary Inspectors had already been stated long before the point was raised on the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I was here on the occasion when they made that point. It was suggested in the House. Hon. Members warned the Government that this suggestion would have to be taken up. At least if this suggestion had been made here already, you could have told us that this suggestion had already been under consideration. I do not think it is fair to hon. members of this House to be given this kind of talk, when members can appreciate the point that in a Ministerial setup we need to and should get the necessary information. When the suggestion was made I said then that I hope the Minister would be seeing to it that the Department would prefer having people under its own jurisdiction. That was what I said. I did not ask that any Hon. Minister be given credit; the House should be given credit for this matter.

It is a fact that the investigation into the possible assistance of the Sanitary Inspectors was not

put as an explanation in the Addendum of this Resolution, so that before we came in here to-day we could have gone through it. You mean to tell me that this is the type of thing that you allow to happen? If this information had been in the Addendum we could have told the Minister, "well, the information you have in this Addendum, I have every reason to think that it is wrong;" and he could have said: "well, since you say so. I will verify the matter." But to print the whole matter and then come in here and say that you have had to do this, (that this is the Director of Agriculture's recommendation) is not right; do not say so. Let us have the facts; we are willing to support you. If it is that the Department of Agriculture is the one to carry out this, they might have good reasons for doing so; but they might not want to say so. If that is so, then this House would have to bow.

6.05 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the honourable senior member for St. John that he was not in the House to hear all my arguments on the matter. I know that he is sort of over zealous to see more and more people employed. That is the feeling of everybody who is interested in the welfare of this island. I do want the honourable member to follow me clearly. I am sure he means well when he gets up to speak; but he has not followed me clearly on this point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has moved a motion that I report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. Will the honourable member speak on that?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on that motion. When the Hon. Minister of Agriculture got up and introduced this Resolution, one of the first things he did after reading the explanatory note was to explain to the Committee that the reason for this vote was because there was a breakdown in the negotiations between the Commissioners of Health of the various parishes and the Government over the inspection. In other words, we were made to understand that we would not have had this Resolution for the appointment of three temporary inspectors if the negotiations between the Sanitary Inspectors of the several parishes and the Government had been carried out.

I want the honourable senior member for St. John to understand that the Government's policy is that of the Government. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture can say that we want three inspectors for this job without saying one word about the Commissioners of Health for the various parishes or of the Sanitary Inspectors. If he says so, we would then have to sit here and say we agree with you, but what my colleague and I are saying, and what any self-respecting member would say, is that when the Hon. Minister said that we would not have had this Resolution if the negotiations between the Commissioners of Health for the various parishes and the Government had been carried out he was wrong: and in support of that statement, he proceeded to read a Minute which pointed out that the Director of Agriculture said that he had tried to get the Sanitary Inspectors to do the inspection and in order to do so, he had written to the Commissioners of Health of the various parishes but only one of them had replied to his letter; the others offered no co-operation, therefore, they had to come in with this Resolution for these three temporary inspectors.

All I am saying is that if you are elected here and you have self-respect, you must demand correct information. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has been wrongly informed and because of that he has

given this Committee incorrect information. We are asking him to give us the correct information. It is a fact that we pass things inside here and from the Hon. Premier right down the line, tells you that if you pass such and such a thing, he would promise to get the information and pass it on to you, but you hear nothing more of it afterwards. The people outside of this Chamber can only get correct information when they read the prepared speeches of the Chief Secretary in the Other Place. If, as my colleague has told the Hon. Minister, it has been the policy of the Government from the beginning to employ additional inspectors to do this job and they did not want the Sanitary Inspectors to do this job and they did not want the Sanitary Inspectors of the various parishes to do it, there was no point in having a Minute from the Director of Agriculture. We do not object to the policy of the Government. I am surprised that the honourable senior member for St. John should clash with me and jump in this river without knowing whether he could swim in it. It is just the type of river which he cannot swim in. He was outside of this Chamber when this matter was first discussed, so he did not know the correct facts.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, it is true that the principal speeches on this matter were made when I was not in my place; but what caused me to be interested in the debate was the statement made by the honourable senior member for the City. I did hear the honourable member asking the Government's Bench whether they had somebody to give a job to?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that; and the honourable member knows that I did not say that. What I actually said was that if you are not prepared to withdraw on the face of all this information, it would appear as if there is an ulterior motive. I have not accused any individual; I just made a sweeping statement generalising on the facts.

Mr. ALLDER: We all know how the honourable member speaks. He does not always remember the slogans and implications which he makes at times. I am sure what I said just now was the principal statement which raised my ire. The question which he put to the Government's Bench gave me the feeling that the honourable member was over zealous in defending the St. Michael Vestry and its employees. His question gave me the feeling that he does not want to see inspectors other than Sanitary Inspectors employed to carry out this Scheme.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I object to that statement. I never suggested any such thing. That is a matter of indifference to me. All I was saying is that I object to the false information. I never made the inference that I wanted Sanitary Inspectors to do the job.

Mr. ALLDER: If the Reporters are doing their job and if you were to read back the honourable member's speech it would be found that what I am saying is right. He said, "do you have somebody to put in a job?"

According to the remarks of the honourable junior member for the City, Sanitary Inspectors cannot be asked to do this, that and the other thing along with their duties.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are making a speech now.

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member did raise the question of how unnecessary it was to employ additional inspectors to do this job.

Mr. LEWIS: I object to that. I have not suggested it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am quoting the honourable senior member for the City. The honourable junior member for the City questioned whether it was right.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I never questioned such right. He is not telling the truth. There is a principle involved in what was suggested; he has brought information which is not in the explanatory note. The honourable senior member for St. John was not in his place to hear everything that was said on this matter.
6.15 p.m.

Mr. ALLDER: I said the honourable junior member for the City. The honourable junior member for the City was charging me for wanting the Government to take on fresh inspectors to carry out this Scheme.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable junior member for the City was charging me with wanting the Government to take on fresh inspectors to see that the Scheme is carried out, and he accuses me of wanting to increase the cost of the Scheme instead of allowing the Sanitary Inspectors—

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of Order. Did I say anything about increasing the cost of the Scheme? The honourable member is incapable of distinguishing between a principle and a political speech. That is all.

Mr. ALLDER: I was not here [Mr. LEWIS: Well, keep out of the debate] when the particular speech was made; and as to the question of the principle to which the honourable member makes reference, I was not in time to hear everything. But the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City caused me to rise to my feet. When I came in here I heard nothing about principle; I heard the honourable senior member for the City speaking and I do not think that the Government should be influenced by the honourable member's suggestion. I am not discussing the principle, nor am I saying that it should not be defended. I was not here but I gathered from the honourable senior member for the City that the Government should have preferred to have the Sanitary Inspectors—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That is a wicked statement. If the honourable member cannot understand it is no fault of mine. It is a matter of indifference to me who undertakes the Scheme; we are dealing with the facts. As to the statement which was given to the Minister I have said that the Ministers should be given proper information by Heads of Departments.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member changes his remarks to suit the occasion; but I was careful to note his remarks. I am suggesting to the Minister of Agriculture that even if the Head of the Department has misinformed him, the matter can be taken up by him at some later date and the Resolution should not be postponed because of that. Another thing is that Sanitary Inspectors should not be employed on this Scheme when other people are ready and willing to take employment from the Government. Why should the honourable member claim that the Sanitary Inspector has to inspect the same pig pen? One Sanitary Inspector has to inspect several large districts and the temporary inspector has to take the number of piglets which might be born in the area where the Sanitary Inspector has not had time to inspect. When people send in for assistance it is withheld from them for too long; that is the point which I am trying to stress. It would be a better working Scheme if the Government were permitted to employ three or six temporary inspectors to go around the island to see

that this Scheme is carried out. The honourable junior member for the City conveniently likes to pretend that he is most willing to defend a principle when that principle is threatened by somebody else; but in the attempt to defend the principle, he does harm to another principle; and two wrongs do not make a right. I am hoping that the question will be put because this is keeping back people who need assistance.

Mr. LEWIS: You have about 80 Sanitary Inspectors and you have probably another 8 or 9 from the General Board of Health; is the honourable member suggesting that they will hold up the Scheme and this wonderful three will do it? When the Peasant Agricultural Inspector goes to inspect a peasant he has to inspect his ten acres, but the Sanitary Inspector has to inspect the peasant's house; but the hon. member says "let the Peasant Agricultural Inspectors do this job because they can do it much better." The hon. member's idea is that these men will do a better job than the men who have to inspect only the pig pens. I wonder if the honourable member remembers saying that if the Director had given wrong information it does not matter. If that is the type of member we are getting, what sort of responsible people will we be? He feels that it does not matter if a Minister is misinformed.
6.25 p.m.

And he is voting the taxpayers' money as a representative of the people.

Mr. Chairman, if you do not postpone this Resolution you will have endorsed the nonsense that the senior member for St. John has managed to speak for the comparatively short time since he got up. Does he know that the number of piglets according to my colleague, is already sent in. Does he know that the information has already been sent in to the Commissioners of Health?

Do not come in here and tell us that you have gone into the matter in a different way, and slandering inspectors. Some of them themselves have to keep pigs. The hon. member was not in here to hear that these three are going out of the island; these are three inspectors taken on on a temporary basis, and the people are not going to be accommodated as well as they should be.

The question that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative on a division as follows—

Ayes: Hon. C. E. Talma, Hon. R. G. Mapp, Mrs. Bourne, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Miller, Mr. Brancker, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Mottley, and Mr. Goddard—9.

Noes: Mr. Speaker, Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr J.C. Mottley, and Mr. Alder—4.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. Talma, seconded by Hon. R. G. Mapp, the question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask leave to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. Goddard, seconded by Mr. Brancker, the House adjourned for half an hour.

6.30 p.m.

On re-assembling.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to put a question which unfortunately I was

unable to put earlier this afternoon due to a professional engagement. I ask now that I be granted leave to put this question.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works & Housing:— Whether Government will, in the interests of the travelling public, and without undue delay take the necessary action to nationalise public passenger transport in this island. [VOICES: Hear, Hear.]

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee on Money Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Pig Breeding Inspection Cont'd

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the motion. Would you be good enough to please repeat it again?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was putting to the Committee that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. LEWIS: No, sir, that motion is not quite correct. It should be that this Head do now pass. Allow me to take this opportunity to ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture if he has managed to get further information on the matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, during the interval I endeavoured to get the information for the help of hon. members, but unfortunately I could not contact the Director of Agriculture; and I do not know what time he will be back. I will give this Committee the assurance that before the next meeting I will supply hon. members with the information which they desire.

That question that Head XXI—stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. CHAIRMAN "I think the AYES have it."

Head XXVI Pensions

Head XXVI — Pensions — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This next Head is for the sum of \$359. This is one of the usual *ex gratia* payments, and it is for Chesterfield LeRoy Bourne in respect of his services from 1938 to 1947 in the Barbados Volunteer Force and the South Caribbean Force. Chesterfield LeRoy Bourne was appointed assistant to the Armourer Sergeant, Volunteer Force, in June 1938 and on the taking over of the Force by the War Office in 1942 he was posted to the South Caribbean Force in which he served until 15th October, 1947. On the reconstitution of the Barbados Volunteer Force this post was abolished and no further employment was offered to this gentleman.

Sir, this is really in line and similar to that of Armourer Sergeant G. R. McComie and Capt. J. R. Jordan, as well as Sergeant Rudder, who were members of the same Regiment and for whom legislation was brought in to give them a similar condition for their services. Mr. Bourne's services in the two Forces do not amount to ten years and it is considered that he should be eligible on the abolition of this office for a gratuity not exceeding five times the pension which he would have been granted had there been

no qualifying period. This is one of the usual gratuities given to officers whose posts are terminated. I am now moving that the sum of \$359 be granted to this officer.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: This is a rather small amount of money for approximately nine years of service. Of course, we have to understand that so far as liability with the Government is concerned there is none; but for someone to be in the service of the Volunteer Force from June 1938 until around 1942, then drafted into the South Caribbean Force in which he served from that time until October, 1947, and at the end of that time to be given \$359 as a gratuity, it would appear to me as if this gentleman was only getting between \$30 and \$40 a month. However, sir, he has to be grateful though some of these people who served with him are now enjoying pension rights and further employment in the Barbados Regiment. I do not know why further employment could not be found for this gentleman. The explanatory note says that the post was abolished and no further employment could be offered him. That seems to be very unfortunate indeed for this gentleman who was willing to risk his life for this country. Was he absolutely no use to you at all? However, I suppose he will have to count himself lucky to get this \$359 for which legally he is not entitled. This means that if there were no qualifying period and he was given a pension, he would have received the princely pension of six dollars a month for nine years of service.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Sir, I really and truly am not happy about this vote. This gentleman, Chesterfield Leroy Bourne, was posted to the South Caribbean Force and that Force was taken over by the War Office in 1944. I think this is a question for the War Office because this gentleman was serving under British regulations and as such, he should have been compensated by the British Government.

This seems to be inconsistent with the established practice. Is this only a token in recognition of this man's services or what? If the Government does not feel like worrying the War Office and we are considering giving this man this token, I think that this matter should be brought to the attention of the War Office. I would like to know if this is the only case which we have to review; I could say a lot on this matter because I, too, have been a victim in my time. Up to now I am due 12 cents a day for the time which I spent in the British Army; we must not lightly pass over these things.

7.15 p.m.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the Resolution for \$2,831 do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, the postponement of two, and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, who took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION re MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT TO UNDERTAKE PLASTIC SURGERY—C TD

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 13 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the passing of the following Resolution: A 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. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not here on the last occasion when this Resolution was discussed, but I understand that the House was generally in sympathy with the Resolution; but they allowed an error to creep in as far as the contract is concerned. I do not want to go over the whole history of this Resolution, because I believe that must have been given to the House by the Hon. Minister who took charge of the Resolution. I tried to get the *Official Gazette* which would help me as to the points which were made on that occasion, but, unfortunately, that has not yet been printed. However, sir, in conversation with you, you did make certain points which appear to be the salient points of the discussion which took place on the last occasion. I will endeavour, sir—

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I was saying Mr. Speaker, that I will endeavour to help the House to the best of my ability with the points which the hon. junior member for the City discussed with me to-day. First of all, I want to inform the House that this gentleman has already signed a contract with the Government as Medical Superintendent. That contract is in force, and these other arrangements when approved of by the House, will be included in the contract. I understand that there was some doubt as to whether the services of this gentleman would be extended to poor people who are unable to pay inasmuch as that provision was not included in the contract. I want to say at the beginning that there is no such inclusion in any contract made with the Medical Officers at the General Hospital.

7.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me contracts made by the Physician Specialist and by Mr. Leacock, Surgeon Specialist and there is nothing in the contracts which says that they must attend poor patients. According to the medical profession, nobody is to be refused attention for lack of money. It is one of the cardinal principles of the profession that whether a person has money to pay or not, he is to receive attention. In such cases there is a loss; but somebody else who is able to pay pays for that. Therefore, it is wrong for honourable members to think that because the words: 'poor patients' are not in the Resolution, that such services will be denied poor patients.

In the contracts which I have before me, the terms made with the Physician Specialist and the Surgeon Specialist are the same; and I want to set the minds of honourable members at rest when I say that in all of these contracts, there are certain words which give the Government authority to call upon these gentlemen to do duty of some kind. These words: "And will be required to perform other such duties as the Government may direct" are included in the contract of the Physician Specialist and also in the contract of the Surgeon

Specialist. Those are the operating words in these contracts, and I am properly satisfied that no patient will have to forego such services at the General Hospital because it is not specifically stated in the contract that this gentleman must attend non-paying patients or patients who are unable to pay.

I hope that my explanation satisfies the House, and that the Government will be allowed to proceed as requested in this Resolution; that is, that this gentleman be allowed to do his plastic surgery and that in the cases where patients are able to pay, that one half of the fees collected will go to the Government and the other half to the officer concerned. I think that that covers the point drawn to my attention by the junior member for the City. I do not see any other.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Surely Sir, those of us who intimated on the last occasion—

Mr. SPEAKER: Do you intend to speak again?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I moved the postponement and it was carried; but if Your Honour rules—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On the last occasion the Hon. Minister of Health was not here, and we generally intimated that we felt that the inhabitants of this Colony would be grateful for the services of so skilled a man in our midst; and therefore, we would not want to do anything to prevent him from exercising that skill for the benefit of the inhabitants generally. As the Hon. Minister of Health has said, (as this is a specialised branch of the medical profession which is rarely used by the poor and ordinary people because of the very expensive charges) we were somewhat fearful; but we wanted it made clear in the Resolution on this matter that non-paying patients or patients who could not pay, and who had suffered from disability or any disfigurement, would be given some opportunity to have his services as in the case of the Physician Specialist and the Surgeon Specialist. We made it quite clear to the Government that in engaging the Surgeon Specialist they should engage him as Surgeon Specialist; and that he would get half the fees from persons who could pay, and that to persons who could not pay, the same treatment would be given.

We realise that this was a definite understanding when the services of the Surgeon Specialist and Physician Specialist were employed; and we were told then by the Hon. Minister then in charge, that there was already an agreement by the Government with this gentleman as Medical Superintendent. All we were saying then that if there was an agreement with him as Medical Superintendent and you were entering now into another and different agreement, we were fearful from the wording in the Addendum to the Resolution before us, that it would only apply to those persons who could pay. As a matter of fact, sir, in reading paragraph 4 I see this: "The Officer 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 Surgical work."

I do not pretend in the slightest to be any scholar or a draftsman, but I do lay claim to a certain amount of commonsense. Speaking purely as a layman, you have brought a gentleman out here as a Medical Superintendent; the Minister of Social Services says. I have been told on very good authority that since you brought that gentleman here you have had a general change and you are really getting things looking in ship-shape; but however well that

might be, you have brought him here as Medical Superintendent. What I do not understand and what I want answered is this: have you or have you not signed an agreement with him?

7.35 p.m.

I just want to find that out first. I am hoping the Hon. Minister of Social Services is paying me some attention. This matter though introduced previously by the Hon. Minister of Communications does concern his portfolio, and that is the reason why I am inviting the Hon. Minister of Social Services to pay me some attention.

What I want to get clear is this: was there an agreement with this gentleman as Medical Superintendent or not when he first came out? If that is so, will that agreement be cancelled? As we all know, an agreement is only worth something if both parties to the agreement have subscribed to back it up. In this case, it lies between the Barbados Government and the profession of the honourable gentleman, therefore, will the Hon. Minister of Social Services tell us whether there is an existing agreement; whether it has been signed; and, if it has been signed, do you intend to cancel it and sign another one?

The first paragraph reads as follows:—

"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 Governor may from time to time direct."

That would be a general agreement for the Medical Superintendent of the Hospital, but it goes on to say in paragraph 2:—

"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."

Now what I want to say on this matter is this: I do not pretend to know anything of drafting and I do not think the Hon. Minister of Social Services would pretend to know anything of that either, but I think he would be able to get advice from the legal luminaries of the Government. This second paragraph seems to be the new agreement because when this gentleman came out to Barbados, he came out as Medical Superintendent; therefore, it is one of two things, either you have had no previous agreement with him, or you have had a previous agreement with him and you are now cancelling it and signing another agreement with him. I would like the Hon. Minister of Social Services to say whether he is satisfied about this matter.

This matter is of such great importance that I am sure Your Honour will exercise your prerogative so as to allow the Hon. Minister of Social Services to take charge of it and to give us the necessary information. To the average layman it seems as if you are hiring this gentleman in a dual capacity. You are saying in addition to the duties prescribed in paragraph 1, this gentleman may perform Plastic Surgery within the Hospital and at the end of that paragraph you are saying he may be called in consultation within and without the Hospital. I am most respectfully suggesting that according to this agreement that the word "without" can mean generally too. I would submit sir, that because he is hired in a dual capacity he can be called outside in consultation in a general way. According to this second paragraph he can be consulted outside of the General Hospital in a capacity other than Plastic Surgery.

Paragraph 3, reads as follows:—

"In the performance of his duties the Officer will act under the general superintendence and direction of the Director of Medical Services."

As you know sir, we in this Chamber, whether we are in the opposition or are back-benchers, are anxious to see that everything possible is done for the good health of the community. It is common knowledge in this country that you had a doctor at the Hospital who was not a Barbadian and incidentally not a West Indian. You used to get complaints by nurses, patients and people requiring him, because whenever he was wanted at the Hospital you would find him at a club or one of the regular houses. Whatever complaints were made about him it is a fact that it was difficult to make or get any investigation into the matter, and if you did manage to get an investigation you got no satisfaction. You can publicise this. I know you get Reporters cutting out certain things.

7.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will warn the honourable member not to make any personal reflections on members of the staff because these things are unknown to the Debates Committee.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I can swear to what I am saying. I do not want to see my speeches. I am saying this: in this first paragraph of the terms and conditions it says that "the officer will be responsible for the supervision and management of the General Hospital;" and so on. We have had an officer at this Hospital who should have been charged with murder or man-slaughter; but unfortunately he was allowed to leave. That is by the way. I hope that with a Ministerial set-up when we hold the Minister of Health responsible, he will see that these agreements are carried out in accordance with the wishes of the people. Paragraph 4 of the "Terms and Conditions" says this:—

The officer 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. (The scale of fees is set out in the Barbados General Hospital (Fees) Regulations, 1951).

The Minister of Social Services has assured us that that is how it appears in the Agreement with the Surgeon Specialist and the Physician Specialist; but I will ask him to read the Agreement in connection with the Physician Specialist and the Surgeon Specialist. I know the Minister may make a statement in the best faith; but I ask him to read that Agreement. It would appear to me that in addition to paying this officer a salary as Medical Superintendent he will perform Plastic Surgery at the Hospital and he will get an allowance equal to one half of the fees. I am not a lawyer, but with the greatest respect to the Hon. Minister, I am telling him that this strikes me to be not on all fours with the Physician Specialist and the Surgeon Specialist. In the case of the Physician Specialist and the Surgeon Specialist, they are employed first and foremost to do something. I want the Hon. Minister to listen to what I am saying carefully and not adopt the attitude of some other Ministers who feel that when Mr. "X" tells them something and because he tells them so, it is so. You have a Surgeon Specialist and he is required to do the surgical work: and for those paying cases you give him one half of the money paid into the Treasury which would not be pensionable, but for the salary which we pay, he performs work on poor people who cannot afford to pay. That is understood by the most ordinary person; but in this case it is not the same thing. You

stressing. In the first instance paragraph two of the "Terms and Conditions" obviously entitles the Medical Superintendent of the Hospital to take cases of Plastic Surgery outside the Hospital and also to undertake general practice; there is no question about that at all. Secondly, there is nothing at all in the Resolution before us which stipulates that people who cannot pay the normal fees are entitled to treatment of this sort. Those two points are so obvious that the length of time taken by these two speakers to emphasise them was unnecessary; and the Hon. Minister should have seen long ago the wisdom of what they were saying and agree to the amendment in order to remove the ambiguities in the Resolution before us. Paragraph two of these "Terms and Conditions" should be amended to read as follows "in addition to the duties prescribed in paragraph one the Officer may perform Plastic Surgery within the Hospital and may be called in consultation within and without the Hospital in cases of Plastic Surgery." In other words, it should have been made completely and crystal clear that he can only be called in or without the Hospital in cases of Plastic Surgery.

That, so far as the case goes, would satisfy the objections of the two hon members for the City; but in my own case, I would go a little further. It seems to me that both the Government and the hon. members who spoke against the Resolution are forgetting what this officer is employed to do; his substantive post is Medical Superintendent. He is not a Surgeon Specialist or a Visiting Surgeon or any Specialist Medical Officer; in other words, he is responsible for the daily conduct and administration of the Hospital and that I submit should be a whole time job. What the Government is saying here today is that the Hospital does not need any Superintendent at all; because if they are telling you that a Superintendent can decide to do work in Plastic Surgery and other general practice without any restriction, then they are telling us that we do not want any Superintendent at all. What they have lost sight of is that the Medical Superintendent is not a person who will perform operations during the week, but that he is responsible for the entire Hospital daily.

8.25 p.m.

It is common knowledge that conditions at the Hospital have been almost chaotic for long periods; and we have employed this officer as Superintendent in order to redress that situation. Now we have suddenly discovered that he is an expert in Plastic Surgery, and we are saying that he can perform Plastic Surgery in the Hospital and go outside and perform it too. To me it is undeniably clear that in this situation the administration of the Hospital must suffer. Who is to be responsible for the conduct of the Hospital when he is absent? It is my submission that he should not go outside the Hospital for anything, including Plastic Surgery. He came here quite content to accept the post of Medical Superintendent at a salary of \$6,000 a year, with free quarters and what not. Now the Government is telling the House that in addition to his \$6,000 with his free quarters, he will get half the fees on all operations performed within the Hospital; and is going further and saying: he can also go outside and perform similar operations and whatever he gets is his.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. I have not said that he can go outside and perform operations.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The wording in paragraph (2) of the Addendum is: "In addition to the duties prescribed in paragraph (1) the Officer may perform Plastic Surgery and may be called in consultation within and without the Hospital." Is the Hon. Minister of Social Services as naive as he pretends to be? What do you think the Medical Superintendent is going to be called at Bayley's Hospital for? If it is Plastic Surgery who is going to perform it? Will he not be called in to look at somebody's face? He can be called in to consult and perform operations. Is the Minister of Social Services sitting there and deluding himself that if the Medical Superintendent is called in at Emtage's clinic that he will say "go to England and have it done." He knows very well that you are not going to get any wealthy patient within the Hospital at all, because the fees at the Hospital are controlled. In the 1951 Regulations we have the Schedule of fees for all operations performed at the Hospital, Plastic Surgery or else. And this gentleman would be very stupid if he were satisfied for a wealthy patient to pay him only half of the fees paid out. When he goes to a private clinic he gets all.

We have not brought him at the Hospital to run about and do private work. If we had brought him here as a Specialist in his field of work that would be all well and good, but we have brought him here to do the superintending of the Hospital. Either you want a Superintendent or you do not want one; and if you want one you cannot tell him, "Well boy, I am paying a Superintendent and you can go outside and do anything you like." I am surprised to see that the Hon. Minister of Social Services is so short-sighted. You are giving this Medical Superintendent *carte blanche* to go outside the Hospital and do operations; and the hon. member gets up and tells us that he can be called into consultation. Has he a coterie of sleuths to run around behind him and see that he is only called to consultation and does nothing more? If we want to utilise his services on Plastic Surgery the most he can be expected to get is what other Specialists get—half of the fees paid in by the patients in the Public Treasury. We pay for the equipment at the Hospital.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The Hospital has no equipment for Plastic Surgery, and the hon. member has said the Hospital has to pay.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well now, the Minister says that the Hospital has no equipment for this specialist's work; they use the Hospital's ordinary equipment and they get half the fee. He is still getting his salary, his free house and what-not; but because he has equipment is he to be allowed to go outside and expend as much time as he likes without restriction and do what he likes? I am going to propose that the Medical Superintendent should not be allowed to go outside of the Hospital at all in cases of Plastic Surgery or anything else. If he is the only Plastic Surgeon in the island everybody rich and poor will go. He will get half of the fees and will furthermore get a free house. Therefore, I propose that in Paragraph 2, line three the words "and without" be deleted. The Paragraph should then read 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 the Hospital."

8.35 p.m.

With regard to Paragraph 4 which reads as follows: "The officer 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," what we want to do now is to make it clear that he should be made available to patients who cannot pay for it. This paragraph could therefore be amended to read that such service should be made free to those unable to pay for it. After the word "work" in paragraph 4, delete the fullstop and put a comma and add the following "but shall perform such service free to those who are unable to pay."

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member moving an amendment?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes sir; I am moving two. 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."

I am moving that the words: "and without" be deleted. In other words, during the officer's working hours he should remain on the premises. As the paragraph reads at present, if this officer feels like leaving the Hospital from eight o'clock in the morning until three o'clock in the evening you cannot prevent him. I am not saying that he will be doing it, but he should stay there during those hours. If he needs not to be there, let us abolish the post and save the money. I know of no reason why an administrator of the Hospital should be allowed to run about and to do general private practice, not specialised practice; and I am at a loss to understand why it should take so long to permeate into the minds of hon. members of the Government that the contention of the Opposition with regard to these proposals is well founded. It is merely absolute ignorance or indifference to what is taking place. It is one of these two things: if, as should be, they really are interested in making the specialised service of the officer available to the public and if they are interested in the efficient conduct of the General Hospital (and we are told that the service there has improved since this officer has been appointed) then they will see to it that his activities are restricted to the confines of the Hospital and that his services are made available to those who can pay and equally to those who cannot pay.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second these amendments. As you are aware, any subject in connection with the Hospital is always one that will generate great heat because the General Hospital is one of the most vital institutions in this island catering to the health of over 200,000 people; therefore, we as elected representatives of the 200,000 people are in duty bound to scrutinise every activity and every appointment that go to make the running of that Hospital a success.

I want to state here now without unduly prolonging this debate that I feel we should give this Medical Superintendent the facility to perform Plastic Surgery, but I agree that his activities should be restricted to within the confines of the Hospital. I therefore hope that the Hon. Minister of Health will accept these amendments in the true spirit that they are given. The arguments which hon. members put up to them are sound and should merit the Minister's approval and appreciation. We really cannot afford to give this gentleman all the liberty as was set out in those paragraphs. This officer might be a very good man. I know nothing of him, but I understand that he knows his business thoroughly. He might have the interest of all the people of this island at heart and might mean to help all to the best of his ability; but we do not know if in

the next few weeks he might go and somebody else might come. I do agree with the argument that his duties should be confined to within the precincts of the General Hospital; therefore, without further ado, I beg to second these amendments.
8.45 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Speaking on the motion for the acceptance of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to say that I believe the Hon. Minister of Health will show his appreciation by accepting the amendments. We do mean to support the Government in this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that since we have a Rule which says that a complicated question can be divided, we should use that Rule. I want respectfully to suggest to you, sir, that this question being a complicated one, it should be divided into two parts and a separate vote taken on each Clause.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: You will permit me, sir, to reply to the honourable senior member for St. Philip. The honourable member, in his usual ranting and fantastic style, says that this gentleman can do as he likes, and that there is nobody to check him; but I wonder if there is no Minister of Social Services or Director of Medical Services. I want to say that this matter before us does not concern the Government; it concerns the service which the Government wants to render to the community. The Surgeon Specialist has the right of consultation in and out of the Hospital.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of Order. When I made that point I distinctly said that you have to bear in mind that this officer is responsible for the everyday running of the Hospital; he is not a visiting specialist or anything like that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: In a small colony like Barbados, how often do you think you will have these cases?

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the suggestion of the hon. junior member for the City the amendments seem to be complicated and I shall divide them so that honourable members can understand. Dealing with Clause 2 of the Schedule the amendment of the hon. senior member for St. Philip is that the words "and without" be deleted. The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Schedule. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE—6.

Noes: Messrs LEWIS, TUDOR, BARROW, CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, ALLDER and E. D. MOTTLEY.—7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the negative, six honourable members voting "Aye" and seven honourable members voting "No." The second amendment refers to Clause 4 of the Schedule. It is that the words "but shall perform such services free on those who are unable to pay" be added after the word "work" in line four. The question is that the words proposed to be added stand part of the Schedule. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was called for.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether an honourable member who has voted in the way in which you have just declared can call for a division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The division came from more than one side.

The division was taken as follows—

Ayes: Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, (Cheers) Messrs. LEWIS, TUDOR, BARROW, CRAWFORD, J. C. MOTTLEY, ALLDER and E. D. MOTTLEY—8.

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, and Hon. R. G. MAPP—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, 8 honourable members voting 'Aye' and 5 honourable members voting 'No.'

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 18 seeks to amend the Electricity Act of 1936. The "Objects and Reasons" set out quite clearly that it is Government's intention to increase the fees charged under the Electricity Act of 1936. As honourable members will see, since 1936 when this Act became operative, the fee chargeable for inspection was 5/-.

The Government Electrical Engineer has drawn to the attention of the Government the fact that there are many buildings which have quite a number of outlets as against others with only a few outlets. The fee charged is the same for one outlet as it is for 50 or 100 outlets. The Electrical Engineer has recommended that the fee of \$1.20 be made as the basic fee and an additional fee of 10 cents per outlet be charged. I think honourable members will agree that it costs considerably more than what it cost in 1936 to run this Department; and the Government has agreed that these fees should be raised. You will see in the new scale of fees that there is a slight variation. Where there was 48 cents it has been increased to 50 cents; that is due to our changing over from the pound to the decimal system.

In the second part of the "Objects and Reasons" you will notice that the Government has considered the question of notifying the Government Electrical Department when fatal or serious accidents occur. I think honourable members will remember that some time ago at the Electric Company there have been a few deaths, and no legal provision existed for notifying the Government Electrical Department of such accidents. The Government Electrical Engineer feels and has represented to the Government that provision should be made whereby an accident should be reported to his Department immediately and the Department be given power to go in and inspect.

Section 9 of the old 1936 Act is amended by Section 9 (a) in this new Bill. This new Section gives the inspector the right to visit the place where an accident occurred and make a preliminary investigation of the circumstances.

In the last phase of this Bill the opportunity has been taken to change the term "Engineer" to read "Inspector" which is the title the officer administering this Department will now have. When the 1953 Regulations were before this House dealing with the licences for the installation of wireless sets in ships, some honourable members made the point, and I agreed that there was an anomaly in that the Government Electrical Inspector ranked first in the Regulations made under the Bill and also in the Estimates. We have made a change in the Estimates, and I think that I promised the House at that time that we would rectify this anomaly as and when circumstances permit.

As I have already said, I know hon. members will agree that you can hardly imagine an inspector having to go say, to a place like the Crane Hotel to inspect that Hotel and only charge 5/- as against some poor person who may be living in Chapman Lane [A MEMBER: Why Chapman Lane?] Because I do not think you would find many houses in Chapman Lane which have more than one or two bulbs in them; and they too have to pay the same \$1.20 as those who have thirty or forty lights. It does not seem fair to charge one and all the same, irrespective of how many units or how many outlets one has; therefore, this Bill seeks to clear up that anomaly and to charge as I have pointed out, ten cents for every additional outlet which may mean a switch or a lamp or a plug. I would like to assure hon. members that in so far as the point which I made about inspections, in case there is loss of life or any serious damage, this question has been discussed with the Manager of the Electric Corporation to which he has agreed. In the case of the Electrical Engineer, he is quite satisfied to be called Inspector and not Engineer.

I made it clear in my opening remarks that hitherto if you inspected 40 outlets, the charge was \$1.20 and if you inspected one outlet it was the same \$1.20. What we are saying now is that if you inspect a place with one outlet, the charge of \$1.20 remains, but you also charge 10 cents more for every additional outlet. [A VOICE: What about Item 5?] That was there before. [A VOICE: What about Item 10 (a) & (b).]

10.10 p.m.

Testing house wires for leakage—

(a) Installation not exceeding			
five outlets			\$5.00
(b) Installation exceeding			
five outlets			10.00

Those items have been increased. They were formerly 2/- and 5/- respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There seems to be some reasonable argument that the fees charged under the Electricity Act of 1936 for inspection of small houses should be increased, and you are now charging by the outlet; what I call points. If the Inspector went, as the Hon. Minister said, to the Marine Hotel or any hotel with 100 points to carry out an inspection, it would be the same fee of \$1.20 as if he were inspecting a small house. I myself thought that was wrong.

Sir, I was one of the first people to let the Electrical Inspector know that whatever his feelings might be, the law was the law and it was a matter to be judicially interpreted and not for him to do so. It is now stated that for inspecting, testing and reporting on any electrical installation or addition thereto, the basic charge is \$1.20 plus 10 cents per outlet, or what I call additional point. There is no house with one outlet. I am wondering if it were ever suggested that the minimum of \$1.20 should apply to inspection of houses of not more than say six points which is the usual number for small dwellings. Will the Minister say? I know there was some suggestion in that respect.

However, sir, the most important thing in this matter concerning these amendments is charges; and what I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister is that while you are amending this Act, and rightly so, in order to allow the Government to collect fees on a more equitable basis, will the Hon.

Minister tell us whether any guarantee can be given to the general public that the Government Electrical Inspector will also test to see that the people are getting the right amount of voltage by the Electric Company? If you take the public lights like those on the Pier Head, it must be realised that your voltage must be up to a certain standard else they will not burn brightly. I am therefore asking the Hon. Minister to exercise his prerogative to see to it that the Government Electrical Engineer, as he is now termed, makes periodical tests in this respect. As a matter of fact, I think it should be covered by the Act. It is not good enough for us to pay for electrical voltage which we are not getting. The general public contributes to the salary of the Electrical Inspector and we all know well enough that within recent years (I am not thinking of the difficult time when you were unable to get electricity) that the voltage of electrical current has not been what it should be. A lot of electrical engineers have told me that various electrical apparatus, such as refrigerators and electrical motors, have been ruined because the actual voltage to power them has been below what the experts called for. Now that the Act is being amended, the Minister should see to it that you have some section inserted so that the people of this colony should actually get what they are paying for. If you are not getting the correct voltage it would mean that the average person who burns a 40-candle-power bulb actually might be called upon to burn a 60-candle-power bulb. It is not good enough.

You have here in Barbados one Electric Company and there is no competition, and it is not good enough that tonight you turn on your lights to get electrical power of 110 voltage and tomorrow night when you turn them on you get something below that. Now that you have your Electrical Department I think it is the duty of the Hon. Minister to see that periodic tests are made on the electrical voltage; and not merely tests to be made for the benefit of the Electric Company. I say again, that periodic tests should be made for the benefit of the public. If you take the street lights which are of benefit to everyone, you will realise that at certain points though they are fitted with 100 candle-power bulbs, that you see nothing else but a red glow from them. When you see that red glow you know that you are not getting your money's worth.

The last point which I would like to make is that I think a bigger fee should have been charged for the inspection of cinemas. The inspection of cinemas in this island is very important although we have not had very disastrous fires in them. I think they should be inspected more often than they are. If you look at the Schedule you will see that for the annual inspection of any cinema or other public place of entertainment the basic charge is 50 cents and 10 cents for the cost per outlet. If you go further down the Schedule you will see that for testing the pressure at any consumer's premises the charge is \$1.20. Does the Hon. Minister think that it is equitable to charge an ordinary householder 50 cents basic charge for inspecting and testing any re-installation, renewal or repair, while for the inspection for pressure at any church, club, or any theatre the charge should be the same thing? This is the only place which I have heard of that.

10.25 p.m.

Your Electrical Inspector should make a quarterly test of the different cinemas. To put in a Schedule that you are charging 50 cents to test the Plaza Theatre to see that it is operating in the interest of the lives of the people who go there, and then to go to Chapman's Lane where there is a woman

living in a two bedroom house to do the same thing, is not correct in my opinion. I do not think the Electrical Engineer should just walk in at these theatres and walk back out; it would be very disastrous to people to be in a theatre where the electricity is not in order. If you are increasing your charges you should increase them where the increase can best be borne. What I would have thought is this: now that you are making this amendment, you should have made it to say that public places of entertainment other than cinemas should pay so much. Where you have proprietary clubs, dance halls and so on you should say that public places other than cinemas should pay 50 cents, but it is dangerous to have a cinema being run without any proper inspection.

It appears to me that so long as you make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness everything is all right. There is no other place in the world where you could put one of these places of public entertainment without seeing that a proper report is submitted where electricity is concerned. I can remember bringing that to the attention of this hon. Chamber; here you have an amendment that for making a test where you feel that there is a leakage there is the payment of an amount of \$5, but in the case of the Roodal Theatres there is a charge of 50c., for inspection where the lives of so many people are involved. If there is one place of public entertainment which must be properly inspected, it is the theatre these people who own these theatres buy a lot of second hand things from all about and install them and you are only charging them 50c., for the inspection of such a place! If you have a house with five points in it and you suspect that there is a leakage you have to pay an amount of \$5.

There are quite a number of hon. members who are more versed on this subject than I am; I suggest that only for the inspection of places of public entertainment other than cinemas there should be a charge of 50c. and for the inspection of cinemas there should be a charge of \$5. In Trinidad the Electrical Inspector is called in to see that the entire machinery is run to the safety of the patrons, but in Barbados you can pay only 50c.; that is absurd, unthinkable and unheard of. The Hon. Minister of Health can tell the Hon. Minister of Communications that he might have some apparatus in the surgery and if the voltage is too low—Look at what has happened at the Hospital! After the Resolution was brought in here, it was discovered that it was the duty of the Electric Company to supply the voltage up to a certain standard and the Company had to supply it. 10.30 p.m.

Electricity is not a luxury; therefore I am asking the hon. member to see that in considering this amendment we have reached the stage where for the benefit of the consumers you should have this Act amended. Now during the War years everybody had to be satisfied because you could not do better. The late Mr. Walter Bayley once raised a rumpus in the Vestry when he found out that the Government was not getting what they were paying for. But I am thinking of the private people. It is my suggestion that your amendments to this act should call upon the Engineer to make the inspections. Some of the amendments are absolutely necessary; for instance, where a man must go to St. John and possibly to the Crane Hotel to do inspection, that is absolutely necessary; but I hope that the Minister will agree with me that Mary Lou should not pay 50 cents and Roodal Theatres pay the same 50 cents; that is out of all proportion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The introduction of this Bill is not completely irrational; the Government

has got a case in calling for a graded scale of inspection under this Bill. It seems to me that taxation is more or less symptomatic with the general policy of the Government. They squeeze every additional cent. they can out of the community and then turn around, of course, and squander it. I suppose that after we have levied this new rate you will hear that they are going to erect some building for the Ministers' servants or something like that. What I feel is this, instead of concerning itself now merely with increasing the fees for inspection, the Government should seek (exercising the authority it has in existing legislation) to more effectively control the rates charged by the Electric Company for energy supplied. Apart from the point raised by the hon. senior member for the City with regard to actually ensuring that customers get the energy and voltage for which they are called upon to pay, I am sure the public is also of the opinion that the current rate is rather exorbitant. The Government itself is one of the victims in this respect, because they consume a lot of electric energy and have to pay for it at exorbitant rates. I think that one of the evils of the present position is to be found in the manner in which the Electric Company is permitted to fix its rates for power supply, for domestic or private use and for industry. Take for instance the pumping stations of the Government Waterworks Dept., they will have electric power in the case of more than one; then Government also has Natural Gas wells to be driven by electricity. Let us assume for instance that you had two 500 horse power electric engines at the Belle Pumping Station and for an entire month those engines were hardly ever used; the Government does not pay for energy used, but it pays at a fixed rate so much per horse power. The amount of energy consumed would have been less than what this fixed rate would give to the company. I imagine that with a 500 horse power plant at a Pumping Station, they will pay about \$500 a month whether or not they consumed that \$500 in power; and they are actually getting away with the matter in the country. We have got to realise that if we want to attract industrial development in Barbados we have to generate power with electricity; and we cannot allow this Electric Company to exploit in the manner in which it does. The Government should introduce legislation and see to it that the Electric Company does not exploit this community. I am not merely suggesting on the one hand that the Government should endeavour to get this done at a flash; but on the other hand Government should also see after its duty to the community and ensure that the exploitation (and that is not too hard a term to use) now being conducted by the Electric Company with regard to the power it supplies to consumers be controlled to some greater extent.

In other words, I am suggesting that it is possible that you should consider taking action on the suggestions made to-night. The Act under which the Electric Company is entitled or allowed to fix prices for rates, also gives the Government the power to control these rates.

I believe the time has come when a most careful investigation should be conducted by the Government itself into the existing rates charged for energy supplied or contracted to be supplied by the Electric Company, because as things stand now the company is entitled to charge for what it supplies to you, not what it contracts to supply to you, whether it has been actually supplied or not. I doubt whether there is any part of the world where you would find a private utility company enjoying what to my mind are such unfair powers. After all, we are quite satis-

fied to pay for what that company supplies to us; but certainly we should not pay for what it contracted to supply, but naturally fails to supply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I agree with the remarks made by the hon. senior member for the City. In the first place, relative to the question of voltage, I myself, have experienced that low voltage; so I feel it should be incumbent on the Government Electrical Engineer to make these tests. While I agree with the hon. member I think he will also agree that if one wants a test to be carried out, one will have to call on the Inspector and pay for that test. What I am saying is, that when you made various tests at houses [A VOICE: That is for leakage]. You make them for low voltage also.

As regards the point made by the same hon. member relative to the fee charged for the inspection of cinemas, while on the face of it it appears reasonable to suggest that a greater fee should be charged I would like to point out to the hon. member that this charge is for inspection and for inspection only. For inspecting, testing and reporting on any electrical installation or addition thereto, you charge \$1.20, but you charge 50c., basically for the annual inspection of any cinema or other public place of entertainment. The word "house" used in Item 10, does not apply only to private residences it applies also to theatres. If you look a little lower down the Schedule you will see that for testing any dynamo or motor, for continuity or installation a fee of \$10 is charged. For testing house wires for leakage where the installations do not exceed five outlets we charge \$5, but where the installation exceeds five outlets we charge \$10; that would include cinemas. [A VOICE: I think it should be more money].

I am glad to hear the hon. member say that. The more money we get in the Public Treasury the more water we would be able to put in St. Lucy. However, these fees were gone into very carefully and were recommended by the Government Electrical Engineer; and I can only promise the hon. member to take it up with the Electrical Engineer in order to see whether we should make any change.

I would also like to assure the hon. member on the point raised about the Electrical Engineer being authorised to go in and inspect these places, that provision has already been made in the Electricity Act, of 1936, Section 9, for these inspections. The Section reads as follows:

(1) "It shall be lawful for the Inspector at all reasonable times to enter any premises for the purpose—

- (a) of inspecting any electric fittings or apparatus with a view to reporting on the condition thereof;
- (b) of satisfying himself that the provisions of this Act, or of the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1940, and the regulations made thereunder have been observed.

(2) The Inspector shall deliver to the owner or occupier a written notice setting out any defects which in his opinion require to be remedied and the period of time within which such defects shall be remedied.

(3) Any person who obstructs the Inspector in the course of his duties, or fails to comply with the requirements of such notice shall be guilty of an offence under this Act."

[A VOICE: They do not do it.]

I really do not know; but I have every good reason to believe that the Government Electrical Engineer does not have these inspections carried out

whether they are Government institutions or not. I think that covers the points made by the hon. senior member for the City.

There were also some points raised by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, but the one point which I think needs a reply is the one about the cost of electricity. If the hon. member looks at the Electricity Act, he will see, although I am not trying to justify the charges which the Company makes, that since 1936 when the amendment to Electric Light and Powers (Orders Confirmation) Act was passed, the Company was allowed to charge a maximum of 36 cents per unit. In my opinion, it was a very ridiculous thing to do; but up to now, the Company has not charged that amount. I think that with the institution of the Public Utilities Board that things such as the point raised by the hon. member of charging high rates can be got over; because one only has to appeal to the Board and the Board has the power to investigate and also to make recommendations for either a reduction or an increase in the charges, as the case may be. I think I have covered all the points raised.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. Cox seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

Clauses, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were called and passed. The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. Cox seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
10.55 p.m.