THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6th April 1948

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN, (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, E. D. MOTTLEY, H. A. DOWDING, V. C. GALE and E. L. WARD.

Prayers are read.

Mr. HAYNES enters the House and takes his seat.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 23rd and 25th March, respectively, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Report of the Inspector of Trees for the parish of St. James for the year 1947.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Report of the Department of Highways and Transport for the year 1946—47.

Report on the Barbados Fire Brigade for the year 1947.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of £80,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay a cost of living allowance as from the 1st April, 1948, to persons eligible to receive a cost of living allowance in accordance with the provisions of resolutions Nos. 14 of 1947, 20 of 1947, 44 of 1947, and 117 of 1947, as if these resolutions had continued in force after the 31st of March, 1948.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to provide from the 1st April, 1948, a cost of living allowance to officers in the full time service of the Savings Bank who receive their salaries from the funds of the Bank at the rates and subject to the terms, conditions and exceptions set out in the Schedule to the resolution.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to sanction the Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 177 of the Trade Act, 1910 (1910—4).

Messrs. MAPP and WILKINSON enter the House and take their seats.

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to approve the rate payable to producer and rate of tax payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on fancy molasses produced during the crop year 1947-48 fixed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board in accordance with the provisions of regulations 5 and 6 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Regulations, 1938.

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to authorise His Excellency the Governor in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (2) of the Clerical Service Act, 1944, as amended by section 2 of the Clerical Service (Amendment) Act, 1947, to appoint two additional clerks to the Clerical Staff of the Clerical Service.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to place the sum of £5,500 at the disposal of the Department of Highways and Transport to complete the work set out in Column I of the Schedule hereto to the extent of the amount set out in Column II of the said Schedule.

Mr. TALMA: Bill to authorise the payment of a gratuity and pension to Jacques Kenneth Predyx Rudder.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945-12).

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

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY gives notice of a Bill to amend the Vestries Act, 1911—5.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of this House:

Whether dissatisfaction exists amongst Motor Omnibus Concessionaires of this Island in connection with the issuing, or failure to issue, of special permits by the Department of Highways and Transport to Concessionaires?

BRANCKER: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at next meeting of this House:

Does dissatisfaction exist amongst members of His Majesty's Civil Service in connection with deductions made from their salaries for payment to Widows' and Orphans' Fund?

2. If the answer to the above question is "Yes," will Government consider amending existing legislation so as to remove the source of grievance abovementioned?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to amend the Stamps Act, 1916—3 is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to authorise the payment of a gratuity and pension to Jacques Predyx Kenneth Rudder is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act 1945—12 is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. DOWDING, a Bill to amend the Vestries Act 1911—5 is read a first time.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. MAPP) is appointed Chairman of Committees for the day's sitting.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee of Supply, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE FOR ORGANIZATION BANKING SAVINGS OF WORKERS IN U.S.A.

Dr. CUMMINS: I propose, Mr. Chairman, to take Resolution No. 2 first. It is a Resolution for £560 to supplement Resolution No. 101 of the 29th October, 1947, for carrying on the organization for banking the compulsory savings of Barbadian workers in the U.S.A., for payment to their nominees of the allotments authorized to be paid under the terms of the workers' contracts, for the payment of any Court Order for the maintenance of any person dependent on the workers, for the reimbursement of any monies paid by the Government of Barbados in respect of duties incurred by the workers in the U.S.A., and in respect of advances by way of loan in order to effect insurance. It is the usual type of Resolution that comes before this House from time to time for the beforementioned purposes and I beg to move that it do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Dr. WILSON joins the Committee and takes his seat.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There is just one observation I would like to make in connection with the money that is being sent back from the United States of America to workers who have been there and returned. I do not know whether there is not sufficient staff in the Department which deals with the matter to cope with the work of paying out this money but many persons have been to me complaining that they have returned to this island from the U.S.A., for the last three or four years and that they have received correspondence from the U.S.A. to the effect that income tax which they paid in the U.S.A. has been refunded and forwarded to them but that up to the present they have heard nothing about it from the local Department. I would like the honourable member in charge of this Department to draw the matter to the notice of those concerned, so that there can be speedier action in the payment of these monies because in many cases these workers cannot afford to be waiting so long for the few cents. If it is necessary to increase the staff to cope with the number of Money Orders, this House would, I am sure, be willing to give the temporary additional staff for the purpose. As I have said, many of these workers have made repeated complaints to me and I am sure that other honourable members must have had some of them coming to them with similar complaints; so I would like the honourable member in charge of this Resolution to draw the matter to the notice of the appropriate Department and find out the cause of the delay in paying out these income tax rebates which have been given to these workers.

Mr. WILKINSON: I was really going to raise the same point that has been raised by the honourable member who has just sat down. I know that a certain amount is deducted from the wages of these workers for income tax and that, in due course, they get it back but there seems to be extraordinarily long delay in the payment of that money. We know that government departments are always slow, particularly when you are trying to get money from them and I was going to ask the senior member for St. Thomas if he could state whether any progress has been made in this respect. There is one point which I should like to take this opportunity to raise and it is this. I read in the newspapers that His Excellency the Governor is leaving today for medical treatment in the U.S.A., and I hope that he will seize the opportunity to see the American Authorities while he is there with the view of obtaining a quota of Barbadian workers for the U.S.A. this year. Perhaps the senior member for St. Thomas will give us some information about that.

Dr. CUMMINS: For the benefit of the two honourable members who have spoken and of the Committee I would like to say this: It is true that there is some delay in the payment of the money that is due to these workers but the fault does not lie with the office here. The matter has been gone into over and over again and the fault lies with the organization in the U.S.A. It seems that they have a certain routine to go through and for that reason the forwarding of the rebates is delayed. I can assure honourable members that the fault does not lie with the office here. As regards the other point raised by the junior member for St. James, it is the intention of His Excellency the Governor to see the persons connected with the Emigration Scheme in the U.S.A., and we are hoping that when he comes back he will be able to give us some encouraging news.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I appreciate that answer but I should like to point out that it is not necessary to see the American Authorities in this matter of emi-

grating workers to the U.S.A. It is an established fact which must be known to honourable members—

The CHAIRMAN: I must interrupt the honourable member. I do not think that part of the debate is relevant to the Resolution before the Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, you are late in your ruling. It is not merely, Sir, a question of negotiating with the Authorities in the U.S.A. It is a question of negotiating with private employers. The workers who went from the Leeward Islands to the U.S.A., were sent as the result of negotiations with private employers in the U.S.A.

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

SUBSIDIZATION OF COMMODITIES.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £129,350 to supplement Resolution No. 107 of the 4th November, 1947, to provide for the subsidization of flour, salt fish, salt pork, and balanced animal feed to the 30th September, 1948. I do not see in the Committee any members who were not members of the House when the last subsidization Resolution came before it and I do not propose, therefore, to waste any time in saying anything more than that it is the intention of the Government to continue to subsidize these particular items because of their being used chiefly by the poorest section of the community and, in the case of animal balanced feed, because subsidization helps dairy keepers and owners of dairy cattle to produce milk at reasonably low cost. I may be asked "What does the Government propose to do with any money that it may save on flour?" Well, as far as flour is concerned, the quantity which we are subsidizing now was ordered months ago and so we do not necessarily benefit from the fact that flour is becoming cheaper in Canada as far as those previous orders are concerned. But we shall benefit as the months go by from the lowered price of flour and if honourable members ask "what is likely to be done with the money which is saved?" I would just remind them that this is a bloc vote which is given to the Controller in respect of these items. Suppose the price of everything went down except salt fish, he could take all the money that is saved and use in respect of salt fish. It is not a question of so much to be allocated to salt fish, so much to salt pork and so on; therefore, honourable members can rest assured that if the price of flour goes down during the period in question, the money available from the normal allocation to flour will be used in respect of one of the other items. It is the usual government policy we have been observing for years and it is on the best possible advice and on the Government's own judgment that we have kept to the subsidization of these particular items. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that. It is hardly necessary for me to add anything to the remarks of the honourable mover of this Resolution and I hardly believe that it will meet with any controversial remark from any member at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD joins the Committee and takes his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I suppose everyone would agree with the question of subsidization but what I would like to know is if any attempt has been made to get a supply of flour from Australia. I understand that Australian flour is being landed in Trinidad and sold much cheaper than Canadian flour. I should like to hear something about that before I vote for this Resolution.

Mr. HAYNES: I do not quite like the remark of the senior member for St. Joseph when he said that the Controller could use this money as he likes. It seems to me that we are giving him a blank cheque, so to speak. I think we shall effect a considerable saving on flour owing to the General Agreement that has been made with other countries but it also seems a great pity that every year we spend this large sum of money and really do not see a lowering in the cost of living in the island generally. I am very sorry to hear the honourable member say that the Controller has this power because it looks to me that this £129,000 will be spent if the price of flour goes below the present figure.

Mr. DOWDING: There is one phase of this matter I should like to bring to the attention of the member of the Government and that is the eccentric and neglected way in which the animal feed is mixed on behalf of the Government. It is very detrimental to the animals to have this mixed feed varying not only from batch to batch but from bag to bag; practically every bag of feed mixed on behalf of the Government varies. The Government should see to it that the feed is mixed in such a manner that one quality mixture is produced.

Mr. WARD: I think there is a lot in what the last honourable member has said. I do not consider that sufficient care is taken in the mixing of this balanced animal feed. As a matter of fact I would not say that it is at all balanced; it is greatly unbalanced because in some bags you get one grade and in other bags you get another grade of feed. Personally I was blaming the merchants but I understand that the Government is responsible for the mixing of this feed and I think that the Government should establish some system by which they could produce a standard grade of this feed. The present feed upsets very much the production of milk and causes it to vary from week to week.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am very pleased to support this Resolution. I think it is a very necessary thing that these items should be subsidized and I am very pleased to know that if the price of flour comes down, the amount saved in respect of flour will not lapse but will be used in respect of salt fish, as the senior member for St. Joseph has told us. An honourable member remarks that I do not want to spend money. I want to spend money because I want to see the poor people get their salt fish and flour cheaper. As I said, I am very pleased to support this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: This is the first time that I have heard any complaint about the mixing of the feed and I shall bring it to Dr. Saint's notice before the day is over. In view of the fact that honourable members have spoken about various grades of this feed I shall telephone Dr. Saint and see what can be done about the matter. I do hope that honourable members, when they have information of that sort, will promptly bring it to the notice of the Competent Authority because it is easier to nip a thing in the bud if I may use that expression. Many grievances may exist if they are not brought to the notice of the Competent Authority and are remedied. The senior member for the City has asked about obtaining supplies of flour from Australia. I think I mentioned this before: Long ago Dr. Saint made enquiries about Australian flour but the difference in price per bag is so little that it is hardly worth while importing flour from Australia. A lot of the publicity in the Trinidad newspapers about Australian flour is done by a gentleman who has the agency in Trinidad. This Government, to my knowledge, about two years ago approached the Australian Government as regards

getting flour, butter and cheese from that Continent and all the things one reads in the *Trinidad Guardian* about obtaining supplies of flour from Australia are not always accurate. I am not blaming the newspaper but the agent who publicizes what he can get. We have balanced Canadian prices against Australian prices and we feel that we can get goods reasonably cheaper from Canada than we can from other parts of the world. If I mention the name of Dr. Saint it is not that I am pushing responsibility off the Control Board but I do know that Dr. Saint has, not once but several times, made attempts to see if we could get goods from Australia cheaper than we can get them from Canada—some are coming in from Australia—but the difference in prices is small and the freight changes on the Australian goods transhipped from Trinidad to Barbados eat it up. We do, however, get some butter and cheese from Australia.

Mr. GALE: I would like to say that as far as flour is concerned, the Australian article is not much cheaper but I can state that frozen meat from Australia is much cheaper than frozen meat from Canada; also butter and cheese is cheaper from Australia. Another thing is this: Australia is in the sterling area and, therefore, I think it is possible for us to get goods from Australia instead of having to obtain them elsewhere and pay dollars for them.

Mr. WILKINSON: I went into these figures some weeks ago and as the senior member for St. Joseph has stated, the difference in price is small. The Australian goods for this island are put in cold storage in Trinidad and then transhipped from Trinidad to Barbados. The obvious thing to do is to get sufficient orders to enable the boat to come directly to Barbados. I think the matter really needs a little more consideration and investigation. I agree with what the senior member for St. Joseph has said. At present we get one ship coming once in 7 weeks with Australian goods transhipped from Trinidad but that is not good enough and as the junior member for St. Michael stated, we should spend in sterling, and not in dollars, wherever we possibly can. As regards the animal feed I was informed by the senior member for St. George that it varies considerably. I made enquiry into the matter some weeks ago and I was told by Dr. Saint's Department that unfortunately they could not get sufficient quantities of feedstuffs to have a continuous run of the same feed. I do hope that they will get the desired quantities to keep up a constant supply of proper animal feed.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTE TO MEET EMERGENCY EXPENSES.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £8,000 to supplement Resolution No. 116 of the 23rd December, 1947, to meet expenses in connection with the present emergency. Honourable members will have had in their hands, for a few weeks now, the usual statement from the books of the Audit Department showing the emergency expenditure. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

PAYMENT OF ADDITIONAL SALARIES TO POLICEMEN AND FIRE BRIGADEMEN.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of £180. 17. 9 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay to those members of the Police Force and Fire Brigade whose names are set out in Column I the amounts set out against their names in Column II of the Schedule to the resolution, being the difference between old rates of pay and the new rates of pay authorised by the Police (Amendment) Act 1946—25 and the Fire Brigade (Amendment) Act 1946—26, in respect of the period from the 1st April, 1946, and the death or retirement from the respective Forces.

The addendum explains clearly what has happened. The members of the Police Force and the Fire Brigade whose names appear in the schedule to the Resolution either retired or died during the period between the payment of the old rates and the new rates. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Chairman reports the passing of four Resolutions and the postponement of one in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA in each case, the four Resolutions which were passed in Committee of Supply are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

THE MARRIED WOMAN'S (SEPARATION AND MAINTENANCE) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to Separation and Maintenance.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—The object of this Bill is to bring the local law in conformity with similar laws in Great Britain and other British colonies by extending the grounds for making an application to include bodily harm, persistent cruelty, desertion, wilful neglect or refusal to provide reasonable maintenance, adultery and the communication of venereal disease knowingly. This Bill repeals section 3 of the Married Woman's Act, 1896, which does not make provision in such cases and in order to bring the present law into line with the English practice and the practice which obtains in other up-to-date colonies of the Empire, it has been necessary to implement these new provisions, so that relief will be granted not only in such cases but also in respect of the custody and maintenance of children of the marriage. Provision is also made in this amending Bill whereby cases brought under the Act will be heard in camera and the services of the Probation Officer, a very useful officer, will be utilized in investigating the circumstances of the parties. Not so long ago the Matrimonial Causes Act was amended and this is really, a corollary, so to speak, to that amended Act. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second the motion. The honourable member has covered the ground completely. The position of a married woman in England is said to be that of a very fortunate creature but here in Barbados a married woman has got to be deserted and her husband has to refuse to support her before she can get an Order against him and this Bill brings the law into line with the English practice. A married woman can be left at the Altar and her husband need never see her again. There is no provision in the local law for an Order to enable her to live apart from her husband nor is there any provision for maintenance in respect of desertion. Those

points are now covered by this Bill and it will certainly help to bring our Act which is 50 years old more in keeping with humane principles than it is at the present moment.

Mr. MOTTLEY : I quite appreciate this amendment but if adultery is proved by a husband and his wife has six or seven children as a result of the marriage, there is no law to make the father support those children but there is an old statute which gives a Churchwarden the right to bring a case against that man and obtain support for the children. The Poor Law Guardians of St. Michael have had several instances in which children have gone astray although their fathers were in a position to support them but under the law, nobody else but the Churchwarden could bring cases against them and in some parishes the churchwardens are unwilling to bring such cases. I would like to know if any provision is made in this Bill to meet such cases. A married woman cannot sue her husband for support for their children and when adultery is proved, the children go astray.

Mr. BRANCKER : There are one or two principles involved in this Bill to which I would like to make reference. I notice, Sir,—and I appreciate it—that there is a principle which this Bill proposes to initiate, that is, the principle of privacy in regard to matrimonial cases. This amending Bill seeks to initiate in Clause 15 the principle that matrimonial cases should be tried in private and I am very much in favour of it. But it seems to me that sub-paragraph (e) of sub-clause 2 of Clause 15 may defeat the whole purport of that principle if the Court is given the discretionary power to permit any other person to be present at the hearing and determination of an application.

Mr. SPEAKER : You are dealing with a particular point rather than with the general principle of the Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER : I am expressing the hope that that particular sub-paragraph (e) will not defeat the carrying out of the principle of hearing matrimonial cases in private.

Mr. SPEAKER : That is a point you should raise if and when the Bill reaches the Committee stage.

Mr. BRANCKER : I notice that Clause 2 of the Bill which deals with the powers of the Court seems to leave untouched the amount which is fixed as the maximum amount in the existing law for alimony. That amount now does not exceed £2.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again you are dealing with a particular point and not with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER : The senior member for St. Joseph pointed out that the local law is more restricted than the English law and that may be the explanation for leaving the *status quo* in respect of the amount for alimony. There is a new principle in Clause 2 of this Bill. It provides that if a husband is convicted summarily on an indictment of wounding his wife or of an assault upon her occasioning bodily harm and is fined more than £5 or sentenced to a term of imprisonment not exceeding two months, that can be a ground for the making of an order against him.

Mr. SPEAKER : Again that point has nothing to do with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER : I will deal with it when we are in Committee on the Bill. It is a new principle and when we are in Committee I shall make one or two observations on it. On the whole, I regard the Bill as necessary legislation and I hope that when it reaches the Committee stage we shall make some obvious and necessary improvements to it.

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

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

Clause 1 is read and is agreed to.

Mr. SYMMONDS joins the Committee and takes his seat.

Clause 2. Any married woman whose husband shall have been convicted summarily or on indictment of wounding her or of an assault upon her occasioning bodily harm and sentenced to pay a fine of more than five pounds or to a term of imprisonment exceeding two months, or whose husband shall have deserted her, or whose husband shall have been guilty of persistent cruelty to her or to her children or of wilful neglect to provide reasonable maintenance for her or her infant children whom he is legally liable to maintain (notwithstanding that the cruelty or neglect complained of has not caused her to leave and live separately and apart from him) or whose husband while suffering from a venereal disease and knowing that he was so suffering insisted on having sexual intercourse with her, or whose husband has compelled her to submit herself to prostitution or whose husband has committed adultery, may apply to the Police Magistrade of the district in which either the wife or the husband resides for an order or orders under this Act; and the Police Magistrate to whom any application under this section is made may make an order or orders containing all or any of the provisions following :—

(a) a provision that the applicant shall be no longer bound to cohabit with her husband (which provision while in force shall have the effect in all respects of a decree of judicial separation);

(b) a provision that the legal custody of any children of the marriage between the applicant and her husband, while under the age of sixteen years, be committed to the applicant;

(c) a provision that the husband shall pay to the Clerk of the Court such weekly sum not exceeding two pounds as the Court shall, having regard to the means both of the husband and the wife, consider reasonable; and when the order contains a provision committing the legal custody of any children of the marriage to the applicant, a provision that the husband shall pay to the Clerk of the Court a weekly sum not exceeding ten shillings for the maintenance of each such child until such child attains the age of sixteen years.

(d) a provision for payment by the applicant or the husband or both of the costs of the Court.

Mr. TALMA : I beg to move that that be Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to second that.

Dr. CUMMINS : Before the question is put I would like to say that I know there is the feeling on the part of certain honourable members that venereal disease should not be included in this Bill; that to-day venereal disease is easily cured and, therefore, no such provision should be made in this Bill. It depends on how the wife feels about it. There will still be a certain amount of uneasiness of mind and I feel that the provision against venereal disease should be included.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT : That is not giving me as much worry as the provision that deals with a husband who has been convicted of an assault upon his wife occasioning bodily harm. I do not know what the lawyers would term "bodily harm" but I would like to say this plainly: I am not one of those people who believe that the State or anybody

should get into a married couple's business but I feel that just as a parent has to chastise his children, sometimes some women do need to be chastised. You cannot open the door to let them do as they like. A married woman may not have the strength to beat her husband, but she can cuff him, and if a married woman wilfully neglects to cook her husband's food he may give her a slap which may cause a black eye and there should not be separation on those grounds. A husband may go home hungry and does not find his meals ready because his wife may have gone to see a wedding. That man may start to talk and she lets him understand that he should have come home and cooked himself. I am not speaking from personal experience because I believe I am one of the happiest married men in the world; but other men may not be as fortunate to have a happy union. I am not in favour of a man beating his wife. My feeling is that if a man should beat his wife so as to occasion bodily harm he should be punished but you should not make the Act too wide. Wounding may be different but bodily harm may occur where the temper of a man rises to such an extent that he gives his wife a slap which causes a black eye; she puts him in Court and gets a separation on that. We should avoid placing the temptation of easy means of obtaining a separation order in the way of a married woman who does not want to live with her husband.

Mr. ADAMS : All I say is that a man who hits a woman ought to be sent to gaol for the first offence and a man who incites by his speech another man to hit a woman ought to be sent to jail too. (Laughter).

Mr. BRANCKER : I am very lukewarm about this provision in Clause 2 which talks about summary conviction or on an indictment of wounding or of an assault occasioning bodily harm and the imposition of a fine of more than £5 or a term of imprisonment exceeding two months. Now, it is a fact that an assault occasioning bodily harm may be the result from one cuff; that cuff may cause a black eye and that would be an assault which occasions bodily harm. If the punishment is a fine of more than £5 or a term of imprisonment exceeding two months, it must be presumed that the bodily harm is of a very serious nature but I would like to point out that there may be a conviction for bodily harm which may not be severe; it may be trivial or slight but the fine may be more than £5 because of previous convictions for assaulting other persons. Perhaps it may be better to delete the words "or of an assault upon her occasioning bodily harm and sentenced to pay a fine of more than five pounds" occurring in lines 3 and 4 of this Clause. Now, Sir, as regards the question of a husband suffering from venereal disease and knowing that he is so suffering insisted on having sexual intercourse with his wife I would have no sympathy with that man at all. One can hardly imagine a worse thing to do. The Court must be satisfied that the man knew that he had venereal disease and how is the Court to be so satisfied? In the case where the Court is satisfied that the man knew that he had venereal disease when he insisted on having sexual intercourse with his wife I would regard that as an instance in which he should unhesitatingly be made to support his wife. I notice that in sub-paragraph (c) of this Clause it is proposed to leave the sum exactly as it has been for many years that is, £2. I would be interested to learn—before I express an opinion to allow it to remain at £2, the maximum it has been for many years—why the Government fixed it at the same £2 having regard to the fact that the cost of living to-day is quite different from what it was before. While a middle class man earns about $7 or $8 a week, if it so happens that an order is made against one of the richest men in the island, a big factory owner for instance, he would pay the same weekly sum not exceeding £2. That is where the disparity comes in. Obviously when a well-to-do man is required by law to support his wife, a weekly sum not exceeding £2 is the maximum that the Court would have the power to make him pay her.

Mr. ADAMS : I would just say this: Like the honourable junior member for St. Lucy I have been practising my profession for quite a long time and my experience is that if a person steals a couple of canes from a plantation he stands a chance of being fined £5 but a man has to nearly kill somebody else before a Police Magistrate would fine him £5; so I see no danger of £5 being too high. I cannot think off-hand—it sounds exaggerating—of any case in which a man has been fined £5 for beating somebody else; the most he is fined is £2 or if the case is really too bad and the Magistrate cannot help himself he sends the offender to prison for two months. This is not an inducement to a married woman to put her husband in Court because she wishes a conviction to be recorded against him. It will take many a year before a woman is going to get her husband fined £5 or get him committed to prison for two months; he must have broken her arm or her leg for that to happen. I do not think there is any danger in the amount of the fine being fixed at £5. On the other hand if you reduce it to £2, you may find a man, who for the first time loses his temper and takes the advice of the senior member for St. Peter, hitting a woman, being sorry for it afterwards, being fined £2 and getting a separation. I think £5 is a reasonable sum.

Mr. BRANCKER : Perhaps I should make my point clearer than what it appears to be. If an assault occasioning actual bodily harm was *per se* sufficient to warrant a fine of £5, then so far as our standards go, it would be serious bodily harm. The bodily harm occasioned by an assault may be slight but the fine may be severe because of previous offences.

Mr. MOTTLEY : The remarks of the senior member for St. Peter in the first part of his speech caused me to smile but, on reflection, it seems to me that what he said is practical. If a woman is beyond redemption it does not worth while to beat her but if she is good then she should not be beaten. Speaking as a Barbadian I say that these things come about through economics. These people in the humbler walk of life might have at times to resort to violence and while at one time I felt that the amount of £5 should be reduced, I appreciate the fact that however fortunate some of us may be, all of us are not and that there is an unguarded moment for everyone of us. As regards sub-paragraph (c) of this Clause I feel that that should be amended for this reason. It is said that the maximum which a man can be ordered to pay is £2 a week. If you take that as a guide and an order was to be made against someone in the walk of life to which, say the senior member for St. Andrew belongs, no Magistrate could think of putting £2 a week on him. If £2 a week is to be taken as the maximum to be imposed on a man in the humbler walk of life, what would you impose on the senior member for St. Joseph? I am suggesting that this sub-paragraph be amended to read "sum not exceeding £5", that in itself will give the Court the discretionary power to fix sums varying from 1/- to £5 per week, considering the value of money to-day as compared with 50 years ago.

Now, as regards the amount for the maintenance of children, nobody would think to-day of fixing it in a sum not exceeding 10/- per week. As I suggested in my second reading speech, the whole question of the support of children—legitimate or otherwise—should be given greater consideration in this country. I have experience—and I know the senior member for St. Thomas has experience too—in dealing with children in the parish of St. Michael and I feel that here again the Court should be given more discretion because if a sum not exceeding 10/- a week is the maximum you can quite understand that the artisan who to-day pays 30c. or 1/6 a week will continue to pay those sums. Some people can afford to pay £2 a week for the maintenance of a child, while other people may not be able to pay 5/- a week. I beg to move that the word "two" in line 3 of sub-paragraphs (c) of Clause 2 be deleted in order to insert the word "five" and that the words "ten shillings" in lines 8 and 9 of the same sub-paragraph be deleted in order to insert the words "one pound".

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: I accept those amendments.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second the amendment by the junior member for St. Lucy. In doing so I would like to say that when the senior member for St. Joseph accuses me of inciting a man to beat his wife, that would be far from me. But I am a firm believer in not making it easy for married people to live apart. I prefer to err on the other side. I prefer that married people should temporarily undergo some inconvenience so as to keep their union together. I am convinced that wounding is a provision to which I could agree but I cannot, for myself, agree to make separation so easy on the ground of bodily harm. A person might fall to the ground and receive a blow as the result of a push by another person and the latter could be charged with an assault occasioning bodily harm. That, to my mind, is not the sort of behaviour for which people may be taken to Court and separation be obtained. There should be some sort of provocation to justify the separation of people's lives. Mistakes will be made in every walk of life. We, as human beings, will err and if there is a dispute between two married people which results in the inflicting of bodily harm, that, to my mind, is not a sufficient ground to say that those two people shall not live together again. We have not yet reached that stage in our civilization. I believe that many a dispute occurs through some misunderstanding and we should not give persons the opportunity, when they are vexed, to go and set themselves apart.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—It seems as though the wrong interpretation has been put on these words. Even the very amendment by the junior member for St. Lucy is not in place because unless the words "or to a term of imprisonment exceeding two months" in lines 4 and 5 are also deleted, the Clause does not make sense. What is disturbing honourable members' minds is the wrong interpretation which is being placed on the real, true purport of this ground. This is bodily harm out and out; it is not an assault. There are offences such as assault and battery, bodily harm, and wounding. Bodily harm is more or less tantamount to wounding; it is not the sort of assault and battery which is referred to by the senior member for St. Peter as a "brushing up". If the "brushing up" continues long enough and ends up in bodily harm I think it is time that the parties should not be divorced but should have grounds for separation and maintenance of the injured party and children, if any. As far as the amendment by the junior member for St. Lucy is concerned I believe he would agree with me that he must necessarily delete those words in lines 4 and 5 if the Clause is to make sense.

Mr. ADAMS: I want to make an appeal to honourable members—who, like me, at first took the senior member for St. Peter facetiously—not to let it go forth to the world that the Barbados House of Assembly is putting a premium on wife beating. Does the honourable member seriously suggest that in the year of grace 1948, a husband has the right to use any force whatever against his wife? He claims that right for a bullying husband or a husband who comes home all hours in the night for a wife to put a knife in him. I hope honourable members will not take his remarks seriously. It would be lamentable for us, in the year 1948 when we are trying our best to help married women, to let it go forth that we are condoning wife beating. You do not automatically separate people because a husband has beaten his wife any more than you automatically separate people because a husband has been fined. There are many wives who know that their husbands have lapses of virtue but do not run into the Divorce Court; they forgive them but you should not put it in the Statute Book that the wife who cannot forgive should have ground for divorce automatically as soon as she carries her husband into Court or gets an order. It happens over and over again that husband and wife appear in Court and the wife gets into the witness box and states that she does not desire to go on with the case. If there is love, there will be forgiveness. If the marriage has not been broken down on some other ground, it would not be broken down on adultery or cruelty. Some wives remain with their husbands although they are beaten every Saturday night. Women are remarkable persons when one considers what they put up with. If women were not remarkable persons, all of us, men would be divorcees or dead. I hope honourable members will see that this is not automatically agreeing to a separation order. You are merely allowing women, if they find their husbands guilty of adultery, to go into Court but they just take that as a temporary aberration due largely to one reason or another.

Mr. BRANCKER: For the benefit of the senior member for St. Peter I will say that grievious bodily harm is an indictable offence. If it is an ordinary care of bodily harm, it does not go before the Chief Justice. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my motion by moving that the words "or to a term of imprisonment exceeding two months" in lines 4 and 5 of Clause 2 be also deleted.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Clause is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3, 4, and 5 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

Clause 6. (1) If at any time after the making of any order under this Act complaint shall be made to the Police Magistrate that any sum to be paid in pursuance of any such order has not been paid, he shall summon the husband and enquire into the complaint, and if he is satisfied

(a) that the amount claimed is due and has not been paid or duly tendered;

(b) that the husband making default has had since the date of the order or the last payment in respect thereof the means to pay the sum in respect of which he has made default (Provided that if he is not satisfied he may either examine the husband on oath as to his means or direct an investigation by

the Probation Officer under Section 4 of this Act or may both examine the husband on oath and direct an investigation by the Probation Officer as aforesaid)

he shall, subject to the provisions of Section 14 of this Act, order the payment of the arrears or any part thereof to be enforced under either the paragraph numbered (5) or the paragraph numbered (6) in Section forty of the Police Magistrate's Act, 1905, as he shall think fit.

(2) Where an order contains a provision committing to the applicant the legal custody of any children of the marriage, a copy of the order may be served upon any person in whose actual custody of the children may for the time being be, and thereupon the provision may, without prejudice to any other remedy open to the applicant, be enforced in accordance with the following subsection of this section.

(3) A person making default in complying with an order served on him under the provisions of the preceding subsection may without prejudice to any other remedy open to the applicant, in the discretion of the Court be ordered to pay a sum not exceeding one pound for every day during which he is in default or to be imprisoned until he has remedied his default:

Provided that a person shall not for non-compliance with any such order as aforesaid be liable under this subsection to imprisonment for a period or periods amounting in the aggregate to more than two months, or to the payment of any sums exceeding in the aggregate twenty pounds.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that that be Clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I advocated a short while ago the payment of a sum not exceeding £5 for a married woman who gets a separation order but I should like to hear the senior member for St. Joseph explain sub-clause 3 of this Clause. I do not think the Government is serious about the wording "or to be imprisoned until he has remedied his default."

Mr. ADAMS: I am afraid that the honourable member has overlooked the fact that sub-clause 3 refers only to sub-clause 2 of this Clause. If a person has the custody of a child and the Court feels that he ought not to have it but that the wife should have the custody of that child and makes an order to that effect and the person refuses to comply with the order then something has to be done with that person. Some husbands carry away children and put them in the custody of their grandmothers or other relatives and the mothers are invariably advised that when they see their children they should hold them and take them to their respective homes. Some husbands, I have no doubt, will go to jail for occasional periods and keep the children.

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

Clauses 7 and 8 are read and are agreed to.

Clause 9. The Police Magistrate of any district in which an order has been made under this Act or under the Married Woman's Act 1895 may, on the application of the married woman or her husband, and upon cause being shown upon fresh evidence to the satisfaction of the Court at any time, alter, vary or discharge any such order, and may upon any such application from time to time increase or diminish the amount of any weekly payment ordered to be made, so that the same does not in any case exceed the weekly sum of two pounds.

Mr. ADAMS, with leave, alters the last two words "two pounds" to "five pounds" and the figures "1895" to "1896".

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER resumes the Chair and adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m., in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 27 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (a) so as to continue Government Business. I hope to finish the Bill with which we were dealing before the adjournment for lunch, and to make a beginning with the Public Health Bill. I believe that most honourable members would like this Bill referred to a Select Committee. It is merely for the purpose of dealing with these two matters that I am asking leave to move the suspension of the Rule.

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

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, FOSTER, MAPP, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, DOWDING, GALE, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, HAYNES and S. A. WALCOTT—4.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended has been decided in the affirmative, ten honourable members voting "Aye" and four honourable members "No." The Rule cannot be suspended, however, since twelve honourable members must vote for the suspension of a Rule.

WEIGHING OF PEASANTS' CANES AT SUGAR FACTORIES

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion of Question Time the House were debating the replies given to questions No. 10 put by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy, relating to the weighing of peasants' canes at sugar factories. Those honourable members who have already spoken are: The honourable junior member for St. Lucy, (Mr. Brancker), the honourable senior member for St. Philip (Mr. Crawford), the honourable senior member for St. Andrew (Mr. Haynes), the honourable senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Ward), the honourable senior member for St. Michael (Mr. Cox), the honourable senior member for St. James (Mr. S. A. Walcott) and the honourable senior member for St. George (Mr. Dowding). The honourable senior member for St. Peter (Mr. F. L. Walcott) was speaking on the last occasion.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT did not rise to speak.

Mr. BRANCKER: I will exercise my right of reply and finalise the discussion on the question. In the course of his remarks relative to the scale beam at Spring Hall Factory on the last occasion, the honourable senior member for St. James referred to the fact that this Factory has received a considerable amount of canes more this season, including a large

quantity from the peasant proprietors, than it has ever received. In fact, the honourable member said that this was a record year for this factory and thereby implied that the peasants were perfectly satisfied in the past; that this was just a mistake on the part of the caneweigher, although the hon. member did not go on to say why it is that this cane-weigher did not weigh the canes this season, and the peasants have had their confidence so completely restored in that scale beam and in the factory cane-weigher and manager that they have decided to send their canes there in large quantities. Many peasants have told me that inasmuch as this factory manager and this cane-weigher at this factory were caught during the last crop season with this big deficit of over a quarter of a ton in favour of the factory they did not think that this would take place in two crops running and that is why they are trying Spring Hall again this year, although other factories may feel that they can enjoy themselves at the expense of the poor peasant proprietor. In other words, the peasant proprietors have such a high opinion of the shrewdness of the person who runs that factory as to think that such a mistake would not be made in two crops running. The peasant proprietors have that feeling this year, but that will not be the case next year. Apart from that, there has been a certain amount of canvassing going on by the factory in order to get as many of the peasants' canes as possible. Special inducements have been offered people to send their canes to Spring Hall in preference to Fairfield. There has been a considerable amount of vision exercised in respect of Spring Hall although, unfortunately, the itinerant inspectors were put to work after the crop had started this year. My final comment in respect of this matter is that the answer which the Government gave to my question is just a general, complacent sort of answer: "All sugar factory scales are tested prior to the commencement of the crop and several times during the crop." That answer does not in itself indicate that they fully appreciate the extreme importance of this situation. There is the need for a satisfied peasantry and we must ensure that justice is done to people who send their canes to the factory. We must ensure that the test which is carried out is sufficiently stringent; we must ensure that a scale tested by the means which the Police are using is properly tested. In other words, the scale must be tested to capacity: even if the Officers do not notify the factory owners as to their visit, they do not test the scales to capacity so as to ensure that if there is anything wrong, the fault would be immediately apparent. The Department which looks after the testing of these scales must see to it that it possesses sufficient apparatus in order to ensure that the scales are tested to capacity, that the cane-weighers are approved by the Labour Commissioner and that when instances occur such as that which occurred at Spring Hall Factory during the last crop, they will be debarred from weighing any more canes in the future. I think I have made my points sufficiently clear in urging that these factory scales be tested by such adequate means as will demonstrate whether they are working correctly or not, and that being so, I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

APPOINTMENT OF WEST INDIANS TO PUBLIC SERVICES IN WEST INDIAN TERRITORIES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order that I might discuss the replies given to my questions No. 15. It will be recalled that my questions were:—

Has the attention of Government been drawn to a circular issued in August 1947, by His Excellency the Governor of Trinidad to all Heads of Government Departments in that Colony directing that "whenever a vacancy for first appointment or promotion occurs they should hesitate long and search their consciences hard before they recommend that it is essential to import a "United Kingdom Officer' to fill it?"

Will Government strongly urge on the Colonial Office that preference be given to West Indian, and particularly Barbadian, applicants for such appointments in the local Civil Service as are now, or may become vacant?

The reply to the first question is "No" the attention of Government has not been drawn to this circular; the only information which they have regarding the issue of such a circular has been obtained from Press reports. The reply to the second question is that it is already the policy of the Colonial Office to develop to the full opportunites for West Indians to staff the Public Services in British West Indian territories. Mr. Speaker, my comments in connection with these replies are these: it is remarkable that His Excellency the Governor of Trinidad should regard it necessary to issue such a circular as recently as August 1947, to all Heads of Government Departments giving them certain directions in respect of vacancies if he was aware, as our Government claims to be aware, that it is already the policy of the Colonial Office to develop to the full, opportunities for West Indians to staff the Public Services in these British West Indian territories. If that is already the policy of the Colonial Office and that policy is being faithfully and conscientiously carried out, one wonders why the Governor of Trinidad should be guilty of such a superfluous act as to be sending out this circular to all Heads of Departments giving them certain instructions. We are in a difficult position nowadays, since the institution of these self-governing Dominions of India, Burma, Ceylon and Pakistan relative to displaced personnel from the Indian Civil Service. As we can readily see, whether we like to face the facts or not, the vast number of possessions which were held by this big Empire overseas have considerably decreased and will continue to decrease. Countries like India, Burma and others are completely free to make appointments in their own Civil Service and one cannot blame the United Kingdom Government if they feel that they must find employment for those officials who were formerly employed in these countries; they have to try and find employment for these officials in the Coloniees. Charity begins at home. I repeat that we cannot blame the United Kingdom Government for attempting to find employment for their own people; but we have to consider putting our own house in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask honourable members on this side of the Table not to carry on any conversation because the Reporter finds it very difficult to report and I find it very difficult to hear the honourable member.

Mr. BRANCKER: I was saying that we have to look after ourselves and register our protest either when appointments are made outside when we know that we have persons equally competent to fill them in the West Indian sphere, or when appointments are anticipated before they are made. It is all well and good to say that there are occasions when officials from our islands are appointed in the service

of the Crown outside but if you keep a careful check on the position you will find that to one appointment of a Barbadian official outside the West Indies, there are three appointments of United Kingdom officials to this island. (Mr. ADAMS : That is not true). The same thing applies to the West Indies as a whole. I take it that we can faithfully say that that is what the Governor of Trinidad had in mind when he issued that circular to the Heads of Departments there. Recently we had a West Indian, a Barbadian Official in the person of the Chief Medical Officer, transferred to North Borneo; as against that we have the Attorney General appointed from outside, and nobody could dispute that there are competent and able West Indians who could fill that post. Even if that post could not have been filled by a local man, there are certain distinguished lawyers in other West Indian colonies who would not, by any means, be averse to filling this particular appointment. (A MEMBER: Like Hannays and O'Reilly?) There is the post of Financial Secretary which, we understand, has been filled by some non-West Indian official. There is vacant at present the post of Executive Engineer in our local Department of Highways and Transport, a post in which a mechanic has been acting. We have got to look for our own people and I do not say that in any narrow sense; I am not speaking from a Barbadian point of view but from a West Indian point of view. If in the West Indies there are suitable candidates for any post even that of Governor or Colonial Secretary, then a West Indian should be appointed to that post. If West Indians are available then one of them should be appointed to the post of Financial Secretary, Executive Engineer or any other post in the West Indies. We can pass a Resolution of sympathy in respect of those United Kingdom officials who find themselves disintegrated, but however great our sympathy is for them, our sympathy for our own people must be greater. The Government's replies to these questions were given as long ago as the 11th of November, 1947, when they said that they had no information on the matter beyond what they had obtained from Press reports. I am glad to see that the Government is now keeping in touch with what appears in the Press; having seen that information in the Press it would have been quite easy for the Government to verify it by contacting the Government of Trinidad. I have no reason to doubt the information; it appears in perhaps the most widely circulated of West Indian newspapers and there was no disclaimer. There was a reason for it; perhaps the present Governor of Trinidad may be a man who is sympathetic with the people of that colony and even although he might feel that his fellows in the United Kingdom might suffer as a result of his circular, yet he sees how great is the need in the West Indies for the preferment of West Indians for posts which they are capable of filling. I am not suggesting that if there is a vacancy in the West Indies that it should be filled by a West Indian who is not qualified to fill it; but when we have men who are qualified, perhaps more qualified than, or equally as qualified as, a United Kingdom official to fill a vacancy in the West Indies, the preferment should be given to a West Indian, because there is no question about it that if there is any vacancy in England, a West Indian would have a hard job to fill it even if his qualifications were better than those of a United Kingdom man. I must say that when the Government observes in their reply that it is already the policy of the Colonial Office to develop to the full opportunities for West Indians to staff the Public Services in British West Indian territories, they do not seem to exercise that amount of vigilance which one would like to associate with the Government with regard to the conduct of the administration of the territory. Apparently the Government is not alive to the situation that there are occasions when persons are appointed to the Public Services from the United Kingdom, persons whose qualifications are no better than, or not as good as, those of West Indians who have applied for such appointments. I feel that I must make that comment and urge the Government to re-consider its point of view in relation to this matter and not rest satisfied in its mind that it is already the policy of the Colonial Office to do a certain thing. The Government must not feel satisfied that that policy is being carried out 100% perfectly. A policy is a thing that might remain on paper, but it is the practice which matters. Perhaps the Government will agree with me that whatever may be the policy of the Colonial Office, that policy is not being carried out as faithfully as many West Indians would like it to be carried out; and we should let the Colonial Office know how we feel about the matter and how there is being put into practice what is claimed to be already the policy of the Colonial Office.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the honourable member's motion. I think that so far as this matter is concerned, we should commend the Governor of Trinidad for his interest in the members of the Civil Service of that Colony. With that view permeating the leading Officer of that colony the appointment of the Colonial Secretary of Trinidad is not to be wondered at. We, in this colony, in spite of the fact that we have an Assistant to the Colonial Secretary, and an Assistant to the Assistant to the Colonial Secretary, we have not yet been privileged to have an important office in the Secretariat, an administrative office filled by a local man. The Government would be well advised to endeavour to follow the policy of the Trinidad Government as demonstrated by the statement in the first question asked by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy. I feel that the local Government should have taken steps to communicate with the Trinidad Government in an attempt to find out whether this Press report was accurate or not. Having failed to do so, the Government does leave one with the opinion that it did not care whether this report was true or not, and it had no interest in the matter beyond the fact that the Colonial Office has already given a directive on the matter. We know from practical experience what actually happens to these directives by the Colonial Office, and what we want to see is not a directive but the actual implementation of the policy contained in it. Within recent date we have had the painful experience as to the manner in which the local Government ignored this directive which the Colonial Office, in so far as this particular recommendation is concerned, saw fit to apply to Barbados. There is no doubt that, with the loss to the Empire of India, Burma and other places both in the Near and the Far East, a large number of Colonial servants of comparatively young ages have found themselves unemployed and it is an open secret that in spite of the fact that we have been told here that the Colonial Office is pursuing the policy of developing to the full opportunities for West Indians to staff the Public Services in the British West Indian territories, it has been suggested by the same Colonial Office to the Administrators in these colonies that whenever and wherever possible certain posts are to be filled by some of these unemployed Administrators from the former eastern colonies of Great Britain. Not only in filling vacancies which now exist but also in the creation of new posts do we see some attempt made to implement this latter recommendation. I hope that the raising of this question by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy will impress upon the mind

of the Administration in this colony that responsible people are paying attention to this matter and are closely watching to see what policy will be followed in the immediate future both in regard to filling vacancies and also in regard to filling new posts which have been created or are about to be created. We have to bear in mind that not only do the imported officials receive fat salaries from the Treasury but when they leave this colony we are saddled with the expense of contributing a considerable sum to them, and it is more or less obvious to anyone who pays any attention to the matter that we cannot afford with impunity to continue the practice which has been our policy in the past. Moreover when members of the local Civil Service are qualifying themselves to fill the highest appointments, it is but right that opportunities should be given them to fill these appointments. There will not be any incentive to young men to qualify themselves for filling these posts and then when the posts are to be filled these men find themselves superseded by people perhaps with inferior qualifications, people who are not natives of West Indian territories. In view of the continual proclamations by the Colonial Office that the colonial service should be staffed even to the highest level by colonial people, this matter is deserving of more than passing attention. It is to be sincerely hoped that we shall not have to suffer the humiliation and the dissatisfaction in the near future of seeing officials who were previously employed in other parts of the Empire pitchforked into positions in this colony over the heads of our locally qualified men.

Mr. ADAMS : I should just like to say that in one of the very first speeches I made in this House I suggested that there are in the island only two posts which should not be filled by Barbadians, namely, the post of Governor and that of Colonial Secretary. For years now I am no longer of that opinion . I agree with the honourable member that as far as possible you should appoint West Indians to posts in the West Indies but I am no longer of the opinion that only Barbadians should be appointed to senior posts in this island although it is reasonable to appoint them to any posts for which they are fitted in the Caribbean or non-Caribbean area. I do not want to particularise because I may give the impression that I have personal feelings against some individual; but in an island 21 by 14 there are certain key positions in which it takes most exceptional men not to be guided by the influence of their families and their friends. I think we should make it clear that we are hoping to see a West Indian service and West Indians being moved around in the area and filling posts. The Governor of Trinidad might have had the best possible reasons for doing what he did. I do not think that we should say anything derogatory of any other West Indian colony or of any West Indian, but what can we learn from Trinidad except how not to do some things? We should look above and not below ourselves; we should not say that because this or that thing is said or done in Trinidad we should say or do it here. That seems to be looking backward rather than looking forward. This matter has not only been raised in this island; I have here a letter from the Secretary of State for the Colonies written since 1945 to our local Government drawing attention to the fact that grievance has been frequently expressed in the West Indies in relation to the number of imported officials who are appointed to senior posts in the Caribbean areas. It is pointed out that where there are suitable candidates available locally, these candidates are considered first, then candidates in the rest of the Caribbean area and it is only for some good reason that appointments are made outside. This matter has cropped up from time to time. Apart from the Agricultural Department in which there is Dr. Saint, Mr. Tucker and Mr. Blackburn, most of the senior officers in this island are Barbadians, and it is only recently that Mr. McLeod has been appointed here from St. Vincent. In Trinidad we have two barristers from this colony, namely, Mr. Fergusson and Mr. Archer; and two others in the Bahamas, namely, Mr. Bancroft and Mr. Field. Mr. Reece ha been transferred to Nigeria and there is Mr. Holder in British Guiana so that we have no real grouse in Barbados at least not among the lawyers seeing that so many have been exported from this island.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but it is now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B)

Mr. ADAMS: For the reasons which I gave just now, I am asking leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to continue Government Business. I did not intend to ask leave to move the suspension of this Rule if Question Time had not been taken up; but now that Question Time has been taken up, I repeat for the benefit of those honourable members who were not in the House in the first instance that I will not do anything more than finish the Bill with which we were dealing before the luncheon interval and then we can make our comments on the Public Health Bill which I believe honourable members desire to refer to a Select Committee.

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

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

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was not here when the honourable member made the motion for the suspension of the Rule in the first instance but I want to make my position clear. I intend to do everything I can do in order to facilitate Government Businses being done, but I cannot give up the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business Tuesday after Tuesday. It is absolutely wrong to do that. When it is a case of important Government Business which must be done, I am prepared to vote for the suspension of the Rules so as to allow such important Government Business to be done. I feel very strongly in this matter; it does not matter what comments are made in the Press, those of us who are outside the Government must see that Orders standing in our names are discussed. It is true that under Private Members' Business there are a lot of things which might be described as nonsense, and unnecessary and I am not prepared to sit down and prevent Government Business which must benefit the entire community from being done. However, there are matters under Private Members' Business with which it is necessary to proceed and I regret that I cannot vote for the suspension of this Rule.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I want to add in the first place that I am in agreement with the remarks of the previous speaker, and secondly, I want to say that in the fixing of the Order Paper, whoever is responsible for it, one notices that there is the deliberate putting of matters of less importance to be discussed during the morning session, and in the afternoon the excuse is made that there are important matters to be dealt with, matters which are deserving of immediate attention. Order No. 2 on the Order Paper under Government Business to-day was the

second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to Separation and Maintenance. We spent over an hour on that Bill when many of us thought that we could have discussed the Public Health Bill or some other measure under Government Business. The policy is very apparent; matters of relative unimportance are discussed in the first instance under Government Business and then in the afternoon when Private Members' Business should be discussed we are told that there are important matters under Government Business which must be done! I think that Private Members of this House are justified in seeing that they get the time which is devoted to their business.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member who has just spoken were capable of thinking decently of other people I could answer him to suit. He has charged whoever is responsible for fixing the Order Paper with doing things which are categorically not true. I give him the lie direct to that. Sometimes we say "Let the Order Paper remain as it is" when we are late and sometimes we ask for the suspension of Rule 60. I have never done what the honourable member has charged; he has a mind which I can only describe by using an unparliamentary expression. The honourable member cannot differ from anybody without giving some wrong impression. What reasonable human being could possibly have expected this afternoon that we would have heard about the Spring Hall affair which we have heard about for seven Tuesdays? I thought that honourable members would have given up Question Time. I quite agree that Private Members' Business must be done as well as Government Business but I do not think that we should spend Tuesday after Tuesday in discussing the reply which has been given to a question. I quite agree with what the honourable senior member for the City has said in respect of Private Members' Business. We must have some sense of proportion and I suggest with a full sense of any implication of what I am saying that anyone who can devote so much time to the discussion of this question has no sense of duty to his constituents.

Mr. BRANCKER: The honourable member has said that there were seven Tuesdays during which the reply to a certain question was discussed. If the 24 members of this House took seven Tuesdays—I do not admit that that figure is accurate—to express their various points of view on any question, they are perfectly entitled to express them. If somebody finds that certain questions are embarrassing, that is his funeral; but to suggest that honuorable members are not entitled to take as long as they think it necessary to express their points of view to the Government is to make an undue attempt to stifle discussion altogether. Until we decide that the Rules of the House should be changed and they are changed, the procedure remains the same. We have the time for Government Business, we have Question Time and we have the time for Private Members' Business and whenever the Government can make out a case for reverting to Government Business, they have never failed to get the sympathetic approval of members of the House. So far as the Public Health Bill to which the honourable member has referred is concerned that Bill is low down on the Order Paper and it should be put as Order No. 1 at the next meeting of the House when honourable members will come prepared with their comments. Nobody could be expected to deal hurriedly with this Bill which is Order No. 15 on the Order Paper: and we have never been able to get through with 14 items in one day. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph objects to the present allocation of the time in relation to the business of the House, let him attempt to make some change; and if the attempt is successful then we can work on some other system. I seem to remember not so many years ago when the honourable member used to expend many a long half an hour or an hour in discussing replies to questions.

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

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN and Dr. CUMMINS—8.

Noes: Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, HAYNES, DOWDING, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, MOTTLEY and WARD—9.

FURTHER REPLIES LAID.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to lay the reply to question No. 50 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter. I am sorry that I did not know that it was put before me to be laid.

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

Mr. TALMA: I ask leave to lay the replies to questions No. 49 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for the City.

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

ORDER POSTPONED.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the motion that this House adjourn for 5 minutes in order to consider that in the opinion of the House the failure of the Government to formulate and declare its policy with regard to the assistance it is prepared to afford new industries is disadvantageous to the best interest of the Island.

This motion was made by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and seconded by the honourable senior member for St. John. Then the adjournment of the debate was moved by the honourable senior member for St. Philip who will have the right to reply.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think I will have to continue my first speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you had concluded your speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I moved the adjournment of the debate and the motion was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the note I have.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Your Honour will recall that it was getting dark and hon. members expressed the desire to have discussion on the motion postponed. I then moved the postponement of the discussion and the honourable senior member for St. John seconded the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree that when an honourable member moves the postponement of a debate and the motion is agreed to, he has the right to continue his speech; but in this case the honourable member has already spoken.

Mr. CRAWFORD: However, the honourable senior member for the City and one or two other honourable members have some matters of some urgency standing in their names, matters with which they would like to deal this afternoon. The honourable senior member for St. George is willing, if the majority of honourable members agree, to proceed with a Vestry matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will call the Orders as they are on the Order Paper and it is up to any honourable member to move the suspension of Rule 60 so as to get an Order taken out of its place.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. DOWDING: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to proceed with Order No. 4 as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

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

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended.

Mr. SYMMONDS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

THE ST. GEORGE'S PARISH LOAN BILL

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to move that Order No. 4 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. SYMMONDS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. George to raise a loan for the purpose of making repairs to the roofs of St. George's Church, St. Jude's Chapel and St. George's Rectory.

Mr. DOWDING: This is not a controversial matter and I do not intend to say very much on it. This Bill seeks to authorise the Vestry of the parish of St. George to raise a loan not exceeding £6,000 for the purpose of repairing the roofs of St. George's Church, St. Jude's Chapel and St. George's Rectory. The roof of the Church is in a very bad condition and it has been so for a number of years. As the honourable member on my right has said, it leaks at times like a sieve. It is estimated that £4,000 will be required for providing a new roof for the Church and £1,000 on the repairs to the roof of St. Jude's Chapel and a similar sum on the repairs to the roof of St. George's Rectory. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to second that. I have visited the Church and it is quite plain to everybody that these repairs are very long overdue.

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

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. SYMMONDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

On a similar motion, the Preamble was postponed.

Clause, 1, the title Clause, was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. It shall be lawful for the Vestry of the Parish of Saint George and they are hereby authorised from time to time as they may require the same to borrow from any person or persons body or bodies politic or corporate willing to lend the same a sum or sums of money not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of six thousand pounds to be applied by them in making repairs to the roofs of Saint George's Church and Saint Jude's Chapel and to Saint George's Rectory and the sum or sums so borrowed with interest thereon at a rate not exceeding three pounds ten shillings per centum per annum shall be a charge on the rates of the said parish.

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I suggest that the words "three pounds ten shillings" occurring in line eleven of this Clause be deleted in order to insert the words "four pounds." That will not prevent this money from being borrowed at the rate of 3½%; I am only throwing out the suggestion.

Mr. DOWDING: I beg to accept that amendment.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The people who drafted this Bill must have had very good reasons for putting the rate of interest payable on this money at 3½%. This Bill has been on the Order Paper for a long time and now we are agreeing off-hand to the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. James to make the interest payable on this money at 4%! I do not understand that. I take it that the Vestrymen of the parish of St. George know their business and they must have known that they could borrow this money at 3½% interest before that rate was put in the Bill. If we agree to the interest on this money being paid at 4% obviously nobody will lend the money at 3½% interest. If we are going to accept an amendment which allows money to be borrowed in a market dearer than that which was put before the House, that is a very serious consideration. The honourable senior member for St. George has introduced this Bill seeking permission to borrow this money at 3½% interest; he is now Churchwarden of the parish and he and other Vestrymen sat around the Table as business men in connection with this matter and when the Bill was drawn up they must have known that they could get this money at 3½% otherwise it would have been only a matter of changing a figure. I think that very good reasons must be given before this House agrees with this amendment; it must be shown that they cannot get this money at 3½% interest and therefore they have to put on ½% more. I know that as business men they would not readily agree to increasing the rate of interest when they knew that they could get money at the cheaper rate.

Mr. TALMA: I think that the honourable member is acting *ultra vires* in this matter in view of the fact that he is not the introducer of this Bill. If the honourable introducer has accepted an amendment how can anyone, no matter what power he might have, say that he is objecting to the principle of the amendment? As far as I know, if the honourable introducer accepts an amendment then the matter is settled. I am not saying that no comments should be made on the matter but there is no motion to be put. A positive motion will have to be made in relation to the amendment before it can be put but so far no motion has been made. If as we have just heard, the honourable introducer is Churchwarden of the parish of St. George and the money of the parish is put in his hands and in view of the fact that money is cheap today, if he accepts an amendment to the Bill I think that the matter is settled. I myself have three private Bills with which I am anxious to get through this afternoon.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I believe that I can throw a little light on this matter. As many honourable members are aware, money is not so readily obtained to-day either in Barbados or in any other part of the world as was the case some time ago. Some time ago at the St. Michael's Vestry we advertised for a loan and the loan was over-subscribed by a very large amount so that we had to allocate amounts to various parties. A few weeks ago we again adver-

tised for a loan offering to pay interest at a rate not exceeding 4% as the honourable junior member for St. James has suggested, and we did not even receive offers amounting to what we wanted. We had to raise the balance in a private manner. I want to make it clear to honourable members that the amendment is a very wise one in days like these because I am sure that it will give the Vestry of St. George the opportunity to raise money perhaps without having to do what we in St. Michael had to do.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If one reads the Bill, one will see that the difficulty is in repaying the money. In my experience I find that when you call for loans and you have to repay them in small sums there is some difficulty. I take it that the honourable senior member for St. Peter is quite in order to ask for an explanation in this matter. If you call for a loan with interest not exceeding 4% you may get people offering the loan at 3½%. As a matter of fact when you offer to repay a loan with interest not exceeding 4% you put yourself in a much better position because big companies may be willing to lend the money at 3½% interest. I feel that we should support this amendment because the honourable senior member for St. George having accepted it, will be able to explain to his Vestry that since this Bill was on the Order Paper, the Vestry of St. Michael tried to obtain a loan of £4,000 and could not raise the amount; and further the Vestry of St. Andrew tried to obtain a loan quite recently, so I am told, and they have been able to obtain the full amount. There seems to be some good reason for the amendment. In the circumstances I feel that we can accept the amendment and I hope that my explanation satisfies the honourable senior member for St. Peter. We in St. Michael offered to repay our loan at a rate of interest not excedeing 4% and we have not received the full amount. If you get people offering to lend money at 3½% interest, of course you accept it; but people are not willing to lend money and get back such small quantities every year. Of course it has to be done in this way because you could not very well lay a rate so as to repay all this money in one year.

Mr. DOWDING: For the information of the honourable senior member for St. Peter I should like to say that this Bill was on the Order Paper in the previous session of this House and it stood in the name of the late honourable senior member for St. George, Mr. Springer. I took over the Bill as it is and in order that there may be no chance of not getting the money I have accepted the amendment suggested by the honourable junior member for St. James. I can assure the honourable senior member for St. Peter that if we can get this loan at 1% interest we will get it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This Bill was introduced by the honourable senior member for St. George and if the honourable junior member for St. James realises that it is impossible to get this money at 3½% interest, what I am saying is that this amendment should have come from the honourable senior member for St. George. I should like to say that it seems strange to me that up to last week the Vestry did not know that it is impossible to get this money at 3½% interest because they could have been told what the position is and the amendment could have been put before them. But it is left to another honourable member to offer this amendment! This House has the authority to sanction this Bill and if we cannot say anything as to this matter, then the Vestry can say that they are borrowing his money at 6% interest and we have to agree with it. As a representative of the people I am only saying how the matter appears to me. I may be suspicious; I say that it seems strange to me that the honourable junior member for St. James should make this amendment when the honourable senior member for St. George does not realise any difficulty in getting this money. The honourable senior member for St. George has accepted the amendment but the honourable junior member for St. James has had to make it. I am not against the Bill, but when there is anything that meets my disapproval I must speak accordingly.

Mr. SYMMONDS: There may be one or two persons in this island who may have money lying down, money which may not be put on the Government Savings Bank; even at the Barbados Co-operative Bank we may be unable to accept more than a certain amount. From my experience and from that of other honourable members, the amendment of the honourable junior member for St. James is a wise one; the opportunity is afforded people who may have an excess of money to loan it and it may be loaned at 3½%.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think that the argument against that of the honourable senior member for St. Peter has a lot to commend it. I am inclined to agree that when the Vestry scrutinised this Bill and sent it to the House with the rate of interest payable on the loan at 3½%, they felt that the money was available at this percentage. People who know about the money market, however, claim that it has been changed and the money is no longer obtainable at 3½% interest. We have Vestrymen here from St. George and St. Andrew and in these parishes they are trying to get money at 3½% interest and they cannot get it. If that is the case, then we are left with no other alternative but to agree to the amendment; but if honourable members feel or know that they can get this money at 3½% interest then let the Clause remain as it is. I feel that in this particular case owing to the money situation in the colony and the way in which the market is affected, the honourable member is justified in saying that we should stick to the figure of 3½% until he has been given some argument to the contrary.

Mr. FOSTER: I take it that the honourable senior member for St. George is the Executive Officer of the parish of St. George. He is a delegate to this House to represent that parish and if he is satisfied that this money is worth 4% then this House should agree to that. I quite agree that there is some difficulty in the parish of St. Andrew in obtaining a loan of £2.000 at 3½%. I feel that this matter rests in the hands of the honourable senior member for St. George and if he as the Executive Officer of the parish accepts the amendment, the responsibility is his wholly and solely.

Clause 2 as amended was passed.

Clause 3 was read as follows:—

3. For the purpose of repaying any sum or sums which may be borrowed as aforesaid (not exceeding together the sum of six thousand pounds) the said Vestry are hereby authorised and required to lay a rate in the said parish in the year one thousand nine hundred and forty eight sufficient to pay the sum of three hundred pounds in part payment and on account of the sum or sums so borrowed with the interest becoming due in that year on the principal sum and the expenses incurred in obtaining this Act and in each of the nineteen then following years a sum sufficient to pay in each and every one of those years a like sum of three hundred pounds on further account of the principal sum so borrowed with the

interest becoming due in those years on the unpaid balances of the said principal sum for the time being and for defraying all expenses incurred by them from time to time in carrying out the provisions of this Act and such rates are to be laid in the usual manner and are to be subject to confirmation or amendment in the usual manner.

Mr. DOWDING: I ask leave to delete the word "eight" occurring in line 6 in order to insert the word "nine."

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

Clause 3 as amended was passed.

The remaining Clauses of the Bill were read and passed the word "'September" being inserted in the blank in Clause 4.

The Schedules and the Preamble were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. SYMMONDS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. CRAWFORD: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to proceed with Order No. 74 on the Order Paper as the next Order of the Day. This Order deals with the granting of a gratuity to the legal Personal Representatives of the late Norman Lisle Roach. I am almost ashamed to say that Mr. Roach died since 1946 and his legal Personal Representatives have not yet received this gratuity. I hope that honourable members will agree to deal with this matter this afternoon.

There being no objection, the honourable member granted leave.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. HAYNES, Rule 60 was suspended.

SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK (ROACH GRATUITY) BILL.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Order No. 74 be taken as the next Order of the day.

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip:—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to grant to the legal Personal Representatives of Norman Lisle Roach deceased, a gratuity.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It will be seen that Mr. Roach had been a Clerk in the service of the Bank for seven years during which time we are told that he faithfully performed his duties, and he died on the 23rd of December, 1946, while in the service of the Bank. This Bill seeks to pay a grant of a year's salary to his legal Personal Representatives. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. HAYNES, Mr. SPEAKER, left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

On a similar motion the Preamble was postponed.

Clause 1, the title Clause, was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. The Sugar Industry Bank (hereinafter called "the Bank") any, if it think fit, grant to the legal Personal Representatives of Norman Lisle Roach, late of Strathclyde in the Parish of St. Michael in this Island, a deceased employee of the Bank, out of the funds of the Bank, a gratuity of an amount not exceeding four hundred and fifty pounds.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I should like to know if the principle adopted here is the same as that which has been adopted in matters of this nature. Mr. Roach has served for seven years and the principle adopted by this House is to give people pensions or gratuities based on a month's salary for each completed year's service. I would like to know if this pension or gratuity is based on that principle because we want to be consistent in our actions here. If we agree to a principle in one instance, we should agree to it in all instances.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You cannot pay a pension to a dead man.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That should be amended; whenever we pay people in a lumpsum that is not a pension. But I think that the honourable member should answer the question rather than quibble over the terminology.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This amount is assessed on the same principle as that adopted by the Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the honourable member is not quite sure about this matter I think he should postpone consideration of the Bill. We have adopted the principle of giving people a month's salary for each completed year of service and if the honourable member is uncertain as to what is being done now, I think that this House would be well advised not to pass this Bill this afternoon no matter how deserving the case is.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think the honourable member must have read in the introductory paragraph of the Bill that Mr. Roach served the Bank for seven years and in these circumstances I do not see how the honourable member's question arises at all. I have already said that we are following the policy set by the Government in dealing with matters of this sort.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was read and passed.

Clause 4 was read as follows:—

4. Nothing in the Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of His Majesty, his heirs and successors, or any person except such as are mentioned in this Act, and those claiming by, from and under them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest to the honourable member that he should postpone the further consideration of this Bill because I can well see that the Head of the Executive will have to disallow it if we are departing from a principle which we have discussed all this time. The Bill is so far down on the Order Paper that it did not occur to me to raise the matter in Executive Committee. I did not know the facts before, and I do not think that it would be right for us, this case coming immediately after what we did in the case of the Porter at Queen's College, to adopt a fresh principle in paying a gratuity to the relatives

of a dead person. I suggest that if the facts as to the length of service are right and the amount is not in accordance with the principle we have been following all this time, we should postpone the further consideration of the matter, let the honourable member work out the amount with the Auditor General and the matter can be made the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business at the next meeting of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suggest to the honourable member that he agree to the postponement of the Bill if he is not sure of the facts. I am a member of the Committee of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and I myself am not quite sure of the position. If it is hinted that the Executive might be forced to turn down the Bill if we are straying from the principle, I think the honourable member should agree to the postponement of the Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: It is set out in the Act where a man would be entitled to a pension. He would have to put in ten years' service but this man was not entitled to a pension and therefore you have to adopt the principle of paying a month's salary for each completed year of service as we have done in previous cases. That is why I ask the honourable member to explain the position and he just said that they were following the principle adopted by the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Board of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank is entitled to pay a pension or gratuity to any of its employees and it was on their instructions that the Bill was drafted. I am not quite sure as to the principle on which the amount is assessed and I will refer the matter to the Board and have a clear explanation for the House. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. MOTTLEY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to deal with Order No. 77 as the next Order of the Day. That Order is an amendment to the Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act and it is a non-controversial matter.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have some matters which have been on the Order Paper for a very long time and I have not had the opportunity of discussing any of them. (Mr. MOTTLEY: These are Vestry matters). I am entitled to express myself and even the honourable senior member for the City has brought up matters for discussion on motions for adjournment when there were matters on the Order Paper to be discussed. I am not against dealing with Vestry matters but I do not feel that it is fair to other honourable members who have matters for discussion on the Other Paper, for matters which are low down on the Order Paper to be brought up and discussed. Some of these honourable members have voted against matters being brought up on the Order Paper. In the interest of my constituents I feel that I am entitled to the same privilege which honourable members are now enjoying. I feel that there should be some consistency in this matter; I have agreed to matters being dealt with and I think that I should also have an opportunity to deal with matters which are of importance to my constituency.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that Rule 60 should be suspended whenever honourable members want to proceed with an Order out of its place and it is a matter for the House to decide whether any particular Order should be discussed or not. It requires the votes of twelve honourable members so as to decide whether a matter should be proceeded with out of its turn or not. The question is that Rule 60 be now suspended. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

THE VESTRIES (COST OF LIVING BONUS TO EMPLOYEES) (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City, —Second reading of a Bill to amend the Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1947.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As the law now stands, the Clerk of the Churchwarden of St. Michael and of the Board of Guardians and the Parochial Treasurer of St. Michael are both paid fixed salaries and this Bill seeks to give the Vestry of St. Michael permission to pay them the cost of living bonus to which they are entitled. All the other parochial employees receive their cost of living bonus but the Act must be amended to enable the Vestry to pay it to these two officers during the year 1948—49. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. SYMMONDS, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. SYMMONDS, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. TALMA asks for and is granted leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 to enable him to take Order No. 82 under Private Members' Business.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. MOTTLEY, Rule 60 is suspended.

GRATUITY TO FLORENCE WILLIAMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church,—Second reading of a Bill to authorize the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of Christ Church to pay a gratuity to Florence Williams, widow of Walter Williams.

Mr. TALMA: This Bill seeks to grant permission to the Highway Commissioners of Christ Church to pay a gratuity to Florence Williams, widow of Walter Williams who was employed by them as a watchman. It is one of the usual Bills that come before this House for purposes of this nature and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes in Committee on the Bill, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive and the preamble are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. TALMA, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

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

NOTICE.

Mr. ADAMS with leave, gives notice of the following Resolution:—

Resolution that the sum of £600 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of a Course of Training in the United Kingdom for the Secretary of the Housing Board.

Mr. ADAMS also gave notice of his intention to deal with this Resolution in Committee of Supply at the next meeting of the House.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

The Order Paper having been fixed, Mr. SPEAKER, on the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, adjourns the House to meet on Tuesday, 13th April, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.