THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 8th June, 1948

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

Present :

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

Prayers are read.

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

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 1st June, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID.

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

Message No. 9/1948 from His Excellency the Governor, with reference to the Address from the Honourable House of Assembly dated the 10th of February, 1948, on the subject of the Resolutions of the Conference on the closer association of the B.W.I. Colonies, forwarding a copy of a further despatch on the subject which has been received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Correspondence between His Excellency the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the subject of the limitation of the Legislative Council's powers in relation to the House of Assembly.

Mr. WILKINSON enters the House and takes his seat.

Statement of Gross Customs and Excise receipts for one month to the 30th April, 1948.

Report of the Labour Department for the year 1947.

Post Office advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 30th of April, 1948.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of £158,190 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of the various works and for the purposes described in the Schedule to the resolution.

Mr. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of £108. 7s. 1d. at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to compensate Messrs DaCosta & Co. Ltd., for damage done to the launch "Trojan" by the Government Dredger.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution to grant to Messrs. D. M. Simpson & Co., Ltd., the sum of £6 14s. 0d., the Customs' import duty and package tax paid on a hand spraying machine imported for the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. George.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of £5,922 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of two motor launches, including essential spares, freight, insurance, Crown Agents' charges, etc., and to provide for running expenses to the end of the current financial year.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the law relating to income tax.

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

QUESTIONS

Mr. COX: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting:—

1. Has the Government under consideration any plan for controlling the transportation of tourists entering the colony?

2. If the answer is "No", will the Government consider the advisability of controlling such transportation with a view to giving equal opportunity to all owners of hired cars to share in the said transportation?

3. If the answer to (2) is "No", will the Government state fully its reason?

To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting:—

Will the Government consider the advisability of amalgamating the two posts, Registering Officer of St. Michael and Registering Officer of the City, with office situated in Bridgetown in order to offer greater facilities to potential voters?

Dr. WILSON, Messrs. GARNER and SMITH enter the House and take their seats.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, a Bill to amend the law relating to Income Tax is read a first time.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the honourable senior member for St Peter (Mr. F. L. WALCOTT) is appointed Chairman of Committees for to-day's sitting.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee on the Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts of this Island relating to Public Health.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Bill, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT being in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when this Bill was being considered in Committee, the Committee got as far as Clause 19 and an amendment by the junior member for St. Michael that the words "by the Vestry of such Parish" in line 2 of sub-clause 7 be deleted and the words "annually by the members of the Sanitary Authority" substituted therefor was under consideration.

Dr. CUMMINS: I accept that amendment. At the last meeting the junior member for St. Lucy, in connection with sub-clause 3 of Clause 19 raised the point about members of the Vestry who are appointed to Sanitary Authorities being legally members of those Sanitary Authorities after the 31st December and during the period in which the Vestries are dead. I consulted the Attorney General on the point and as a result I ask leave to further amend sub-clause 3 by adding the following words "and shall hold office for a period of one year. Provided that if any member so appointed shall not be re-elected at the Vestry at the election next following his appointment he shall cease to be a member of the Sanitary Authority, and the Vestry shall thereupon appoint a vestryman in his place who shall hold office until the expiration of the year for which the original appointment was made." It is felt that it should be stated definitely that they shall hold office for a period of one year.

Mr. WARD: I suggest that after the word "vestryman" in the amendment which the honourable member has just made to sub-clause 3 of Clause 19 the words "at its first meeting" be inserted. The point which was really raised by the junior member for St. Lucy is this: When the Vestries die on the 31st December in each year, it is doubtful whether the business of the Sanitary Authorities can be carried on in the interim between the death of the Vestries and their election. Well, apparently with this amendment it is obvious that the business of the Sanitary Authorities can be carried on although the Vestries are dead and if the vestrymen who are members of Sanitary Authorities should lose their seats on the Vestries, then the newly elected Vestries will appoint vestrymen to fill their places on the Sanitary Authorities.

Dr. CUMMINS: I accept the honourable member's amendment to my amendment.

Mr. ADAMS: I made a motion which was seconded and I ask leave to withdraw it.

Clause 19, as amended, is read.

The question that Clause 19, as amended, stand part of the Bill is then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 20 is agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The Select Committee which considered the Bill recommended that Clause 21 be amended by (1) adding at the end of the first paragraph of sub-clause 3 the following words "subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee who shall prepare a scale of salaries and furnish each Sanitary Authority with a copy thereof before the twenty-fifth day of March in each year," and (2) deleting the word "Director" wherever it appears in the Clause and substituting therefor the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee." As regards the latter recommendation, the Head of the Administration feels that inasmuch as all appointments to the Civil Service are made by the Governor, that principle should be observed in this case; therefore, I ask leave to substitute the word "Governor" instead of the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee" for the word "Director." Further, I ask leave to add at the end of the first paragraph of sub-clause 3 the words "with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—The amendment the Select Committee recommended in respect of the first paragraph of sub-clause 3 of Clause 21 is worded differently and I would like to know from the introducer of the Bill why he has worded it in that way. The Select Committee made it clear that there are several parishes—we know them well—which may decide on salaries for the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee that may be so meagre that they would hardly attract people to be employed and, therefore, it recommended that in addition to approving of the salaries, the Governor-in-Executive Committee "shall prepare a scale of salaries and furnish each Sanitary Authority with a copy thereof before the twenty-fifth day of March in each year." That recommendation was made so as to enable sanitary inspectors to know exactly the scale of salaries at which they are appointed, and there is nothing impossible about it. Obviously the Governor-in-Executive Committee would prepare a scale of salaries in keeping with the ability of the particular parish to pay and the Sanitary Authorities should have the scale in their hands before they actually make the appointments.

Dr. CUMMINS: If the honourable member would just wait, I think I would be able to satisfy him on that point. There are certain amendments to be made to Clause 22 and one of those amendments is to the effect that the Governor-in-Executive Committee will be authorized and empowered to make regulations which would cover that point along with others.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. HAYNES: The senior member for St. Thomas was Chairman of the Select Committee and he knows what a vexed question this sub-clause 3 of clause 21 was. To my mind, it is the most important thing in this Bill because it is the whole bone of contention. At the present mo-

ment, a sanitary inspector in one parish is paid $50 a month, another sanitary inspector doing the same type of work in another parish is paid $60 a month and another sanitary inspector in another parish still is paid $70. The one at $70 per month thinks he is underpaid; the other at $60 per month also thinks he is not getting sufficient money and the third at $50 per month does not want to work at all and the result, in some instances, is that the work is neglected. The only way to remedy that state of affairs is to have a uniform scale of salaries. As I said sometime ago, a police constable at District "E" gets so much per month and his colleague at District "F" also gets the same amount per month. Why should sanitary inspectors not be put on the same basis? The senior member for St. Thomas tells us that there is a new sub-clause to be inserted which will cover that point. That sub-clause says:—"The Governor-in-Executive Committee is hereby authorized and empowered to make regulations to secure (1) the preparation of estimates of expenditure by the Sanitary Authorities; (2) the provision of all necessary information so as to enable the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make grants; (3) the making and forwarding of reports relating to the expenditure of grants from the government contribution." But I see nothing in this sub-clause about a scale of salaries for the various sanitary inspectors and I am asking the honourable member to accept the amendment which has been recommended by the Select Committee. As the honourable member knows, the Select Committee went into this question very carefully and I am asking him to accept its recommendation in connection with it, otherwise we will never have uniformity as far as salaries of sanitary inspectors are concerned. Take it from me who have twenty-five years' experience in the matter.

Mr. ADAMS: I hope what I am about to say will not cause the debate to be protracted. I have no feeling in the matter, one way or the other — absolutely none. But when the honourable member talks about uniformity, are they going to transfer sanitary inspectors from parish to parish? Would the parish of St. Andrew be desirous of employing Sanitary Inspectors from St. Michael? I do not see how you can pay a sanitary inspector who has to visit and inspect 200 houses the same salary that is paid to a sanitary inspector who has 500 houses to visit and inspect. When the honourable member talks about police constables being paid the same salaries no matter whether they work in District "A" or District "F", I should like to remind him that police constables are shifted about. The work of a sanitary inspector in St. Michael may be three or four times greater than the work of a sanitary inspector in St. Andrew and are you going to pay them equal salaries? If the attitude of parochial employers is that they are prepared to employ sanitary inspectors from any part of the island, then there can be uniformity of salaries. From the Government's point of view if a parish can put forward a case showing that an inspector should be paid $80 a month but they can provide only $60, the Government would put the required $20.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The senior member for St. Joseph is right. The Select Committee discussed that phase of the matter and did not agree with the senior member for St. Andrew at all. What I am worried about is this: The Select Committee has actually recommended that the words "Subject to the approval of the Executive Committee who shall prepare a scale of salaries and furnish each Sanitary Authority with a copy thereof before the twenty-fifth day of March in each year" be added at the end of the first paragraph of sub-clause 3 of Clause 21 and if the phraseology of the amendment is not bad or unparliamentary, the senior member for St. Thomas should show us cause why it should not be inserted. The honourable member tells us that a new sub-clause will be added to Clause 22 but that will not cover the point. Unless the amendment which the Select Committee has recommended is illegal or does not make sense, it should be inserted. Personally I feel that it should be inserted, although not for the same reason given by the senior member for St. Andrew. I agree with the Leader of the House that you could not think of paying the Chief Sanitary Inspector or the Assistant Inspector of the Parish of St. James the same salary which the Chief Sanitary Inspector or an Assistant Inspector of St. Michael or Christ Church gets, but sub-sanitary inspectors, whether they be employed in St. Michael or St. Andrew or St. James or St. Lucy should receive the same salary and I am not satisfied that the new sub-clause to which the senior member for St. Thomas refers would cover that point. I must be satisfied beyond all doubt as to why the Select Committee's recommendation cannot be inserted in sub-clause 3 of Clause 21. It reads very clearly: the language is parliamentary and, therefore, it should be put in.

Mr. GALE: We seem to be running around in a circle. If we add the words "Subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee" and the Governor-in-Executive Committee is to prepare the scale of salaries, surely it is not necessary for it to approve of something which it makes itself. I take it that the Sanitary Authorities will be sensible people and that they will prepare a salary scale and submit it to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for its approval.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am afraid that the junior member for St. Michael has not seen the point. You are not only asking the Governor-in-Executive Committee to prepare a scale of salaries but you want it to approve of the employees of Sanitary Authorities so that some parish may not appoint some broken-down man in preference to a qualified sanitary inspector. The introducer of the Bill has not yet told me why the aamendment which the Select Committee has recommended should not be inserted in sub-clause 3 of this clause.

Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable member who has just sat down has certainly got sub-clause 2 and sub-clause 3 of the Clause 21 mixed. Sub-clause 2 deals with the appointment of employees of Sanitary Authorities, and these appointments shall be subject to the approval of the Governor but sub-clause 3 deals with the salaries which shall be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. He also made reference to a recommendation by the Select Committee but the honourable member will remember that there was a difference of opinion on the part of the members of the Select Committee as to the date on which the parochial estimates should be prepared. Some thought that it should be on the 25th March; others thought that it should be the 31st December and others again thought that it should be in the month of October. These recommendations of the Select Committee were referred to the Attorney General for him to draft a sub-clause along the lines of this particular recommendation of the Committee and it was felt by him and the Executive Committee that the sub-clause to which I referred and which has been quoted by the senior member for St. Andrew would cover the

point about salaries as well because salaries form part of the Estimates.

Mr. HAYNES: As regards the point about the transferance of sanitary inspectors I do not see why that should arise. If a man cares to work for a person, good gracious, could he not do so? If a sanitary inspector working in a parish is desirous of working in another parish, can he not do so if the opportunity is offered to him? I think the senior member for St. Joseph has overlooked the point at issue. This dispute on the salaries of sanitary inspectors goes on year after year; it is the most annoying thing with which Sanitary Commissioners have to deal and if there is a salary scale for these inspectors, there will be a really satisfactory state of affairs. Now, Sir, I am told that in the Crown Colony of British Guiana there are seventy seven sanitary inspectors and they are all graded under a Central Authority. Why not work this proposal under a Central Authority?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to interupt the honourable member but I think that when he agreed to the second reading of this Bill he accepted the principle of the Bill and the principle is not what the honourable member is now suggesting. So far as the transference of inspectors is concerned that can only be done if there is one Service but there is a different service in each parish.

Mr. HAYNES: I am not altering the principle of the Bill. I am only altering a clause of the Bill and I am suggesting to honourable members to see how vital this is to the Bill. In keeping with the recommendation of the Select Committee I beg to move that sub-clause 3 of clause 21 be amended by adding the following words at the end of the first paragraph of the sub-clause:—"subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee who shall prepare a scale of salaries and furnish each Sanitary Authority with a copy thereof before the twenty fifth day of March in each year."

Mr. WARD: As far as I can see, what the honourable member is asking for is centralization because if he says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee must fix the scale of salaries it would mean that the salaries would be fixed by a Central Authority. Under the present set-up each parish fixes the salaries of its own sanitary inspectors and I feel that if we were to depart from that system the only result would be centralization. The honourable member spoke about British Guiana but the sanitary services in British Guiana are centralized under a Central Authority; the inspectors are employed under a graded system, are transferred from one part of the colony to another and the inspectors in a particular grade get the same salary, no matter in what part of the colony he is working. In Barbados it is not so. The Sanitary Authorities know the work which their inspectors have to do and they should fix the scale of salaries and submit it to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for its approval.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am very pleased to see that the word "Director" has been deleted from sub-clause 2 of this Clause and the word "Governor" substituted therefor. I cannot see anything wrong with sub-clause 3. If the salaries which are fixed by the Sanitary Authorities are too small, the Governor will not approve of them. You cannot pay a man who has six houses to inspect the same salary which you pay a man who has six hundred houses to inspect but what is worrying me is the provision that the appointments are to be subject to the approval of the Governor. What will happen, Sir, if the Governor does not approve of appointments that are made and the particular Sanitary Authorities did not make fresh appointments? That is the point which I should like the senior member for St. Joseph to clarify for me. We may come to a stage where, as a result, the particular parish would not have inspectors to do the sanitary work of that parish. I would like some alteration made to sub-clause 2 to meet a situation like that in case it arises.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And the only alteration is the amendment which has been recommended by the Select Committee and has just been moved by the senior member for St. Andrew. The only alteration to what the senior member for St. James has been pointing out is a salary scale.

The CHAIRMAN: He is dealing with sub-clause 2 and you are dealing with sub-clause 3 and I do not see the connection.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sanitation to-day is a profession and nobody in this island can convince me that sub-sanitary inspectors, whether they work in St. Lucy or St. Michael, are not entitled to the same salary. If the Government employs a sub-sanitary inspector who is a trained man with the R.S.I. Certificate, he is paid a certain salary and if a trained man with an R.S.I Certificate is employed by the Sanitary Authority in St. John, let us say, is he not entitled to the same salary? Although two sub-sanitary inspectors may not inspect the same number of houses in their respective parishes, yet they travel the same distances, and the Sanitary Association which represents sanitary inspectors in this island has recommended that men who are equally qualified should receive equal pay, no matter in what part of the island they are working. I am surprised that honourable members on the other side of the table do not agree to that because these sanitary inspectors are among the people who belong to the Barbados Workers Union.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot agree to that because no honourable member on that side of the table has spoken yet on this question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Unfortunately for you, Sir, you are in the Chair to-day but that has been and is the bone of connection. I do not expect certain honourable members to agree to that proposal but I am surprised that honourable members on that side of the table do not agree. to it. The Sanitary Association made that representation on behalf of the inspectors; they feel that if the inspectors must be trained men possessing the necessary qualification they should be paid equal salaries. When the malaria campaign started, inspectors in St. Michael were paid a higher salary than inspectors in St. James where the malaria epidemic broke out. The inspectors in St. James look after the health of the island in the same way as the inspectors in St. Michael do. Do honourable members know that for a man to qualify as a sanitary inspector it costs him something like £5 to begin with the purchase of books? And you are suggesting that because he does not inspect the same number of houses, although he covers the same distance, he should not receive equal salary! I am bound to support the amendment recommended by the Select Committee unless the introducer of the Bill tells me it does not make sense. Do you know that the qualification for a man to become a Sanitary Inspector to-day is the School Certificate and why on earth should not the sanitary services of the island be so organized that a man who becomes a Sanitary Inspector may be able to look forward to a decent salary? If you are consolidating and amending the Public Health Bill now, do not leave this phase of the matter to the whims and fancies of other people. There

are two brothers, each of whom possesses the School Certificate; one enters the Civil Service knowing that eventually he will be working for, say, $140 per month; the other enters the Sanitary Service and should he not know that after a period of years his salary will be so much? Why should there not be fixed salaries for sanitary inspectors? Mr. Chairman, I am seconding the motion of the senior member for St. Andrew if we are the only ones to vote for it and I repeat for the last time I am surprised at members on the other side of the table not willing to allow people who must be trained, educated and qualified to know what they are going to work for. Sometimes one reads the most amazing things in the local newspapers and one wonders sometimes what sort of mentality some people have. There are some people who still believe that a sanitary inspector should get $24 a month and they would have the temerity to advertise for a qualified man at that salary.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I just want to reply to the suggestion that the Government is shirking its responsibility——

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation, Mr. Chairman, I would hate to think that the Government is shirking its responsibility.

Mr. ADAMS: Surely the very essence of this matter is that the Government should not interfere more than to see that justice is done and as regards the suggestion of the senior member for St. Andrew about the transfer of sanitary inspectors is concerned, you can no more transfer an employee under A than you can transfer an employee under B. Would the honourable member suggest that the manager of his factory be transferred to the management of Bulkeley factory? The senior member for St. Lucy made an excellent speech. You must let the Sanitary Authorities have control over the work in their respective areas; they know their wants and the limits to which they can go in respect of the salaries to be paid to their employees. The senior member for the City is confusing, if I may use that expression with the greatest possible respect, fixing the minimum salary below which a properly qualified Sanitary Inspector should not be asked to work with fixing the salary for an inspector who does not have the same qualification.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That interpretation is bad.

Mr. ADAMS: What the honourable member said was that every sanitary inspector should receive the same salary if they have the same qualification. Could there be more adulterated nonsense than that? Does the honourable member suggest that because an Assistant Master at the Coleridge School has a Double First he should get the same salary as Mr. "Chris" Springer at Harrison College? The Sanitary Inspector who has the School Certificate and the R.S.I. Certificate should not be paid less than X dollars a month. If I were an inspector and had to travel over Coggins Hill or Melvin Hill to inspect 200 houses I would feel pretty murderous if I realized that I was getting no more than an inspector in St. Thomas who has to inspect 500 houses on the flat. The honourable member must see that the Sanitary Authority in the latter case must say to itself "this man has 500 houses to inspect on the flat; therefore, he should be satisfied with, say, $80 per month;" whereas the Sanitary Authority in the former case would say "this man has 200 houses to inspect but he has to travel over hill and through gully to do so; therefore, he should get $100 per month." I agree with what he said in respect of what sometimes appears in the local newspapers but to suggest that the same salary should be paid to a man who has to inspect 200 houses on the flat as is paid to a man who may have the same qualification but has a lot more work to do is nonsense. The Government has no intention of shirking its duty but how can any Government know the difficulty of the work in St. Joseph or St. Thomas as well as the Sanitary Authority of the particular parish knows it? If the Sanitary Authorities do any injustice to their employees in the fixing of salaries, it would be remedied when it comes before the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The Governor-in-Executive Committee is, in effect, the Court of Appeal in respect of any wrong that may be done by a Sanitary Authority. This difficulty always arises when one Authority has to do something that is subjected to the approval of another Authority. For instance, the Governor has to approve the appointment of a Parochial Treasurer but I believe that it was only on one occasion that a Governor did not approve the appointment of a Parochial Treasurer. If the worst happens to come—and the worst came in Christ Church about 20 years ago—then you will have to apply for a writ of mandamus against the particular Authority. If a Sanitary Authority appoints So and So and the Governor does not approve and the Sanitary Authority says that it is not going to appoint anybody else, then application for a writ of mandamus will have to be made. The Bishop appoints a Rector and if the occasion should arise for the institution of an approving body, then both sides will have to exercise commonsense so as not to have a deadlock. Nothing we may do in this Chamber can make the appointing body do justice to a man who has the School Certificate or what not. I hope the senior member for St. Andrew and the senior member for the City will not press their motion because there is nothing to be gained by it. The regulations to be made under the next Clause will provide for the Sanitary Authorities preparing a salary scale but I do not think we should necessarily have a uniform salary scale for sanitary inspectors in the island.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want to support the motion made by the senior member for St. Andrew because in Select Coommittee many of us felt that here is an opportunity, now that we are about to have the sanitary services put on an island wide basis and the island divided into three wards for sanitary purposes, for sanitary inspectors to be given the same treatment as civil servants are given. We shall soon be considering the Report of the Civil Service Commissioner by which Civil Servants will be able to look forward to a better salary scale. (*Interruptions*) I am putting a point that was discussed in Select Committee. If some of the members of that Committee have changed their opinions overnight that does not mean that I am changing mine. As I was saying, an opportunity is now presenting itself for giving sanitary inspectors the opportunity to serve under what, we hope, will be a uniform Sanitary Service and the proposal was put forward that since in many parishes the revenue is too small to enable the salaries which many of us feel qualified people should work for in this modern age, where a parish happens to be too poor to pay proper salaries the Government should make up the difference and hence we suggested that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should prepare a scale of salaries whereby all sanitary inspectors, irrespective of the parishes in which they may be working, would be enabled to enter the Sanitary Service at a fixed salary and to be promoted in accordance with some unified system. You will find in St. John a man with the R.S.I. Certificate and in St. Thomas another man with the R.S.I. Certificate, each of whom is working for a different salary. Even if you say that in

St. Michael, where there is a greater number of people, a man has to perform more work, you have also to remember that in St. John, let us say, or St. Thomas, there would be less sanitary inspectors employed to do the work of the parish; so that when you look at the matter broadly you find that a sanitary inspector in the country districts performs about the same amount of work as a sanitary inspector in St. Michael would perform, by virtue of the fact that there are fewer inspectors to do the inspection of houses. To me, it seems that it would be an unwise thing to allow this opportunity to pass without doing what is definitely an act of justice to a hardworking section of this community. This is the only reason why I waive my objection to the appointment of a Director of Medical Services at all, so that these hardworking men may be given some just treatment. Here is an excellent chance for a Labour Government advising His Excellency the Governor to say as Labourites representing Labour "These hardworking men must be paid a minimum of so much per month." We know that the revenue of certain parishes is too little to meet the salaries which we would like them to pay to their employees and we are recommending that the amounts be made up by the Government. This matter was deferred in Select Committee and I was led to believe that the Executive had agreed to that proposal. Were it not for that, I would have put in a minority report against this entire Public Health Bill because I definitely believe it is a backward step to appoint a Director in charge of public health without the people's representatives having any direct control over him. This is a matter in which somebody is breaking faith with these hardworking employees. I do not agree at all with the idea of leaving it to the various Vestries to say "We recommend so much to be the salaries of our employees." I feel that the opportunity is offered whereby we, as members of this House, should be able definitely to put it on record that we have sufficient confidence in those who advise His Excellency the Governor that they will recommend to him a proper rate of pay for these deserving employees and remove them from the system of patronage whereby they would have to please several members of the Vestries in order to receive proper salaries. I am going to urge on honourable members to support the motion made by the senior member for St. Andrew because, as he suggested, this is overdue not only in relation to sanitary inspectors but in relation to many another worker in this island. I feel that if members of the Government dodge this issue they will be letting down these people, shirking a responsibility which they ought to shoulder and breaking faith with a section of the people whom they promised at election time that they would do everything in their power to see that their wages and living standards are improved. I want most wholeheartedly to support the motion made by the senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—I think, Sir, that it is quite right that we should debate this point as carefully as possible. The whole working of this Bill depends upon the employees of these Sanitary Authorities and by that, Sir, the sanitation of the whole island is inevitably bound up with the staffs of these Sanitary Authorities. If we allow anything in this Bill to pass which does not provide for the absolute maximum working efficiency of all the employees of these Sanitary Authorities we will be doing something quite wrong because dissatisfied employees of one Sanitary Authority may cause trouble in the whole island. Although, Sir, I cannot agree with all the argument of previous speakers yet I do feel that there should be some legislation which will let sanitary employees know what their jobs will worth them and for that reason I do not see why some clause similar to the amendment which has been moved by the senior member for St. Andrew should not be inserted in this Bill. If we insert a clause providing for a salary scale fixing a minimum salary for sanitary inspectors I do feel that it will tend towards greater efficiency on the part of these inspectors. There are some honourable members who would say that the Sanitary Authorities should get together and prepare a salary scale but it is a well known fact that while some of the Sanitary Boards would like to get together and regulate these things, there are obstacles which are put in their way by other petty Boards and which prevent them from doing certain things for the benefit of their employees. I do consider that some legislation enabling the Governor-in-Executive Committee to recommend a salary scale fixing a minimum wage would tend towards greater efficiency in the entire sanitary service.

Mr. ADAMS: I am going to make a suggestion at this stage. I hope the senior member for St. Thomas will forgive me for doing so. In the proposals of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, to which reference has already been made and to which the junior member for St. George obviously was not listening, it will be making regulations to secure certain things and I suggest that we insert in clause 22 a provision for the inclusion of the fixing of a reasonable salary scale.

Mr. HAYNES: If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph gives me the assurance that that will be done I am willing to withdraw my motion.

Mr. WARD: From some of the speeches which I have heard to-day, it would appear that the speakers have no confidence in the Governor-in-Executive Committee because the Governor-in-Executive Committee is the body to approve of the salaries and I do not think that it would try to underpay any individual who is employed in any parish of the island. In my opinion, if an individual has the R.S.I. Certificate, there should be some system by which he would be given a better salary than an unqualified inspector is given. I feel that no Sanitary Authority, knowing that an individual has a better qualification than the other fellow alongside him, would ever think of giving the qualified man a smaller salary than it gives to the fellow who does not have the qualification. Certain men with the R.S.I. Certificate in certain parishes would still not be given as good a salary as men without the R.S.I. Certificate in other parishes are receiving. It is not always the qualification that counts; the work counts also. A man who has 1,000 houses to inspect would not be satisfied if he received the same salary as a man who has 200 houses to inspect. I feel that we should fix a minimum salary for the man with the R.S.I. Certificate and that the Sanitary Authority or the Governor-in-Executive Committee should be allowed to fix what it considers a fair salary for the unqualified man.

Dr. CUMMINS: I rise to give honourable members the assurance that in Clause 22 provision will be made for the preparation of a salary scale. I beg to move that Clause 21, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman,—I intended to support the motion made by the senior member for St. Andrew and I am glad to-day to see that he is converted. A short while ago, the Sanitary Commissioners of St. Andrew raised the salary of a qualified inspector to the same salary that another

qualified inspector was receiving and the senior member for St .Andrew brought that on the noor of this House. It showed that the Sanitary Commissioners of St. Andrew are alive to their responsibility when they did that because I, like the senior member for the City, feel that if men burn the midnight oil, spend money on purchasing books and become qualified they should be given the same consideration as far as salary is concerned. As far as the work in St. Andrew is concerned, sometimes a man in St. Andrew has to travel a mile up hill to inspect one house. In St. Michael where there are thickly populated areas an inspector can inspect many houses in a few minutes but in St. Andrew an inspector often has to travel two or three miles over hills and through gullies to inspect houses. The senior member for St. Andrew knows that to be true because I often meet him out canvassing. (Laughter.)

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put I should like to suggest that to meet the possibility of a deadlock we should follow the precedent established in the Anglican Church Act in connection with the appointment of a Bishop and add the following proviso to sub-clause 2 of Clause 21:—"Provided that if any appointment shall not be approved of by the Governor and a new appointment shall not be made within four weeks from the date thereof, the Governor may appoint without the right of appeal." In other words, if the Governor does not approve of an appointment, it goes back to the particular Sanitary Authority for them to make another appointment. If this is going to be controversial I would not press it. I only thought that honourable members would like it put in the Bill.

The question that Clause 21, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: As regards Clause 22 I beg to move that it be amended by added the following sub-clauses:—

"(3) There shall be provided by the Legislature an annual contribution to assist in defraying the expenses of Sanitary Authorities to be called "the Government Contribution".

(4) Grants to Sanitary Authorities from the Government Contribution may be made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee in the manner following, that is to say:—

(a) Where the amount provided by the Vestry of any parish for ordinary sanitary purposes equals or exceeds one-seventh of the total revenue collected by such Vestry by parochial rates and taxes a grant from the Government Contribution may be made to the Sanitary Authority of such parish not exceeding one-fourth of the total amount provided by the Vestry for ordinary sanitary purposes in such parish, but not otherwise;

(b) Whenever in any parish expenditure is incurred by the Sanitary Authority as a result of the unexpected appearance of any dangerous epidemic or of undertaking any special works which such Sanitary Authority is required to undertake by the Director a grant may be made from the Government Contribution of the whole or any part of such expenditure as the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall determine;

(c) The Governor-in Executive Committee may reduce the grant payable in respect of any year under this Part of the Act to any Sanitary Authority by such amounts as he thinks just, if—

(i) the Governor - in - Executive Committee is satisfied, either upon the report of the Director or upon representations made to him by any Association or body of persons experienced or interested in matters relating to public health that the Sanitary Authority has failed to achieve or maintain a reasonable standard of efficiency and progress in the discharge of its functions relating to sanitary services, regard being had to the standards maintained in other areas where financial resources and other relevant circumstances are substantially similar, and that the health or welfare of the inhabitants of the parish or some of them has been or is likely to be thereby endangered; or

(ii) if he is satisfied that the expenditure of the Sanitary Authority has been excessive or unreasonable, regard being had to the financial resources and other relevant circumstances of the area;

Provided that, whenever the Governor-in-Executive Committee makes such a reduction he shall make and cause to be laid before both Houses of the Legislature a report stating the amount of the reduction and the reasons therefor.

(d) All sums of money provided as required by sub-section (3) of this section shall be paid from the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

(5) The Governor-in-Executive Committee is hereby authorised and empowered to make regulations to secure—

(i) the fixing of a reasonable salary scale;

(ii) the preparation of estimates of expenditure by the Sanitary Authorities;

(iii) the provision of all necessary information so as to enable the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make grants;

(iv) the making and forwarding of reports relating to the expenditure of grants from the Government Contribution."

Clause 22, as amended, is read.

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

REPLIES LAID.

On re-assembling,

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 33 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to lay the reply to question No. 45 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (a)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) so as to resume Government Business, namely, the Public Health Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I suggest that we agree to the suspension of Rule 61 (a) only so that at 3.30 o'clock we can proceed with the Sugar Industry Wage Rates Bill. The consideration of this Bill should not take very long and we can return to the Public Health Bill afterwards. I am therefore objecting to the suspension of Rule 61 (b).

Mr. ADAMS: I would like to point out that the Sugar Industry Wage Rates Bill is far from being non-controversial; I cannot see it being dealt with in five or ten minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the question in respect of the suspension of Rule 61 (a). The honourable member is asking leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (a) so as to resume Government Business. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the honourable member. There being no objection, the honourable member may make the motion.

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

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment for lunch the House was in Committee on the Public Health Bill.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH BILL

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee on this Bill Clause 22 was under consideration.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 22 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Sub-paragraph (4) (a) reads as follows: "Where the amount provided by the Vestry of any parish for ordinary sanitary purposes equals or exceeds one-seventh of the total revenue collected by such Vestry by parochial rates and taxes a grant from the Government Contribution may be made to the Sanitary Authority of such parish not exceeding one-fourth of the total amount provided by the Vestry for ordinary sanitary purposes in such parish, but not otherwise." I do not agree with this grant of one-fourth of the total amount provided by the Vestry for ordinary sanitary purposes in the parish. The Government has a lot of authority under this Bill and it can direct the Sanitary Authorities to do a lot of things. If the Vestries pay one-seventh of the revenue for ordinary sanitary purposes, the Government is only going to pay one-fourth and the Vestries will have to lay more rates so as to pay the extra charges. The Director may regard as ordinary expenditure what the Sanitary Authorities may regard as extra-ordinary expenditure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the Director directs any thing to be done, the Government has to pay for it; but these are only ordinary matters here.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: If this is only ordinary expenditure then it is unnecessary to have this amount of one-fourth in this Sub-paragraph and I submit that this amount should be deleted. The Government will come to the assistance of the parishes as it does today and that will be extraordinary expenditure. The Director might give an order to drain the Constitution Swamp, for instance; there is no epidemic and that would be ordinary expenditure. He might give an order to weed the gullies——

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member will read Sub-paragraph (4) (b) he will see that his point point is covered.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: If the Director says that the bush in the gullies is detrimental to the health of the community, that is nothing extraordinary. For many years 15% of the revenue collected has been meeting the cost of sanitation in the parishes; the Government is arranging to give us this amount of one-fourth of the amount provided for ordinary sanitary purposes but the Government is doubtful if that amount will be sufficient. Any overstepping of that amount we will have to pay. If we have to carry out this great sanitation then the Government should pay for it. We are paying a proper proportion of the revenue if we pay what we paid last month. I beg to move that all the words occurring after the word "parish" in line 8 of this Sub-paragraph be deleted.

Mr. HAYNES: I should like to see substituted for the entire Sub-paragraph (4) (a), Sub-paragraph (2) (b) as recommended by the Select Committee. Sub-clause (2) in the Select Committee's Report reads: "There shall be provided by the Legislature in each year such sums of money as may be necessary for any of the following purposes", and then Sub-paragraph (b) says this:—

"(b) To pay to the Sanitary Authority in any parish if the Governor-in-Executive Committee should determine that financial assistance shall be granted to any Sanitary Authority, a sum of money not exceeding in the aggregate one-fifth of the total amount (excluding loans) raised by the Vestry in any parish by parochial rates for ordinary Sanitary purposes. Provided that no Sanitary Authority shall receive financial assistance as herein provided unless the amount raised by the Vestry by Parochial rates for ordinary sanitary purposes shall in the cases of the parishes of Saint Michael and Christ Church be not less than twenty per cent and in the cases of the other respective parishes fifteen per cent. of the total amount raised by Parochial rates in such parish".

I support the recommendation that financial assistance shall not be given unless the amount raised for ordinary sanitary purposes shall be not less than 20% of the total amount raised in the parishes of St. Michael and Christ Church and 15% in the case of the other parishes. I therefore beg to move that Sub-paragraph (4) be deleted and Sub-paragraph (2) (b) as recommended by the Select Committee be substituted therefor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. That is exactly what the Select Committee recommended and the Report was signed by the honourable member in charge of the Bill, as Chairman. I should like to know the reason for the change from what the Select Committee recommended. I am supporting the honourable member's motion unless I am convinced as to the reason for the change.

Dr. CUMMMINS: It is true that the Select Committee made that recommendation but it was decided in Executive Committee that instead of having one-fifth in some cases and one-seventh in others, for the sake of uniformity, instead of having two proportions, there should be one-seventh in all cases. In the cases of St. Michael and Christ Church they raise more than 15% for ordinary sanitary purposes, they spend 20% of their revenue on sanitation and

the other parishes spend 15%; but instead of having two different figures in the Bill it was decided to make the figure one-seventh for everybody. The parishes of St. Michael and Christ Church will continue to raise their 20% as before and they will receive assistance if there is anything to be expended over that. In reply to the honourable senior member for St. James I should like to say that I cannot foresee that ordinary expenditure for sanitary purposes in any parish will exceed one-seventh of the total revenue collected plus the one-fourth of the total amount provided for these purposes, which the Government will provide. That applies to ordinary expenditure and Subclause (4) (b) provides for extraordinary expenditure in case it is called for by the Director, to be met by the Government. The ordinary expenditure can never exceed the figures I have mentioned.

Mr. HAYNES: What the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has said is that the extra charge will be met by the Government. The parishes of St. Michael and Christ Church are two wealthy parishes and they will be able to pay one-fifth of their total amount for ordinary sanitary purposes; but when it comes to the poor, unfortunate parishes like St. Lucy and St. Andrew, they cannot meet these expenses and you will have to help them. The Government has to realise that it must assist these parishes because in the matter of sanitation if you have one insanitary parish that will endanger all the others. These poor parishes should be assisted and the others allowed to work on their own.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not want to appear to be specially drawing this point to your attention, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that the motion of the honourable senior member for St. James cannot be entertained.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That motion has not been seconded.

Mr. ADAMS: As regards the other matter, we have gone one better than the Select Committee has gone in its recommendation but apparently the honourable senior member for St. Andrew does not want that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I withdraw my seconding of the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew.

The question that Clause 22 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 22 as amended was passed.

Clauses 23 to 35 inclusive were passed.

Clause 36:—

36. (1) The fees to be charged by an auditor for his services under this Part of this Act shall be such as shall be prescribed by Regulations made by the Director under this section and shall be paid out of the fund to which the accounts subject to the audit relate.

(2) Regulations under this section shall not come into force until they have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 36 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot agree that the Director should make these Regulations; this Director sounds too much like dictator. I beg to move that the word "Director" occurring in line 3 of Subclause (1) of this Clause be deleted in order to insert the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee." That will necessitate the deletion of Sub-clause (2). As regards the payment of the fees to be charged by the Auditor, I am wondering if provision should not be made for the Government to pay these fees seeing that the Government appoints the Auditor, and that would relieve the parishes of that expense. I am of the opinion that the Government should pay these fees but that might be a charge on the Treasury. Perhaps we might postpone the further consideration of this Clause.

Mr. ADAMS: Nobody wants to do anything against the wishes of the majority of the House, but a vote for the postponement of the consideration of the Clause should be taken so that it can be said that the majority of the House want that to be done.

Mr. WILKINSON: I think that Clause 24 should be recommitted so that an amendment could be made whereby there would not be any question raised as to the fees being paid. I think that the Sanitary Authority should make the appointment subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have to deal with Clause 36 first.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the further consideration of Clause 36 be postponed.

Mr. WILKINSON seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 36 was postponed.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to move that Clause 24 be re-committed. This Clause reads:—

24. (1) Each Sanitary Authority shall keep proper accounts of all moneys received, whether from the Vestry of their Parish or from any other source, and expended by them.

(2) Such accounts shall be made up yearly to the twenty-fourth day of March, or to such other date as the Governor-in Executive Committee may either generally or in any special case direct, and shall be audited as soon as may be thereafter by an auditor who shall be appointed for the purpose by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

My object in making this motion is to ask the honourable senior member for St. Thomas if he would accept an amendment to Sub-clause (2) of this Clause.

Mr. GALE seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to move that after the words "who shall be appointed", the words "by the Sanitary Authority and approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee" be inserted.

Dr. CUMMINS: The custom now is that the Governor-in-Executive Committee approve of the appointment of the auditor by parochial authorities. That is all right when these authorities are only spending parochial funds; but in this Bill Government funds will be the concern of the auditor and therefore the Government ought to have more voice in the appointment. However, I am quite willing to postpone this Clause as well. I beg to move that this clause be postponed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If we postpone Clause 24 for the reason given by the honourable junior member for St. James, if he feels that the Sanitary Authority should appoint the auditor subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, then the necessity for amending Clause 36 in respect of this matter does not arise. If the Sanitary Authority appoint the auditor they should pay him. I beg to second the motion for the postponement of this clause.

The question that Clause 24 be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 24 was postponed.

Clause 37 was passed.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 38 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suggest that this Clause be read.

Clause 38 was being read when Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the welfare and the safety of the community in cases of Hurricanes and Earthquakes with an amendment.

It being now 3.30 o'clock, Mr. SPEAKER stated that the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business had arrived.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (B).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 61 (b) so as to continue Government Business, namely, the Public Health Bill. If the Sugar Industry Wage Rates Bill were non-controversial there would be some point in our dealing with it and postponing the Public Health Bill; but we still have to consider nearly 200 Clauses of the Public Health Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I ask leave to deal with the Bill to enforce the wage rates for the Sugar Industry for the year 1948-49.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me take the feeling of the House with respect to the suspension of the Rule.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think that the Sugar Industry Wage Rates Bill is as necessary to be dealt with as any other business in this House.

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

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, HUSBANDS, SMITH, COX, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD and DR. CUMMINS—16.

Noes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER and CRAWFORD—4.

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

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

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business arrived the House was in Committee on the Public Health Bill.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee on this Bill, Clause 38 was being read.

Clause 38:—

38. (1) A Sanitary Authority is hereby authorised and empowered to acquire lands:—

(a) for the purpose of constructing any sewers, drains, tunnels or sewage disposal works which may be necessary for sanitary purposes in their Parish;

(b) for the purpose of continuing or altering the course of any sewers, drains or tunnels already constructed, as may be necessary for sanitary purposes in their Parish;

(c) for the purpose of providing sites for water-pillars from which water may be supplied to them by the Waterworks Department for the sanitary requirements of their Parish;

(d) for any other sanitary purpose where it shall be necessary for them to acquire land;

and not otherwise.

(2) Whenever any Sanitary Authority shall require any land or lands for any of the purposes mentioned in subsection (1) of this section, it shall be lawful for them to proceed, in similar manner as laid down for the Governor-in-Executive Committee in regard to the widening, making or laying out of roads by section thirteen of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, to have such land or lands laid off and assessed, and upon payment or tender of payment of the money awarded and assessed to the person entitled to receive the same, such land or lands shall thenceforth be for the public use, and such Sanitary Authority shall have power at all times to enter upon any premises of which the land laid off formed part for the purpose of repairing such sewers drains, tunnels or water-pillars, or for cleansing the same.

(3) Whenever a Sanitary Authority shall require any land for any of the purposes mentioned in subsection (1) of this section the said Sanitary Authority are hereby authorised if they shall think it expedient to do so instead of purchasing as nearly as possible the exact quantity of land required for any of the purposes mentioned in this section to purchase either by agreement with the owner of the land or in similar manner as is laid down for the Governor-in-Executive Committee section thirteen of the Department and Highways and Transport Act, 1945, the land immediately adjoining with the buildings, if any, thereon which may be affected by the taking of the land required by the Sanitary Authority instead of paying compensation for the damage to the adjoining land or property so taken.

(4) The provisions of section thirteen of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 shall apply in respect of any acquisition of land by a Sanitary Authority under this section as they apply with respect to the acquisition of land by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the said section thirteen.

(5) If in any case it shall be deemed advisable that there should be a conveyance for a piece of land acquired by the Sanitary Authority for any Parish under any provision of this section such conveyance may be made to the person who shall for the time being be Parochial Treasurer of such Parish and his successors in office and such land shall thereupon become vested in such Parochial Treasurer and his successors in office as trustees for such Parish.

(6) The Sanitary Authority for any Parish are hereby authorised to sell any land or property already acquired or that may hereafter be acquired by them which may not be actually required for the purposes of the work to be done by such Sanitary Authority; and the Parochial Treasurer of such Parish, if the said land shall have been conveyed to him by the direction of such Sanitary Authority,

shall when required by such Sanitary Authority convey any land sold by them to the purchaser or purchasers thereof and shall receive the purchase money thereof and pay over the same to the said Sanitary Authority to be used by them for sanitary purposes of the said Parish, and the conveyance of the said Parochial Treasurer for any land or property so sold shall be a good discharge for the purchase money therein expressed to be paid.

(7) Any land purchased by or belonging to any Sanitary Authority for any Parish which they may desire to sell and which may not have been conveyed to the Parochial Treasurer of such Parish may at the request of such Sanitary Authority be conveyed by the person who sold the same to such Sanitary Authority direct to the purchaser from them and the purchase money thereof shall be paid to the said Sanitary Authority and applied by them for the sanitary purposes of such Parish.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sub-Clause (1) (d) is similar to the wording of the old Act and there has been a difference in legal opinion as to whether the Sanitary Authority would have the necessary power for acquiring places for the erection of communal latrines and baths. I am wondering, therefore, if an amendment should not be made there so as to avoid any controversy over the matter. Perhaps the amendment can be made in respect of Sub-clause (1) (c) and I see nothing wrong in making it there. I beg to move that this Sub-clause be amended by the addition of the words: "or for the erection of latrines, baths and similar buildings." I see that no provision is made for the erection of an isolation hospital.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are we not making an amendment in relation to something which is provided for later on in the Bill?

Mr. HAYNES: I would like to know what part the isolation hospital takes in this Bill; it seems that whenever they consider buying a building to be used for the purpose it is destroyed. Of course no Bill can prevent that but it would be a good idea if the Government can acquire whatever building they want. I would like to know if there is any objection to the inclusion of an isolation hospital here. In the old Public Health Act mention is made in this respect but I do not see anything like that mentioned in this Bill. I take it that the old Act will be out of date when this Act comes into operation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am very glad that no mention of any isolation hospital has been made here; because if there is one thing I would oppose it is the idea of having eleven isolation hospitals in this country. As the position is now each parish should provide an isolation hospital. (A MEMBER: We have not got any). I am sitting between two Commissioners of Health and I am wondering if they should not be prosecuted in this respect. However, I would not like to see in this Bill anything about local authorities having to provide isolation hospitals; I would like to see the Government provide a central isolation hospital because it would be cumbersome in this Bill to call upon eleven local authorities to provide land for the erection of isolation hospitals. I am hoping, therefore, that arrangements will be made whereby the Government will make provision for an isolation hospital which will serve the entire island. I do not think we should worry about that today.

Mr. GARNER: I feel that it is time that the Government should see fit to provide a central isolation hospital to serve the island. It is of no use having eleven isolation hospitals because the Parishes have not got the money with which to maintain them. I remember that some time ago we voted money for the purpose of renovating certain buildings but when it came to the question of purchasing material we found that we did not have sufficient money for that purpose. It is time that the Government should really do this job of erecting an isolation hospital large enough to serve the whole island.

Dr. CUMMINS: I accept the amendment proposed by the honourable member for the City.

Mr. GALE: I do not think that that amendment is necessary having regard to Clause 157 of the Bill. That Clause says: "A Sanitary Authority may provide such public baths and wash-houses as they may consider expedient."

Mr. MOTTLEY: That Clause does not give a Sanitary Authority power to purchase the land for the purpose.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I want to make a few remarks relative to the amendment made by the honourable senior member for the City affecting this matter of acquiring land for the purpose of erecting latrines. In many cases when you acquire land for the purpose of widening a street, the value of a person's land may be enhanced; but when you erect a latrine on a bit of land opposite a person's home the value of the property decreases. I am wondering whether some provision should not be made for compensating people when the value of their property happens to be decreased through the erection of a latrine. The assessors may say that the land is worth, say, one shilling per square foot but they might not take into account the depreciation in value of a person's property (A MEMBER: Look at Sub-clause 3). The point is not exactly covered by that Sub-clause and it is a point which is worthy of consideration. It is within my experience that sanitary authorities have, from time to time, found it necessary to erect latrines immediately in front of people's homes and at times the value of people's homes has gone down considerably. I think it would be wise for some provision to be made, where land which is bought for the purpose of erecting a latrine, for the payment of some compensation over the nominal value of the land to the owner of the land for its depreciation in value as a result of the erection of the latrine.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not see that the honourable member's point is not covered by Sub-clause (3). We have to assume that the Sanitary Authority will exercise some reason in selecting a site for the erection of a latrine. They would not select a site in the middle of the Pine Road, for instance, because specific provision is made for acquiring land for this purpose. In the case of land which is not very valuable, instead of acquiring 400 square feet you should acquire the adjoining land and the buildings thereon rather than pay compensation to the owner thereof who is affected. As regards the other point, we have to thank the honourable junior member for St. Michael for drawing our attention to Clause 157 of the Bill, but the Sanitary Authority have not got any power to purchase the land for the purpose of erecting these baths and washhouses. I am inclined to agree with the opinion of which the honourable senior member for the City spoke; it might be correct in the light of the Act. There were no such things as communal latrines when the old Public Health Bill was passed about 100 years ago and therefore the opinion given might have been perfectly right under the law as it existed then; but if we are passing a new Bill today and we say that a Sanitary Authority is hereby authorised and empowered to acquire lands for certain sanitary purposes and for any other sanitary purpose, surely nobody would hold that that is not sufficient to cover the erection of any building for sanitary conveniences. Therefore we would be in order not to amend any of the Sub-clauses (a), (b), (c) or (d) feeling that

everything would be covered. The power to provide a bath or washhouse does not provide for acquiring land for the bath or washhouse and I suggest to the Committee that we should not amend this Clause in the way in which we are proposing to do. Again as regards the point made by the honourable junior member for St. George I feel sure that the combination of commonsense on the part of the Sanitary Authorities will be sufficient to prevent them from putting a latrine or bath near an expensive property and so create a nuisance. I have been reminded that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has already accepted the amendment. I beg to move therefore that the words just inserted be deleted and that the words "sanitary conveniences and for" be inserted after the word "for" occurring in line 1 of Sub-clause (1) (c).

Mr. MOTTLEY: I still think that my amendment which was accepted by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas is a right amendment. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that his proposed amendment would cover the point but it does not cover it. Nothing is said about baths and I say that these laws should be enacted for the benefit of the lay mind, not for the legal mind. The laws should be made so simple that any body of laymen can sit and interpret them without having to worry about any legal interpretation. The honourable member's amendment will only cover the provision of latrines. Year after year when you want authority to erect baths and latrines you have to come to the House and get authority to do that, otherwise it cannot be done. It would be quite easy to say that the Sanitary Authority is authorised and empowered to acquire lands for the purpose of constructing sewers, drains, and so forth, and include latrines and baths rather than have laymen enquiring as to the definition of "sanitary conveniences". I think that latrines and baths should be mentioned in the same way as drains and tunnels are mentioned. Clause 157 does not deal with latrines.

Mr. TALMA: The definition of "sanitary conveniences" is set out in the Bill. The term means closets, urinals, baths and everything connected therewith; it covers everything in a wide sense and lawyers and laymen alike will understand what it means.

The question that Clause 38 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SYMMONDS: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that Clause 38 be re-committed for the reason which I was trying to point out a little while ago. I was speaking on the question of erecting a urinal in front of a person's home and creating a nuisance. I feel that this matter should not be left entirely in the hands of a Sanitary Authority who may be totally unsympathetic as regards the claims of a poor person.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has already made that point but if he wants the Clause recommitted, let the matter be put to the Committee.

Mr. SYMMONDS: That point has not yet been made; the Sanitary Authority alone has the right to decide if it is expedient for an entire property to be bought. I think that where a poor man's property has considerably depreciated in value by the erection of a urinal nearby, he should have the same right as the Sanitary Authority to say that the whole property should be bought so as to prevent him from owning a property which has depreciated in value.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second the honourable member's motion.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put, I should like to say that you cannot make serious legislation off-hand; you have to go far more carefully into the matter. What is there to prevent a person from saying: "I live 100 yards away from this urinal, it is a nuisance and therefore you have to buy my house." I repeat that you cannot make serious legislation off-hand. The point made by the honourable member can be covered any way; the Sanitary Authority can be sued as individuals.

The question that Clause 38 be re-committed was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. HUSBANDS, SYMMONDS, BRANCKER and GARNER—5.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, COX, MAPP, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD, Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. SPEAKER—13.

Clause 39:—

39. (1) It shall be lawful for a Sanitary Authority to enter into a contract or contracts with any person or persons——

(a) for the execution of any works required of them by or under this Act;

(b) for the performance of any duties or services or the doing of any work required of them by or under this Act;

(c) for the supply of materials necessary for any of the purposes mentioned in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

(2) Any such contract as is mentioned in sub-section (1) of this section may be made for a period of one year or a longer period not exceeding five years at the discretion of the Sanitary Authority.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 39 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I should like to know why a contract should be made for five years; I think that that is for too long a period.

Mr. GALE: The Sanitary Commissioners of St. Michael used to make contracts for scavenging for periods of five years over the last 30 or 40 years before we changed over and did the work departmentally.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: The contractors did the work so badly that the Commissioners had to make a change. They had to take away the work from them.

Mr. GARNER: I do not think that anybody would enter upon capital expenditure without knowing that he would have a period over which he could recover his money. I think that the Sub-clause should remain as it is.

Mr. ADAMS: We are making provision for sewerage; if the Authorities in the parish of St. Michael or Christ Church were laying down sewers a person may not be willing to enter into a contract for less than five years; but the very knowledge that if you give a man a contract for too long a period he might give you bad work should be sufficient warning to the Sanitary Authority not to make the contract for too long a period.

Mr. COX: I beg to move that the word "five" occurring in line 3 of Sub-clause 2 be deleted in order to insert the word "three". I think that a period of five years is too long; you cannot tell what the price of materials might be and you might be able to get materials cheaper from one firm than from another. If a contract is entered into with a firm you will have to buy materials from that firm for the period of the contract.

Mr. WARD: The Sub-clause says that the contract may be made for a period of a year or a longer period not exceeding five years and any Sanitary

Authority can use their discretion. If we say that the contract should be made for a period not exceeding three years the Sanitary Authority may have to pay more on that contract than if it was made for a longer period. I feel therefore that the Sub-clause should remain as it is. I am not in agreement with this amendment.

Mr. MAPP: I agree with the honourable senior member for St. Michael. To my mind, the wording of the Sub-clause is redundant. If we say that the contract may be made for a period not exceeding three years that will cover the whole thing. I beg to move that the words "of one year or a longer period" occurring in lines 2 and 3 of Sub-clause (2) be deleted and that the word "five" be deleted and the word "three" be inserted.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: I see no harm in having this five-year period in the Sub-clause. The Sub-clause has been badly drafted and I think the easiest way to get out of the difficulty is to say that the contract may be made for a period not exceeding five years.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I intend to support the amendment. (Mr. GARNER: Shame.) The honourable member is entitled to be ashamed. I see nothing against making the contract for a period of three years and if it has to be renewed the better it will be for the public.

Dr. CUMMINS: I do not envisage any contract which will call for a period longer than three years. A minimum of one year is set out in the Sub-clause and I think it should be left as it is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part—

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that the question be divided; the part relative to the deletion of the words "one year" should be put first and then a vote should be taken relative to the three and five years; because all of us will agree to the deletion of the words "one year" so as not to bind the parties down to one year when a period of only six months might be required. I should like to remind honourable members that there is a Rule of the House which says that a question can be divided.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I do not see that Rule.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member did not have the mind which he has he would know that I am speaking the truth although I cannot put my hand on the Rule at once. The honourable member should read the Rules before coming into the House.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I do not want chapter and verse for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to Rule 83. It says: "The House may order a complicated question to be divided." I take it that the Committee can do the same thing and I am therefore putting the question that——

Mr. SYMMONDS: Neither the House nor the Committee has decided that the question should be divided.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the words "of one year or a longer period" stand part of the Bill. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye". those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

The question that the word "five" stand part of the Bill put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: WILSON, MESSRS. HUSBANDS, SMITH, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD, DR. CUMMINS and MR. SPEAKER—15.

Noes: Messrs. SYMMONDS, BRANCKER, COX and MAPP—4.

The question that Clause 39 as amended stand part of the ill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 40 was passed.

Clause 41:—"A Sanitary Authority may sue and be sued in the name of their Clerk."

Dr. CUMMINS I ask leave to withdraw that Clause and to substitute the following therefor:—

"41. A Sanitary Authority shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and may sue and be sued in the name of the Clerk."

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

Dr. CUMMINS: There seems to be some uncertainty as to this Clause and I am therefore asking leave to postpone consideration of it.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to postpone consideration of the Clause.

Clauses 42 and 43 were passed.

CHAIRMAN REPORTS PROGRESS

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. CHAIRMAN,—I beg to move that you do now report progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

REVERSION TO PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the House do now revert to Private Members' Business.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

The question that the House do now revert to Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. SYMMONDS, COX, TALMA, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, DOWDING, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—14..

Noes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, HUSBANDS, BRANCKER, SMITH and MAPP—5.

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.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 60 so as to proceed with Order No. 81 under Private Members' Business. That Order deals with an amendment to the Vestries Act which seeks to give the Vestry of St. Michael authority to increase the amount of the loan for running the parish for the first four months of the parochial year. The Bill is a very necessary one and I hope that honourable members will agree to deal with it this afternoon.

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

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

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Order No. 81 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. HAYNES seconded the motion which was agreed to.

VESTRIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for the City:— Second reading of a Bill to amend the Vestries Act 1911.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is a non-controversial matter. At present the Vestry of St. Michael has authority to borrow the sum of £9,000 at the beginning of the parochial year for the purpose of running the parish until taxes are collected. It has been found that this sum is absolutely insufficient to run the parish for the first three or four months of the parochial year, hence this amendment. When the Bill was enacted the expenditure of the parish was about $10,000 a month and today it is $40,000 a month. It is therefore obvious that other steps had to be taken on several occasions to obtain money for paying the expenses of the parish. This Bill seeks to amend the Vestries Act by deleting the figures "9,000" in Column 2 of Schedule "C" set opposite the words "St. Michael" occurring in Column I of the Schedule and substituting therefor the figures "20,000". That amendment will allow the Vestry of St. Michael, in view of the increased expenditure of the parish, to borrow £20,000 instead of £9,000 to carry on the work of the parish for the first three or four months of the parochial year. I do not think it is necessary to say anything more in connection with this Bill; I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: I should like to ask the honourable senior member for the City to accept an amendment dealing with an increase in the amount of the loans in respect of the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Peter. At present we have permission to borrow the sum of £500 and that amount is inadequate for the purpose as mentioned by the honourable member in the case of St. Michael. I am asking the honourable member to accept an amendment whereby the Vestries of the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Peter will be able to borrow £1,000.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I want to give an early notice; I have a lot to say about any loan being obtained in respect of St. Peter before this matter goes through. (MEMBERS: This is not a loan). I am telling the honourable senior member for the City to deal with this Bill if he wants to do so and not worry about St. Peter. I would like Your Honour's ruling in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Vestries Act 1911 is a public Act and the amendment proposed purports to amend a general Act. When a Vestry ask for anything in relation to a servant they always proceed by way of petition. This is an amendment to an Act which is a general Act but inasmuch as it has become more or less the practice for a particular Vestry to have one of their members to make a motion in the House on behalf of that Vestry, I would advise the House to deal with the particular amendment which is before them.

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. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. DOWDING, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT being in the Chair.

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

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Schedule "C" to the Vestries Act 1911 is hereby amended by deleting the figures "9,000" in Column 2 thereof set opposite the words "St. Michael" occurring in Column I of the said Schedule and substituting therefor the figures "20,000."

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

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: What I am saying now perhaps I should have said on the second reading of the Bill; but before we give the third reading to this Bill I would like to know what the Vestry proposes to do. Section 71 of the Vestries Act says: "It shall be lawful for the Vestries of the several parishes of the island at any time during the first three months of the parochial financial year, if their parochial funds shall have become exhausted, to raise on loan from any person....." I do not see that the Vestry can raise this money before next year for the purposes as mentioned by the honourable senior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The first three months of the parochial financial year have not yet gone.

Clause 2 was passed.

On the motion of Mr. MOTTLEY seconded by Mr. GALE, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: In moving the adjournment of the House I should like to mention that I propose at the next meeting of the House to deal firstly with the amendment of the Other Place to the Bill to make provision for the welfare and the safety of the community in cases of Hurricanes and Earthquakes. I say that in case the amendment is not printed and circulated. The Other Place have put in the Sub-Clause which we deleted. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 15th day of June, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 15th day of June, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.