

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1947—48

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th September, 1948

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Dr. J. A. LeV. WILSON, Messrs. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, A. E. S. LEWIS, C. E. TALMA, H. D. BLACKMAN, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., V. C. GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

Prayers are read.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 7th September, 1948, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID.

Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,— I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:—

Report of the Conference of Prison Officers held under the chairmanship of Mr. N. R. Hilton at Hastings House, from the 30th April to 6th May, 1948.

Recommendations of the Conference of Prison Officers.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of £4,350 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of providing, furnishing and equipping a new Police Station at Oistins.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to advance from the Public Treasury the sum of £600 (to be subsequently refunded as a free grant under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act on the terms and conditions stated in the Message from the Honourable House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor dated the 14th of December, 1943) to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to cover the cost of a course of training in modern methods of Infant Teaching in the United Kingdom for the Inspector of Infants' Methods in the Department of Education.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with to-day the Resolution for the sum of £600 relating to a Course of Training for the Inspector of Infants' Methods, of which I have just given notice.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the other money Resolution, of which I also gave notice to-day.

Mr. SMITH enters the House and takes his seat.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly have the honour to request Your Excellency-in-Executive Committee to make provision whereby the salary of Mr. George McDonald Carew, Postmaster for the parish of St. James, may be paid to him during his absence on leave from the island on a cricket tour to India representing the British West Indies, and express their desire and willingness to provide any funds necessary for this purpose.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Of my intention to move later in the day for the passing of the abovementioned Address.

Mr. COX: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly beg to inform Your Excellency that since the retirement of Mr. A. J. Caddle from the post of Head Messenger and Librarian no person has been put to act in either of these positions. The Assistant Messenger, Mr. Beresford Yearwood, has consequently had extra duties to perform.

The House, therefore, request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to ensure that the Assistant Messenger be paid a sum not exceeding £5 which amount was recommended by His Honour the Speaker before his departure from the island.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

QUESTIONS

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

Will the Government take the necessary steps to enable financial assistance to be provided for employees of the Pumping Station and Postmen for the purpose of helping them to obtain bicycles or other means of transport?

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

1. Will the Government please state why the recent recruitment of workers for the United States was assigned to Mr. Fitz Herbert Bostic?

2. At what address did Mr. Bostic recruit these workers?

3. Is it a fact that people who are in a comparatively good position—owners of property and motor cars—were recruited to the exclusion of unemployed who are really in need of assistance?

RESOLUTION Re ALLOCATION OF THE BALANCE OF STABILIZATION FUND TO PRODUCERS OF FANCY MOLASSES AND SUGAR.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am asking permission to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order that Order No. 2 under Government Business may be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The application would have to be made by the honourable member in whose name the Order stands.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order that Order No. 9 may be taken as the first Order of the Day.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 60 be suspended.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Rule 60 be suspended is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89.

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 to deal with the Resolution for £600 relating to a Course of Training for the Inspector of Infants' Methods, of which I gave notice earlier to-day.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with the Resolution for £600 relating to a Course of Training for the Inspector of Infants' Methods and that it be an instruction to the Committee of Supply when the House is in Committee of Supply to deal with this Resolution.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended and that it be an instruction to the Committee of Supply when the House is in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution for £600 relating to a Course of Training for the Inspector of Infants' Methods is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee of Supply to consider the grant

of sums of money for the service of the Government.

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

SUBSIDIZATION OF RICE IMPORTED FROM BRAZIL.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The first Resolution relates to the much talked-of subsidization of rice imported from Brazil. I ask leave to delete the word "ten" in line 1 of the Resolution in order to insert the word "eighteen", so that the Resolution will now read as follows:—"Resolved that the sum of Eighteen Thousand Pounds be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to provide for the subsidization of 550 tons of rice imported from Brazil, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein and, if concurred in,

"Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this resolution." (Cheers). Before I resume my seat I want to say that this rice is expected here shortly, maybe in a day or two, and it is proposed that when this rice is put into circulation, the B.G. rice will be withheld. The reason for that step is to give the Government the opportunity to build up a stock of rice. I beg to move that this Resolution, as amended, do now pass.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second that motion and in doing so I am very pleased to see that the Government has realized that there is no rice in the island. I have been making enquires from several shopkeepers and they have told me that the people are not getting any rice. I am also very pleased to know that the cost of this rice will be 6c. instead of 9c. per pint.

Mr. HAYNES: I, too, want to congratulate the Government on showing contrition for their former stand in this matter. I think it has acted very wisely in subsidizing this rice so that it can be sold at 6c. per pint.

Dr. CUMMINS: I do not want to detain the House but I should like to say that this has always been the Government's stand but it depended on the quantity of rice in the island at the time.

Mr. MAPP: The Government has quite rightly decided to send down for an additional £8,000 because, as the Acting Leader of the House has said, the B.G. rice, as was expected, did not arrive and on that basis it is wise to bring down a Resolution for £18,000 so that this rice from Brazil can be subsidized to the extent that it can be sold at 6c. per pint. This subject has been debated *ad nauseam* and I do not want to prolong the debate much longer but I am going to repeat, if I am alone in so doing, that this additional £8,000 would be better spent in rationing rice. In the Mother Country, goods in short supply are rationed, so that everybody can get a fair share. In Trinidad, rice is rationed, so that everybody can get a fair share. In Barbados I will continue to argue that instead of spending more money to enable rice to be sold at 6c. per pint, so that some people would get half-bag each and others would get 10 pints each and others again one pint each and others still would get none, it would be far better if we spent this money in rationing the rice so that each person would get his fair share. I will continue to preach that. The Government has seen fit to accede to the wishes of the majority of this House but in this instance it does not mean that the wishes of the majority of this House are the wishes of the majority of the people; that is to be clearly understood. This is purely for propaganda purposes. The members of the Government and other members of the House, for

their own reasons, ignore my suggestion but I am convinced that it is the wiser thing to do; it would be fairer and would be doing more justice to the inhabitants of this island, if the Government spent this £8,000 in rationing rice. If that were done I am sure that more people would be able to get rice than is at present the case. That, I repeat, is my idea and I shall continue to preach it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, I think it is necessary to make one or two observations in reply to the remarks of the last speaker. He said that the £8,000 would be better spent in rationing rice, rather than subsidizing this rice from Brazil to enable it to be sold at 6c. per pint. In other words, if we spend £8,000 on a ration scheme we can sell the rice at 9c. per pint; therefore, the honourable member does not appreciate the fact that the entire intention behind the suggestion that this rice be subsidized to the tune of £18,000 is to place the rice on the market at the cheaper price of 6c. per pint because it is felt that that is the price which the people can afford to pay for it. The whole tenor of the honourable member's remarks seems to be that this rice is being put on the market for a certain section of the community and that the others will get none of it. If that is the case, why bother to subsidize it at all? He has already been asked: "If this rice is being put on the market for only the wealthy class of people, why should the Government bother to give the wealthy class £8,000 more? The mere fact that the Government decided to subsidize this rice at all shows that the Government itself felt that something should be done to make the price as reasonable as possible (Hear, hear) and the argument of the Opposition was that the Government did not sufficiently appreciate the condition of the people, was out of touch with the situation as it really exists and that in order to provide food for the people, it should go farther and bring down the price to 6c. per pint; that is what is being done to-day. Rationing the rice, even though it might guarantee a more equitable distribution, would not guarantee a cheaper price and it would mean that the people would have to pay a higher price for the rice than they would pay if the rice is subsidized to the fullest extent.

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

COURSE OF TRAINING FOR INSPECTOR OF INFANTS' METHODS.

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution is for £600 to cover the cost of a course of training in modern methods of Infant Teaching in the United Kingdom for the Inspector of Infants' Methods in the Department of Education. This lady, Sir, has been selected to attend a one-year course of training in the United Kingdom and this amount will be refunded under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I would just like to remark, as I do on every occasion when there is no copy of the Resolution that is being considered before me, that I can quite understand that the Government might find itself in the position of coming late to the House with a Resolution but it certainly should have sufficient clerks in some office who could type or cyclostyle a few copies for the members of this House.

Dr. CUMMINS: I think I should explain that this lady has to leave the island in a few days' time, consequently we are asked to deal with this Resolution to-day.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

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

THE PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. GARNER enters the House and takes his seat.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—Honourable members will remember that a few weeks ago, when we were considering this Bill, a few clauses were postponed and I propose to deal now with those clauses that were postponed. The first I shall take is Clause 24 which reads as follows:—

"(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 general 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."

This clause deals with the appointment of the auditor by the Governor-in-Executive Committee" and clause 36 deals with the payment of the auditor by the Sanitary Authority. Honourable members will remember that the point was raised that if the auditor is to be appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, he should be paid by the Government and not by the Sanitary Authority and it was on that ground that this clause was postponed. The Governor-in-Executive Committee has agreed that the auditor should be appointed by the Sanitary Authority subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee; consequently I beg to move that the words "for the purpose by the Governor-in-Executive Committee" in the last line of sub-clause 2 of clause 24 be deleted and the words "by the Sanitary Authority subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee" substituted therefor.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the clause is put and resolved in the negative, the Chairman declaring that the "Noes" have it.

The question that the words "by the Sanitary Authority subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee" be inserted in the blank is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that Clause 24, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: In consequence of the postponement of Clause 24, Clause 36 was also postponed. It reads as follows:—

"(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."

In view of the amendment to Clause 24 I do not think that it is necessary to alter Clause 36 because the auditor will be paid out of funds under the control of the Sanitary Authority. I, therefore, beg to move that Clause 36 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I agree with the honourable introducer of the Bill that this Clause hinges on Clause 24 but inasmuch as Clause 24 has been so amended that the position in respect of the appointment of the auditor remains as it is to-day, with the exception of the appointment being made by the Sanitary Authority subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I do not think that the necessity for Clause 36 arises. I, therefore, move that Clause 36 be deleted.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second the motion of the senior member for the City.

Dr. CUMMINS: I cannot agree with the honourable member who has just sat down. If the Committee wants to delete the word "Director" in line 3 of sub-Clause 1 it may do so but this Clause is merely to give the Governor-in-Executive the opportunity to regulate the fees that are to be paid to the auditor. Honourable members will remember that in connection with a previous clause dealing with the appointment and payment of sanitary inspectors, it was agreed that the salaries of the inspectors should be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and I think that the same principle is involved in this clause.

Mr. GALE: I really cannot see the necessity for Clause 36 since we have amended Clause 24. At present, a parochial treasurer is appointed subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee but the Governor-in-Executive does not fix any salary for a parochial treasurer under any regulations. If a Sanitary Authority is to appoint an auditor subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, it will make the appointment knowing that it is going to pay the auditor. The person is to be appointed subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, not the salary. I do not see that Clause 36 is necessary.

Mr. TALMA: Clause 24 deals with the appointment of an auditor subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee but Clause 36 is entirely different. It deals with the making of regulations which would govern the services of an auditor; so the two things are disconnected entirely. No mention is made of regulations in Clause 24 but provision is made in sub-clause 1 of Clause 36 for the making of regulations to control the payment of an auditor's fees, regulations which, according to sub-Clause 2, shall not come into force until they have been approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Both clauses are essential. The Director is to be the Head of the Sanitary Authority and it is he who should make the regulations, not the Governor-in-Executive Committee. The deletion of Clause 36 would make a mess of the matter of appointing and paying an auditor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The senior member for Christ Church would have honourable members believe that if they delete this clause, they would deny the Director the right to make regulations governing the payment of fees to an auditor. Now, what is the real position? As the junior member for St. Michael pointed out, at present under the Vestries Act an

auditor is appointed and, invariably, the auditor of the Vestry—it will be so whether you change the Vestry to Mayor and Corporation or Borough Council—is the auditor of the Sanitary Authority and there are no prescribed regulations relating to his fees. These proposed regulations may entail the payment to the auditor of fees which may be too high, especially when we take into consideration that at present an auditor audits the accounts of a Vestry and its subsidiary Boards. Clause 24 allows the position to remain as it is, only it goes further and provides that the appointment of the auditor shall be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee and that was done because the Governor-in-Executive Committee will be providing some of the funds of the Sanitary Authority. The auditor will be paid by the Sanitary Authority; where, therefore, is the necessity for Clause 36? I agree with the senior member for St. Thomas that if we allow this clause to remain we will have to allow it to remain as it is but I contend that the necessity for it does not arise at all because it only deals with the making of regulations under this part of the Act. Clause 36 was postponed because Clause 24 was not finally dealt with but now that Clause 24 has been amended and passed I do not see the necessity for Clause 36.

Mr. TALMA: What surprises me is that the honourable member does not realize that he answered himself, because this part of the Act merely deals with the manner in which the payment of an auditor's fees should be governed. This is a new Public Health Bill whereby you will have a Director of Medical Services whom you never had, and this clause is merely giving him the right to make regulations governing the payment of an auditor's fees. But the honourable member is trying to say that an auditor's fees should not come under the supervision of the Director; that the Director should not have the right to make regulations to govern the payment of those fees. We all know that auditors must be trustworthy people or otherwise everything goes wrong.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Clause 24, before it was amended, provided that the appointment of an auditor should be made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and in that case Clause 36 was necessary because if the Governor-in-Executive Committee appointed an auditor, the Government would have to fix the fees. But Clause 24 has been so amended that the Sanitary Authority shall appoint an auditor, therefore Clause 36 is no longer necessary; the Sanitary Authority would have to fix the auditor's fees. The provision that the appointment shall be made subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee is to ensure that a proper person is appointed and has nothing to do with the payment of the fees. The Governor-in-Executive Committee has to approve of the person to be appointed but the Sanitary Authority has to fix the fees.

Mr. COX: I believe that honourable members have lost sight of the real point at issue. I think we should deal with Part 7 as a whole. When we amended this Part of the Bill, we did so with the intention that the Government should assist with the necessary funds in case a Sanitary Authority is not able to pay salaries which the Government would like employees to receive and each of these sections in Part 7 is contingent on the other. Clause 24 deals only with the appointment of an auditor but inasmuch as the Government, under this Part of the Bill, has to put up some of the money it is felt that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should have some say in the fixing of the fees that are to be paid. Sub-clause 1 of clause 36 says that the fees to be charged by

an auditor for his services 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. That really means that the Governor-in-Executive Committee will have the power to fix the fees or to say that the amount which has been fixed is sufficient or not enough as the case may be. I do not see how you can deal with clause 36 without considering that Part 7 as a whole has been amended to allow the Governor-in-Executive Committee to assist those Sanitary Authorities which are not in a position to pay fees commensurate with the work to be done.

Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT and SYMMONDS enter the House and take their seats.

Mr. MOTTLEY asks for and is granted leave to withdraw his motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the words "by Regulations made by the Director under this section" in lines 3 and 4 of sub-clause 36 be deleted in order to substitute therefor the words "by the Sanitary Authority subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee". That will be more in conformity with clause 24 as amended.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Dr. CUMMINS: I accept that amendment.

The question that Clause 36, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: I propose to take next clause 66, renumbered 64, which reads as follows:—

"(1) If it appears to a Sanitary Authority that the drainage of any land is insufficient they may by notice require the owner of such land to make such sucks, wells and drains as shall be sufficient effectually to drain such land, and properly to fence all wells and sucks so made.

"(2) The provisions of section one hundred and ninety five of this Act with respect to appeals against, and the enforcement of, notices requiring the execution of works shall apply in relation to any notice given under this section."

This clause was postponed in order that consideration might be given to cases in which owners of land may be called upon to sink wells and are not in a position to pay for so doing. I beg to move that clause 66, renumbered 64, stand part of the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that and in doing so I should like to throw some light on the matter. After going carefully into this question I have come to the conclusion that this clause is really necessary. In my opinion this section must remain in the Act but I feel that a Sanitary Authority should be allowed to use its discretion as to the payment of the expenses incurred in cases in which the owners of land are not able to pay for the digging and proper fencing of wells and if honourable members feel disposed to make an amendment to that effect. I would be the first person to agree to it. There are many small peasants in this island through whose land water from highways flows and sometimes settles and you can well understand that if they are called upon to pay for digging wells to effectually drain such land, they cannot do it. The clause should be in the Bill but the Sanitary Authority should be required to bear the expenses or portion of them.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I quite agree that a suck well would be necessary for the sanitation of the particular locality but I do not agree that a person owning a $\frac{1}{4}$ acre of land should be required to dig, at his expense, a well which may be draining 30 or 40 acres of land belonging to somebody else. Some provision should be made in the Act whereby the

Sanitary Authority should bear the expenses. I will vote against this clause if an amendment is not made to that effect.

Mr. SYMMONDS: I think that this Clause will bear very hardy upon small owners of land. I do not think we can pass it as it is and I shall move that it be again deferred in order that some provision be put in whereby a Sanitary Authority may, in case they are satisfied that the owner of a piece of land which offends in this respect cannot pay, dig a well at their own expense. I am not inclined to vote for this clause as it stands.

Mr. TALMA: I endorse the remarks of the senior member for the City because it would be extremely unreasonable for a Sanitary Authority to compel people to utilize at their expense their land in a way which that Sanitary Authority thinks fit. I beg to move that a proviso be added to sub-clause 1 of clause 66, renumbered 64, as follows:—"Provided always that the expenses incurred therewith shall be borne by the Sanitary Authority in Question."

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Mr. GALE: I am not quite certain that the honourable member's amendment will meet the situation. Suppose a man had a tremendous area of land and the Sanitary Authority called upon him to drain it, the drainage of that land would considerably enhance the value of it, and I do not see why the Sanitary Authority should have to pay for that drainage. I think that the clause is a little bit loose and that we had better consider it more thoroughly.

Mr. MAPP: What the honourable member who has just spoken said is exactly what I was about to say. The argument about poor peasants, in this case, does not strike me with much force, for the simple reason that this clause applies to the big owners of land (Voices: To everybody) and when it comes to the question of drainage, improper drainage is more likely to be found on large tracts of land. It is only fair that if the owner of the land can stand some of the expenses he should be required to do so. I think it would be well if we do not tamper with this clause; we may pass something which would result in putting a burden on a Sanitary Authority when the owner could afford to pay the expenses himself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I feel that the amendment of the senior member for Christ Church is the correct thing. This does not apply to tenancies and areas of that sort. There are instances in which water from adjacent lands settles on small portions of land because of the improper drainage of the latter—I have an instance in mind right now—and the Sanitary Authority has no power to call upon the owners to drain those lands. Provision should be made whereby the Sanitary Authority could call upon those persons to drain such lands, so as to prevent them becoming breeding-places for mosquitoes and nuisances to other people living in the particular localities. It is not a question of going on land situated at 300 or 400 feet from the road and calling upon the owner to drain it but where land adjoining tenancies or lands of other people in the area is so improperly drained as to cause water to settle on it and become a nuisance, it is absolutely the correct thing for a Sanitary Authority to call upon the owner of that land to drain it. Some of these areas in which water settles are natural receivers of water. Any nuisance which results from the settling of that water can only be remedied by the proper drainage of the land and if a Sanitary Authority wants to prevent that nuisance from continuing it should bear the expenses of draining

that land. I fail to see how a Sanitary Authority which bears the expense of draining the land of Mr. X who may be a man of affluence is doing him a favour if by so doing it is preventing a nuisance from continuing. What the Sanitary Authority would be doing is improving the conditions in the vicinity and making them conducive to better health. I have gone carefully into the matter and I see the absolute necessity for leaving this clause in the Bill. If a Sanitary Authority calls upon the senior member for St. Andrew to so drain his land as to make the surroundings conducive to good health, then I say that that Sanitary Authority should bear the expenses and that is why I am in agreement with the amendment of the senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—My opinion is that this amendment is out of order because it will be more or less creating a charge on the Treasury. But even if you do not rule that it is out of order I should like to say that I am not going to support it. If a man has 4 acres of land and water which flows from that land settles on a quarter of an acre of land belonging to another individual I fail to see why the latter should be called upon to dig a well on his land to carry off water from the land of the former. Secondly, what are we proposing to do? Are we going to take the money that is being collected from the taxpayers as a whole and put it at the disposal of persons who own large tracts of land and tenancies? I will quote an instance. I know an area of land which has recently been offered for sale in lots and people are purchasing these lots at very high prices from the individual who bought the land, perhaps, at a cheap price. On that land there is a pond which is a nuisance to the people living in that area. Do you mean to tell me that after this individual has made so much profit out of this land, you are going to turn around and ask the taxpayers to subscribe towards the expenses of the drainage of it? It should be binding upon that individual to drain his own land at his own expense. The Sanitary Authority should call upon that individual and say to him: "This pond is a nuisance and you have to drain your land." The expenses should be borne by the owner of the land and not by poor people who to-day have to pay taxes if they own houses of the value of \$500 or \$600. The junior member for St. George talked about this clause imposing a hardship on the small man but it goes farther than that. It is not a question of helping the small man because the small man does not own sufficient land to be drained; it is the land in the big tenancies which has been sold at exorbitant prices that needs to be drained. I repeat that if the amendment of the senior member for Christ Church is passed, it will be creating a charge on the Treasury in the first place and in the second place would be helping people who need no help at all. Certain people talk about the poor when it suits them to do so. The honourable member's amendment if it is passed would mean that never mind how rich a man may be, never mind how much land he has, if his land has been drained at the request of a Sanitary Authority, the expenses incurred therewith must be borne by that Sanitary Authority. I agree that the particular area would be improved not only for the benefit of the individual who owns the land but for the benefit of the people residing in the particular vicinity but I also say that the individual should be called upon to remove the nuisance and should bear the expenses himself. I cannot see how it is reasonable to expect the taxpayers as a whole to pay the expenses incurred by an individual in digging a well to drain his property, out of which, perhaps, he has made

handsome profits. If a person has anything of an offensive nature on his premises, the Sanitary Authority does not go in and say "This is a nuisance. I am going to take it away and pay for so doing!" No; the Sanitary Authority goes in and says:—"Get this offensive matter away at once," and the person has to get it away as speedily as possible and pay the expenses.

Mr. TALMA: I rise to a point of explanation. A Sanitary Authority buries many an offensive matter at its expense.

Mr. COX: I say that it is not fair to ask taxpayers who are already hard hit to subscribe to the expenses incurred by the type of drainage which we envisage from this clause. As the junior member for St. Thomas has pointed out, you are more likely to have water settling on large tracts of lands than on small spots of land; it is the former that needs to be drained,—those tenancies which have been sold out at exorbitant prices without proper roads and proper drainage, although the Act says that these things should be first provided. The owners of those tenancies should be called upon to drain their lands at their own expense and the poor taxpayers should not be required to further swell the pockets of those individuals.

Mr. TALMA: The honourable member who just sat down has made one or two points but I am afraid that he is too petty and insular. As long as that state of affairs exists in this Chamber, things will remain as they are. The honourable member referred to tenancies and to land that has been sold in lots. This is a Government Bill which has been brought down in the interest of the health of the people of this island. It is not a question of rich or poor; it is not a question of providing something for the rich and not for the poor. Rich and poor alike live in this country and this Bill is something to help the people of this island as a whole. This clause is the substance of the Bill. How can we have better public health if we cannot have wells dug on lands that are natural settling places for water? This is to help the poor people more so than the rich because the rich live in surroundings where their health is not so easily affected and those who can afford it go away at regular intervals in the interest of their health. There is no question of this being a charge on the Treasury. If the amendment which I have put forward is not accepted, then you may as well do without this Public Health Bill. If there is no enactment for compensation to be paid in a matter of this sort, what is the object of having this Bill? It would only be a waste of time, paper and everything else. I want to say this further. Where you find water lodging here and there it is resultant from the act of God, not the act of man and if some enlightened people can formulate a scheme like this whereby provision would be made for the removal of that water, where is the need for opposition to it? I counsel honourable members to pass this clause with the amendment I have made, otherwise they would be defeating the object of the Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When I seconded the amendment of the senior member for Christ Church I would have thought that I would have to convince a person like the senior member for St. James as to the necessity for it, not the senior member for St. Michael but it is no fault of mine if he cannot understand. He talked about persons who caused the nuisances being made to bear the expenses of draining the lands but nobody causes water to settle on his land to such an extent as to create a nuisance; it is resultant from the act of God. Really I would expect to hear the senti-

ments which have been expressed by the senior member for St. Michael come from the senior member for St. James. The honourable member seems to think that after this Bill has been passed, Sanitary Authorities will drain lands belonging to Lower Estate or Bruce Vale but no such thing is intended. There are places about this island which are natural receivers of water and nobody can stop it and there is no authority at present to enable Sanitary Authorities to drain them so as to prevent them from becoming nuisances to the inhabitants in the particular districts. When I suggested the postponement of this clause on the last occasion I did so because it appeared to me at the time that it would create a hardship but after giving the matter further consideration I have come to the conclusion that it is a necessary provision and should be in the Act. A man might own a piece of land on which he cannot prevent water from settling and there should be statutory authority to enable a Sanitary Authority to call upon him to dig a well and fence it for the purpose of draining that land and the expenses incurred should be borne by the Sanitary Authority. I am sure that the senior member for St. Thomas will see the wisdom in the amendment of the senior member for Christ Church. Why should the expenses be borne by the Sanitary Authority? Because this is a Public Health Act dealing with the health of the people of this Island. I can visualize a number of these places where water settles about this island being drained within a short period after this Bill is passed and to talk about a man who owns $\frac{1}{4}$ acre of land at the foot of Hillaby being called upon to dig a well to drain the 4 acres of land owned by his neighbour at the top of Hillaby is, to my mind, begging the question. Water finds its level and nobody can stop it from settling in places which are natural receivers.

Mr. COX: Indeed I am not in the habit of taking the senior member for the City seriously because I have known him for many years now but I would like to tell him that when it comes to the question of understanding I am in a position to state that there are many people who have a lot of understanding but they use that understanding to promote their criminal instinct even to the extent of finding themselves in the box in the Chief Justice's Court sometimes. As I have said before, I am not prepared to support this proposal that the poor taxpayers of this island should pay for the drainage of land which has been sold by people who have made fabulous sums out of that land. I go further and say that if there are cases in which the individuals cannot provide the means to pay for the drainage of their lands, they should be treated on their merits. We know that our resources are limited and yet it is proposed that we should take the taxpayers' money and pay for the drainage of land wherever it may be situated and irrespective of whether the owner is a millionaire or not. I am not going to vote for it.

Dr. CUMMINS: I appreciate the argument that has been adduced on all sides. This is a matter of public health and the health of the public must be protected. We cannot control the flow of water; it flows where it wants to flow and it settles where it wants to settle. Where it settles can be a nuisance and I, Sir, am prepared to accept the amendment of the senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. MAPP: There is just this I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I suggest that the mover of this amendment should be very careful, for this reason—

Dr. CUMMINS: To a point of order. The honourable member is out of order. I have already accepted the amendment.

Mr. MAPP: I am not going over the whole argument but you may be enhancing the value of a man's land by draining it. I am just asking the senior member for Christ Church to see that point. It is true that no one can control the flow of water but if a Sanitary Authority is to pay for the drainage of land, the extent of the payment should be stipulated because the Authority may be enhancing the value of the particular land tremendously and land is not taxed on its real value in this country.

Mr. COX: There is a section in the Highways Act —

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—Is this debate in order? I have already accepted the amendment and is the continuation of this debate in order?

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to read section 30 of the Highways Act which is relevant to this issue. It says:—

"30. (1). If the owner or occupier of land adjoining a highway shall have or shall sink a well thereon within 30 ft. of the highway, such owner or occupier shall have a wall or other substantial enclosure erected around the same four feet high. And any person failing to comply with the provisions of this sub-section or after receiving seven days' notice from a Commissioner, Inspector, Superintendent or other person entrusted with the care, maintenance or repair of the roads of the parish, shall incur a penalty of 2/6 for each day after the expiration of such notice during which any such well shall remain unclosed as aforesaid."

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. DEPUTY 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. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the reply to question No. 65, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John, and the reply to question No. 71, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to lay the replies to questions No. 60, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (A)

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to continue Government Business.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Dr. CUMMINS: Before we proceed with the Order with which we were dealing before the adjournment, I ask leave to move for the suspension of

Rule 60 so as to deal with Order No. 2 on the Order Paper—a Resolution to approve the allocation of the balance of the stabilisation fund among the producers of fancy molasses and among the producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Rule 60 be now suspended.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

FANCY MOLASSES AND SUGAR PRODUCTION RATES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the following allocation of the balance of the stabilisation fund fixed on the 2nd of September, 1948, by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board under the provisions of section 10 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937:—

The balance of the stabilisation fund shall be allocated among producers of fancy molasses and among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar as follows:—

- (a) among producers of fancy molasses at the rate of .8990c. a gallon on every wine gallon produced; and
- (b) among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar at the rate of \$3.6686 per ton of sugar made.

Mr. TALMA: This is a Resolution to approve the following allocation of the balance of the stabilisation fund among producers of fancy molasses and among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar:—

- (a) among producers of fancy molasses at the rate of .8990c. a gallon on every wine gallon produced; and
- (b) among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar at the rate of \$3.6686 per ton of sugar made;

The Addendum to the Resolution sets out other points with which hon. members will be conversant and probably the matter needs little or no explanation. However there is a memorandum here in these files which will give all the necessary information as to the method by which these figures have been arrived at. This allocation has met with the approval of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board which is comprised of parties who are interested in this matter and who are conversant with it. The matter is one which affects more or less those who comprise the Board; it has been gone into with the expert, Dr. Saint, and I expect little or no controversy in connection with it. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HAYNES: As a member of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board I beg to second the motion. This allocation is in order and therefore there is no reason why there should be any controversy over it.

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

THE PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, to revert now to Order No. 1, namely, the Public Health Bill.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When this Bill was under consideration before the adjournment for lunch, the House was in Committee on it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee on this Bill before the luncheon adjournment, we were considering Clause 66, renumbered 64.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question that Clause 66, renumbered 64, as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Clause with which we have to deal is Clause 87, re-numbered 85, relative to public elementary schools. In pursuance of the suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I beg to move that the words "whenever necessary" occurring in line 2 of Sub-clause (1) be deleted.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question that Clause 87 re-numbered 85 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Clause to be dealt with is Clause 88, re-numbered 86. I beg to move that after the word "filth" occurring in line 6, the following words be inserted: "and for keeping them in a clean, inoffensive and sanitary condition"; and that from the words "The teacher" occurring in line 6 down to the words "sanitary condition" in line 10 be deleted. The idea is that the burden of keeping all sanitary conveniences of the school in a clean, inoffensive and sanitary condition shall not be on the teacher; but it shall be the duty of the Sanitary Authority to make provision for the cleansing of these school premises.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second those amendments. This Clause was debated and honourable members will appreciate the amendments which have been made. If the Clause had been passed as it was, it would entail even the imposition of a penalty on a teacher by a Police Magistrate for not seeing that the sanitary conveniences of a school are kept clean without giving him a janitor to keep them clean. Just as the Sanitary Commissioners in the past were responsible for keeping earth closets on school premises in order, so the Sanitary Authorities are responsible for keeping these sanitary conveniences clean. A head teacher should not be responsible for keeping sanitary conveniences on the water-borne system clean; with about 700 or 800 children who cannot help themselves properly attending school, great nuisances will be created perhaps without the knowledge of the teacher, and it is therefore felt that the responsibility for keeping these sanitary conveniences in order should be that of the Sanitary Authorities. Someone may argue that this will entail greater expense but such expenses as are shown can be provided for in the Estimates and suitable people will be appointed to keep these sanitary conveniences clean.

The amendments were agreed to.

The question that Clause 88, renumbered 86 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: Clauses 97 to 108 dealing with streets were also postponed and I propose to deal with them one by one. Honourable members will remember that there was a difference of opinion on the question of streets belonging to private individuals or otherwise and suitable amendments have been made. In connection with Clause 97, renumbered 95, I beg to move the following amendments: that in lines 1 and 2 of Sub-Clause (1) the words "(not being a street repairable by a Highway Authority)" be deleted and the words "(whether located in a privately-owned tenantry or not) which is not a street repairable by a Highway Authority;" that in line 3 of Sub-Clause (3) the words "and if the Governor-in-Executive Committee approves" be inserted after the words "think fit", and that from the words "together with interest" down to the words "completion of the works," occurring in lines 5, 6 and 7 be deleted. If we agree to the amendment to Sub-clause (1) of this Clause then Clause 108 will have to be deleted. Both Clauses deal with tenantry roads, privately-owned tenancies and village roads, and Clause 108 deals distinctly with privately-owned tenancies. We have bridged the difficulty by the amendment to Sub-clause (1) of Clause 97 and consequently there will not be any need for Clause 108. In connection with the repair of the streets whether they are located in privately-owned tenancies or not, the Sanitary Authority can call upon the owners of those streets to put them in a state of repair. As regards Sub-clause (3), in case the repair of a street became a charge against a property, the expenses in connection with the repair could originally become a charge against the property together with interest. We have removed the question of interest altogether and left the matter to the Governor-in-Executive Committee who will decide as to how much and who should pay for the repair of the streets.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second those amendments.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: This Clause was postponed because it was considered that its provisions were too hard, and the only improvement which has been made by the amendments is that the 5% interest on the debt which shall be due to the Sanitary Authority to the owner of a premises has been taken off. If the streets in privately-owned tenancies need repairing, the Sanitary Authorities can be called in to do the job and the money apportioned among the different owners; therefore no relief is granted to these people at all. I consider that that would be very hard on owners of tenancies. I see that some members are laughing, but Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is a fact. The tenantry roads are now being repaired by grants from the Government and if this Clause is passed as it is, these grants can be stopped and each man can be called upon to stand his part of the repairs which are to be done. I will certainly oppose that. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Clause 102 covers that). That only covers one-half of the expenses of the repairs, and one-half of the expenses of repairing some of these roads will carry away some of the small owners' properties. Let honourable members be told what it costs the Road Board to repair a mile of road; I repeat that the repairs of some of these roads will carry away some of the small people's properties.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was responsible for having this section of the Bill dealing with streets postponed, and honourable members will have to read from Clause 97 down to Clause 108 and then read the amendments so as to appreciate the point which has been made by the honourable senior member for St. James. The Sanitary Authority will have to be

given some power to be able to bear all the expenses of these repairs if the necessity for that arises. I am supporting the amendments as they are from Clause 97, renumbered 95 down to Clause 107, renumbered 105. Clause 108 will have to be deleted; that Clause gives separate and distinct powers to persons who own private tenancies as against persons who own land running through villages. It was felt that just as the Sanitary Authority can go into the villages and repair the roads, they should also have power to call upon people who own private tenancies with no proper roads, to repair the roads and if they are not repaired within a certain time, the Sanitary Authority should be able to repair them. Hence it was considered advisable to delete Clause 108. On the other hand, the hon. senior member for St. James has drawn to the attention of the Committee the matter of the expenses in repairing roads under Clause 97. That Clause says that the Sanitary Authority may call upon people to repair the roads or they may repair them and the question of interest relative to the expenses incurred by the Sanitary Authority which will have to be paid by the owners of the premises has been removed. What everybody wanted was that the Sanitary Authority should have the power to say that none of these people can pay these expenses and therefore the Sanitary Authority should pay them. Clause 102 says this:—"A Sanitary Authority, if they think fit, may at any time, either before commencing any works which they are authorised to execute under section one hundred of this Act or after the completion of such works, resolve to contribute a portion not exceeding one-half of the expenses of any such works, or resolve, upon motion carried by not less than two-thirds of the whole number of members of the Sanitary Authority, to contribute any greater portion or the whole of such expenses out of the rates."

There is a proposed amendment to that Clause, namely, the insertion of the words "and if the Governor-in-Executive Committee approves" after the words "think fit" occurring in line 1. If that amendment is inserted, I do not think that any harm can be done. The position will be that the Sanitary Authority may, subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, pay all the expenses or they may not pay all of them, and I do not see that there is anything wrong with that. I am supporting these amendments because the Sanitary Authority are given a certain amount of power and it is all with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. If you read this Clause carefully you cannot get out of saying that in this particular case, the Sanitary Authority should be the people to say how these expenses are to be apportioned; and the individuals in any particular area have the right of appeal. I repeat that with these amendments, with Clause 108 deleted, and with the same Regulations as would apply to certain individuals applying to large tenantry owners—that is the correct thing. The Sanitary Authority can call upon them to repair the roads and they have the right to apportion the expenses. You cannot say that they must bear all the expenses. Any Government can say that a landlord is getting so much money out of his tenantry and therefore he can repair the roads, and wherever the Sanitary Authority find it necessary, they must call upon people to pay. Where there are small tenancies and the roads are roads in common, there is no reason at all why the Government should not bear the entire expense of repairing the roads.

where people are unable to pay for repairing them. I am bound to agree with these amendments as they are; I cannot see how this Clause can be amended in any other form so as to suit local conditions. I think the amendments will meet all the objections which have been raised by hon. members.

The amendments were agreed to.

The question that Clause 97, renumbered 95, as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: With regard to the next Clause, the amendment proposed is the substitution of the words "sitting in its appellate jurisdiction" for the words "or a Judge thereof" occurring in line 6 of Sub-clause (2). That amendment was decided upon in respect of former Clauses and I do not think that that needs any argument.

At this stage, it now being 3.30 p.m. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair and stated that it was now time for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ORDER NOT PROCEEDED WITH

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor *re* the Prorogation of the House.

ADDRESS RE PAYMENT OF MR. G. M. CAREW'S SALARY DURING HIS ABSENCE ON CRICKET TOUR

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave to proceed with the Address of which I gave notice earlier today, as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

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

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The Address reads as follows:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly have the honour to request Your Excellency in Executive Committee to make provision whereby the salary of Mr. George McDonald Carew, Postmaster for the Parish of St. James, may be paid to him during his absence on leave from the Island on a cricket tour in India representing the British West Indies, and express their desire and willingness to provide any funds necessary for this purpose.

I do not think that this Address needs much debate. There is an Addendum to the Address and it supplies any information which honourable members would require. The Government has done all that it can possibly do for this Officer but the Civil Service Regulations only allow his *locum tenens* to be paid 6/- per working day. This Officer is on leave all right but the Regulations do not allow him to be paid anything for the time when he is away. I think that he can be considered as an ambassador and I do not think that he should be made to suffer for being called upon to represent the West Indies in a cricket tour to India. I hope that this Address will be passed unanimously; it asks the Government to send down a Resolution to pay this Officer his salary

during the period of his absence from the island. It will cost the Government £75. I do not think that there is anything more which needs to be said on this matter. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that. I do not think that I need add very much more to what has already been said. My colleague has circulated copies of this Address to honourable members and I am sure that everybody will agree that this Officer should not suffer through going to play cricket in India.

Mr. LEWIS: I must say it is regrettable that it is necessary for an honourable member to bring forward an Address of this sort so as to settle what one would regard as something of a domestic affair in the employment of Government servants. I congratulate the honourable senior member for St. James on having copied the example of the Government and offered an Addendum to this Address. Of course he is looking after the interests of his constituents. (Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: Which I should do). I think that if the Government can recommend that £5,000 of the taxpayers' money be taken out of the Treasury for the purpose of building a cricket pavilion and putting a wall around the ground and making preparations for the English cricketers who were coming out here, the same Government should be sufficiently minded after they have provided this recreation ground and showed a keen interest in the game, when the inhabitants of the island take to the game and become sufficiently proficient as to represent the West Indies, the same Government should give sympathetic consideration to this matter. I personally regret very much that this matter could not have been settled in a different way. While I agree that this is an Address to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, the fact remains that the Governor-in-Executive Committee have apparently taken a decision in the matter already. My opinion is that some Government spokesman should be here now to inform the House of the facts on which they have arrived at a decision. I see that a relative of the person involved is going to act for him and she will receive a part of the salary. I wonder if the honourable mover of the passing of this Address has in mind that the full salary must be paid to the substantive holder of the post. I should like to know that because if we insist on that, perhaps the Government might make other arrangements with regard to the acting appointment. I repeat that it is regrettable that I should have to vote on this matter, a matter on which the Governor-in-Executive Committee have apparently taken a decision, without hearing from the Government spokesman the reasons for which they have arrived at their decision. I do not know exactly for what I am voting now; if I vote for the full salary to be paid to the substantive holder of the post, the Government might make further arrangements for the acting appointment. The fact remains, however, that they have taken a decision which, on the plain reading of the Regulations, they feel will satisfy the ends of justice. I regret that I shall have to vote on this matter without hearing the Government's point of view because I am pledging myself to support any Resolution which might come down to this House to make good this money, and then I might hear an argument which might cause me to change my opinion. This is a case in which some argument as regards compensation has been made but there are other cases in which I understand no compensation change my opinion. This is a case in which some arrangement as regards compensation has been made but there are other cases in which I understand no

compensation whatever has been paid to people's family as a result of their being out of the island on a similar mission. However, I have nothing more to say about the matter because I am definitely of the opinion that nobody should be made to suffer as a result of going on the mission for which this young man has been selected. Of course, there is always the opportunity for a person to refuse to go on such a mission and to place the colony in the position of not having the best player selected as a result. We must lose sight of that fact.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the honourable mover and second to present this Address.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: As Your Honour pleases.
Mr. WILKINSON: As Your Honour pleases.

APPOINTMENT AT SPEIGHTSTOWN BRANCH LIBRARY DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to discuss a matter of public importance. The matter which I want to bring to the notice of the House is in relation to an appointment that has been made at the Speightstown Branch Library. An advertisement calling for applicants was inserted in the Press and I shall read that advertisement to the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I observe that there are only ten honourable members present and I ask the Clerk to have the Bell rung.

The Bell having been rung, a quorum was again obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The advertisement reads as follows:—

PUBLIC LIBRARY NOTICE

Applications are invited for the post of Clerk-in-Charge of the Speightstown Branch Library.

2. Appointments will be made subject to the candidates being passed as medically fit for employment in the Public Service, and will be on two years' probation. The minimum educational standard which will be accepted is a pass in the Cambridge Local School Certificate or similar examination of equivalent standard. The ability to type would be an advantage.

3. The salary attached to the appointment is at the rate of £75 per annum for the first two years, then at the rate of £90 rising by annual increments of £7 — 10s. to £150 per annum. In addition a temporary Cost of Living Allowance is at present payable.

4. Applications should be made on forms obtainable from The Public Library and The Branch Library, Speightstown and must be returned to The Public Librarian not later than August 14, 1948.

5. The successful applicant will be required to assume duty on September 1, 1948.

By order of The Trustees,

D. A. WILES,
Public Librarian.

It has been drawn to my attention that a lady has been appointed to this post and she does not possess the minimum qualification that has been

asked for in this advertisement. I want to make it clear that there were other candidates who applied for this post and those candidates possess the Cambridge Local School Certificate. It should be forcibly drawn to the notice of the Administration or whoever is responsible for making these appointments that in making these appointments, especially in an island like Barbados where you have a large number of people unemployed, you have to be very careful that you stick rigidly to the advertisements. I say that for this reason: there are lots of people who could have applied for this post, people who have experience in this line of work, but they did not apply for the post because they do not possess the minimum qualification which had been asked for in the advertisement. There is a lady who was acting as Librarian at the Speightstown Branch Library, and I presume she was acting efficiently, for a long number of years; she did not apply for the post because she did not possess the qualification asked for, and now we find that in spite of candidates who have the qualification making application for the post, a young lady who has not got the minimum qualification has been appointed! I raise this question because I think that we, as representatives of the people, should make our position clear. When there is an appointment to be made, we are not telling the Administration or any Department whom they should appoint by any means: but what we should persist in is this: if they insert an advertisement in the Press stipulating the qualifications which they want for the holding of a post and people with those qualifications apply for the post, then it is their bounden duty to make the appointment from among those people, unless they are going to feel that the people with the qualifications cannot come up to the standard which is required and in that case the post should be re-advertised. I do not contend that the holder of this post must possess a School Certificate, but if those who possess this Certificate did not measure up to the required standard, then it would be the duty of the persons responsible to re-advertise the post. If you stipulate qualifications for the holding of a post in an advertisement and you do not make the appointment from among those candidates who apply for the post and who possess those qualifications, then that would be breaking faith with the people. I repeat that many people who would have applied for this job people who are capable of filling it, have not applied for it because they thought it was incumbent upon them to have this minimum educational qualification. What worries me—I do not know if any information went out—is that some people without any qualification at all were called in for an interview; that was drawn to my attention. I know that none of the members of the Executive Committee is anything to do with this matter because this is an administrative appointment; but we, in this House, must draw these matters to the notice of the Administration. When things are going wrong we have to make our voices heard in the interest of the people whom we represent. I make no apology for raising this question on the floor of the House this afternoon because if we are not careful in so far as appointments in this island are concerned, we will pass a lot of money, we will agree to do certain things and it will be left to people to give jobs to whoever they like by way of favouritism. I cannot subscribe to that sort of thing. If a person is my friend and he applies for a job for which the qualifications are stated and he has not got those qualifications, then he must stand down and wait until a job which he can fill turns up. I feel that it is hard on those people who do

not possess the qualification asked for in this advertisement and who did not apply for this job, to hear that someone who is in the same position as they are in, without the qualification, has been given the job. You may say that a person is not suitable for a job from his theatrical appearance, and, unfortunately, that goes a long way in this island; but if he has the brains for doing a job there should not be any question as to how he might appear. I strongly deplore this appointment; I have nothing against the appointee but I am against the method by which the appointment was made. If this appointment were in order the matter would not have been drawn to the attention of this House; this is one of the things which we have to strike at whenever they occur. It is only by accident that I know about this matter because I am not an inquisitive person. I happen to hear someone wishing another person goodbye and I discovered that this lady was appointed to fill this post. I cannot understand how anybody putting this advertisement in the Press could decide to appoint the person who has been appointed. Nobody would feel pleased if his child who possesses this qualification applied for this job and was not appointed while somebody else who has not got the qualification is appointed. It does appear as if favouritism has been shown where this appointment is concerned because you would wonder how anybody who did not have the qualification had the nerve to apply for this job and then it is given to her. This appointee was doing another job, gave it up and is now a probationer in this job for two years. The salary is \$75 per annum for the first two years and then it will be at the rate of \$90 rising by annual increments of \$7. 10s. to \$150 per annum, and a temporary Cost of Living Allowance is payable. This appointee starts at the same salary as that at which Civil Servants start. It is more or less a Civil Service appointment. To appoint a person who has not got the qualification which has been asked for is, to my mind, undesirable. I do not think it is necessary for me to use any strong language in saying that this is a deplorable state of affairs; my object in bringing the matter to the attention of the House is that the Administration should make an alteration in respect of this appointment and let an advertisement be inserted in the Press so that everybody will have a chance of applying for this job. I do not want a thing of this sort to occur again. I have drawn the attention of this House by way of questions to other appointments and I have received pious replies as to suitability and so forth. I would cause this House to shudder this afternoon if I told it of people who were suitable for appointments but who have not been appointed for certain reasons. I believe that the appropriate occasion will come when I will be able to mention particular instances in detail. This appointment—I can read the advertisement again if honourable members so desire—is, to my mind, one of the worst that have taken place in this island for a long time. I have heard of bad cases, but this is a bad one multiplied by any figures at all. I think we should allow the Administration to know that we cannot countenance these things.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I do not want to go over the points which have been made by my colleague, but I must tell this House that this matter has occupied my mind for some time and I have made some official enquiries about it. I do not see how this Government can advertise a post, make it known that a certain

qualification is required and then go out of the way to appoint somebody who does not possess that qualification. Although I am not one of those persons who would put undue emphasis on the passing of examinations, yet I should like to point out—I was at pains to do it in making my enquiries—that there are many persons who would have applied for this job but having noticed that the advertisement called for certain qualifications, they did not apply. I feel that the Administration was unfair to those people who were shut out. I have nothing personal against anybody but I do feel that if this individual has been considered as being capable of serving in this post, many of those persons who possess the School Certificate are such as might benefit equally as much or more than this individual under any proposed system of training that may have to be undergone. For that reason I particularly pointed out when I made my enquiries that this acting appointment was very unfair. I was told that this applicant was subjected to an intelligence test but I have not heard of any holder of the School Certificate being subjected to any such examination. I do not see that a certain qualification should be called for in the advertisement and then somebody who has not got that qualification should be appointed to the post. I therefore join with my colleague in protesting against this appointment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before the honourable member takes his seat I would be glad if he would read the advertisement of which he complains.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member acceding to that request?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can read it.

The advertisement was read.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The minimum educational qualification was a pass in the Cambridge Local School Certificate or similar examination of equivalent standard and it is known that the individual who has been given the appointment does not possess that minimum qualification. In making my official enquiries I was told that none of the candidates who possess the School Certificate was considered eligible for the job but this particular individual was subjected to an intelligence test and was considered eligible for the post. What is peculiar about the matter is that I have not been told that any of those candidates who possess the School Certificate was subjected to a test. As far as I know, the candidates were interviewed and told what the duties of the post would involve but nothing else. No other candidate was subjected to this test. That is my information and I think that those who are responsible for making this appointment should have subjected the holders of the School Certificate to this intelligence test as well. If that had been done I would have said that the holders of the School Certificate may have failed in this test. Whereas some applicants were interviewed in the country others were interviewed in Bridgetown. I do feel that the Administration needs to review this matter and I beg to second the motion for the adjournment made by my colleague.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I merely want to make a few observations on the matter. To begin with, the Government has nothing at all to do with this appointment. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you defending the Government?) This is a question for the Trustees of the Public Library; they are in charge of the Library and they were responsible for the appointment. Shortly after the appointment was made, two

or three people from St. Peter came to me protesting against the way in which it was made and saying that the person appointed was unpopular. A few days later a letter appeared in the Press making a similar protest. I discussed the matter with one of the Trustees of the Library and he told me that nobody who made any protest understood the advertisement, because the Trustees had been very careful in wording the advertisement which was sent to the Press. The advertisement called for somebody who possesses the School Certificate or similar qualification of equivalent standard. In other words, this Trustee told me that they were very careful not to say, as has been endeavoured to be emphasised by previous speakers, that the only qualification for holding this post was the possession of a School Certificate. I suppose the Trustees had in mind that they may not get the person whom they wanted or had already selected without the School Certificate and they were very careful to word the advertisement where the qualification is concerned so that any protest would have to be made on grounds outside the fact that the person who is appointed is not the holder of the School Certificate. It is highly possible that a case can be made out on other grounds, but at the same time I want the House to appreciate that the Trustees of the Library were shrewd or careful enough not to do what they are now being accused of doing. The honourable junior member for St. Peter said that, according to the advertisement, a certain qualification was required and that this person who has been appointed does not possess that qualification. What is the qualification?—The School Certificate or its equivalent and in so far as the equivalent is concerned, that is a matter which I presume the Trustees of the Library left to themselves to judge. That is what they did. I made it my business to discuss this matter with the Trustees; I took with me the letter which appeared in the "Advocate" along with the information which I had, and they said: "We did not say that we wanted a person who possesses the School Certificate alone." Faced with that I could not do anything in the matter. I repeat that it is highly possible for a case to be made out against the Trustees on other grounds, but I do say that the Trustees in wording the advertisement were very careful to give themselves some shelter behind it in case the eventual appointee did not meet with the approval of certain people. What I think the line of criticism should take is that in an advertisement of this sort the qualification should be specified. If it was stated in the advertisement that the qualification required was a School Certificate or London Matriculation or Bachelor of Commerce degree or some degree in Librarianship, then the Trustees could not have gone behind that; but if they set out that applicants should possess a School Certificate or a similar qualification, obviously anything is expected because it is left to the Trustees to appoint whoever they like and feel that in their opinion the appointee possesses a similar qualification to the School Certificate. Even if the Trustees intended to do something unreasonable and unfair, you still have to give them credit for covering their tracks before they did what they intended to do.

Mr. MAPP: I do not know if honourable members regard this matter as a laughing matter, but this is serious criticism of this appointment on the ground of principle. It is becoming a regular farce in this colony for officials to put out advertisements of this kind, apply all sorts of meanings to them and make rings around the Government. This principle is definitely wrong and there is no excuse

for it. I do not know if the honourable member who last spoke had in mind that the word "qualifications" appeared in a Resolution which we passed here—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I had nothing in mind. All I have done is to quote the advertisement and explain to the House that one of the Trustees of the Library has told me that from the way in which the advertisement was worded the Trustees were entitled to do what they have done.

Mr. MAPP: If the honourable member will give me a chance to speak he will see what I mean. The word "qualifications" appeared in the Addendum to a Resolution which we passed recently and I said at the time that I did not agree with the phraseology of the Addendum under which you can pay one salary for one sort of qualification and another salary for another sort of qualification without referring to what the qualifications are. Nowhere in this advertisement does the word "qualification" appear. I do not know if the honourable member read from a different newspaper.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not got a copy of the newspaper here, but in order to let the House know what I was talking about I asked the honourable junior member for St. Peter to read the advertisement, and in reading it he mentioned the words "School Certificate or similar qualification of equivalent standard." Now the honourable member says that the word "qualification" is not there.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable member said that the Trustees of the Library had in mind that the applicants should not only possess the School Certificate but also certain qualifications of an equivalent standard, and he is now saying that the advertisement contains the word "qualifications." As far as I know, the Clerk read from the same newspaper which I have here and the word "qualifications" is not used. The advertisement says: "The minimum educational standard which will be accepted is a pass in the Cambridge Local School Certificate or similar examination of equivalent standard."

Mr. CRAWFORD: I thought the honourable junior member for St. Peter had mentioned the word "qualification" when the word was really "examination."

Mr. MAPP: Has the honourable member risen on a point of order? I do not know for what reason he has risen. Obviously the Administration or whoever is responsible for this advertisement must know that persons who read the advertisement will be guided by what they read and they should state definitely what they have in mind and not get around the position by some back hand move, putting in all kinds of words in the advertisement. No one reading this advertisement could think that what was in the minds of those responsible was other than that they were only going to accept a person who has a Cambridge Local School Certificate or similar examination of equivalent standard. I do not mind how much you twist about these words, they could only mean one thing to any ordinary, intelligent person. Of course, to some people's minds the qualification for a post would be a light shade of colour. If you have the qualification but you are of a certain hue you cannot get the job; but if you are of a light hue and you have no qualification at all you are considered fit for the job. I think that for the future, these officials must be controlled. Nobody who has not got the Cambridge Local School Certificate or its equivalent and who had seen this advertisement would think of applying for this job no matter how badly he wanted a job. Nobody would think that he would only have to pass an intelligence test or something of that kind so as

to fill the job. It was not stated in the advertisement that an intelligence test would be applied. These appointments are limited to people holding the Cambridge School Certificate because that is the generally accepted educational standard and there are numbers of boys and girls who are up to the standard competing for jobs. It was with the object of getting an opportunity of filling jobs like this one that these people were given a secondary education. The principle on which this appointment was made is wrong; it is completely going out of the way so as to select somebody whom they had in mind. That is not fair. You have somebody in mind for this job and you limit the number of candidates who might apply for the job and you give it to the person whom you have in mind! Only a fool would stand for a thing like that; I do not see how the Administration could think that they could get away with a thing like this. At this stage of our political life such a happening is not only ridiculous, but it may lead to trouble. I do want to go any further into the question; I am sure that the members of the Government will draw to the attention of the proper Authorities that this appointment is not in order, and that they will take steps to see that the proper thing is done and make amends for such an infringement of what is just and right.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not concerned with the popularity or otherwise of the particular person who has been chosen permanently or otherwise for this post, but this is reprehensible behaviour on the part of any person in public life and especially on the part of people who are Trustees of the Public Library. No one would expect that they are there from association with criminal literature but from the possession of a breadth of vision and culture and a standard of education which would not presuppose any such trickery or smartness in the conduct of public affairs. It is fairly obvious to those who know the difference between the School Certificate and its equivalent—I do not claim to be one who knows it—that the Trustees knew quite well what they were putting in the advertisement having perhaps seen it in other Government advertisements. People were definitely precluded from applying for this post and I am informed that the intelligence test that was thought necessary to be applied to the person who has been temporarily chosen for the post, was taken to mean the equivalent of the Certificate which was asked for. Mr. Deputy Speaker, how can you, after putting out that advertisement, apply a test and say that it is the qualification which a person should have when he applied for the post? How can you do that and ask honest people to interpret your action as the action of an honest person? I am saying that the information which has been given to this House by the honourable senior member for St. Philip is not strictly correct. The information which I have is that the Trustees inserted this Notice and received applications but they could not appoint anybody to the post. The appointee has to be paid from the Public Treasury and therefore the Trustees had to recommend the person to the Administration, whatever that is, or the Government for final appointment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like the honourable member to say what information I have given the House which is incorrect.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not quoting the honourable member verbatim but he informed this House that the making of this appointment was solely in the hands of the Trustees of the Public Library and that it was nothing to do with the Government. There is a difference of opinion as between the Government and the Administration. The word "Ad-

ministration" was used and the honourable member perverted it to the word "Government." The honourable introducer of this motion used the word "Administration" and I was led to believe by the honourable senior member for St. Philip that the Trustees of the Public Library had the filling of this post solely in their hands.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I cannot sit here and allow the honourable member to say that I perverted anything. If the honourable member has a mind like a corkscrew that is not my fault; what I said was that after a protest was made to me I went to one of the Trustees and I was told what I have repeated here today. The impression I got from the Trustee with whom I spoke was that they were responsible for the appointment and that is what I said today. The Trustees were responsible for this appointment and they were very careful to word the advertisement in the way in which they worded it.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member attempted to put the best possible information before the House but he did it in a way to criticise the action of honourable members.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did nothing of the kind. I particularly said, whether the appointment was popular or not, that I was told that the Trustees safeguarded the position by wording the advertisement in the way in which they worded it. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member attempted to assist the House and failed with his lack of information and I will accept that. I should like to say that the people whose minds appear to the honourable member to be like corkscrews, are on the look out for the political corks which are bobbing up and down on the tide of hope. (Laughter). The honourable senior member for St. Philip insisted on the advertisement being read; he had it read and took down the words wrongly. He said that he knew everything about this advertisement, he had acted as an adviser to somebody in the matter and this is the position in which the honourable member finds himself. My information is that the Trustees of the Public Library took these candidates and sorted them out; they were persons who applied for this job who possessed the School Certificate and some without the Certificate or an equivalent, and some person who does not possess either the School Certificate or the equivalent was chosen and put through an intelligence test which the Trustees of the Library said was equivalent to the School Certificate. On the face of it, this is not a thing of which men in public life, men who are in charge of an educational institution and one of those institutions having the greatest influence in the community, should be guilty. If the Director of Education is connected with that state of affairs we can see where we will get this community if some notice is not taken of conduct of this sort. An advertisement coming from the Director of Education appeared in the newspapers stating that certain persons would be given lectures to qualify them as extra-mural teachers and the advertisements since this was being done with the consent and approval of the British Council and it would appear as if the British Council is in charge of the educational policy in the West Indies now. I intended to bring that matter to the notice of the House but I was told to leave it alone. I appeal to the honourable senior member for St. Peter that since this appointment has not actually been made—it is true that a two-year probationary period has been put in the Notice and the appointment is called an acting appointment—not to force this motion

to a division. Honourable members can express their opinion; the appointment is not final and it is therefore revocable and I would appeal to the honourable member on that score, the grievance having been aired, to withdraw the motion. I am hoping that in making this appeal it will not fall on deaf ears, and that this debate will be taken in such a way that a word of warning will be sufficient.

Mr. COX: I, too, want to voice my disapproval of this acting appointment. I regard this question as a very big one, involving a principle and not merely something having been done to people in any particular district. It is the principle about which we are speaking and I do not think that there could be anything more dishonourable than this particular appointment. As has been read out, the advertisement called for somebody who holds the School Certificate or similar examination of equivalent standard and persons who did not possess this qualification did not apply for the job; whereas people who had the necessary qualifications applied and were completely turned down. What we have to ask ourselves is this: how did this particular individual, in the face of the advertisement, know that she could apply for the job? After all, if you take up a newspaper and see that some person between the ages of 21 and 30 years is wanted to fill a job and you are only 19, you would not apply for that job; but this individual knows that she has not got the qualifications required in the advertisement, yet she can apply for this job and get it in the face of many others who have the qualification asked for! This is certainly not a clean act no matter what polished language we may use; we have to find out why this individual applied for this job. And then we hear that some of the applicants were examined in Speightstown while this particular individual was called to Bridgetown and examined among others by the Director of Education. This is a very bad case. We are here as the people's representatives to speak out against these injustices because we do not want them to exist. We have seen many of them. I know of an appointment which was made some time ago, an appointment which was protested against by the people concerned and even by members of this Government after it was drawn to their notice but nothing was done about it. It was done by the present Director of Education and I say that in my opinion, the former Director of Education would not have done that; I feel that he is far beyond a thing like that. I want to say in all seriousness that we have to put our feet down on these things. We cannot administrate but we can draw to the notice of the Administration and the individuals responsible that we are not satisfied when certain qualifications are required of people so as to be appointed to fill this job and then we find that an individual who has no qualifications whatsoever, except perhaps a charming smile, is appointed to fill it. I feel that each and every member of this House who realises his duty to the public should express his disapproval of this action in no uncertain terms. I was not going to speak on this question, but after hearing from the honourable junior member for St. Peter, the manoeuvring that went on—some candidates being examined in Speightstown and others being examined up here by the Director of Education and this individual being appointed—I was obliged to add my quota in protest of such action. Such a thing would mean that people who are starving and drawing their belts so as to educate their children are just wasting time; if people who did not take the trouble to qualify themselves can get jobs over the heads of others who have qualified themselves, where are

we? We must express our disapproval of action of this sort and I hope that the Administration will re-consider this appointment and pay attention to these bad cases in future.

VISITOR EJECTED FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—As a member of this Chamber I would like to draw your attention to the manner in which a visitor has walked into the Chamber. This is the second time it has happened this afternoon and I feel that, if nothing more, we have to preserve order in the Chamber. If we are going to reach the stage where people cannot respect the highest Legislative Chamber in the island, then God help us. I feel that Your Honour should use your authority as Deputy Speaker of this Assembly and make that visitor understand that this is the House of Assembly of Barbados (Cheers).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the honourable member spoke I was asking the Marshal to contact the Police and let the necessary action be taken in connection with the visitor. I do not see that that visitor could have been allowed to enter the Chamber the second time if the Police were functioning.

The visitor was ejected.

APPOINTMENT AT SPEIGHTSTOWN BRANCH LIBRARY DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will not detain the House much longer because I am going to withdraw the motion. Before doing so I want to say that I was a bit surprised to hear the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Philip. I was surprised because I am sure that the honourable member can appreciate what is an equivalent examination to the School Certificate. He is not so dense as not to know, from his years of experience, what is equivalent to the School Certificate. The honourable member knows that a pupil teacher obtains his certificates and reaches a stage where his education is equivalent to the School Certificate standard; and he knows that a boy or girl might fail to gain the School Certificate by failing in a compulsory subject—

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the honourable member had been listening to my remarks he would have heard me mention certain qualifications which are equivalent to the School Certificate. I mentioned the London Matriculation, the Bachelor of Commerce degree or a degree in Librarianship. I particularly said that, and this is the first time I am hearing that a pupil teacher's examination can be equivalent to the School Certificate.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: If the honourable member does not know that he can enquire from the Education Department. Boys and girls who have not sat the School Certificate can have education which equals the School Certificate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not pupil teachers.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: They sit the Intermediate and they go on to further examinations.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The equivalent to the School Certificate is not a pupil teacher's examination.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Anyone who has any knowledge of the teaching profession will realise that when a teacher obtains Certificate "A" he possesses the equivalent to the School Certificate. If the honourable member was paying any attention to his own statement he could not have said that the Trustees could get out of the terms of the advertisement. The wording of the advertisement is precise; I

read it from the beginning. The honourable member opened his remarks by saying that the Government has nothing to do with this matter; but I would like to point out that the Public Library Act says this:—

“The Governor is hereby authorised to appoint from time to time the following Officers who shall perform such duties as the Trustees shall appoint” and the Officers are set out. This appointment is not made until the Governor confirms it and that is the position. I said at the beginning that this is a matter for the Administration and that is why I brought it to the notice of the House. The principle is what I am driving at and with those remarks I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not propose to proceed with Order No. 1 standing in my name under Private Members' Business—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor *re* the prorogation of the House—inasmuch as there is a very thin House now and I should like to get a better expression of opinion in this matter. I am therefore asking leave to move the suspension of Rule 60 in order to deal with Order No. 86—the Address of which I gave notice on the 31st of August relating to the salaries to be paid the Official Reporters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave—

Mr. LEWIS: I am not opposing anything which merits any expeditious consideration and certainly not where people's salaries are concerned. However, I would like to draw to your Honour's attention that the honourable member was given the privilege at the last meeting of the House of having this Address made Order No. 1 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. The House agreed that this Address should be considered at this meeting and it is of such importance that I feel that the person who is making the arrangements for the holding of the General Elections should know where he is and how this House feels about an earlier date being fixed for the holding of these Elections.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before I asked for leave to move the question of the Rule I said that the House is fairly thin this afternoon, and the Address is a matter on which we should get a better expression of opinion from honourable members. There are only fifteen honourable members present in the House now and it is not fair to ask only fifteen members to express their opinion on the matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to move for the suspension of Rule 60 in order to deal with Order No. 86 as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business. If there is no objection, the honourable member will be granted leave. (After a pause) There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to make the motion.

Mr. TALMA: I rise merely to make this point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the motion on which the honourable member is speaking? The honourable senior member for St. Philip asked for leave to move the suspension of the Rule 60 in order to proceed with Order No. 86—

Mr. TALMA: I object to leave being granted the honourable member. That Order was on the Order Paper last Tuesday when the present Order No. 1—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have already declared that leave has been granted the honourable member to move the suspension of the Rule.

Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable senior member for St. Philip does not seem prepared to go on and—

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is not fair for the honourable member to put it in that way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave has been granted the honourable member to move the suspension of the Rule.

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

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS *re* SALARIES TO BE PAID THE OFFICIAL REPORTERS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the salaries to be paid the Official Reporters.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Address, of which I give notice on the 31st of August, is in connection with the salaries which we have agreed to pay to the Official Reporters. Honourable members have the text of the Address before them, which is in reply to the Message from His Excellency the Governor in which he referred to the same matter. This Address embodies the decision of the House in connection with the salaries of the Official Reporters which were approved a few meetings previously. The opinion was expressed that the Reporter of the Other Place should be paid a salary commensurate with that which is paid the Assistant Reporter of this House because his years of experience, his seniority, his qualifications and his eminence as a reporter entitle him to receive that salary. The Reporter of the Other Place is the most experienced Reporter in the colony and it is regrettable that the House decided by the very narrow margin which it did—I think the division was 11 to 9—to pay him even less than they were going to pay the Assistant Reporter of this branch of the Legislature. Be that as it may it is impossible now for us to interfere with that decision and I express my protest against the way in which the Reporter of the Other Place has been treated. I beg to move that this Address do now pass; it reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly beg to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 14/1948 relating to the salaries to be paid the Official Reporters.

2. The House beg to inform Your Excellency that the Debates Committee held two meetings concerning the above salaries. The first meeting was held on the 22nd March 1948, when the Hon. Dr. C. H. St. John, M.L.C., attended the meeting and agreed to the decision arrived at. At the second meeting held on the 15th day of June the only business done was to confirm the decision of the previous meeting.

3. Mr. Brancker then introduced into the House an Address embodying the suggestions arrived at on the 22nd day of March 1948, when the Honourable Dr. St. John was present.

4. At a meeting of the House on the 22nd day of June 1948, the above address was considered and amended to read as set forth in the Address already forwarded Your Excellency.

I sincerely hope that in the very near future, honourable members will see fit to mete out to the

Reporter of the Other Place the treatment to which, in all fairness, he is entitled.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not think that we should use the names of honourable members in Addresses and I therefore suggest that we substitute the words "The Deputy Speaker" for "Mr. Brancker" at the beginning of paragraph 3 of the Address. I would also like to enquire if by this Address any alteration is intended to what has previously been done. The honourable mover has expressed some disagreement with something which the House has done but I do not think that we would be in order to express disagreement with ourselves. I merely want to point out that this Address is not going to remedy the unfortunate position in which we have put ourselves. This is merely an Address with an explanation; we are explaining how certain things were done; if we want anything remedied we are not expressing that opinion here. I am not so *au fait* with the progress of the matter so as to offer any suggestion and I leave it the honourable mover to do so. This Address does not state anything on which the Head of the Administration can be guided if we want any alteration made and that is very regrettable in the circumstances.

• Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable mover accept the suggestion which has been made as regards paragraph 3 of the Address?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is so relatively unimportant that it does not matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member accepting the suggestion?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not object to it. Merely for the purpose of clarifying the matter in the minds of certain honourable members who might be confused about it, I should like to say that in June an Address was introduced setting out the salary of the Assistant Reporter of this House and the Reporter of the Other Place. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas made a motion that the Reporter of the Other Place be paid the same salary as the Assistant Report of this Place and that motion was not agreed to. The division was 11 to 9 as I have already mentioned. I just want to re-emphasize that the decision of the House was unfortunate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must be careful in referring to the action of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Address merely embodies the decision of the House on that occasion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this Address as amended do now pass. Honour-

able members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Philip to present this Address.

Mr CRAWFORD: As Your Honour pleases.

REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the House do now revert to Government Business for the purpose of dealing with Order No. 3.

Mr. TALMA seconded the motion which was agreed to.

SPECIAL RESOLUTION *re* SALARIES OF OFFICERS OF THE VOLUNTEER FORCE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Special Resolution under the provisions of section 6 of the Volunteer Act, 1909, as enacted by section 4 of the Volunteer (Amendment) Act, 1948 (1948-11).

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution is a Special Resolution relative to the salaries which are to be paid to certain Officers of the Volunteer Force. We all know that the Volunteer Force is now being revived and it is necessary to appoint a Staff Officer and Adjutant and an Instructor in order to carry on proper training and so on. The salaries proposed for these Officers are £880 and £500 per annum respectively. Without any more ado I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. BLACKMAN seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday, the 21st day of September, 1948, at twelve o'clock noon.