

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th May, 1953.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 p.m. today.

Present :

His Honour, Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. R. G. MAPP, Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mr. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:—

The Report of the Highway Commissioners of St. Joseph for the half year ending 31st March, 1953, on Tenantry Roads.

The Report of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Joseph for the half year ending 31st March, 1953.

The Report of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Philip for the half year ending 31st March, 1953.

The Report of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of Christ Church for the half year ending 31st March, 1953.

The Report of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of Christ Church on Tenantry Roads for the half year ending 31st March, 1953.

The Report of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Peter for the half year ending 31st March, 1953.

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following Message from the Other Place:

*The Legislative Council
To*

The Honourable The House Of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to refer to the Message from the Honourable House dated the 26th of February, 1952, appointing:—

Dr. H. G. Cummins,
Mr. W. A. Crawford,
Mr. F. C. Goddard,
Mr. O. T. Alder,
Mrs. E. E. Bourne; and
Mr. L. A. Williams,

to be members of a Joint Select Committee with members of the Legislative Council "to examine the question of over population in Barbados and to make recommendations for dealing with this problem" and to inform the Honourable House that the Legislative Council have today re-appointed the Honourables Dr. C. H. St. John, F. C. Hutson, V. C. Gale and Dr. A. S. Cato as members from the Legislative Council to serve on the joint Select Committee for the ensuing session.

2. The Legislative Council will be glad to learn at as early a date as possible the names of those members whom the Honourable House of Assembly proposes to appoint to serve on the Joint Select Committee for the ensuing session.

H. A. CUKE,
Senior Member Presiding.

Legislative Council Chamber,
5th May, 1953.

Mr. ALDER entered the House and took his seat.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

Mr. GODDARD: Before the business of the House is entered upon, I would like the House to pass a Resolution of Sympathy to the Deputy Leader of the House on the passing of his beloved wife to the Great Beyond during last week.

It was only a few weeks ago that we knew he had occasion to leave Barbados to take his wife to the United States to seek medical aid, and we all hoped and prayed that he would soon return with Mrs. Cummins in improved health. He came back last week with Mrs. Cummins and we felt that her health would be a great deal better by her visit. But this

was not to be so, and, sadly, I must express my personal sympathy to the Deputy Leader on the passing of his wife. I know, as well as other people who are closely related with their family, what intense grief can be caused after an association has been severed by death of some loved one as has been the fate of the genial doctor, the Deputy Leader of this House, with his wife after so many happy years of marriage.

Not only was the late Mrs. Cummins a beloved wife and mother, but she was a moving figure in the public life of Barbados. For years, she was one of the corner stones of the Girls' Industrial Union and a co-worker of a Baby Creche. Like most public-spirited Barbadians whose work is not publicised, but who do a lot of good work which the public does not know, Mrs. Cummins gave freely of her valuable time to social work in this community. I knew her personally and I also know of her work among the people of this community. I believe every honourable member in this House is well aware of the good work she has done.

I, therefore, move this Resolution of Sympathy:

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly hereby place on record their profound sympathy with their Deputy Leader, the Honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas, Dr. H. G. H. Cummins, and all members of his family, at the loss sustained them, as well as the inhabitants of the whole island, through the death of our said Deputy Leader's wife."

"Resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the family of the deceased."

In doing so, I would ask that the honourable members stand in their places when the Resolution is passed.

Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took their seats while Mr. GODDARD was speaking.

Mr. MAPP: In seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution, I am sure that I am expressing the sentiments of the entire House when I offer my deepest sympathy to my colleague and members of his family.

I am not going to say very much on an occasion like this, but I think it appropriate to say that the deceased lady was not only a good wife and mother, but one who deservingly received the respect of the entire community. Her passing is not only a loss to my colleague and his immediate family, but it is also a loss to the community itself. We all are well aware of the good work which she did, inasmuch as she was a leader of many social activities that took place in our midst and had set an example which was one to emulate. I am sure that many of her sex will follow in her footsteps in the years to come. Her influence was indeed strong and her life has been a shining light.

I take much pleasure in seconding this Resolution of sympathy.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know that this is not a time for speechmaking but I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without associating myself with this public expression of my sympathy to the honourable Deputy Leader of this House. I do so from the depth of my heart.

It is only last week that the Deputy Leader moved a similar expression of sympathy to his colleague and I believe that he was not then aware that a similar fate was near at hand for him, to prove in truth and fact of their partnership, not only as colleagues in politics but also in death of their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am prone to differ with a lot of people and on this occasion my views are different as to the esteem of the beloved wife of the honour-

able Deputy Leader of this House. I pay tribute not to the publicity which some truly deserve and get in the public Press, on a public platform, or the show which they might have made in public life; but although it might be embarrassing, I pay tribute to the late Mrs. Cummins, because I can say that there was a wife who was a shining example to many women. For many years I have watched and seen her influence both in public and private life and it can truly be said that Mrs. Cummins was not only a public figure of great repute, but as a wife she was one who made her home a place of happiness for her husband and her five children and that means more to any man than however distinguished a public figure his wife may be.

Somewhere in Holy Writ, I have read: "A good woman, her value is beyond riches." I think these are the words of Solomon, but I can find no more fitting words to express on this occasion my high estimation of the life of this great woman. As I have said already, I pay tribute not because of her distinguished public life, but because of what she put into her home in the bonds of marriage life and the raising of her family. It was a marriage life which many should emulate. I know her passing is a hard blow to the genial doctor, but I want to console him by saying that it is the way of all flesh.

I, too, beg to associate myself with the passing of this Resolution of Sympathy to the family of the deceased and the good doctor. It might also be taken to represent the feeling of the general public of Barbados. I hope that in years to come that the honourable Deputy Leader of this House and his relatives by this Resolution will be able to look back and say that the House of Assembly representing public opinion, paid this tribute not only from their lips but from the depths of their hearts.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—In supporting this Resolution of Sympathy, I should like to share in the sentiments which have been so appropriately expressed by the previous speakers. I would like to think that even in matters of this sort, this House represents the generality of opinion of this country.

There is no doubt about it that the deceased was held in the highest possible esteem by all sections in this community and those who had the pleasure of her personal acquaintance held her in the highest regard. It is therefore fitting that the Legislature should share in this spontaneous expression of public sympathy which has been made to her family on the occasion of her passing. I think, Sir, that of the late Mrs. Cummins, it can truly be said that she has fulfilled her niche in life. She has reared a family which reflects the greatest credit, not only on their father and herself, but to the community as a whole. She, too, had discharged her social obligations by exerting every endeavour to improve the wellbeing of her fellowmen, both men and women. It should not, therefore, be wondered why there has been such widespread expressions of regret at her passing. My own opinion of her philosophy and outlook, is that if she were fully conscious at the end, she would have died happily being fully conscious of the fact that her life had been well and fully lived.

Our thoughts go out today to her sorrowing relatives and friends. I sincerely hope that the widespread and spontaneous expressions of sympathy to them would go a long way towards relieving the burden of sorrow which they have been so unexpectedly called on to bear.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I do not want to increase the sadness of the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas, but I too must tender my expression of sympathy which has been extended by the previous speakers towards the passing of so unselfish a wife and so serviceable a woman to the

citizens of this community. Not only do I share the great sorrow which her family is at present sharing, but I also share the sorrow which is being felt by the numerous cultural organisations to which this lady had rendered yeoman service.

I feel that the late Mrs. Cummins has left an example of service not only to her immediate relatives but to the community in general through her social work throughout the whole island. I dare say that many have a full heart by her passing. I know that her place cannot be easily filled in the immediate future. I do hope that her example of life would be emulated by those who are left behind and from whom unstinted service is expected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I ask all honourable members to rise on the passing of this Resolution, I must associate myself with all the expressions of sincere sympathy which have been offered here to-day.

I would just like to console the honourable Dr. Cummins by saying that his load of sorrow can be regarded as being lighter as we all realise that it is his wife who has given many years of good service to the satisfaction of the public of Barbados.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, honourable members standing in their places.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I thank the honourable members for their lofty sentiments which they have expressed and the many kind things which they have said of my wife. I thank the public as a whole for the sympathy expressed. Thank you.

PAPERS LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph, I have the honour to lay on the Table of the House the following:—

The Colonial Estimates, 1953-54; and

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1953.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay the Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 28th February, 1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph, I give notice of the following Resolutions:—

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order 1953.

Resolution that with effect from the 1st of April, 1952, the salary scales payable to persons holding non-established offices as set out in Appendix B to Resolution No. 33/1949 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto;

Resolution that with effect from the 1st of April, 1952, the salary scales payable to unestablished and casual staff as set out in Appendix C to Resolution No. 33/1949 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto;

Resolution that with effect from the 1st of April 1952, the salary scales payable to Teachers in First and Second Grade Grant Aided Schools as set out in Appendix D to Resolution No. 33/1949 shall be varied as shown in the Schedule hereto.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to give notice of the following Resolution: Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the rate payable to the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on fancy molasses produced during the crop year 1952-53.

BILL

Dr. CUMMINS: On behalf of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph, I beg to give notice of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

Mr. BARROW entered the House and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker,—I give notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Acting Governor*

The House of Assembly begs to inform Your Excellency of its desire to commemorate the Coronation of Her Most Gracious Sovereign Queen Elizabeth II by the granting of Ten (10) scholarships for Boys and Girls born of Barbadian parents in straitened circumstances.

2. The House of Assembly further desires that these Coronation Scholarships should cover the island and therefore suggests that one each be tenable at the following Government Aided Schools:—

Harrison College, Lodge School, Combermere School, Coleridge-Parry, Alleyne School, Boys' Foundation, Queen's College, St. Michael's Girls', Alexandra and Foundation Girls'.

3. The House therefore requests Your Excellency to take immediate steps to implement this Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: With your approval, I would like to ask for leave to deal with this Address later this afternoon.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS: I beg to give notice of the following Address:

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Acting Governor*

The House of Assembly begs to inform Your Excellency of its desire to commemorate the Coronation of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II by the erection of a T.B. Sanatorium. The House of Assembly therefore requests Your Excellency to take immediate steps to implement the Address.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to give notice of my intention to enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. Is Government aware of the fact that there is discontent among the ranks of the following workers:—Bus Conductors, Drivers of Omnibuses, Chauffeurs, Hotel Workers, Domestic Workers etc., and that this discontent is due to the low scale of wages, long hours of work, conditions of service and the absence of any security of tenure?

2. If the answer is in the negative, will Government appoint a Committee to investigate the conditions mentioned above?

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government immediately proceed to set up a Wages Board for the purpose of remedying this unsatisfactory and undesirable state of affairs?

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

1. Is this Government fully aware of the treatment meted out to a former Head Teacher of Saint Ambrose Girls' School, who, sometime in the year 1949 after rendering 25 years' faithful and efficient service was advised to resign from her post on medical grounds; and who has not yet received a gratuity and/or reduced pension?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government please explain the cause of the delay, whereby the said Teacher has for the past three years and upwards, been deprived of her gratuity and/or pension for her twenty-five years' faithful and efficient service as aforesaid?

3. If the answer is in the negative, will Government please cause an immediate inquiry to be made into the matter, with a view to granting some measure of redress?

Mr. LEWIS: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

Will the Government please disclose the price paid for the property known as "The Garden" in Country Road and the expenses incurred in the purchase thereof?

Mr. WILLIAMS: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

1. How many boys applied for entry to the Lodge School, in the last three school years, 1950, 1951, and 1952?

2. Of these what percentage were Barbadians, and what percentage were foreigners?

3. Of those accepted, how many were Barbadians and how many were foreigners?

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. ALLDER: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

Is the Government aware of the threatened unemployment of hundreds of factory workers in the Sugar Industry due to the pending closing down of some, or all, of the small syrup plants around the island?

2. If the answer to the above is yes, will Government state why such a procedure is permitted to be carried out before the necessary safeguards are set up to protect the small syrup plants producers, who are willing to carry on, the Peasant Proprietors in getting their canes ground and the factory workers?

3. Will the Government cause an investigation to be carried out in the Sugar Industry of this Island before any further changes take place, with the view to safeguarding the interest of all concerned in this Industry, and the basic economy of the Island especially.

Mr. MAPP: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

1. Has the Government applied for assistance from any of the agencies of the United Nations Organisation?

2. If it has, what has been the result of such application?

3. In view of the assistance given certain other West Indian colonies under the United Nations Children's Fund, will the Government seek assistance from this fund if it has not yet done so?

Mr. BRYAN: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

1. Is Government aware that the owners of an area of land situate at St. Stephen's Hill and Cave Hill, containing by admeasurement 21½ acres, have decided to sell out the same area in lots in the open market?

2. Will Government consider the advisability of purchasing this land for the purpose of (a) securing the tenancy of the sixty-two families now occupying the same and (b) further developing the area so as to accommodate some of the hundreds of applicants for whom no house spots are available at the Pine and Bay Estates?

Mr. MAPP: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

1. In view of the Nigerian delegate's assurances to the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association recently held in Canada to the effect that Nigeria would welcome any immigrants from Barbados, will the Government take steps to find out how far Nigeria, or any other Commonwealth territory, will go in relieving this Island of its surplus population and in providing employment for some of its unemployed.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, be now read a first time.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to make a motion that a Committee to revise the Rules of the House be now appointed.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House, I appoint the following members to serve as such Committee:—The honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph (Mr. ADAMS), the honourable Senior Member for St. Lucy (Mr. BRANCKER), the honourable Junior Member for Christ Church (Mr. GODDARD), the honourable Senior Member for Christ Church (Mr. TALMA), the honourable Senior Member for St. Thomas (Mr. MAPP), the honourable Junior Member for St. James (Mr. E. K. WALCOTT), the honourable Senior member for St. Philip (Mr. CRAWFORD), the honourable Senior Member for St. George (Mr. BARROW).

FIRST ORDER OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider grants of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take charge of the Orders standing in the name of the honourable Senior Member for St. Joseph.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

WEST INDIAN STUDENTS' CENTRE, LONDON.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of \$5,040 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part II, Capital, for the purpose of the founding of a Cultural Centre in London for West Indian Students.

Honourable members will remember that in September 1951, in reply to a Message from the then Governor, the House expressed themselves agreeing in principle that there should be a Students' Union in London for West Indian students and that they were willing to share in the capital cost and annual recurrent cost on a 'student' basis.

This Government has been informed that a suitable property can now be acquired, the capital cost of which is £15,000 and the recurrent expenditure in the vicinity of £3,000 per annum. On the 'student' basis Barbados is called upon to subscribe 7% of the capital cost which amounts to \$5,040.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman—While this amount appears to be small, I cannot help reflecting on the past when this House agreed to certain sums of this sort, which appeared then to be small, but as the years went by, the recurrent expenditures have increased to a greater amount than have been expected.

While I agree with doing anything which may make our students comfortable overseas, yet I feel that this generosity should be comparable with the means of the colony to stand such expenditure. Honourable members are aware that we have just had an example of this increase in recurrent expenditure in our commitment with the University College of the West Indies. When that College was started, we were influenced with the scheme and we agreed to certain commitments, but recently, the charges have been increasing considerably and to a tune which has caused some fear in the minds of those who are interested. These charges are bearing very heavily on the finances of this colony.

It is clearly set out in the Addendum that this colony must bear 7% of the total cost and annual expenditure, but the question is whether the overall expenditure on this Centre in London is going to be increased in the future. I brought this up because some honourable members might have it in mind that this colony would only be called upon to subscribe \$1,008 annually to the recurrent expenditure on this Centre, but I want them to bear in mind that one does not know if the general overall expenditure will be going up by several hundreds percent as the years go by. We have agreed already to commit ourselves to this expenditure, but I would like to make the suggestion that the administration should recommend to those who are responsible for the setting up of this Centre to be very careful and do everything possible from increasing the running costs of this institution so as to prevent this Colony from forwarding more than what it is reasonably able to afford.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—Naturally, I have no more first hand information on this matter than what I have before me, but I marvel at the recommendation that the colonies should purchase this property under the conditions which appear in this Addendum. I imagine that somebody must have advised the Colonial Office in the matter, but I do not believe that any of us with our peculiar

knowledge of conditions in this colony with respect to the purchase of properties like this, would submit to the buying, acquiring and equipping of a £15,000 property merely on a 23½ years' lease of ground. It does not appear to me, judging from local conditions in this respect, that a 23½ years' lease is sufficiently long enough for the amount which is to be paid for this property. We think in terms, on an occasion like this, of a lease for 50 or 99 years. Perhaps, the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas can presumably more apprise us of the matter. He may be able to shed a little more information on this aspect of the issue. I repeat, we would not regard it as good business in Barbados to spend £15,000 on a property for a lease of ground on which it stands for 23½ years.

One wonders whether the owners refused to extend the lease, and if that be the case, it would be foolhardy to embark on the scheme. One also wonders on what grounds have the owners refused to grant a further lease. I do submit that members deserve a little more enlightenment on the question from the introducer of the resolution. The actual principle of the proposed expenditure has already been threshed out. One presumes that the establishment of the Centre will serve some useful purpose, but I think, we should be told in what comparative short time is this money needed and whether we should embark upon this scheme without a little more information as regards to the short term for the lease of the land.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not intend to rise and speak before I had heard the opinions of some of those honourable members who had the good fortune of studying in England. I shall only express my own opinion.

As I see it, this information has been received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies and it points to the fact that according to the leasehold system in England there is a property on some land for sale, for which there is 23½ years to go before the lease expires. That property can be bought for \$72,000 and according to the student basis our share would be \$5,040 of the capital cost and then we will have to pay \$1,008 annually. When the principle of this matter was before the House, I expressed my view and said then that it was regrettable that the address should come before the House for what was at the bottom of it was the racial prejudice which existed in the heart of London and which caused the English people to refuse to take negro students. The result was that the students had to go in hundreds to the Colonial Office and make an appeal for some such home. I also said that it was better to be in America and have Americans to deal with because you know where you stand with them. A line was drawn there and you did not have this continual hypocrisy going on. This is by the way.

Thinking in terms of real estate, what I want to know from the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas is this: Am I right in saying that the only logical interpretation on the second paragraph of the Addendum is that this \$72,000-property in England has a 23½ year lease to go and after this 23½ years have expired,—we buying the property,—we do not own any building at all but the owners of the land would own it. If that is so, it strikes me that this deal seems to be a racket because few people, even those in England with their system of leasehold purchase, would hardly attempt to spend £15,000 on a property with so short a lease. I hope that the honourable gentleman in charge of this Resolution would concede that I know something of the leasehold practice in England, I having read something on it. This deal does strike me as strange. I know that somebody would say that this property

is suitable and would say that it is all well and good because those boys must have some place to herd together, the reason being, I suppose, that in some instances, they are not wanted. Sometimes, I feel that it is rightly so, because some of them come back to their homeland very stupid; sometimes, I think some of them should pass back by way of America and stay there for a short while, because when they come back to the West Indies from there, they would come back with normal minds and not with that pompous feeling, as one that is literally walking in mid air.

I ask: "Why can't they find a place with a 99-year lease? Do you realise when I look around this Table, I see honourable members who have young sons and by the time that the son of the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter is ready to complete his studies in England this lease will be out and we will be called upon to get another suitable building? As I know it, when this place is sold to the West Indian students and the 23½ years lease is up, the owners of the land would say to the students: "The lease is up, you can take the building; we would not war about that." I think the legal luminaries of the Government will give me more enlightenment on this matter. If my interpretation on the second paragraph of this addendum is correct, then no argument I hear will make me support this resolution. I am perfectly willing, despite the criticisms I have made to give the resolution my support so as to give ease to those students in England, but I am not willing at the expense of this colony to agree to the payment of this money on this place when at the end of 23½ years it would be of no use to us; we would have to dig it down.

(A VOICE): Do you know that practically all the properties in London are on leasehold lands?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I know that practically the whole of London is leasehold land. I am however asking honourable members, although this property might be a suitable place for West Indian students, to ponder and think over this matter, bearing in mind that you are not buying a place for today and tomorrow, but that you want to buy a permanent abode for West Indian students.

I think, first of all, that the Colonial Office should know that we wish a permanent abode for our students. They must remember what buying a leasehold property means and they should not expect us to pay out £15,000 for a building with only a 23½-year lease. That is only buying a building for tomorrow. What will our children who go out to England think of us for so doing? It must be remembered that the owners of the land on which this building stands are not going to concede us any consideration after the lease expires. Paragraph 2 states: "what appears to be a suitable property can now be acquired on a 23½-year ground lease for use as a Centre. If the property proves to be suitable it is essential that an offer be made without delay if the premises are not to be lost. The total capital expenditure which would be involved in acquiring and equipping the property as a Student Centre is estimated at \$72,000." Therefore, Sir, I ask honourable members to exercise their judgment on this matter; to do what they would do in their own personal business. I ask any of you: If you wish your children to enjoy some of your benefits, would you pay £15,000 for a property with only 23½-year ground lease? I say, you would not. Then, surely ask the Colonial Office to find some more suitable place; some property with at least a 75-year lease. I therefore ask honourable members to be very truthful to themselves over this matter.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I take it that when this matter comes up before this House 23½ years from now that the honourable Senior Member for the City will not vote another cent for it. That is by the way.

I merely rise to say that I am, too, awaiting the explanation of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, but I would add that I know my remarks shall not be construed to mean that I feel that 23 years from now, the same number of students who leave the West Indies now to go to England for tuition would be going then, because I envisage the day — except in the case of students who want to go to Europe merely for the different atmosphere which a European university might bring to them — when we in the West Indies will be self-sufficient with universities for the training of our own students. I would resent any suggestion that a half century from now the West Indies will still be dependent on England for student training. I am making no application for any extended period in the future; I believe the West Indies by then should not be obligated to the United Kingdom to provide for this sort of training.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,— This is not a legal matter; this is a matter of common-sense. The time may appear to be short to the honourable senior member for the City, but he must remember that this is not a matter purely of real estate; it is a matter coupled with the chance of luck and the difference between buying a place and renting a place. I can tell the honourable member that the Regional Economic Committee has to rent suitable quarters in London for the establishment of a Trade Commissioner Service and he may not think so, but the rent that is charged for those quarters is something in the vicinity of £200 per month, and remember, it is only for a window or two upstairs. If you realise that this is the condition which exists in London, then you have to look at this matter in the circumstances that you do not regard it as a 23½-year leasehold property, but a 23½-year rental value of a property. If time is the object, then you should regard this purchase as good business. You must bear in mind that this is not a question of lease alone, but also a question of if you turn it down, whether you would be lucky enough to go in the London market and find a building of similar proportion which you can rent to work out in the long run at less cost than this leasehold value. While attending meetings of the R.E.C., it has been drawn to my attention by those who visit England that the English businessmen are asking abnormal rates for their business premises. Therefore, I ask honourable members to look at this matter in that light.

It must be regarded as urgent too. Anyone who goes to England would agree that West Indian students should have a centre of their own because in many instances some of our students are forced to live under very difficult circumstances. There is also a sense of pride when you can look on a centre of your own. It brings to you some sort of national outlook. It is true that the time for this lease to expire is short, but it also means that you have to look at this matter under present circumstances and while 23½ years is a short time for buying a leasehold property, the time is not so short, because in the next 23½ years, we do not know what would be the position.

I regard the cost of £15,000 for this building on ground leased for 23½ years as a good purchase. If that amount was paid in rent spread over that period, it would not be exorbitant.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, — What the honourable senior member for the City must realise is that not only is there a capitalist society in Barbados that exerts to its fullest its business dealings, but, unfortunately, there is the same capitalistic atmosphere in London as well. I may tell you Sir, that very early in my student days, I began to learn the facts of capitalistic organisations because I was on a committee which was responsible for investigating the possibilities of acquiring a centre for West Indian students and for West Indians as a whole. Our terms of reference, among other things, in those pre-federation days, were that the centre should be open to all West Indian visitors coming from this area to the United Kingdom on holiday, provided that there were room and accommodation for them; and that we should not restrict the facilities of the centre to the West Indian students who were pursuing their studies at English universities, but also to those West Indians who found themselves domiciled in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Chairman, after a considerable amount of investigation and after making a protest to several governmental departments in the United Kingdom we discovered that the best thing we could acquire of a building was a 14-year lease for £20,000. Therefore, I am rather happy to see that the Colonial Office has acquired a building and has gone one better than my committee by getting something at less cost.

(A VOICE): You do not know. The size of the building, its location and the area of land on which it stands is not stated.

Mr. BARROW: The first problem is that of acquiring a suitable property which would accommodate a reasonable amount of students. There is at present a minimum of 1,300 West Indian students in the United Kingdom. Barbados has about one-twelfth of that number, but at the time of which I speak, that is between six and seven years ago, when the committee first began its investigations, that number was three times that of today. At that time, there were nurses, technicians and other people from the West Indies in the United Kingdom that would have been eligible for accommodation in addition to those students who are normally resident in England pursuing their courses of study. When that Committee was investigating the matter, it could be said that it was putting the cart before the horse, because it was seeking to acquire a property without any means of paying for it. Yet, it can be said that the Committee of which I was a member, had no idea that the market which must have been more restricted now than it was then would have offered a better deal now from the point of view of purchasing. I must pay tribute to the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. James Griffiths, because it was due to his support that the Committee was able to convince some of the West Indian politicians that it was a necessary thing to have a West Indian Centre in England. Even at the high figure at which we could get a property then, he heartily approved of the scheme and did everything he could to convince West Indian Governments that it was a highly desirable thing. I can well remember remarking to the then Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. James Griffiths, that it was a rather deplorable feature of West Indian life that people inside the West Indian community are too prone to accept a recommendation sent through the Colonial Office rather than to think of

a problem for themselves and to support something which was in their own interest of national policy.

Sir, I will now answer some of the points raised by previous speakers.

The honourable senior member for the City praised himself, with some justification, in being a real estate gentleman. At this stage, I will tell that honourable member that he is wasting his time in Barbados if real estate dealing is as simple in England as he thinks. What is the position with regard to real estate in the metropolitan area of London? It is virtually impossible to purchase any property there freehold; therefore any purchase of property which is transacted in the metropolitan area is generally done on a leasehold basis. According to the explanatory note of this Resolution we are buying a property for \$72,000 with a ground lease amounting to 23½ years. This is the unexpired term of that property when it was originally bought. When you purchase the remainder of a term of ground lease of a property as we are doing now, you are in truth and in fact renting a property at what is considered the market rental value with security of tenure for 23½ years. You are not renting the ground. From my experience, judging from requirements, this building should contain three stories, if not five, because it should have residential accommodation for anything like 30 students alone. It may be more. I happen to know that some West Indian students in modest circumstances are paying £10 per month for their accommodation. I challenge the honourable senior member for the City to go to England and see if he can get a two-room flat for less than £10 a month. It is impossible. Therefore, if you work it out, taking away £3,000 for furniture and fittings, the rental value for the building would not be more than £500 per year. If this building is anything like the specifications which the Committee of which I was a member set forward in 1947, I think that we are fortunate in getting a property of that proportion at such a low price. I think it is remarkable in Coronation Year, of all times, that the British Ministry of Works or the Colonial Office should be so fortunate as to have placed at their disposal such a building for the moderate sum of £500 per year. That is all that this purchase means; that is, that we are paying our rent in advance for 23½ years.

I do not think that I need to convince honourable members, whether they have been fortunate to live in London for any period of time or to visit there for a short time, of the necessity of this centre. I think the only argument at this stage should be whether the Barbados Government is called upon to pay too high a proportion of the gross contribution to this Centre. Taking everything into consideration, I would like to assure the honourable senior member for the City that he still has a lot to learn in this matter. I think, Sir, that there was even an attempt by the honourable member to suggest that instead of purchasing this leasehold property, it would be better to rent it as it would be less costly to do so. By the way, I would like to inform this House that at present, in the centre of London, all the ground leases are expiring with the most palatial buildings standing on those grounds and the Duke of Westminster is finding himself one of the richest men in London as a result.

I think the honourable Senior Member for the City is condemning his own system which he has stated even on public platforms has given him that measure of independence, when he speaks against the terms of this purchase. All that we are doing is paying \$200 per month for a national centre so

as to make our presence felt in the heart of the Empire. I do not think \$200 a month is too high a price to pay for a building, probably four or five stories high and with accommodation for people like the honourable Senior Member for the City when he finds himself called upon to visit London. As far as I remember, every colonial unit has a national centre of their own in London with the exception of the West Indies. Sir, the West Indian students have to borrow the premises of the West African students which is, by the way, one of the most magnificent buildings in that part of London, one which any nation could be proud of as an embassy. The West Indian students have to borrow from the West Africans if they want to stage a cocktail party, a little social meeting or a little debate of their own. We have to beg our West African brothers to let us come in. We have prided ourselves as being far more advanced than they, yet they have a national centre of which any embassy would be proud, both for its location and its architecture, and we have no such thing.

Mr. Chairman, we need not investigate the rationality of race prejudice. This matter has nothing to do with race prejudice. The Canadians and the Australians have their own Centre in the United Kingdom, not only there, but all over the place. Despite the fact that the Australians and Canadians have their own national centre, they also have a student centre for Dominion students only. Colonial students cannot attend that centre.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that at long last, West Indians are likely to get a national centre of their own. I shall vote for this resolution. I counsel all honourable members to vote for it. I repeat it has nothing to do with race prejudice. Any man with some self-respect would like to have a place which he can call his own; a place where he can go and entertain his friends; a place where he can invite anyone to speak to him; a place where he can have free unequivocal social intercourse with other nationals or other West Indians.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the last time we discussed this matter in the House, the colour question was about to take precedent and some honourable members had to rise and move that the question be put. That meeting took place on the 25th September, 1951, and this is the Address we passed:—

**THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR**

"The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 28/1951, and to inform Your Excellency that the House agrees in principle with the proposal to establish a Club and Centre in London for West Indian Students and would be prepared to approve a contribution towards the capital and annual recurrent costs on a "student basis."

In my humble opinion, I think the capital cost should be raised on a "population" basis and the recurrent costs on the "student" basis. What I mean is that if the West Indies are buying property in London for a student centre, they should buy it on a "population" basis per island and run it on a "student" basis. However, it was stated on that occasion that we would have to contribute a little less if we bought it on this basis.

Sir, what I would like to draw to the attention of the House is that I would like a little information from the honourable Junior Member for St. Thomas on a Message which this House received

from the Acting Governor on the 14th April last just before the House prorogued.

The Message refers to this same question and is to the effect that "the Secretary of State for the Colonies has by recent telegram asked for authority to spend up to \$1,440, divided between the participating Governments, on "Advisory and Surveyor's Services on the preparation of an estimate and, if necessary, on the purchase of an option in connection with premises now being investigated. It goes on to say that on a 'student' basis this Government's share of the advance needed at once amounts to \$101, and unless the Honourable House of Assembly indicate that this course is not acceptable, His Excellency proposes to grant the necessary authority for the advance of that amount against the funds of this Government and to send down a special resolution on the re-opening of the Legislature." Sir, it seems to me that this House made a mistake in not replying to that Message stating that we approved of this action.

So far as this Resolution is concerned, we are now asked to do something which we have already agreed in principle to do. What I would like to ask is this: Why was it necessary to be so cautious about this matter? Can some more information be given? If the Government feels that if they say where the place is situated, others will get to know and that the price will go up; in that case, I would sympathise with them. It appears, as is briefly hinted by the Addendum, that this place is some part of London; probably, it was so briefly hinted for security measures. I think there are some members of this House who would feel in like manner, that is, that if the place was mentioned and the location given that we would be giving away the bargain. If it is not absolutely necessary to do so, then I feel that we should have a little more information. I feel that we can be told where is the situation of this building in London.

Mr. COX: If you sit for a minute, you will be given some more information.

Mr. LEWIS: I have no doubt that there are West Indian students who are interested in this Centre and are interested to see that we get it at a bargain. Not only will it be of good use for West Indian students but, perhaps, for West Indian visitors to London. Whether anybody exercises colour prejudice, West Indians should still have their own national centre. It really is a disgrace that we, West Indians, have no national centre for ourselves in London, therefore, if as this Resolution states that there appears to be a suitable place to be had for such a centre, let us buy it.

I do not know exactly what the circumstances are, Mr. Chairman, but I feel, as the honourable member has said that even if we pay this price now and have this building for 23½ years it would cost us more if we rented it for the same period. It is a pity we did not get it in 1951 because we could have rented it out for the Coronation now and got back a fair amount of our money. I am sure that my colleague would support a real business scheme of that sort. If he owned it he would have done that. Whatever the disadvantages are at the moment, let us hope that in 23½ years' time the English people will be sensible enough to elect a real Socialist Government so that there will be no danger of having a building on rented land in London.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I am not going to generate too much heat over this matter. It is a simple matter as I see it. As the honourable senior member for St. George has explained, there

is difficulty in getting places in London. All the building that goes on is leased for 99 years, 999 years etc. I remember that Americans buying a small piece of land in Portland Square some years ago, gave a million dollars for it just like that. Anyone who knows London well know that in these days those smaller countries which are sending legations to London find great difficulty in getting offices. The Ethiopian and Dominican Embassies had to move over across to the West End of London. Pakistan also had great difficulty in getting a building.

What the honourable senior member for the City fails to realise is that if we secure a lease for a longer period than 25 years the cost of that lease must go up. So we cannot say that 25 years is too short unless we realise that if the lease was for 50 years the cost would be at least twice as much. Apart from that, we may not be able to get a 50 year lease in the present market. As the honourable member also knows rents are worked out on the same basis as money put on loan. The question is how much can my money bring me etc. With our present interest rates and present market values, I do not think we could have done much better than we have done. I know for instance that the Nigerian Government was trying to set up a Trade Commissioner service in London and they had to take an office down Victoria over the Colonial Office, I do not think that the Government has been ill advised on this occasion, and I do not think they would have done better than they have done under the present market conditions.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I have some information which I can give to the committee. The size of the building is not stated. It is located at Princess Gate Kensington. It will provide a dining room, lounge, library, games room, committee and sitting room and wardens quarters, and accommodation for a dozen students will also be available, but the committee, including student representatives are strongly of the opinion that the money should be used in the first place for club facilities to all students, and that residential facilities which will increase the cost of running it should be considered later.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: At this stage in my life I am still willing to learn all I can about politics, real estate and everything else. If there is one thing I am glad about it is that my timely comments drew out some cheers for the honourable senior member for St. George—a thing that has not happened for a long time. I am willing to learn for this reason: I cannot speak *ex cathedra* like the honourable senior member for St. George on real estate. But I can speak on the principles of real estate in London. As far as I am concerned nothing that has been said has changed my opinion. From the time that I made my debut in real estate I have understood the principles of real estate in London and the U.S.A. and I know that the whole of London is nothing but lease hold. If I did not know the honourable member as well as I do I would come to the conclusion that his being over-zealous in getting this passed was because there was a likelihood of his being associated with a number of these so-called West Indian students in London. These things might sound strange coming from me; but I am going to pick to pieces all that the honourable senior member for St. George has said. Let us say that he erred when he talked about a five-storey building. In what part of London, on a 23½ year lease, could you get a five-storey building for £15,000? I will bet him now that this building is not above a three-storey building. Let us get the information. I also think that he made an error when

he talked about 30 resident students. On the last occasion that this matter was discussed it was pointed out that there was no question of resident students, and now that the honourable Deputy Leader has clarified the position he has made it worse. What has he told us? A dining room, lounge room, library, games room and accommodation for 12 students.

There is another thing: Both my colleague and the honourable senior member for St. George—I do not know if it is because of the Coronation Medals around—asked me not to raise the question of racial prejudice. But it is nothing but racial prejudice which has resulted in the need for this building. These are West Indian students in the City of London in this 20th Century. They are members of the Commonwealth, and this is what is happening. The honourable senior member for St. George went into the Royal Air Force, and he worked in the Colonial Office, and he is telling me that we need this building so that West Indian students can have a place to get together, meet people and talk etc. I have never been to England, but I will ask any sane man, “are you telling me that in this 20th Century students from the West Indies and from Africa for that matter, cannot mix with English people and absorb their way of life: What is it more than segregation?” I am surprised to hear that from the honourable senior member for St. George. We are being asked to put up a building which one would expect to find in Texas or Georgia. Mind you I am not saying that there is no racial prejudice in Barbados. It is all over the world as far as I can see. That is a matter of indifference to me. Sometimes it is a good thing for a lot of people. But you are asking West Indians to vote money to set up a centre in London because our students there cannot be absorbed. If you asked me to vote this to set up such a centre in Alabama, or Georgia I would say yes; because I know what the situation is down there. But in voting—

Dr. CUMMINS: We are not now discussing the principle of setting up this centre. That has been accepted long ago. We are discussing whether we should provide this money or not. I do not see that discussion about Alabama or Texas is relevant.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I can appreciate the fact that the honourable Deputy Leader is not up to the debate today. He knows I am not out of order. The honourable senior member for St. George has said that because of national pride West Indian students in London want this centre. Do you think he means a student like the son of the honourable junior member for St. James? I appreciate what he means. When I agreed to the principle of setting up this centre I did so with certain mental reservations, and I expressed certain views because I wanted the Colonial Office to know that there are still people in this colony with strong feelings on this matter. There are those of us who find ourselves in the position I am in. We are not professional men, and we must take the opportunity to let it be known that while we vote for setting up this centre in London we realise that you are not setting it up because of any national West Indian pride. We know the real reason behind it, regardless of the fact that many of these students return from England mere intellectual snobs.

I am very strong on this. I have never had the opportunity of taking part in university life—I hope that my children will be more fortunate—but there are a lot of people for whom we are voting this—this is not a place where 30 students can reside. This is a place where they can get together and read etc. I am not misquoting the honourable senior member for St. George. This is a place where they can read, and have games together etc. While we

vote for this to-day, those honourable members who have had an opportunity of living in England must realise that because they have had that opportunity they cannot expect to come back here and fool people like myself, people who think for themselves. I repeat, this centre is the result of West Indian students not being able to be absorbed into the general life of England. There are no two ways about it. We as West Indian people should let it be known in no uncertain terms by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that we do not appreciate this.

Now to deal with the Resolution itself, Mr. Chairman; as I have said I appreciate that London is nothing but leasehold. I do not know if I have made this clear already; but of course a 23½ year lease, working it out on the basis of \$250 a month rent is cheap for London. The honourable senior member for St. George referred to furniture. The honourable Deputy Leader has not told us that furniture is included in this. I do not think that furniture is included. If you are going to pay £15,000 to acquire a property on a 23½ year lease and it included furniture, do honourable members not think that the Deputy Leader would have told us? The Resolution says nothing about furniture. As I was saying, I consider this price cheap. I am in agreement with the honourable senior member for St. George there.

Now the point which I was making, and I think the honourable member for St. George misunderstood me, is that judging from the site which I understood the honourable member to say this building is on, and from what I heard the honourable junior member for St. Lucy say about that area, I am wondering if it would be really an economic proposition to have this property on a 23½ year lease, which as the honourable member points out, is really rent, or whether it would not be better business to try to get a property on a longer lease. Of course I realise that as night follows day you will have to spend more money; but from a long term point of view the cost would be less. It is nothing more than rent, and I think it is a matter of commonsense that if you had it over a longer period it is bound to work out cheaper in the long run.

I did not intend that the debate should have taken this turn, and I quite appreciate the support that the Government will get with this Resolution. During the debate on this matter on the last occasion I made the points which I have made to-day. I do not see why I should refuse to vote for it, but what I do not like is the idea of a 23½ year lease for £15,000. I would have preferred, for the reason I have given, for the Government to have come with a Resolution for this same building to be acquired on a 40-year lease. If that had been done the rental value would not have worked out at \$250 a month. It strikes me that every effort should be made to get something under better terms and conditions.

I finally say this: With all the arguments that have been used by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy it must be appreciated that although he and the honourable senior member for St. George are recent arrivals in Barbados in the sense that they have recently returned from England, from the old country, from the Mother Country, when you leave the House and you are really talking seriously—not when you are making a speech here for the benefit of the Colonial Office—you know as well as I do that the sole reason for coming to the House of Assembly, for going to Trinidad and Jamaica etc. to get money to set up a centre where West Indian students can get together, and to which they can bring their friends and meet with national pride, is merely because West Indian people have never

risen up and said, "this is an absolute line drawn." Deep in the mind of the honourable member for Christ Church he agrees with what I am saying. When he tells me not to talk about Alabama he knows that what I am saying is true. Someone has got to say it. My son or grandson may go to England. Why would you not hear of such a centre in Washington or New York? Because you have a Harlem in America. If you had a Harlem in London there would be no need for this centre. There are times when you do not worry to raise the question of race. But when it is a question of a broad national issue like this you must stand shoulder to shoulder.

I am convinced that the only reason for setting up a centre like this is because West Indian students cannot be absorbed. Imagine having to set up a centre for the son of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew! He would not have to go. It is a shame that we have to vote this money at all. But I will vote for it. I will vote for it because there is no alternative. I believe that we should have been able to do better from the economic point of view. My criticisms have been in good faith. I heard something mentioned about 100 students. The tendency is for this—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am addressing the Chair. I want this to be understood, and I know that you too, would like it to be understood, Mr. Chairman, that we are voting for this with very strong feelings. The honourable senior member for St. George says that there are 100 West Indian students in London. Barbadians who go to England come back here with a sense of false pride, stupid, snobbish false pride. Eventually they have to come back to earth here, and these are the things which we do for their assistance. What I am saying may apply to my child or anyone else's child. I know, Mr. Chairman, that you, like many of us hate to see them when they come back here playing what is generally called the fool.

Dr. CUMMINS: There is no question of segregation in this matter. This is a colonial centre and a club for West Indian students. I have been a student in Canada and I have mixed with the Canadian people. There we had students from Grenada, British Guiana and all over the West Indies. Although we mixed with the Canadian people we felt that there was a time when we as West Indians should meet with each other. Eventually such a club was formed. West Indians got together once or twice a week and enjoyed themselves as West Indians. It was not that we did not want to absorb Canadian culture.

Now, Sir, there is a young lady from Bank Hall who went to England the other day. The honourable senior member for the City knows her. In writing to me the other day she told me she went to the Colonial Hostel where Colonial students can go and have temporary residence. She mentioned to me the names of some Barbadian students whom she met at this place, and among them was the name of the son of the honourable junior member for St. James. That was a club that he could visit, and he visited it.

As I have already said, this centre for which the House is being asked to vote this money will have a dining room, lounge, etc. and the committee including student representatives, are strongly of the opinion that club facilities should be made available to the students, while residential accommodation which will increase the cost should be considered later. Students of all nationalities in London have their clubs and centres, and West Indians in general feel that they too should have their own club. The

idea is not to segregate them but to provide them with a club and centre of their own. I must say that a little while ago two men told me that they came from Birmingham University to London and they found difficulty in getting a place to stay. Provision of a club of this sort will remedy such a situation.

Mr. BARROW: I must apologise for rising to my feet again especially after the honourable Deputy Leader has spoken. But there were one or two misrepresentations made, and I feel myself constrained to correct the honourable member who made them. I said that there are approximately 1,300 West Indian students in England, of whom approximately 100 are Barbadians. I believe a more accurate figure would be 91. As regards the question of accommodation I would like to make it clear that what I said regarding residential accommodation for 30 students was what was envisaged five or six years ago when the number of West Indian students in England was about three times what it is to-day. The idea of having residential facilities is that students who arrive at 3 o'clock in the morning at Victoria Station or Kings Cross straight from Barbados or Trinidad would be able to have someone to meet them and to take them to a place where they will feel at home, until they find their feet.

I am rather surprised—I think that the students in England must be trying to appease people like the honourable senior member for the City—that students are suggesting now that they would be even willing to discard the idea of residential accommodation in order to reduce the cost. It seems to me that they are suggesting that the centre be used for recreational purposes only on the ground that people like the honourable senior member for the City might want to indulge in a little cheeseparing in different legislatures throughout the area. I have always strongly upheld the idea of having residential facilities for people who come suddenly into London, and also for those who live in the provinces and who come to London for examination purposes or otherwise and who might be unable to find suitable accommodation. There are students who in normal circumstances live in colleges or private boarding houses. The idea of establishing a West Indian centre is not to herd all the West Indians into one corral, for they have plenty opportunity for intercourse with the students from other parts of the world, and especially with English students within the universities themselves or at living quarters, whether in college or at private boarding houses. But if we are on the eve of becoming a West Indian nation it is right that we should try to get West Indian students together so that they can get to know each other better. The idea, I repeat, is not to forgather all West Indian students into one ghetto and make them reside there.

That is why emphasis has been put on the cultural rather than the residential aspect of this question. I think that at this stage we should make our views known that there should be residential accommodation for students coming into the U.K. suddenly. As far as I can understand from what the introducer of this Resolution has said, the Colonial Office envisages that the centre will have normal residential accommodation for a dozen students, and that in an emergency it would be able to put up 30 to 36 students. In Coronation week it might well put up 60.

I think that there is a certain amount of confusion on the other side of the table as to the purpose which this club is to serve. That is why I rose to correct the misrepresentations that had been made. The honourable senior member for the City has agreed with me that \$250 or even \$260 a month would not

be exorbitant. I understand that Princess Gate is an ideal site. To go down in Park Lane would be obviously incurring unnecessary and unwise expenditure. To go three quarters of a mile further to Princess Gate is a wise act because there are two or three student hostels like Hans Crescent in the immediate vicinity. It is also near a big tube station so transportation would not be difficult.

As far as the £15,000 is concerned, if the honourable member had read the addendum he would have seen it stated that the total capital expenditure which would be involved in acquiring and equipping the property as a Student Centre is estimated at \$72,000. On a "student" basis, this Colony's share of the cost will be 7% or \$5,040. The annually recurrent cost of maintaining the Centre is estimated at \$14,400 of which Barbados is requested to contribute \$1,008 annually.

Therefore furniture and other fittings must necessarily be included in this Resolution. It is true that sometimes things are brought down to the House under Capital Expenditure when they should be under recurrent, but taking the words of the Addendum in their normal meaning the price of the furniture must come out of the \$72,000. It is fantastic to think otherwise.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—I rise to support the passing of this Resolution. I hardly expected such a long debate to have taken place on a matter of such urgent necessity. Now that the principle of Federation has been agreed upon and the idea of West Indians getting to know each other, not only in the islands, but in any part of the world where they meet, one can realise the grave necessity of having this entire set up as early as possible.

In my opinion the period of 23½ years mentioned is ample in the circumstances; and we can only hope that by the time that the period of the lease has expired the Federated West Indies will be able to boast not only a little building in some back street, but a proper embassy in London which will offer facilities for West Indian students. But at the moment the urgent necessity is to release this money so as to provide this centre or club in London for West Indian students who when they are entertained at other places have no place at which they can reciprocate. Those are simple points.

As regards the question of how much it will cost I regard that as a drop in the ocean when we consider the benefits to be derived. At a time like this when the West Indies are coming into their own as a nation, West Indian students in London need some place where they can meet together, and also where they can reciprocate invitations to other people's centres and clubs, and I feel that \$5,000 when compared with \$50,000 spent in other directions for no useful purpose should be passed without wasting time.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—For an expenditure of \$15,000 the centre will only be able to accommodate 12 students.

Dr. CUMMINS: I have said that it will be primarily a club house, but provision may be provided for 12 students for temporary residential purposes.

Mr. ALLDER: I think that we are spoon-feeding these couple of students in England too much. We spend a lot of money and give them free scholarships and we lend their parents money to educate them. Now every possible vestige of difficulty must be removed from their path at our expense. While we are trying to give them every possible convenience there are school latrines in this colony which need replacements.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the honourable member not to stray away from the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: I am thinking of avenues in which an amount like this could be well spent. I know of some schools in the country areas with their latrines in bad shape. I think we have been overdoing this spoon feeding for too long, and what is more, you are only preparing a couple of snobs to come back here and milk the community with high fees. They certainly do not contribute any reasonable service to the community after this money is spent on them.

The next point is that I take it the centre will have 12 rooms and there will be 12 resident students in these rooms. Those 12 rooms will have to be shared among all the students from all the colonies, and they are more than 12 colonies with students in England. Has the honourable Deputy Leader any guarantee that there will be reservations at all times for Barbadian students? If so, for how many? I have been told, Sir, that although this place is going to be subsidised by us the expense is still high because you have to pay 10/- a day for bed and breakfast. This whole situation is very vague, and no particular information has been given. I take it that if you assist in the purchase of a building of this sort you automatically become a shareholder or partner in the building, and therefore its dimensions should be given to us as well as its capacity for accommodation so that we can make up our minds clearly whether we are willing to become a shareholder.

We have been told that this building is about to be sold on a 23½ year lease, and that it will cost \$72,000, while another \$14,440 is to be spent and then there will be recurrent expenditure of \$1,008. This is a small amount, it has been said, but as soon we commit ourselves to it we will be told that the overhead charges are going up, and we must make up our minds to forward more money every year. We have to contribute towards the University College of the West Indies. We are paying nearly as much to keep that college going as we spend on our education in the island. We have heard that there are about 91 Barbadian students in England. Look in the Estimates and see the amount that we spend on them and compare it with the amount we spend to educate the population in this island and you will find that you are overdoing it as far as these individuals are concerned. Then these individuals turn around and are of little use to us in the end. I think that we give them a false idea of their true obligation to the community. Some line should be drawn. I think it would be adding to their education if you allowed them to experience if only a small percentage of hardship.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried *nem con.*

RECURRENT EXPENDITURE FOR CENTRE

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is as follows:—

Resolved that the sum of one thousand and eight dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953—54, No. 3 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, 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.

As honourable members will see, this Resolution seeks to provide for the annual recurrent ex-

penditure of the Student Centre. I move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

The question was put and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox in each case the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. Cox, the House adjourned for half an hour.

On the re-assembling: ✕ ✕ ✕

On the order being called for Dr. CUMMINS to move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolved that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 2 Order of April, 1953, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, and that the Legislative Council be asked 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.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution is a very simple one. As honourable members know, the Entertainment Tax has to be collected by the Income Tax Department. The Commissioner of Income Tax says that in order to collect this tax he must have assistance, and he considers that a senior man would fill the bill. This Resolution is for the purpose of amending the Order so that this senior officer can be provided.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I know that some honourable members will say that there is nothing in this. I am sorry if I misunderstand the situation; but when it was proposed to make the Income Tax Department responsible for the collection of Entertainment Tax I wonder if it was not then thought that it would be necessary to have this additional staff. On many occasions we have passed Acts here creating more work for some departments — the Audit Department for example — and it did not mean that you had to provide that department with an additional clerk. I would have thought that the question of whether or not an additional officer would be needed would have been gone into at the same time that Government was contemplating the collection of the Entertainment Tax. All that the Memorandum on the Five Year Plan says — Paragraph 36 — is that it is intended to introduce Entertainment Tax in Barbados as soon as possible, etc. I know that there are regulations and that the Bill says it is to be collected by the Income Tax Department. But what strikes me as peculiar about this Order is that it shall be deemed to have come into operation as from the 1st of April, 1953. I would like to know if this officer has been appointed from the beginning of this financial year. If the officer has not been so appointed or up-graded, why bring the Order into operation as from the 1st of April, 1953? Do you mean to tell me that after the length of time that the Five Year Plan was considered the Government waits until the beginning of May to come to tell us that this should be done from the 1st of April? Has this officer been appointed before this Order came to the House, or are you saying that someone who is doing the work now should be up-graded? We are creating an office and we are spending money out of the Treasury in the House itself.

Honourable members do not seem to accept the suggestion that the House should go into committee on things of this sort. In the House you may speak on a matter and you may get an explanation which does not satisfy you, and money is coming out of the Treasury at the same time. Looking at the Civil Establishment Order of 1949 as a layman, I think it rather doubtful whether you can back-date any of these orders. This is not the first time that such a thing has been done, but I would like to know whether this officer has been performing these duties for a month before this House knows anything about it. This is not a case of giving someone an increase in salary and back-dating it. This is a case of creating a new office. Are you going to back-date the creation of an office? These things should only have effect when both Houses of the Legislature have agreed to them. I am merely drawing these things to the attention of honourable members.

It seems to me that the greatest amount of work done as far as the Entertainment Tax is concerned must have been done at the Cricket Matches that were played here before the 1st of April. Now we find that we are creating a post and back-dating the creation of it. What we are really saying here tonight, unless there is another explanation of it, is that the post has been created and there is no necessity to tell the House anything about it. At any other time in the future you can bring in an order and back-date it. Government got the Entertainment Act through in time to collect money off the cricket matches. The Act has been in existence a sufficiently long time that this appointment could have been decided on and put into effect probably before the 1st of April. It does not seem right to me. It seems to me that the Legislature is being treated in this way merely because they do not protest against it. It is not fair to the Legislature that this kind of thing should be done.

I agree that if the office has been created already it is an act of justice to pay salary from the date that it was put into effect. But why create an office and then come in May and ask that it be back-dated from the 1st of April? If you had someone in the post from the 1st of April why was the Legislature not told anything about it? This is making use of legislation to do as you like and ignore the Legislature. I say that this needs an explanation. I hope that the Government's explanation will be a satisfying one.

Government itself has told us that a certain amount of re-organisation was necessary in the Income Tax Department. In the Estimates we have voted money for that re-organisation. Do you mean to tell me that because you have a tax that is going to bring you in additional money and you have it initiated already you are going to create another Civil Servant? Cannot someone with the necessary seniority and ability be seconded to do this work? I suppose there is an explanation, but as I will not have the opportunity of speaking again, because the House does not accept the idea of going into committee on these things, I have had to speak at length on it.

There is another point. The House was told that the reason for changing these various Acts and the Civil Establishment Act was that whenever you wanted to do something the Act had to be signed by the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the President of the Other Place, the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The present system on the other hand was an easy manner for facilitating matters. But now you find a situation like this. The Legislature is not treated with courtesy. We ourselves are to be blamed.

Dr. CUMMINS: I happened to be a member of the committee that dealt with this additional taxation, and the Commissioner of Income Tax told us there and then that he would have to have additional staff, but inasmuch as the Financial Year was almost ended he would try to make out with the present staff until the 31st of March. He said he was proposing to do the work which would arise, up to and including the 31st of March; but that it was a fact that the work would impose substantial additional duties particularly in the supervision of small entertainments. "In my view," the Commissioner said, "the additional work will require a total increase equal to the work of one officer. This will include work arising from the collection of the tax."

Government therefore knew that we would have to ask for additional staff. The remarks of the Commissioner were endorsed by the Financial Secretary who said that if the tax had been confined to cinemas this additional expenditure would not be necessary. But it was contended, and with good reason, that it would not be fair to tax one kind of entertainment only, and that Government should set up machinery for the maximum collection. . . . The officer is not yet appointed. The Commissioner said he would try to carry on until the end of the Financial Year, but from that time he would need assistance.

Mr. LEWIS: I never questioned the necessity for the additional staff.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and carried *nem. con.*

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE WATER RATES REGULATIONS

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—With the permission of the House I will ask leave to take Order No. 5 as the next order.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—This resolution, as honourable members will see from the Waterworks (General) Regulations, 1953, which presumably, they have in their hands, seeks to increase the rates paid at present to the Waterworks Department. The resolution reads as follows: "Resolved that the House of Assembly sanction the Regulations, entitled the Waterworks (General) Regulations, 1953, made by the Executive Committee under Section 68 of the Waterworks Act, 1895 (1895-1)."

I think honourable members will remember, Sir, when the Five-Year Plan was before the House as well as from the Beasley Report, that the Government acquainted the House of its intention to increase the water rates of this island. I should like to say from the outset, Mr. Speaker, that since 1921, generally speaking, that the water rates have not been changed. It is true, that as a result of the increased value of properties which brings in increased taxation for parochial authorities, the water rates in some cases have been stepped up a little.

As honourable members are aware, Mr. Speaker, the Waterworks Department is not a paying concern. I know we can never hope to make it a paying concern because it provides a necessary service for the whole island. Its expenditure at present is estimated at \$727,521, whereas the revenue is only \$313,355, so that you will see that there is a deficit of \$414,166 during this 1953-54 year.

I know that it would appear as if Government is imposing a hardship, more particularly since water is not available as flowingly as many of us would like, but it is really due to no fault of Government; it is the result of the drought which is existing at present.

Honourable members are well aware that Government in its Five-Year Plan had among other means of collecting additional revenue, the raising of water rates so as to collect \$50,000, but this effort has been thwarted by the very fact that the Electric Company since then has charged an increased rate which pushes an additional expenditure by Government on electricity to \$45,000 per annum. Therefore, it can be seen that while Government was aiming to get this \$50,000 to carry out or assist in the carrying out of our programme of re-organisation and extension of the water service, that money is now necessary for paying the additional rates imposed by the Electric Company.

As honourable members will remember, Professor Beasley in his report with reference to water rates states:—(See page 78, paragraph 57) "WATER 'RATES AND RENTS' (\$181 thousand). These are 'a set-off against departmental expenditure of \$505 thousand, that is to say payments for water cover '36 per cent of the cost of the waterworks and 64 per cent is given free. During the last five years before 'the war receipts, which then averaged just over \$100 thousand, covered 76 per cent of expenditure and 'only 24 per cent was given free, and in still earlier 'days the Waterworks was a profit making concern. 'There has no doubt been a steady increase in the 'amount of water delivered at public standpipes, but 'the figures indicate that private and industrial consumers are now being fairly heavily subsidised. It 'is suggested that a far more satisfactory picture of 'the working of this enterprise would be obtained if 'its accounts, like those of the Post Office, were transferred to annexed estimates. The Waterworks Department would credit itself with revenue at commercial rates for water delivered at standpipes, for 'which service a specific vote would be passed annually by the legislature from an appropriately named 'head of the ordinary budget. Whether or not this 'procedure is introduced, it is suggested that consideration will again have to be given to raising the 'water rates, so as to eliminate the element of subsidy to paying consumers. An increase of \$50 thousand is credited under this head, bringing receipts 'up to about 46 per cent of waterworks expenditure."

As I was saying, even with this increase, as honourable members will see, the amount of \$50,000 which will be derived from it will only bring the receipts up to about 46 per cent. of the expenditure. This increase will cause persons who pay on the smaller rates to pay approximately about one cent per day.

I anticipate criticisms because it will be said that we are raising water rates and this and that, but I think, Sir, in this case, the criticisms cannot be justified, in that the Government has no other alternative than to pay the Electric Company for what that company charges for the supply of electricity. Government was under the impression some time ago, when the Electric Company made it known that they were purchasing two turbine engines that the unit cost of electricity would be reduced because those engines were supposed to be steam engines and would cost less to operate, but Government was informed afterwards that the Electric Company decided to buy diesel engines in which case the operating costs will be higher than what we thought. If honourable members will bear with me for a few minutes, I will quote a few figures to show the trend of increase in the cost of electricity at the pumping stations since 1943. In 1943, the electric unit cost was 2.3 cents and fuel oil was 33.10 cents. I will leave out the figures of the years between 1943 and 1950. In 1950 the electric unit went to 3.1 cents and the fuel oil cost was 42.17 cents. In 1951, electricity was

3.12 cents and fuel oil 46.37. In 1952 electricity was 3.12 cents and fuel oil 45.64 cents. This year the electric unit cost is 4.25 cents; the figure for fuel oil is not yet to hand; so that honourable members will see from those figures that the percentage increase so far as electricity is concerned from 1943 to 1953 is 84.78 percent, and the increase in the cost of fuel oil is 37.88 per cent. With regard to the increase in the cost of materials, half inch pipe has gone up from \$1.08 to \$2.08; that is an increase of 73 per cent; half-inch stop cock from 96 cents to \$2.38 which is 147.9 percent; the six-inch cast iron pipe which was \$6.96 per 9-ft. length is now \$18.00, an increase of 158 percent; the three-quarter meters which were \$13.30 each are now \$35.69 which is an increase of 168.3 per cent; the half-inch lead pipe which was 12 cents per pound is now 46 cents per pound which is an increase of 283 per cent. I will not quote any more items, but this increase in cost of materials goes on throughout the entire list, so that members will realise from quotations the trend of increases from time to time.

As I have said already, the maximum rate for water is \$5.00 per annum which is just over one cent per day for the supply of water. In the Five-Year Plan, Mr. Speaker, page 20, it states with regard to Water Supplies:—

"The programme is a continuation of the re-organisation and improvement of the water supplies of the Island. The Department's estimate of full requirements was an additional \$1,767,752 including the amounts provided in the Capital Estimates 1952-53, Head IV—\$347,000 and Head VIII—\$12,000 and \$198,952 in the Supplementary Estimates 1952-53, No. 19."

"The amount of \$1,083,000 included for organisation should be sufficient to meet requirements in the five-year period; and the \$200,000 included for additional mains and standposts would provide about 50 standposts. The amount of \$17,000 for the development of the water resources is for the continuation of the drilling scheme started with funds provided under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act."

"A proper water supply for District 'F' Police Station is essential. The capital cost is estimated at \$12,100."

Sir, as I have said, honourable members will see that there has been a very substantial increase in the expenditure of the Waterworks Department. It is the responsibility of the Government as well as its intention to push water in every nook and cranny of this island so that it would be available to the many inhabitants who now suffer through lack of a water supply in their particular areas. That being the case, it is also the duty of the Government to collect rates from paying consumers and increase them, if necessary, to provide water for others who at present are not in a position to provide for themselves. With these remarks, the information and explanation, I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I suppose, Mr. SPEAKER, the question of water is one which has engaged the attention of every aspirant of political honours in this Chamber. As far back as 1929, every person that offered himself for political honours canvassed with the promise to improve the water situation.

This resolution to-day seeks to increase the rates charged for water. I do not think it is necessary for me to make a fiery speech or to play to the gallery. The Government's intention to increase water rates has been stated in the Five Year Plan. We know that Government had to raise additional revenue as it was finding it impossible to

carry out these social improvements without so doing. I would say also, that if people get a better water supply and better facilities, they must pay for it. I see honourable members on the other side of the Table smiling when I say so, but I think I have gained reputation for calling a spade a spade.

One of the things of this resolution which I must draw to the attention of the Government, and I am sure that they would realise that it is true, is that this is another occasion where this Socialist or Labour Government has fallen into the trap of merely copying and bringing before this House enactments and regulations which were made by former Governments, but which in the course of time have become outmoded. If you read the regulations which this resolution seeks to approve, can you imagine more of a Tory principle in the drawing up of regulations than these? I wonder if the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael has read these regulations. Let me draw Regulation 2 to his notice. It reads as follows:—"The rates to be charged for the 'supply of water for domestic purposes shall, except where the supply is by meter, be calculated on the net annual value assessed by the Vestry for parochial taxation. . . .'" Mr. Speaker, this is the most inequitable way for laying water rates that you can ever think. And for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker that this method is the one which has been in practice many years ago, but which owing to the diverse valuations of properties by the various Vestries makes it impossible to be universal. The honourable Senior Member for St. James, is another Vestryman in this Chamber, representing the constituency of St. James—one of their party members—Let them ask him and he will tell them that he cannot vote for that regulation as it stands. If you know the system of valuation by vestries, you will realise that if you own a house in St. James with two water taps in it, you will pay more for water rates than you would pay at Union Hall, St. Michael, which contains five taps. That is no joke. I challenge any honourable member to deny that statement. Is that right? I say again that this is the most unfair method of laying water rates; all because you are perpetuating a system of many years ago which is outmoded; you are coming in here purely with Tory regulations, just adding on to them. I know that the residents of St. Michael are getting away with less water rates through the valuation of the St. Michael Vestry probably, that is the reason why the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael see nothing wrong in these regulations. I know also the valuation of properties in Christ Church. If you compare a two-bedroom house in St. Michael with a similar one in Christ Church, each having two water taps and a shower bath, you will pay three times more for water rates for that house in Christ Church than you will pay for the one in St. Michael. I repeat again: Is that a fair way of imposing taxation? As I have said, you can't get social improvements without paying taxation, but I am also saying do not tax the people inequitably. I shall not make a long speech but when I am finished, I shall ask this Chamber to postpone this resolution so that Government can find a different way to make this tax equitable. In this day, you cannot perpetuate this type of legislation.

(A VOICE): The Maude Bill will make it equitable.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I shall not labour that point any more. I will go further. The Regulations states: "The rates to be charged for the sup-

ply of water for domestic purposes shall, except where the supply is by meter, be calculated on the net annual value as assessed by the Vestry for parochial taxation, and shall, irrespective of the number of taps, be as follows:—

"(a) In case of any net annual value not exceeding one hundred and fifty dollars per annum, a rate of ten cents in the dollar for every dollar, with a minimum rate of five dollars per annum."

"(b) In case of any net value exceeding one hundred and fifty dollars per annum, the aforesaid rate for the first one hundred and fifty dollars and a rate of seven cents in the dollar for every dollar of the net annual value above one hundred and fifty dollars."

Now, you Socialists, take that up and read it. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will, Sir. Does this regulation mean that in your constituency, in the constituency which the honourable Senior Member for St. James represents, or the constituency in which I reside, that a \$150-house must pay per annum 10 cents in the dollar for every dollar, but as a house is valued at more than \$150, you pay seven cents for every dollar above that \$150? I am sure the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael has not read that. I know that somebody is going to suggest that this is not applicable to business premises, but I ask all honourable members: "Who are the people with the \$150-dollar houses?"

Mr. COX: Those who have houses that can bring \$12.50 per month.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is those people that will pay rates of 10 cents in the dollar. According to subsection (b) you say that in case the net value exceeds one hundred and fifty dollars per annum the aforesaid rate will be seven cents in the dollar.

Mr. COX: You are wrong.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, the honourable member cannot interpret these regulations for me. I shall not take these regulations item by item. I will go to Regulation 6, sub-section 4: "For factories or for any trade or business purpose, at the rate of eighty cents per thousand gallons and two dollars and forty cents per quarter for the rent of each meter."

If you carry up these rates, Sir, the rate paid for water will in proportion be more inequitable because all parochial taxation has a bearing on the rate to be paid for water.

I am again saying that I am in favour of some increase in the water rates, but I feel that you should set up some committee to go into this matter. If the Government feels this is the best method of doing it, I think they should be severely criticised. Government should postpone this in order to find a better solution. The method of parochial taxation differs in each of the eleven parishes. The taxes to be assessed are dependent upon how much money that parish may want to run its affairs for the particular year and therefore, they make a different property valuation almost every year. Each parish differs. Property valuation is high in the case of St. James, higher than St. Michael or Christ Church and it is more so in the smaller parishes. As long as you have something in the small parishes, you are rateable. You are not rated with that equity as you get in St. Michael or even Christ Church. By these regulations, you are asking some people in the small

parishes to pay five times as much for water rates as a fellow with a similar property in St. Michael (A VOICE): That is not true.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that honourable member cannot argue that this is not true.

I agree wholeheartedly with the principle of making an increase in the water rates because you are giving increased service in all the villages, but I suggest strongly to Government that they postpone this resolution so that these regulations can be studied more carefully so as to tax for water in a more equitable manner. This inequitable taxation for these water rates has been a burning question for many years, from the time I have been in this House. Mr. Speaker, I speak from personal experience. I am going to move that Government postpone this resolution and take the matter up so that a more equitable taxation can be arrived at. No harm can be done by postponing this resolution. If honourable members feel the same way as I and vote for its postponement and the Government feels that I can be of any service in arriving at a better solution, I will be glad to serve in any way.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—On the question of the extending of the water supply, I think that on all sides of the Chamber, we generally agree that the extension of the water supply is of vital importance. Those of us who have to traverse the rural districts from time to time are particularly apprised of the absence of water facilities in many parts of the country districts. In many of the country districts, standposts are few and far between, and water is obtained, in many cases, after the greatest difficulty on the part of a large number of rural people. It is therefore, Sir, as the honourable senior member for the City said, we all are vitally interested in the question of increasing and extending the colony's water supply. I have said in this Chamber only about four months ago, that I personally would like to see, especially in the City of Bridgetown, water mains running in every direction so that every single house should be able to make connection and in so doing, there should be no need for public standposts. In the country districts, the same thing should apply. We should have water running throughout the length and breadth of the colony.

Now, Sir, naturally to extend the water supply of the country, it must take money to extend your water mains, and to provide standposts and other material which is used for that purpose; undoubtedly, it will cost money. Every honourable member in this Chamber knows that the cost of these materials has gone up considerably within the last five, ten or fifteen years. Therefore, if the water supply is extended, it will take more money than it would have taken ten or fifteen years ago. I regard water as one of the essential public services, one which it is the obligation of the State to provide for its citizens at the minimum possible cost.

In so far as I am concerned, I strongly resent any implication or suggestion as was advocated by the introducer of this resolution about the Waterworks Department being able to pay its way.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, I never even suggested that. I said that I regarded water as a public service. I never in my speech even suggested that the Waterworks Department should be able to pay its way.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member said that if we refer to the figures, we would see that the Waterworks Department is not a paying concern; therefore, the implication in his speech was that inasmuch as it is not a paying concern, inasmuch as its expenditure is more than its revenue, the possibility of a case for providing more revenue exists. What

was his contention? It was that if you increase the rates, even if you do not want to, you must do so, because the revenue is at the minimum, it does not equate the expenses.

Mr. COX: Sir, I never made that point at all. What I said was that this additional revenue which Government had hoped to get has now been offset by the increased cost of electricity which the Electric Company is charging the Government by its increased rates. I quoted figures in this instance, showing that Government hoped to get in \$50,000 by these rates, but the Electric Company's new rates would mean that Government would have to pay an increase of \$45,000 for electricity, hence what Government had hoped to get was offset by the company's new charges. I never made that point which the honourable member has now put forward.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Every honourable member of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, had the opportunity of hearing the introducer of this Resolution say that the Waterworks Department was not a paying concern.

Mr. COX: That is a statement of fact.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the honourable member went on to say we are to reduce the difference between the expenditure and revenue by

Mr. COX: I did not say we are to reduce the difference, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, when we increase the rates today, are we not trying to bring the revenue near to the expenditure? In other words we are trying a little more to make it a paying concern. Sir, I submit that water is a social service. (Mr. COX: I agree.) and by no stretch of the imagination or otherwise should we begin to think in terms of the Waterworks Department paying its way. We should impose taxation, both direct and indirect, to provide money for social necessities of the country such as water, roads, police, fire brigade etc. For instance, Sir, nobody would suggest that the Police Magistrates should collect sufficient fines to pay Police Magistrates. We have to provide facilities in any civilised community for the dispensation of justice. The point I am making is that your judicial courts exist as a public service to render special services to the community and there is no question of your collecting sufficient money to provide for the cost of their maintenance. I look at it this way Mr. Speaker: the introducer of this resolution has said that the cost of all the equipment used by the Waterworks Department has gone up appreciably since 1921 when the rates were last increased, but he has also to bear in mind that the taxation paid by members of this community has increased also. This community is now paying higher direct taxation as well as a number of other measures of indirect taxation which its members were not paying then. Since the Government is collecting an appreciable revenue from these sources it can afford to extend the water supply out of this revenue without increasing the water rates. This is my contention and to support it I would say that Professor Beasley in his report suggested, and the Government has repeated it, that this proposal to increase the water rates would bring in \$50,000 a year. If the Government approached this question from the point of view of a social obligation to the community rather than from the point of view of making revenue and expenditure equate, it would not have fallen into the pitfall in which it has fallen to increase these rates. At the time when the Government estimated that it would need \$50,000 from this source in order to finance the so-called Five-Year Plan, Government had estimated that the annual

pany; yet this same government is now increasing the rates it charges to citizens for water in order to pay for a public utility; this same government is now increasing its water rates to pay the Electric Company which they said they would nationalise six months after they came into power. What a far cry from nationalisation! If this Government was more far-sighted, it would take some of this same money which it is going to pay the Electric Company and make use of it for further development of water; it should make greater use of natural gas.

(A VOICE): This can't be done in a day.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, the Electric Company is finding it difficult to raise additional capital in London, but this local Government whose members have condemned that company so publicly, is going to supply the same funds which it needs to raise its capital, which it could not raise elsewhere. I query: When is this increase in the cost of living to the citizen going to stop? I want to know. This incessant increase, week after week, on some service is scandalous; this incessant increase is now becoming an administrative scandal. There is no other term for it; there is no excuse for this kind of thing. Throughout the whole Caribbean this is the only colony that is consistently increasing on its rates for service, so as to build up surplus revenue. What do you find elsewhere? The Jamaican Government has been spending more than they receive. The same thing is happening in Trinidad and all through the Caribbean, governments are having a greater expenditure over their revenue. This government, over the past twelve years has been collecting a substantial surplus and yet it is still taxing the citizens unnecessarily.

(Mr. SPEAKER resumed in the Chair).

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, As I have said, I heartily agree with all that has been said before on this issue. I want the Government to appreciate the fact that water should be had at reasonable rates. Water is like air; it is an absolute necessity of life. I am asking Government not to make it more expensive for life than necessary. I think if government could harness the air which you breathe and they could put it in pipes, many of us would die through the Government's philosophy of charging for these things; many of us would not be able to pay for it.

If Sir, the Government really wants to increase its revenue, the better way would be to make the rates of water cheaper. By so doing, hundreds in this community would instal water in their homes. The Government lacks imagination. They cannot think that the extension of the water service would be a means of increasing the revenue. That is too broad for them to think; they have a limited outlook. I am sorry to say that this increase in taxation is becoming a habit. It is causing an increase in the cost of living. When are they going to stop? It is time to make some big public protest. Every week we are here telling them of their misdeeds; we have said enough; the time has arrived when we must make some public protest. We must make some public demonstration against this unnecessary increase in taxation week after week. It is not enough to talk in this House to this demented Government; it is absolutely impervious to raising the mentality of its members; they do not react to any appeal of reason. This is the time for those of us in the opposition to make some public protest to this oppressive system of administration. I warn this Government to put a stop to bringing in these oppressive measures of taxation. I am sure if it does not stop, some reaction will take place in this country which Government will not welcome.

I therefore beg to second the motion of the honourable senior member for the City for the postponement of this resolution.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I too am in duty bound to protest against this unnecessary burden which is being put on the people of this colony. This matter of water has deep ramifications, but the man in the street takes it for granted that certain things will be done for him by this Government, and we, the elected representatives should insist and see that he is not let down. I think that this is a case of letting down these men and women who went faithfully to the polls over a year ago and sent us here to represent their interests; and Mr. Speaker, I cannot see why this Government persists and has persisted within the last year, in putting undue burdens on the backs of the people who have given them a mandate. Government cannot justify these unnecessary increases because under the Five Year Plan they are collecting over a million and a half more dollars than they estimated for. It is not only the rich who are called upon to bear this burden; it is every man, woman and child throughout the length and breadth of this island who will be called upon to contribute their quota to these new increases.

I would be untrue to the confidence placed in me by the electors of St. Philip to stand here and subscribe to these increases. I am raising a voice of protest against them. Government has not convinced me of the need for these increases. They have told me that we have had these rates for the last 100 years. That is not enough justification for the increases. On this issue I challenge the Government to show me that they are so hard up for revenue that they must impose this undue burden. We have sat here and fought and argued against a good many increases already this year. I wonder where all this is leading to. The Labour Government has repeatedly told us that the people of this island have given them a majority and they will do as they like. I want to give them the warning that they can do as they like but not as long as they like. The day is coming when they will be thrown out. They can get here and talk all the foolishness they like; but the people are aroused; they are awakened to the conditions that prevail and to the nefarious practices that the Labour Government is perpetrating. I am protesting against this unnecessary increase especially as it is as regards water.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—Did I understand the honourable member to use the word "nefarious"?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member did make use of the word "nefarious".

Dr. CUMMINS: Is that parliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER: The rules of this House preclude any member from using any unbecoming language towards another member. The honourable member in using the word "nefarious" was referring to the Government, and not to any particular member. In that connection my ruling is that the word "nefarious" is quite permissible.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to prolong the discussion. I just want to register my protest most emphatically against the infliction of this undue burden on the community, for the mere gratification of the Government. My remarks may not have the effect of stopping Government, but I am registering my protest as I am in duty bound to do. I was sent here to speak at all times in the interest of the working man, and that is what I am trying to do in my weakness. With these few remarks, Sir, I give notice that I am going to vote for the motion for postponement.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—In spite of the fact that we have a motion for postponement it seems to me that most honourable members have already spoken, and so, even if we postponed it, there would be no member to speak on it when we come back to it. In case the motion is lost, I am taking the opportunity now to say a few words.

The first thing that I would like to say is that the honourable senior member for St. Michael has told us that it is on account of the high rates that they now have to pay for electricity that pumping expenses have gone up.

Mr. COX: On a point of order, Sir. That is not the statement which I made. I pointed out that the Government in the Five Year Plan had decided to increase water rates in order to collect an additional \$50,000. I also said that since that decision was taken the rates of the Electric Company have been increased, and therefore, instead of collecting \$50,000 to assist us with carrying out our programme, we have to pay \$45,000 out of it to the Electric Company.

Mr. LEWIS: I am thankful to the honourable member for saying that what I said is perfectly correct. If in your Five Year Plan you feel that for the good of the island you need to collect an additional \$50,000, and subsequently something goes up and as a result you need \$45,000, you either need to collect \$95,000 or you are collecting \$50,000 and putting \$45,000 of it in the hands of the Electric Company, and keeping \$5,000 for yourself. The more it is explained, the more it becomes true.

There was something I wanted to tell the Government when we were considering supplementary estimates for the Waterworks. But I postponed it until we came to consider the annual Estimates. I asked the Government if it was sensible, right, or socialist in principle to see a concern increasing its rates on you to the extent of \$45,000 a year, and you refuse to buy your own generating plant; and then you have to collect additional money and put in the hands of a company that is blaming you for not being able to raise capital. By the time that they are through collecting additional amounts from the Government they will not need to raise capital outside. They will not have to raise it at all. They will buy everything they want out of you. It is disgraceful that such a statement should come from a member of this House. I suggested to the Government to discuss the question of a generating plant with their engineers. I am not an engineer. But it strikes me as a layman that £10,000 a year additional rates is something that calls for much consideration. Can you not generate your own electricity for pumping at the Belle? Could you not expend £30,000 which would represent three year's rates at the present cost, to put up your own pumping equipment? I do not claim to be speaking with authority. I am putting forward what seems to be a common sense view. The members of the Government are being paid extra to do the business of the House. It should not be done by a trick. I think it is time for them to realise their responsibilities.

Your engineer is in England on holiday at present. He is one of the best engineers in the universe, not in the world. In the universe. Can you not send him a letter form for a sixpence and ask him to enquire what a generating plant for pumping will cost? Do you have money in the Treasury to give away? You are not laying these increased rates in order to extend your water service. People by the hundreds are waiting to put water in their homes. They are willing to pay for it. You are not able to give it to them, but you can give the Electric Company £10,000 a year more for pumping some of the

water. That company shuts off the electricity for the waterworks just as they shut off private people's lights. Honestly I do not understand it. It does not seem right to me.

I feel that the Government should be glad to listen to criticisms they get in an attempt to help them. I do not care what they think about me. The criticism that I am giving is good criticism, and there is no Socialist or anyone who is interested in the people who can get behind what I am saying. It is not £10,000 a year that you are paying for pumping this water. It is £10,000 a year extra. The current used to be supplied at about two and a half cents a unit, now they charge three cents a unit for it. You can imagine what that is.

Take the water that is used at the Rum Bond on the wharf. I have drawn attention to that before. Government has been supplying that water for years and private people go down there and wash bottles free. Then they use that water to break down the rum and they sell it, and do not pay one cent for the water they use.

There is a question that I would like to ask and I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Michael will be able to give me an answer to it. There is a 15 per cent. rebate on the water rates bill. I understand that it is provided for in the Act, but I have not been able to find it in the Act. Perhaps it is in some regulation. If we repeal all these regulations — and there is a long clause doing that — it is possible that you may be increasing the rates by the 15 per cent. that you used to take off before. I would like some information on that.

There is another point. The water service is something that brings you in money by way of income tax and other taxation. I will explain. If you have no water in hotels tourists would not come to the hotels. Therefore, by supplying water to the hotels, the hotels make money and you get income tax as a result. Without water the amount of business that is done could not be done. The water that you give away in the street you get paid for in other ways. For over half a century there was short sightedness in dealing with the question of water, and no provision was made for its extension to the people at a time when you could get pipes from overseas merely by writing and ordering them. We only started to think about water extension when we could not get the materials.

As far as Vestry rates are concerned, Sir, I suppose that this method of charging for water is copied from other places because of the fact that the local government in other places is the authority for supplying water, and electric light, and looking after the Fire Brigade, the Police Force etc. Some honourable members are arguing that it should be paid for at so much per tap, or some other method should be used, for example, the method used for charging for electricity. It does not matter who it is, there is a minimum charge for electricity and a minimum charge for water. If you link it to the valuation of the property — I take it that it is linked more to the valuation than to the taxes — you will get in the same parish people using the same quantity of water in the same size house, but because the house is in a different locality you will have to pay more rates.

Another thing is that I feel that the Government should take the opportunity now of collecting water rates from the owners of places rather than the occupiers. I do not think that any great amount of amendment will be necessary. I am talking about the domestic services. You will make it easier for everyone. There are some people who own 10 to 12 houses. Someone owns 40. Let us say that 20

have water installed. That means that 20 people have to queue up at the Waterworks' Office at the end of the quarter, when the owner could send a cheque for the whole amount.

In spite of the increased rate that the Electric Company is charging they have not yet reached the maximum authorised by law. So they can still increase on you again and perhaps make you pay out another £10,000 a year. Let us get on with cheapening water rates by doing our own pumping and extending the service. We have to pay £10,000 a year more to the Electric Company and £3,000 a year to the Waterworks' Engineer and we cannot get information on how to generate our own electricity. We have splendid opportunities for progressing in this island, and we are speedily retreating.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to add a word or two to this debate. The Government will always be in an awkward position when they have to deal with a company like the Electric Company. I feel that since the Government has natural gas in its possession it would not be wrong to forbid its sale to anyone else because the gas will reduce the cost of pumping the water from the bottom of the well to the users. The Electric Company is itself a misfortune to the whole island. Not long ago the Company after being subjected to heavy public criticism reduced the cost of current to private people from 18 cents to 12 cents a unit and then turned around and increased the price to industrial producers. The reason is obvious. The moment you increase the cost to industries the man in the street still has to bear it indirectly. Very often, as a matter of fact, the man in the street is paying for the electricity used in private houses.

With the amount of money that the Government pays the Electric Company they could buy a diesel plant or several diesel plants. It is a very simple matter. There is no reason why the only plant in the island should be in the hands of private people. It is not in their interest to find share capital to boost electrical production. They have completely blanketed the building business in this city. There is no doubt about that.

I do not agree with those who say that there is no justification for increasing the cost of water. But you should extend the water service. What I do not agree with is the system under which a man with six or seven domestic taps will pay the same thing as the man with one. That is the old conservative system; the system by which the monied class exploited those who had no redress, and I feel that it is an oversight on the part of this Government. Although I say that there is justification for increasing water rates, I will say too that to have to pay this extra £10,000 to the Electric Company is farcical in this age. That company should be possessed by this Government. You can buy it for £100,000. There is no question of finding out first the total of what the company costs. You pay the first £100,000 and possess it. The question that you will have to find all the money first is a joke. Is there any business which does not exist on overdrafts? I want to tell the Government that they are timid souls, even though they may have the best of intentions.

I am saying that there is nothing wrong in increasing the water rates. The price of 3/- a thousand gallons is a first class joke. If the original idea was to pass on water to the people who could not pay for it, well, that is a thing that God himself would have you do. But as regards the individual who can pay for it there is nothing wrong in increasing the cost. Honourable members know that too. But they

like to ride the water horse. It is an easily ridden horse on which they can prance up before the electors.

I hope that the timid souls in the Government realise that what I have said is true—that they can possess the Electric Company for a surprisingly small sum of money.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I did not hear what the honourable senior member for St. Michael said in introducing this Resolution, but I want to say that this is not a case where any accusation can be brought against the Government. Let us bear this in mind: there is no country in the world with a similar constitution to ours where the Central Government is responsible for the entire water supply system. In other territories there are water Commissions acting as separate authorities. I have just come from Jamaica, and it will surprise honourable members to know that in that island there are areas cut off entirely from the water supply. I have often been amused when listening to the honourable senior and junior members for St. John. I have heard talk about people putting water in their houses.

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken yet.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have not said anything which means that the honourable member has spoken on this Resolution. I will continue. The Government cannot put water in anyone's home. The person has to decide to put it in. They are many people who can put water in their places and do not; but the Government cannot compel them to put it in. There seems to be a snobbish idea that people who are not accustomed to having water in their homes will feel that they are different from the people around them if water is put in their places. There is no member in this House who is paying more than an average of two dollars a month for the water that he uses in his home. On the other hand you can realise what it costs the Government to supply that water—increased cost of pipe and other material, and of electricity etc. It is an expensive business. The honourable senior member for St. Michael says that no one objects to that. I want to remind him and other honourable members that there are certain social services that you have to pay for. You live in a capitalistic community, and to change it you have to go down to the roots. You have to start with yourself.

Now, what is the real objection to these rates? Are we saying that every time government increases rates it is something pernicious? Mention has been made of the Electric Company. Let us write that off as a bad job. Let us say that we do not agree with the policy of the Electric Company. But what is \$45,000 in the whole water system? The honourable junior member for the City is famous for his research. Look at the estimates of capital and recurrent expenditure. The people must pay for it. Even in Russia the people pay for the things they get.

I agree that the old system of rating is not the best. But if at this stage you attempt to revise or to change the whole system what will you find yourself against? On the other hand I have proved that to judge by the number of taps a person has in his house how much water he uses is not a perfect system either. A man may have four taps in his house, but that does not mean that all four taps are turned on simultaneously. So because one person has four taps and another person has one, it does not necessarily follow that the person with four uses more water than the one with one.

In approaching this question honourable members have to ask themselves whether the people who are paying for water are not in a more privileged posi-

tion than those who are not. Are you saying that giving these people water is adding an extra burden?

As regards the taking over of the Electric Company, that is not as easy as the honourable senior member for St. George would have us to believe. I hope that one of these days those members who make these statements will be placed in a position of responsibility so that they will realise that the things they used to advocate are not so easy as they thought. I think that these regulations are reasonable. The people who do not have the service in their homes cannot be roped in by telling them "you have to pay." In matters like these it is always easy to attack the Government, and some members make much of the opportunity; but they remain silent where matters of greater importance are concerned but in which the crowd appeal is not so strong.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—There is a well known maxim that when you pass a law and the reason for the passing of that law ceases to exist, the law itself is automatically abrogated. The position that the Government finds itself in is this: Professor Beasley in his fiscal survey expresses the opinion that water rates could produce more revenue by way of an increase. But Professor Beasley at no time suggested that the waterworks should pay for itself because that would be a fantastic proposal, as fantastic as to suggest that the Department of Highways and Transport should pay for itself, in the same way that the acting Head of the Administration has come to the strange conclusion that the Deep Water Harbour should pay for itself without any specification as to the length of time in which it should. That arises from a confusion of ideas and confusion as to the role which the particular service plays in the life of the community.

As far as water is concerned, it is the most essential commodity. There is not a single human being or animal in the island that could exist for three days without water. Every member of the animal kingdom including the members of the Government, must have water in order to survive. The capacity of the human stomach is more or less fixed within a given range, and given normal habits of sanitation, the average amount of water which individuals use is more or less the same. To try to approximate the revenue and expenditure of the Waterworks Department is a monstrously inept suggestion.

The raising of \$50,000 by way of increasing water rates was suggested in the Five Year Plan. It has been subsequently shown that there has been a gross under estimation of revenue, and considerably more will be raised than was envisaged at the time of the Five Year Plan, and this \$50,000 from increased water rates will be only a drop in the bucket. There is another aspect. The mere fact that people are enjoying the water service at a comparatively low rate is no justification for increasing the rate. Government should rejoice in the fact that it can provide a service like the water service to the community at a relatively low rate. There is no justification in increasing a tax or rate unless you need money badly to do something else for the benefit of the community. There is no such thing in Barbados as the collection of particular revenue for a particular purpose. It all goes into one central fund.

In the interim period between the Five Year Plan and now, the Electric Company has found that the Government plans to raise \$50,000 extra from water rates; and the company reduces its rates on those who will protest, and proceeds to milk the Government of \$45,000 extra for the pumping of water. If there is one thing for which I must join in the condemnation of the Barbados Electric Supply Cor-

poration it is the fact that every share is owned by City of London parasites and blood suckers. It is one of the few companies, apart from Cable and Wireless and the Telephone Company owned entirely by people in London, many of whom have never even seen Barbados. Now the honourable senior member for St. Peter is telling us that when responsibility weighs on their shoulders they say things they never said before.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I never said anything like that.

Mr. BARROW: In the absence of an explanation I will have to rely on my own memory and paraphrase. It seems to me that where certain views are concerned they undergo a metamorphosis when responsibility rests upon their shoulders.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: All I said was that nationalising the Electric Company is not as easy as it seems.

Mr. BARROW: I would never accuse the honourable member of agreeing with anything that I have said. It seems to me that as soon as you get into the Government you undergo a metamorphosis. The majority of members of the House agree that if there is one hydra headed monster among us holding up industry and preventing people from getting light in their homes it is the Electric Company, and the Government is saying that they cannot nationalise it, when even the members of the Other Place are saying that it should be. I promise to show the honourable member how we could nationalise the Electric Company tomorrow on £1,000. In little Barbados we floated a loan the other day and it was over-subscribed by three and a half times the amount, Jamaica had one and in one day it was oversubscribed by one and a half times. Do you think you have to sign a cheque and give it to the people who own the Electric Company in order to nationalise it? No where in the world today are Governments allowing private companies to control the supply of water or electricity. The manufacture of electricity today is no "white man's magic." A school boy can tell you how it is done. Up at the Electric Company they have a few decrepit diesel generators that my colleague could build in his backyard. They could put down new equipment and get rid of the old one which has proved unfit and inefficient, and they will not; and the Government sits down and allows them to hold us up to ransom.

The suggestion made by the honourable junior member for the City is useful. It is another aspect of the matter. If we set up our own generators at the pumping stations these same generators will not only be able to pump water; they will also be able to supply water to many people.

It is high time that we cried halt to these increases of taxation on the people of the island. We cannot justify them on the grounds of necessity. In the last analysis, if we put on a dollar a month on the water rates, and the Electric Company puts on a sixpence a month on their rates, and the C.I.F. values on commodities make the man in the street spend more for essential commodities, you will soon find that all that the people of this community will have to look forward to will be death and taxes. I do not see how this increase of \$50,000 becomes a necessity at all; because it is not for development as envisaged in the Five Year Plan, but an imposition to feed the hydra headed monster called the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation.

Mr. COX: I want to say that I agree with the view that the charging of water rates on the basis of the parochial tax on the property is not a very equitable way of doing it. I have discussed the question several times, and I feel that there is some

thing in that view. But on the other hand I am sure that honourable members will agree that changing such a system is not something that can be done in a day or two. Much consideration and enquiry will be necessary. An honourable member spoke about introducing a Tory system. The increases in the rates are definitely based on the old system, and they are not as some honourable members seem to feel, a change in the system. Later on I will attempt to explain the system laid down. At this stage I will say that while the Tories used to collect taxation and give nothing in return for it, we Socialists are collecting taxation and giving to the people the things which are rightfully theirs, and the things which were withheld for all these years.

Anyone who listened carefully to the honourable senior member for the City will agree that he was pointing out in no uncertain terms that in the parish of St. Michael you have one way of rating, while on a property, say in St. James, you will pay twice as much. That is something for local government to consider, and as everyone knows we will soon have the good old Maude Bill before us again. I would point out here that the water rates are based on the annual rental value of the house. If therefore, the value is \$150 this year and the Vestry rate is 10 per cent, and next year the value is the same \$150 and the Vestry rate is increased to 11 or 11½ per cent that does not affect the water rates because as I have said they are based on the yearly value of the house. I am trying to show that although some honourable members feel that this will impose a great hardship on some people it does not work out as they think. I have a case before me in which people who rent a place are actually paying twice as much rent for the place as it is rated by the Vestry of St. Michael.

Therefore, I ask: How does the hardship arise? Where is the hardship? As a matter of fact, they should be rated on the annual revenue which they are really getting from the particular buildings & houses; but that is not so; they are paying water rates on what the assessors value the house at and not on what annual revenue those houses are bringing in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Junior Member for St. John in his usual manner, criticises the Government. At this stage, I would say that the criticisms are not so much because of the increases which Government is making but because of the fact that when Government was putting over the Five-Year Plan, honourable members on both sides of the House opposed it a great deal. I would say that this item of increasing the water rates was one of the things on which agreement was reached in the Five-Year Plan. I shall read again just a portion of the paragraph which I read in my opening remarks from the Fiscal Survey by Professor Beasley on Water Supplies. On page 77, para. 57, he says: "There has been no doubt been a steady increase in the amount of water delivered at public standpipes, but the figures indicate that private and industrial consumers are now being fairly heavily subsidised." That is what he says and because of that we propose to do what we are doing here. I cannot see anything in these accompanying regulations which would be a burden on the poor man. As a matter of fact, where this increase is concerned, as the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter said, I know that people who have to pay to bring water for their use in their private homes have to pay much more than that. I know of one who has to pay something like three shillings a week, and at that, the supply is very inadequate; the quantity is nothing like what you

would consume if you had your own pipe in your home. These increases work out at not more than 1.7 cents per day as against three shillings a week which people without the service have to pay.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I agree with that.

Mr. COX: Sir, I stressed that because it was said by the honourable Senior Member for the City and the Junior Member for St. John that the rate would be multiplied three or four times by the increase and the way it was assessed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I must object to that, Mr. Speaker. I never said any such thing. The honourable member knows that I did not say so.

Mr. COX: Yes Sir. These are the rates as they stand to-day: domestic taps 40 cents in the pound. Our increases is 10 cents in the dollar which is actually 10 cents more in the pound. Exceeding £30 per annum, for the first £30 the rate is as above and then 30 cents in the pound for every pound which exceeds £30. This works out, at present to \$3.60 and by these rates which we are about to lay, the Government is asking the person in that category to contribute \$4.00 that is, 40 cents per quarter more. These are the rates which some honourable members said have been multiplied three or four times. The rate which is at present charged for shower baths so constructed as to be capable of containing water to any greater depth than six inches is \$1.80 per annum. The Government is now asking for \$2.00 which is 20 cents more for a whole year. In case of shower baths where the capacity is 24 cubic feet, the rate at present is \$2.40 per annum and the Government is now asking for \$2.64 which is 24 cents more per annum. For baths exceeding the 24-cubic feet capacity, the rate at present is 10 cents per annum for every additional cubic foot and the Government is now asking for 12 cents which is two cents more per annum. As Professor Beasley pointed out in the rates which are being paid at present, the Government was heavily subsidising commercial industry; so, as you will see, for water supplied for commercial purposes, the rate which is at present charged per thousand gallons is 72 cents and Government is now asking for 80 cents. The meter rent which is at present \$1.80 per quarter, Government is now asking for \$2.40. I must say here that the Government Party agreed to these new rates, I too, am agreeing to them and anything which I agree to I feel is right and fair; and something which I can go to my constituents and defend myself.

The honourable Junior Member for the City asked a question about the 15 per cent. rebate. I would like to tell him that 15 per cent. rebate has been removed. It was never a regulation. It was put forward by the late Mr. C. A. Braithwaite when he was a member of this House, but as far as I can see, it was never given for prompt payment or anything of that sort. However, it was passed by the House of that time.

The question was also raised by the honourable Junior Member for the City and by some other honourable members with regard to generating our own electricity for this purpose. I would like to say that question is under consideration and as soon as the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department returns to the island it will be finalised. Some honourable members feel that we should not tax the people to pay these new rates of the Electric Company. I counsel them to see the fact that we are more or less in the hands of that company now and if we do not pay our bills, that company would cut off its current and then we would be without light as well as water. I repeat again that consideration is being given to the question of installing our own

generating plant at the Belle Pumping Station for the purpose of lifting the water.

Now the honourable Junior Member for the City said that Government would be foolish when he was talking about our collecting this money. He suggested that it would be budgeting for \$95,000 instead of \$45,000.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member has misinterpreted my remarks. I told him by way of explanation that he should be collecting \$95,000, but I did not tell him to do that. He should not make such a reckless statement.

Mr. COX: I heard the honourable member say that instead of collecting \$45,000 you would be collecting \$95,000, otherwise you would be foolish.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member did say that somebody would be foolish.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable Senior Member for St. Michael has deliberately twisted what was said. When the hon. member explained about the amount, I said that if he were right, that would have to be the case.

Mr. COX: While the honourable Junior Member for the City was saying that on one side, the honourable Senior Member for St. George was saying on the other side that inasmuch as the Electric Company was collecting almost all that we were budgeting for, what was the use of our bringing in this resolution because our object was defeated. I am saying that whether we agree to increase these rates or not, the additional \$45,000 which the Electric Company has told the Government that it will have to pay will be paid. Government must pay it whether it is paid by those persons who have water installed or the taxpayers in general; but I feel that it would be more equitable to call upon the people who have this service installed in their homes or in their business premises to pay this additional amount than for the general taxpayers to do so because they do not have this convenience. As I have said already, five dollars a year for water rates is not much more than one cent per day and I do not think that amount is too much to ask the people to pay.

The honourable Senior Member for St. Philip has pointed out that although the Waterworks Department shows a deficit of \$358,000 last year, that it was not running at a loss. His suggestion is that inasmuch as Government might be collecting a little more money than it has anticipated, that likely increase can be taken to spend in providing for the extension of the service instead of increasing the rates. That honourable member runs a printing press as well as he runs a dairy and kitchen garden. Now, if in his running of his dairy, he finds that it is not a paying concern, do you think that he is going to take money out of his running of the printing press to offset the loss by the dairy, or would you rather think that he would dilute the milk with water so as to make the dairy a paying concern? I think he will take the latter course.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise at a point of explanation. I do not think it is fair for honourable members to accuse other honourable members behind their backs as the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael done when he accused the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip of adulterating milk.

Mr. COX: I did not tell the honourable senior member for St. Philip to leave the House; so long as the House is sitting, honourable members are expected to be in their places until it is adjourned. At the same time I was not saying that the honourable member would do that. What I meant to suggest was that adulterating milk was a means of

making a dairy business a paying concern. It is a normal business practice, illegal though it is.

As I was saying, Sir, those persons who at present pay 85 cents, the minimum rate for water per quarter, would be called on to pay \$1.20 per quarter. I am convinced that the increases which have been made by the Government are not at all unreasonable. I am also satisfied that at present, this island water services are cheaper than in any other part of the West Indies, may be in the world. Further, I am satisfied that there are so many areas where there is yet no water mains to be found and so many people crying out for this service that it is necessary for Government to carry through the whole of its construction and extension plan. I am pleased to say that wherever you go throughout the island now, you can see water mains being laid and standposts being erected. It is therefore not too much to ask people to pay a little more for their rates so as to have this service extended to those persons who are not in a position to pay for the service directly. No matter how cheap this service may be, you will find that circumstances will still prevent some people from installing it in their homes.

I appeal to honourable members to pass this resolution because it is nothing that has been done haphazardly by Government. It is also a policy of Government which was laid down in the Five-Year Plan and to vote against it must be regarded as a vote of censure.

Mr. SPEAKER: During the speech made by the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael, I am now reminded of his making reference to the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip who was not in his place. The honourable Senior Member for St. Michael in question form asked if the honourable Senior Member for St. Philip might not have acted in such a way as he was suggesting about adulterating milk to make a dairy pay. I do not think that reference is becoming of the honourable member.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, if that was anything offensive I would withdraw it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to speak on this matter. However, I stated when I hear members of the Government say that the people have to pay, and this has been repeated more than once. I know the people have to pay but the question is, should the people pay for the amount which they get?

I agree with the previous speakers who feel that this increase is unnecessary. It is definitely unnecessary even though the honourable Senior Member for St. Michael has said that the Government has to look for an additional sum to pay for electricity. There are several other sources other than this which can bring in an increase and some honourable members have attempted to name some of those sources.

I have also noticed here that the rates which are charged for supplying water to the shipping are comparable to those which local consumers are asked to pay. Certainly, I do not see the reason why the shipping should be supplied with water at the same rate—80 cents per thousand gallons—as the unfortunate householder. I do not see why the Ju-C Company which turns out 60,000 drinks per month as some honourable members said, should pay at the same rate as is charged to shipping. Definitely the Government is devoid of business acumen; Government is blatantly ignorant. The Government would not suggest to anybody who has ideas to come and help it to solve problems like these.

Government has allocated, according to the year-Plan, one million dollars to be spent on extension of the water system. The question is: How can Government get the additional revenue it wants to carry out this work? Certainly by getting more people to install the service. There are several built up avenues within recent years where the people are crying out for the bringing of this service to their doors. What do you find? Taking Deightons Road as an example, even since the water main has been put down in that street, there is definitely a refusal by Government to allow certain householders to instal the service from that main. Besides that, there are several country districts which are still in need of this service and which the Government has consistently refused to extend the service to meet the needs of those people in those districts. If this service were to be extended, I am sure that partly every householder will be proud of paying to instal the service. Again, what do you find? The charges which the Department imposes, are very high when it has to attach a new service to a residence. I have an example of a householder having to pay about \$80 just to attach the service from one end of the gutter to the other—a matter of twelve feet of piping. These abnormal charges are prohibiting ordinary people from making use of the service.

I am wondering if the Government had in view these increases when they increased the salaries of the Heads of Departments in that indiscriminate manner.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable member not to stray.

Mr. ALLDER: There is another point on which I want to make some observation. As is known, water is an essential service. It is the first essential need of any community. It is one of the leading things in civilising an area, therefore, it should be considered as an essential service to the people of any area. If therefore the Government makes any charges for this public service, these charges should be nearly free. If you do not make them as reasonable as possible, and you continue to increase your rates you are almost certain of getting the other utility companies following in your footsteps, carrying up their rates. It will be the same as the land question. Because the Government buys land at a high price, other land agents have stated that Government has bought at such a figure and they are going to sell at that figure. The Electric Company and the Transport Company will be justified if they say that inasmuch as your Government has carried up their rates on certain essential services, they, as businessmen, are justified in asking for increased charges for their services. It is a trend which one follows as he sees the other fellow doing a particular thing. In this case the burden falls on the unfortunate people whose standard of living is too low to bear it.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this increase is definitely a wrong policy. It is nothing wrong in paying for water, but you can be overcharged or unreasonably charged for it. I share the same feelings as those other honourable members who have spoken against

the passing of this resolution and for the postponement. I would however like to say that it would be of no use for us to vote for the postponement of this resolution to study the regulations with a view to a more equitable taxation, if after a couple of days they will be presented back to this House in the same form. The contents of these regulations are against the interests of the people; therefore they are going to create a hardship. I hope honourable members realising this and their obligations to their constituents would vote against these regulations and wait until the Department concerned present regulations which would be more acceptable.

Mr. COX: I rise at a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member who has just sat down, said that Government was not increasing the rates on people like the Ju-C Company. I thought I made it crystal clear that commercial undertakings which are at present paying 36 cents per thousand gallons, by these regulations will be paying 48 cents.

The question that the Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. LEWIS, BARROW, VAUGHAN, ALLDER and E. D. MOTTLEY.—(5)

Noes: Messrs. MAPP, TALMA, HOLDER, BRYAN, COX, MILLER, F. L. WALCOTT and DR. CUMMINS.—(8).

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. MAPP, TALMA, HOLDER, BRYAN, COX, MILLER, F. L. WALCOTT, and DR. CUMMINS.—(8).

Noes: Messrs. LEWIS, BARROW, VAUGHAN, ALLDER, and E. D. MOTTLEY.—(5).

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the next Order is taken, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the fact that I have heard and observed when the vote was being taken just now for the postponement of this resolution that certain members voted out of their places. Such a thing is gross disorder; it is unparliamentary. If it ever occurs again, I will view it with grave displeasure and will draw it most forcibly to the attention of this House.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,— It is rather late now and we cannot start on the resolution to approve Civil Establishment Orders for the paying of increased salaries to Civil Servants. Inasmuch as we wanted to give consideration to those resolutions tonight and in view of the fact that many Civil Servants are looking with longing eyes for the increases which are to come to them, I make a motion that this House do now adjourn until Thursday, 7th May,— the day after to-morrow— at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move a motion that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 12th May, 1953, at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.