

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th July, 1956.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*)  
Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*)  
Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS entered the House and took his seat.

### MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

### DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Hon. Acting Chief Secretary:—

Chief Secretary's Office,  
Barbados,  
17th July, 1956.

Sir,

I have the honour to refer to Section 3 (2) of the Sugar and Fancy Molasses Production & Export Control Act, 1940, which read as follows:

"The Board shall consist of the Director of Agriculture and seven other members appointed in the manner following, that is to say, one member by the Governor, two members by the Legislative Council and four by the House of Assembly."

2. I shall be grateful if you will let me have the names of the four members appointed to the Sugar Production and Export Control Board by the House of Assembly for the current legislative session.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,  
G. T. BARTON,  
Acting Chief Secretary.

The Speaker,

The House of Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Highway Commissioners of the parish of Christ Church a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure on tenantry roads for the half year ended 31st March, 1956.

Also, from the Highway Commissioners for the parish of Christ Church a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 31st March this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to remind the House that there has been a vacancy on the Fancy Molasses Control and Export Board, due to the resignation of Mr. H. O. Emtage.

### PAPERS LAID

By command of His Excellency the Governor the following papers were laid:

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1956;  
The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 17 Order, 1956;  
The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order, 1956;  
The Jurors (Remuneration and Allowances) Regulations, 1956;

Statement showing amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received

from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts for the period ended on the 31st March, 1956, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature;

Report of a Survey of Secondary Education by G. S. V. Petter, Education Adviser to the Comptroller for Development and Welfare.

Hon. M. E. COX: Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st May, 1956.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Report of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture for 1954—55.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:—The Customs (Petroleum Products Bulk Storage) Regulations, 1955;

Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year 1954.

### NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$16,166 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956—57, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1956—57, No. 12 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$14,676 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956 — 57 Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1956—57, No. 13 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$11,898 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956-57, Part II—Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1956-57, No. 11 which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$37,779 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1956—57 Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1956—57, No. 14 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 16 Order, 1956".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 17 Order 1956".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order, 1956.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to sanction the Customs (Petroleum Products Bulk Storage) Regulations, 1955.

Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Solicitors Act, 1896.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$5,695 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1956—57, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1956—57 No. 15 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House in Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

### PRIVATE NOTICES

Mr. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of the following Address to His Excellency the Governor:—

*The House of Assembly  
To  
His Excellency The Governor*

The House has learnt with pain and dismay of the high death rate from starvation of children in the Island.

2. The House is of the opinion that a free distribution of milk to the parents and guardians of all children under five years, would tend to ameliorate this condition.

3. Accordingly the House request Your Excellency to take all the steps necessary to make such a benefit available to the parents and guardians of young children.

3.25 p.m.

### QUESTIONS

Mr. J. A. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions:

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—

Is the Minister aware that no tenantry roads have been done in the years 1955 and 1956 in the parish of St. Andrew?

2. Is he aware that at the request of the Department of Highways and Transport a priority list of roads was submitted by the Vestry of St. Andrew and that no action has been taken on same?

3. Will the Minister investigate this state of affairs and take the necessary action to have the above grievances remedied?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—

Is the Minister aware that the road through Turner's Hall Wood has been impassable for many years due to subsidences and landslides?

2. Is he aware that the above road is a vital link between St. Simons and Hillaby Villages and that churchgoers and school children are considerably inconvenienced by the lack of this road?

3. Will the Minister at his earliest convenience investigate questions Nos. 2 and 3 and examine the possibilities of by-passing this landslide area and adopting the suggestions for a more suitable road to connect the above villages?

### BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Solicitors' Act 1896 be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.  
*The question was put and agreed to.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act 1921 be now read a first time.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.  
*The question was put and agreed to.*

### STATEMENT ON INCOME TAX BILL

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House begins I wish to make a statement with regard to the interpretation to be given to the proviso to Section 18 (2) of the Income Tax Act, 1921.

1. The attention of the Government has been drawn to a recent decision of the Court of Common Pleas as to the proper interpretation to be given to the proviso to section 18(2) of the Income Tax Act, 1921, and in particular to the word "voluntary" appearing in that proviso.

2. The Government has been advised that this decision of the Court of Common Pleas reveals a defect in the Income Tax Act, 1921, and that if taxpayers chose to take advantage of this defect, the revenue of the Island would suffer.

3. It is accordingly the Government's policy to remove this defect and the Government will therefore be introducing legislation in the near future to seek to achieve this purpose.

4. As the matter is still with other related matters under review, no indication can at present be given as to the precise form that the proposed amending legislation will take, but as it is intended that such legislation should, when enacted, take effect as from the 17th day of July, 1956, I have considered it only fair to all taxpayers to give this notice of Government's policy.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH BILL—C'td

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Social Services: to resume Committee on the Bill to amend the Public Health Act, 1908.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, hon. members are familiar with this Bill. It was referred to some weeks ago and Section 3 was postponed. The Government is asking leave, Sir, to withdraw sub-section 3 (1).

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, we were not quite able to hear the Hon. Minister and we would like him to repeat that.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Section 3(2) is already contained in (2) above, that is, the amending of 2,400 to 1,800 which has already been passed.

I beg to move Clause 3 as amended stand part.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to report the passing of a Bill with amendments in Committee.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded in each case by Hon. M. E. COX the Bill was read a third time and passed.

3.35 p.m.

#### POSTPONEMENT OF ORDERS

Hon G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, with regard to Order No. 2, I am sorry that I am unable to proceed with it today. It is necessary for me to confer with members of the Judiciary and others, but I should like to give the House the assurance that I am prepared to go on with the next Order next Tuesday. I therefore ask leave to postpone the consideration of this Bill.

*There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Premier.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, as regards Orders Nos. 3 and 4, the Hon. Minister in charge of them is out of the Island at present, and I am asking leave that they be postponed and that Order No. 5 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

*There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Premier.*

#### Lease Of Land To Barbados Light And Power Company Ltd.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the lease of a parcel of land situated at Grave's End to the Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the approval of the House to authorise the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease a parcel of land approximately 3,150 square feet in area situated at Grave's End to the Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd. for the purpose of installing a pump house and pipe-lines leading to and from the sea to be used as a water cooler for the steam turbine plant which the Company proposes to install at their works.

The Addendum explains fully the purpose of this Resolution. The land is to be rented to the Company at a cost of \$240.00 per annum; the land will be leased for the first fourteen years, after which the Company has the right to renew the lease for another period of seven years. Mr. Speaker, we have been given the assurance that there will be no pollution of the sea as a result of the installation of this pump house and these pipe-lines. The only difference, we are told, is that the water which returns to the sea will be about 4° Fahrenheit warmer or in excess of the temperature of the water when it comes from the sea.

Hon. members will remember that the honourable junior member for Christ Church, who introduced the Bill accompanying this Resolution, postponed it because the point was raised by the honourable senior member for St. George about the denial of the people of their rights to go on the beach and bathe and play cricket as they used to do before. That matter had been gone into quite thoroughly long before the Bill was brought before this House, and there was absolutely no question of any interference with the beach as a beach. As a matter of fact, the pipes which are to be laid by the Company will be laid underground, and therefore the people who go to bathe and play cricket on Sundays (although they should not play cricket on Sundays, Sundays being days for rest [Laughter]) will continue their games as they have been doing in the past. Honourable members should have no fear therefore, as to the interference of the privileges which the people now enjoy; that fear can be allayed inasmuch as I have explained to the House the position as it stands.

I have plans here of the exact area at which these works will be carried out. I should mention that this matter was put before the Director of Public Works and also before the Officer commanding the Barbados Regiment, and they have both agreed to the erection of the pump house and the installation of these pipe lines. Therefore, there is absolutely no danger as to the interference with the rifle range, as it is proposed to construct this pump house on the North Eastern side of the building which is now leased by Mr. A. E. Taylor at Grave's End.

As far as I can see, there is no danger as to the installation of this pump house and these pipe lines.

I assure the House that every possible question has been gone into, and we are satisfied that there will be absolutely no harm if we agree to lease to the Barbados Light and Power Company Ltd. the area which they desire to lease for the purpose of carrying out these works. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, nobody wants to put anything in the way of the industrialisation of the Colony, but when leases such as this one are being given, we have to be very sure that nothing contained in them will cause any unhappy feelings on the part of the public. While the Honourable Minister has said that guarantees have been given that there will be no pollution of the beaches in the area, yet, I have noticed that he has admitted that the water which will be coming from the plant will be some degrees Fahrenheit greater than the adjoining seawater. I sincerely hope that the Honourable Minister will make sure that these pipes will be carried some distance from the fore-shore so as to prevent any unhappiness; even although the difference in Fahrenheit may not be great, it may not be desirable that this water should be mixed with the water in which people bathe when they go to the sea. I hope that the Honourable Minister will see that everything will be done alright; that is to say, that these pipes will be made to run far enough out side so that no water which comes out of the Company's premises can flow back into the position of the sea in which members of the public habitually bathe.

3.45 p.m.

Besides that, Sir, I would like to know in respect of that land something as regards a particular matter. I noticed that some of that land was leased a couple of years ago to Mr. A. E. Taylor for the purpose of erecting a restaurant and some time after it was erected and put into operation, that gentleman observing that it was not a paying concern closed it down. It was closed down for about three years, speaking under correction. You can see from that that the purpose for which the lease was made was not enjoyed by the public. I notice that the building is now rented out to another individual and that there is some difficulty in keeping that place opened. It is said that the Government refuses to give permission for the sale of alcoholic beverages at that place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now speaking on a subject matter which is not pertinent to this Resolution. He is not speaking on any lease of land.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I thought what I was speaking on was permissible because it was in connection with the same land. There was some disagreement in the giving of that lease by the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not come under the subject matter of any lease.

Mr. ALLDER: All right, Sir.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing for letting us see the plans of this proposed erection because it is usually very difficult to understand these things without such plans. However, I do not think that there is any objection in principle to permission being granted to the Barbados Light and Power Company to erect these pipelines, although Your Honour will remember when the hon. senior member for St. George spoke about this matter, he had certain reservations made particularly as regards the discomfort which might be caused to bathers who enjoy the amenities of that beach.

I think there will be some discomfort to bathers but perhaps, in the long run, as the Hon. Minister says, it may not be too much discomfort: and the fears as expressed by the hon. senior member for St. George, may not be realised.

What I am disturbed about is some of the conditions of the lease as laid down in the Schedule. For one thing, I think that the lease for a period of 14 years with the option of renewal for another seven years is rather too long. Looking at it from the point of view of the bathers—the people who might want to enjoy the amenities of that beach—it does seem, despite all assurances given, as if the inconveniences to the public are greater than are now feared; and if that is so, it will take the greater part of a generation before it can be rectified or even renewed. If, on the other hand, the Barbados Light and Power Company has the prospect of getting a renewal after 14 years I do not think there is any harm in cutting down on the initial period of the lease. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for them to say now that they can guarantee that there will not be any inconvenience or that there will not be any noxious matter coming out of the pipes to disturb would-be bathers, but it is quite possible that the very pipes themselves might burst and as a result there might be possibly a discolouration of the water. I am not saying that it will be of the proportion that you might not be able to bathe in it, but it might be just rust-coloured water which, though it may not necessarily be a pollution, is a disturbing matter to people who like to bathe in clear water, as Barbadians and the majority of us like to do.

Perhaps, some conditions may be attached to the granting of this lease. One such condition should be to have a shorter lease. I think a lease of 14 years is rather too long because this thing is in the nature of an experiment. It looks alright now. I noticed from the plans which the Hon. Minister has allowed me to see that while the pipe which takes in cold water extends a good way out to sea, as it appears from the scale of the map, that the pipe that lets out warm water is a bit nearer in to the foreshore. I have been made to understand that the water will not be appreciably warmer, but unless there is a technical reason I am wondering if it would not be better for the prospective bather if the pipe taking in cold water was nearer in than the pipe giving out the hot water. As I have said, it does appear to me that the lease of 14 years is too long and I think it should be modified. Of course, it does not effect the principle of the Resolution.

My next point is with respect to the sum of \$240 per annum which will be paid for the tenancy of the land. I have no knowledge of what the land values are in terms of a lease, but I do know that the Barbados Light and Power Company is a big monopoly and in respect of allowing them to use 3,000 square feet of land for what seems to me the slender sum of \$20 a month seems to be something wrong. It is a great privilege we are giving them and however little it might be, we are depriving the people of this country of the use to some extent of that beach.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether this Government is doing the very best thing in allowing the Barbados Light and Power Company to use 3,000 square feet of that beach in return for only \$20 a month, and I am also wondering whether this is one of the conditions that can be changed. I am convinced that if the Barbados Light and Power Company wanted this bit of land so badly and if the Government can acquiesce with the request, a greater degree of bargaining should go on. I think the Company should be asked to pay a greater sum.

There is no question of a non-industrial development going on. This power house is just an accessory for the company. It does not make the enterprise more profitable, so there is no harm in asking them for more money.

3.55 p.m.

But we must draw the line somewhere; and if people in this island have no prospect of getting cheaper electricity—at least we have not heard that company said anything about that, and if there are no prospects of getting electricity in more houses, I think it is disturbing to find that the Governor-in-Executive Committee is prepared to lease land which is the property of the people of Barbados for so little in return. Twenty dollars a month is too little; and it does not represent what I think to be a realistic view of the whole matter and if this is the condition, as it seems to me, of the terms attaching this grant of land, it is a condition which can be modified and made more realistic. They ought to pay more because it is valuable land they are using, and a valuable stretch of beach during the time they occupy it, will be denied some part of the bathing population.

With respect to the undertaking which was given by the Company about there being nothing in their view which will disturb the bathers generally, I should only say this: that Government would be well advised to have one of its Departments made responsible for the periodical inspection of that beach, and the periodical testing of the water in the sea around the pipes. That, I think, would be the very least that could be done because it may well be that to the naked eye there may be nothing of which you can complain, but there might be an accumulative process of pollution which could only be discovered scientifically; and I do not think that Government should leave it to the Company to give the assurance that the water would be alright without carrying out periodical inspection. I think it is an inspection which should be done every three months, and it cannot be left to them.

Mr. Speaker, I should just re-emphasise this. I think some change should be made in shortening the period of the lease, that a much higher scale of remuneration than twenty dollars per month should be the price charged them by the Executive Committee, and that Government itself ought to undertake a periodical inspection of the beach and the water surrounding the pipes to make sure and to satisfy itself that no great harm, if any at all, is being done.

Hon. M. E. COX: I can assure the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that every care will be taken to see that the Company carries out its assurance and see that the water is not polluted because it is a fact that the majority of poor people go there to bathe.

Mr. TUDOR: I should like the Minister to say whether he thinks the \$240 per annum is reasonable or whether it should not be more.

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

### CARIBBEAN FARM INSTITUTE

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Resolution seeks to secure Legislative approval to the draft agreement which appears in the schedule thereto. The terms and conditions of this draft agreement in connection with the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute contained in the the Addendum to the Resolution. The Addendum sets out the whole history of the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute provides inception to date. As honourable members will see,

the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute from its very agricultural training at intermediate level on the theoretical side, and on the practical side is up to the standard of the Diploma of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture. The object of the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute is to provide a pool of qualified instructors in the middle grades of Government Departments, particularly those concerned with agriculture and education, and in commercial agriculture. The Addendum further states that with the concurrence of the Legislature, this Government has participated in the Scheme and quotes various messages sent down to the House in 1950, Message No. 30, replies given by the Hon. Legislative Council and the Hon. House of Assembly on each occasion sanctioning the formation and establishment of the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute. It will be seen that Barbados' capital contribution to the cost of this Farm Institute was \$20,520 up to now; that is, the capital cost. Barbados is sharing the capital cost of \$20,520, and funds to meet Barbados' share of recurrent costs have been voted from time to time in the Annual Estimates. Hon. members will in all probability want to know how much Barbados has spent up to now in the cost of running this Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute. I have the figures here. You can see from your Estimates what is actually voted, but what is voted and what is actually spent are entirely two different amounts because there are supplementary estimates which are voted from time to time. To give the actual recurrent costs of running this Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute from its very inception: in 1952—53 it cost this Government \$1,251.25, that was before it actually got into operation; in 1953—54 the actual cost was \$2,748.69; in 1954—55 the actual cost was \$8,470.01; in 1955—56 the actual cost of recurrent expenditure was \$6,955.61, and in this financial year the actual recurrent cost or the actual money expended so far up to December this year is \$6,632.44. Barbados' contribution is based in a proportionate relationship which the number of student places bears to the total number of student places at the college; that proportion is the proportion which Barbados pays so far as recurrent costs are concerned.

4 05 p.m.

The funds to meet Barbados' share of the recurrent costs have been voted in the Annual Estimates from time to time, and these contributions have been based on the proportionate cost of the number of student-places occupied. In other words, Barbados has four student places at present, and there are fourteen student places so that Barbados' share is about 10%. The Government has guaranteed, subject to our minimum contribution, at least four student places. The Institute is being expanded, as the Addendum to the Resolution further sets out, and with that expansion, it will accommodate sixty students instead of forty. The Addendum further explains that this Institute is now in the process of expansion to accommodate sixty students, and this will enable the cost of the student's places to be maintained despite the rising cost of living.

Originally, British Guiana did not seem fit to come into this scheme, but in 1955 it decided to do so, and contributed its share of the Capital cost. The Capital cost of the expansion has been met from this payment, and also from a grant from Colonial Development and Welfare funds, and further from an increased Capital contribution by the Leeward Islands consequent upon a decision of that Government to increase the number of student places for which payment of recurrent cost is guaranteed.

Therefore, there will be no additional cost as far as Barbados is concerned.

The arrangements for the operation of the Institute have now been reduced to the form of the draft Agreement, which is set out here in the Schedule to the Resolution and which, on the face of it, is reasonable, and contains all the various terms and conditions under which the Barbados Government is willing to participate.

Hon. members will have gone through the terms of the draft Agreement, and they will have seen that Barbados is entitled to four places, British Guiana ten, Antigua two, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla two, Montserrat and the British Virgin Islands one, Trinidad and Tobago thirteen, Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Lucia and Dominica two each, making a total of forty places.

Under the new arrangements, when the expansion at the Institute shall have taken place, Barbados will be entitled to six student places, and that will be implementing the wishes of this Chamber which, in 1951, insisted that Barbados should have more than four student places. The House has the assurance therefore, that in the very near future—the expansion programme is taking place at present—probably, by the end of the year Barbadians will be enjoying six student places which has been the desire of this Chamber from the time of the inception of the scheme.

As Clause 5 (2) of the Schedule sets out, in the event of the expansion of the Institute, the total number of places which the Participating Governments may be occupying through their nominees shall be determined in the same proportions as those adopted in Article 5 (1), provided that the proportionate basis of contribution towards Capital Expenditure as between the Participating Governments set out in Article 4 (2) is maintained.

Mr. Speaker, the terms of this draft Agreement simply implement the terms and conditions to which this Government has agreed during 1951; all the other Participating Governments have already signed this Agreement, and had the concurrence of their respective Legislatures in assenting to the terms of this Agreement. It is on account of the hurricane and other factors which are well known to hon. members that we are the last of the Participating Governments actually to assent in the Legislature to this draft Agreement. Hon. members can rest assured that the terms and conditions of this Agreement are perfectly in order, and that they implement the conditions under which we went into the formation and establishment of this Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

#### OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:— To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Offences Against The Person Act, 1868.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I should like to point out that Section 45 of the Offences Against The Person Act, 1868, discriminates against women of immoral character by denying them protection against procurement. That might have been quite in order in 1868 when the Act was passed, but recently, there has been an International Convention brought into force and among the provisions of that

Convention, the removal of this discrimination was sought. The Act, as it stands at present, is found to be at variance with the present Act in the United Kingdom. In 1951, a similar step was taken for the removal of this discrimination, and we are now asking the Legislature of this Colony to honour that International Convention by removing that discrimination which exists now in the 1868 Act.

Section 45 of the Act reads as follows:—

“Any person who —

(1) procures or attempts to procure any girl or woman under twenty-one years of age, not being a common prostitute, or of known immoral character, to have unlawful carnal connexion, either within or without the Island, with any other person or persons; or

(2) procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to become, either within or without the Island, a common prostitute; or

(3) procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the Island with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel elsewhere; or

(4) procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave her usual place of abode in the Island (such place not being a brothel), with intent that she may for the purposes of prostitution become an inmate of a brothel within or without the Island, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour . . . .”

And the penalty on being convicted is set out. We are asking in this amending Bill, to delete from subsection 1, the following words: “not being a common prostitute, or of known immoral character” In Sub-section 4 the words “such place not being a brothel” occur, and we are asking to delete them.

By deleting these words in those two Sections it will bring the Act of 1868 into line with present day thought in connection with women of that sort. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

4.15 p.m.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

#### WATERWORKS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing; second reading of a Bill to amend the Waterworks Act, 1895.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Waterworks Act, 1895. I think honourable members will remember some time ago, I intimated to this House that a Bill was coming down to simplify and make easy the administration of the Waterworks Act. As is set out in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, honourable members will see that various clauses of the Act of 1895 are antiquated, and it is absolutely necessary to have a new Bill so as to fit them in with modern developments. (I have copies of marginal notes of the various amendments and I would like the Clerk to hand them to

hon. members in order that they will be able to follow the amendments more easily.) (*Copies were handed hon. members.*)

As the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill set out, this Bill seeks to amend the Waterworks Act so as to bring that Act into line with modern administrative practices and to make certain amendments rendered necessary by the defects of legislation enacted since the coming into force of that Act and by scientific and other developments that have occurred since that date.

Clauses 2, 3 and 10 (b) seek to make provision were the days of horses and carts and buggies) no provision was made under that Section for motor vehicles. Since we have nowadays quite a number of motor vehicles, it becomes necessary for us to amend that Section in order to include motor vehicles in that Section.

Clause 5 substitutes for the reference in Section 9 of the Act to the Compulsory Powers (Land) Act, 1888 reference to the Land Acquisition Act, 1949 which has since taken the place of the Act of 1888, and similarly Clauses 8, 19 (a) and 20 substitute for the references to "Manager of the Waterworks Department" and "Colonial Secretary", reference to the "Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department" and "Chief Secretary." Hitherto in acquiring lands for the Waterworks you had a special Act—the Act of 1888. Since then that Act has been superseded by the 1949 Act which embraces all sorts of land which are necessary to be secured by the Government from time to time; therefore, hon. members will see that Section 5 of that Act is no longer necessary because we have an Act dealing in general with the compulsory acquisition of land. It is therefore necessary to have this Clause deleted. Clauses 8, 19(a) and 20 make references to "Manager of the Waterworks Department" and "Colonial Secretary." Now that we have a change in nomenclature of those two offices in the Civil Establishment Act a change is necessary; so you will see that wherever it refers to "Manager of the Waterworks Department" and "Colonial Secretary" those words have been deleted and inserted in the place of the first phrase are in the words "Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department," and "Chief Secretary" in place of the second.

Clauses 11, 12 (a), 13, 14 (a) and (b) and Clause 17(b) seek to provide for the introduction of Fire Hydrants which now are used instead of Fire Plugs. Years ago, the term "fire plugs" was used but today we have "fire hydrants." Therefore it is necessary to take out the words "fire plugs" wherever they appear because there is no question of referring to fire plugs.

4.25 p.m.

It goes on to state that whilst Clause 21 seeks to effect minor changes in the language of Section 52 of the Act to accord with the provision of the Police Magistrates Act, 1905.

I think it is necessary to read out all of these Sections, but as hon. members will see there is a change in the Act as I hinted, and it will take some time if I have to read all the Sections with which I am dealing.

As the law stands, the Act requires that frequent reference be made to the Legislature and to the Governor-in-Executive Committee with respect to matters of a purely administrative nature. That, Sir, hon. members know is unnecessary at present. For example; if you are moving a standpost beyond twenty-two yards, you have to come to the House with a plan and get permission from the House,—a book of reference it is generally called—with the accompanying Resolution to have the standpost

moved from that particular site. That is a waste of time; it costs something to get it before the Legislature, and it is a fact that that could be better administered by the Department concerned. It might have suited us in 1895 under the Act, but I am sure hon. members would agree that we have long passed that stage, and it is time that an amendment should be effected. The Act also contains several provisions which have since become superfluous. Clauses 4, 9, 10 (a) and (c), 12 (b), 15 (d), 16 (a) and 17 (a) accordingly seek to free the Act of these defects and Clauses 6 and 7 seek to effect certain amendments consequent upon the repeal of the Sections which are in the first Schedule to the Bill. As you look at the Bill, Sir, members will see the Section set out in the first Schedule which should be repealed. You get Clause 14 dealing with the same plans as I said just now. Section 14 says "true copies of the said plan and sections and book reference or extracts, therefrom certified by the Colonial Secretary, which shall give to all parties interested, shall be received in all Courts of Justice" and so on. That is considered unnecessary and cumbersome at present and therefore it is necessary to repeal these Clauses that I referred to.

Now, Sir, by Clauses 14 (c), 16 (e) and (h), 22 and 24, it is sought to express the penalties provided under the Act in terms of dollars and in certain cases to increase the amount of the penalty. At present, hon. members will remember that we have changed over from pounds, shillings and pence to dollars and cents and the decimal system, and it is necessary to amend this section and in places where reference was made for example to £5 which is \$24, you round it off by saying \$25.

From experience it has been found that the language of Section 32 of the Act fails to prevent the accumulation of outstanding debts and that it is not always practicable for the Department to observe provisions of that section which require the Department to install service pipes within the time limited, and it is proposed in the Bill to give power to the Department to stop water from flowing in one's private premises or otherwise if one fails to pay for the installation and so on. Clause 15 (a), (b), (c) and (e) accordingly seeks to cure these defects, the defects to which I referred to just now. The amendments contained in clause 18 (b) are in line with those effected by clause 15 (a) and (b).

Clauses 16 (b), (c) and (d) seek to amend section 35 of the Act in view of the abolition of occupancy tax, — there is no longer occupancy tax, therefore these clauses have to be amended—whilst clauses 16 (f) and (g) seek to improve the administrative procedure set out under section 35 (3) of the Act; and in the final paragraph, Mr. Speaker, a minor change of language to effect a more correct description is sought to be made by clauses 18 (a) and 23, whilst clause 19 (b) seeks to make more explicit the provisions of section 44 of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, Sir, it is absolutely necessary that we have changes such as these at this stage. As you know, at present the Act lays it down that the Executive Committee is actually in charge of running the Waterworks, and that is why constant references have to be made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee; but under this amendment the Waterworks Department will be administered just as, say, the Public Works or any other Department without this constant reference to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and, as I said, constant reference to the Legislature for simple administrative matters. For example, it has never—or rather

for many years, at least since I came to this House, and even before—we have never adhered to that section which makes it compulsory to have plans submitted to the Legislature for any development in water. In other words, in any area that is to be developed in which water mains must be laid under the present Act, that has never been done. For pipes that are laid in the various tenancies or along the highways, no plans for laying these pipes come to the Legislature although the Act says that; but as I said, from long before I came to this House in 1944 and since, the only plan that comes, is when you want to remove a pipe from a certain distance or rather to a certain distance beyond 22 yards, or if the pipes are laid on lands belonging to the Government for development purposes; otherwise no plans have come to the Legislature and these sections are more honoured in the breach than in the observance. 4.35 p.m.

Therefore, we have found that it is unnecessary and also expensive to have plans drawn up and put before the House from time to time when we are laying down water mains; and many other sections of the Act make it necessary to have these amendments. The Sections are no longer workable in view of the improvement and the advancement which have been made from time to time; hence, we feel that the time has come when the Act must be amended in order to catch up with modern day practices.

If there are any questions which hon. members desire to ask, in so far as I am able to answer them, I will do so. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

*On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.*

*Clause 1 was called and passed.*

*Clause 2 was called.*

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it may be that I should have waited until we got to Clause 3 of this Bill to say what I want to say, but this Clause 2 is so bound up with Clause 3, that I will say what I want to say now. This Section deals with the inclusion of motor vehicles in the Act, and I am wondering whether what is proposed here is the correct thing to be done. Section 3 of the Act says this:—

“(1) A supply of water for domestic purposes or for domestic use shall not include a supply of water for cattle other than domestic stock, or for horses, or for washing carriages where such horses or carriages are kept for sale or hire or by a common carrier, or a supply for any trade, manufacture, or business or for watering gardens or for fountains, or for any ornamental purpose.

(2) Domestic stock shall mean stock kept by an individual for domestic purposes and not for trade, sale, or agricultural purposes.”

Section 2 of this Bill inserts the words “motor vehicle” between the definition of the words “City” and “rate” in the Act, and give the words “motor vehicle” the same definition of “motor vehicle” as set out in the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937. As the position is now, if that definition goes in, without any further explanation—well we have come a long way from washing carriages and what not. I should like to point out that 90% of the peo-

ple who own motor vehicles, only have domestic taps, they have no garden taps, and this amendment is saying that if you have a domestic tap on your premises, and you own a motor vehicle of any sort, you cannot wash it, or you cannot even put water in the radiator from that tap. This amendment is really being put in without giving the matter any serious thought, and I would urge hon. members to give it very serious consideration.

It might have been alright in 1895 when you had carriages, but when this amendment is inserted, it will affect persons who have domestic taps only. It will affect such persons who make their living out of the use of cars, and I say that if you insert this amendment as it stands, you will leave it wide open to anybody, not excluding the Police, to say that you cannot use water at all for washing cars, although you may not be washing any car. We have not reached the stage where we are using something other than water, and therefore, I counsel the Hon. Minister to say whether or not this Section should not be further defined. This Section might be phrased in such language as to let it be understood that if anyone is hailed before a Police Magistrate for using water from a domestic tap and putting it into the cooling system of the engine of a motor car, no offence has been committed. I hope the Hon. Minister will be able to clear up that point.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member has not got the point. We are not saying that you cannot use water in any car, we are saying that you cannot use the water for washing cars. I think the hon. member should know that the large garages carry meters in respect of the water with which they wash their cars and buses. We are not saying that you cannot wash your car, we are saying that you cannot wash it from the domestic tap; we are saying that in order to wash cars, you must have a water meter. We are saying that you should not wash horses which are used for freighting, and so on, from your domestic tap, but you can wash them from your tap which carries a meter. That is all we are saying.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When I am dealing with legislation and passing it, I am not thinking of any big garage. You have four or five big garages. If the Hon. Minister will read the Act, he will see the words I have already read out. It says this:—

“A supply of water for domestic purposes or for domestic use shall not include a supply of water for cattle other than domestic stock, or for horses, or for washing carriages where such horses or carriages are kept for sale or hire or by a common carrier.”

What I am telling the Hon. Minister is this: we know that the big garages have meters, and it will hardly be necessary for them to use their domestic taps for washing cars. You are really enacting something in respect of which we know that 90% of the people who keep cars for hire are people who would only have a domestic tap, and you are therefore enacting a farce and exposing people to the danger of being prosecuted for using this water for the purpose of washing cars.

4.45 p.m.

The question really is not a question of big garages at all. This is a question that after you have enacted this law and put in motor vehicles, it is going to affect not only the people who own big garages for whom you are legislating but also the people who own only a car or so. The great majority of people who own cars use water from domestic taps to wash them. As a matter of fact, to the majority of them there is no other means. Mr. Chairman, how many people do you know who use motor cars who will be able to put in a water meter? It is not like in

1920 when six people owned motor cars and those people by the overwhelming majority were the only people who had domestic taps installed on their premises. As a matter of fact, in a great number of cases owners of taxis actually use the public standpost for washing their cars. You can go down to the Lower Green at any time and see them using water from a public standpost to wash their cars.

Hon. M. E. COX: If they do that, they will be breaking the law.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, surely they are breaking the law but you have come a long way from the days of carriages. The Hon. Minister says that if you wash off your car with water from a public standpost, you will be breaking the law. That is out of the question. He also talks about the owners of big garages and racehorse owners. Let us forget the question of the owners of big garages and racehorse owners. That is brought home forcibly. We can do something in this matter but not in this way. I do not think we should include motor vehicles in this sense. No number of big garages in this Island should convince this Chamber that we should make an amendment in this way.

The Section goes on to read "or a supply for any trade, manufacture, or business or for watering gardens, or for fountains or for any ornamental purpose." Everybody agrees to that. I may say at this point that with your new system of tourist encouragement, you are offering prizes to people in villages for well kept gardens, and certain allowances should be made for that. I am sure the Hon. Minister if I asked him a question about this matter will say that this amendment is only inserted for those who are carrying on trade.

We have registered in the parish of St. Michael over 2,000 hired cars. The business of hired cars is not confined to one or two persons. Hundreds of people are making their living by keeping a taxi or a motor lorry. Some who own hired cars and motor lorries do not even have a pipe in their yard. But these people have to present their taxis to their clients in a clean and sanitary condition. If they have to present their motor vehicles in a clean and sanitary condition, must they wash them off with sea-water? This amendment would be alright if you were dealing with garages of the old days, but a man who keeps a taxi has to put water in the radiator of the car and wash it off to keep it sanitary. I do not think this amendment should be made in this way.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, every possible Clause of that old Act should be scrutinised by us very carefully because we have gone a far way since 1895. In 1895 the exploration of the water resources of this Island was then being carried on and the distribution was considerably smaller than what it is now. At that time we spent a negligible amount for running the Waterworks Department but today we are spending over \$1 million to explore new water resources, and millions of gallons of water have been released for public consumption. Therefore, the prohibition which the 1895 Act contains, does not necessarily mean that that should be included in any new Bill. When a thing is scarce, you make legislation, punitive or otherwise, to take care of the limited supply to be released; but after you have spent millions of dollars on your water supply and you have it in greater quantities, you do not have to put in your new Act these prohibited bits of legislation. It is shortsightedness to do so. You have a sufficient supply of water. Districts which suffered for water in the past now have a generous supply; therefore you do not need to have all these old clauses inserted into the new Bill. It is unnecessary. Why should

you ask tax payers whose rates have been increased in recent years and whose money has been taken from them so as to spend larger sums on the extension of the water service to pay for the water which they take to wash off their motor cars? You are telling them now that if they have a motor car they cannot wash it with the water from a domestic tap.

I am going to suggest to the Government that, with the realisation of the water supply of the Island being what it is now, these restrictions should not be applied because they cannot help the colony prosper. You are getting a greater use of a natural resource which does not cost a cent. Water is like the air; you only have to tap it. We have the necessary skill and machinery to do so; therefore these punitive Sections of the Bill need not be re-inserted.

I can remember, say, from 1910. This Waterworks Act was drafted in 1895 when most householders had to walk two or three miles for a pail of water. Only exclusive householders could afford a tap in their homes or could obtain water from a well on their premises. This amendment might all be very well if we were living in those days but today the situation has changed entirely. As a matter of fact our water situation is such today that no 12 or 24 persons should be allowed to assemble at one given standpost to draw a pail of water. Instead of having one standpost to accommodate people from a district and an adjoining village, every village should have its own standpost. Every village contains some two hundred or three hundred people. If a private householder is allowed to have two or three taps in his house, where the people of a district are too poverty-stricken to afford a tap, you should make sure now that you have such a generous supply of water that the inconveniences suffered in the past are absolutely removed.

4.55 p.m.

Therefore, that Clause can be taken out, because you know full well that every man who owns a motor-car is going to wash it. Not a member here would say he is not going to wash his motor-car whether he has a private tap or otherwise, so what is the use of putting in legislation which would bring conflict between legitimate citizens and the police. It is a waste of time. I believe it must be a little shortsightedness on the part of the Attorney General's Office, but it is unnecessary in this day. We have travelled fast from 1895 to now and it should be cut out. The more freely you allow the population to use water regardless of how they use it, the quicker the economy of the island would rise, because I know many a householder earns an extra dollar because of the increased supplies of water which we have been able to get, and I am hoping that the Government will see the wisdom in the suggestion of the hon. senior member for the City. It is unnecessary and it should be removed.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I must confess like the hon. members who have just spoken that I do not find myself enamoured by this proposed amendment. It says "'motor-vehicle' shall have the same meaning as is assigned to it by the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act of 1937." and the meaning Sir, is any mechanically propelled vehicle for use on the road, but it does not include vehicles constructed exclusively for use on rails or other specially prepared trains, so you will see how wide this definition is. In 1894, of course,—I believe that neither of us was living at the time—people who owned horses were people in affluent circumstances. In 1894, I doubt whether there are more than two members of this present Chamber sitting in here at the moment

who could have owned horses, but today a motor vehicle is owned whether for hire purposes or otherwise by almost everybody in the community except those people who prefer to use their friend's means of locomotion. Now, I do not know if it is going to be contended that by inserting the words "motor vehicle" after the word "carriages" that that will mean that this will apply only to motor vehicles which are kept for the sole purpose of hire or otherwise, and I do not know whether this is the interpretation, but even if it is, I am not conceding that it might not, because a lot of legal difficulty will be found in the interpretation because, as you see Sir, that is how it appears in the original Act of 1894, Section 3, where it says that "a supply of water for domestic purposes or for domestic use shall not include a supply of water for cattle other than domestic stock, or for horses, or for washing carriages where such horses or carriages are kept for sale or hire or by a common carrier, or a supply for any trade, manufacture, or business, or for watering gardens, or for fountains, or for any ornamental purpose". So in other words, it may be the subject of interesting legal discussion as to whether if you put "motor vehicle" there after "Carriages" it refers only to motor vehicles for sale or hire by a common carrier. If the big garages have their other supply of water, obviously this would not deal with them and what I am fearful about is — I mean if it is interpreted as I said, I cannot help interpreting it to apply to the one-man taxi—I think it is bound to create a hardship if we limited it to not more than one car or not more than two cars on certain premises. Sometimes, Sir, the owner of a single taxi merely has a license for hire; so that if a friend wants to borrow it, he could say it is licensed for borrowing, and the rent is so much per day or per mile; and it would be working a hardship with the proprietor who runs a taxi and who has to have an extra supply of water beside what he has for domestic purposes in order that he might legally wash his car. That is where I said in the old days the owners of horses were well-to-do people, so in 1894 the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or say the honourable junior member for St. Andrew would have owned their 'carriage-and-four.' Of course, they should pay for water, but even in those days the justification was that the supply was so limited and the sources which we have recently tapped were then untapped; but, Sir, I am not in favour of the inclusion of these words because I do see that as wide as it is now, the one-man taxi owner would have to have an extra supply of water; otherwise he may not legally wash his car in his yard. I make little distinction between that person and a person who has a private car. As a matter of fact, a person with a private car is usually a person in quite a better position than the person who has one car for hire in the majority of cases, because he has a private car for comfort and convenience and sometimes for purposes of luxury, whereas the proprietor of a one man taxi has a source of slender livelihood and he deserves more consideration than this would entitle him to. That is why I look with disfavour on the inclusion of these words. It seems to me a matter of trying to bring the Act up to date so that anyone reading the Waterworks Act would realise that Barbados has motorcars—just putting in something to say we have motor vehicles in this island and no longer have horses and carriages,—but Sir, that is my view of the matter and I am not persuaded that it is wise to include "motor vehicles" when certainly that can be interpreted to apply to the case of a single vehicle owned by someone who happens to have a licence for hire.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I must agree with those other members on this side that we are making this amendment to bring the Act up-to-date from 1895 to 1956. We need not include carriages or any of these things today. There are no carriages anyhow. If you want to bring the Act up-to-date, eliminate carriages and do not put in automobiles. Apart from half a dozen large garages who have already installed means of water which I am sure they will continue to pay for, cars for hire are owned individually. There are owned not only in Bridgetown, but throughout the island. Are you going to tell me that these individuals will be asked if they have domestic taps now, to have in another one metered because they happen to have one or two cars? That is what you are asking!

5.05 p.m.

Or else you are asking people not to wash their cars at home; they must go somewhere and buy water and wash them! I think that this Bill would be more up-to-date if these vehicles were eliminated; if you put in an established garage employing 10 or 12 taxi drivers, you may say that you cannot afford to lose anything, but the majority of cars in this island which are licensed for trade are owned individually and are owned in such a way that it would be impossible for persons to turn in another tap and have it metered. I think that the Government should see that point, and at this stage, I think they should realise that a further amendment should be made.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I should like to ask the hon. member whether his argument applies only to cars. Does the hon. member realise that the distinction between a domestic supply and a non-domestic supply of water extends to baker shops too? Does the hon. member realise that every person who is carrying on every single bit of trade of any kind has to pay for a non-domestic supply? Is he going to carry his argument further and say that not only should you collect from people who own 10 cars or 12 cars, but you should also collect from bakeries or gardens of a certain size? Is he going to eliminate sugar factories and gardens? What has happened, is that the hon. member has forgotten, and I myself forgot, that a private person cannot use his domestic water supply for washing off his car. I used to use my garden hose for washing off my car; I am not saying that is on every occasion,—[Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What?] if the hon. member will let me finish my sentence—my car gets washed sometimes when the rain falls.

The hon. senior member for the City, being more astute than the hon. senior member for St. John, could at once turn his argument in a different direction; having failed on the question of the domestic supply, he went off in respect of one car owner. The hon. senior member for St. John, more lumbering in his arguments than the hon. senior member for the City, made the mistake of saying that we are hitting at a person who owns a private car. To suggest that,—after all, you can always call it a domestic supply—reminds me of a case which I once happened to hear the late Mr. Walter Reece argue. A baker was charged with using water for domestic purposes in carrying on his business and the late Mr. Walter Reece argued that the baker sold his bread in Barbados, and did not sell it abroad. [Laughter].

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The argument of the hon. senior member for St. John was even stronger than mine. The Government got a few shillings as licence for a car, and it is a fact that you have been able to develop your water system in Barbados. I should like to say that on every gallon of gasoline which a

car owner uses, you get 28c. and when you talk about washing off a car with this water, I should like to ask how else did you get this water supply? If you are using your car for hire, and you wash off that car, then under this Bill you will have to pay something extra.

As regards the question of bakeries, that is an entirely different matter. I have argued this matter on another occasion. Let us take the factories where drinks are manufactured in this Colony; whether they make \$40,000 or \$50,000, I argue that the manufacturers of these drinks should pay at a higher rate than anybody else in this Colony. Another point is this: every time you get a gallon of rum, you get 3 pints of water. That is common knowledge. [Laughter]. It is a trade secret, says the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but how else can you do business? [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What about the milk?] Well, the Hon. Premier knows more about that than I know; he has been practising in the Courts.

I contend that the Hon. Premier's argument in respect of the bakeries is not on all-fours with the other argument. In connection with a person who has a car and who must keep it in a proper condition, he is told that he must install a meter in respect of water; that is not at all on all-fours with the bakeries and the rum shops which actually sell the water. With regard to dairies and drug stores, they sell all water; I hope the hon. junior member for St. John will not take umbrage at that. [Laughter]. I am not saying that the dairies generally sell water, but they must use a lot of water if they must sell clean milk.

I am not wasting any more time with that; I am not voting for this amendment. We have come a long way from the carriages; today you collect from the owner of a motor vehicle a tax which is laid down, but you collect 28c. on each gallon of gasoline he uses, and now you say that he cannot wash his car on the domestic water supply, although the water supply has been obtained as a result of this taxation on the car.

I do not think that the Attorney General or the Legal Draughtsman would be as well acquainted with the local conditions as the Hon. Minister would be. You will find that some of the owners of these vehicles have not even got any taps in their yards never mind a domestic water supply.

5.15 p.m.

What do they do now? If you go into the lower Green, you will see them using water from the public standpost to wash their cars. Those whose taxis are parked in front of this building use water from the standpipe in this yard to wash them off. They are not washing their cars with water registered by a garden water meter system. As soon as you put amendments like this in an Act you make it difficult for people. I am suggesting to Government that this is an error. It is wrong and it should not be included in this Bill. We on this side of the table are not going to vote for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I want to say that it is not really on Clause 3 that the question should be put, it should be Clause 2. The reason why I would vote against Clause 2 is because that Clause deals actually with what we are debating.

Clause 3 hinges on that.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. MILLER—8.

Noes: Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. J. C. TUDOR, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GODDARD, and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY—6.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

## ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.25 p.m.

On resumption.

## WATERWORKS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: On adjournment the House was in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 and 24 inclusive were called and passed.

The first, second and third schedule were called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this closes the Government business for the afternoon, and I believe the hon. junior member for Christ Church wants to go on with his Bill.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. In view of what has been said by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I am willing to proceed with Order No. 2 of Private Members' Business standing in my name.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Christ Church was on his feet first.

Mr. BRANCKER: Order No. 1 is first, but as the proposer for that is out of the House at present, the next one is Order No. 2.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask leave to take Order No. 8 as the next Order of the Day.

## XMAS BONUS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a right to take the orders as they stand. The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this Address is one which I am sure hon. members should at least be convinced of its dire necessity. As you recall, Sir, it was in September 1949 ....

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I hope the hon. member does not mind if I interrupt him. I want to inform him that this question is being put before the Salaries Commissioner; and I wonder whether he would still go on with it.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am sure hon. members of this Chamber are prepared to strengthen and fortify the attitude of the Salaries Commissioner in reviewing a matter of this kind, and I am certain if the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, the Minister of Finance, tells the Salaries Commissioner that this has passed this Chamber, he will look with greater favour on it than if the matter had been done with out scrutiny accorded to the public purse. You will recall that in September 1949 when we fully and first threshed out this matter, in those less enlightened days there were only six members to be found to support this Resolution and seven members who were then to oppose it. That unlucky number of thirteen was the number who happened to be in the Chamber at the time. The Address reads as follows:

*HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
TO  
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR*

1. The House draws to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the necessity for the institution of an annual Christmas bonus for all public employees whose pensionable emoluments do not exceed fifteen hundred dollars (\$1,500) annually.

2. The House requests that Government take effective action whereby such will be paid as from December this year."

6.10 p.m.

As you know, Sir, it is the practice of private firms in this Island, hard as they undoubtedly are in many instances towards their employees, to give a certain amount of Christmas bonus; sometimes, they will give a fortnight's wages or a month's wages as the case may be. It is the Government which should set the example and leave it to private enterprise to follow. We cannot, in this case, set an example, because the precept is already before us: but I do not see the justification for continuing to lag behind private enterprise, and allow the lower-paid employees of the Government to suffer. Your Honour will realise, as a person who mixes with people, what it is to the humbly-paid employees of this Government—from the casual employees of the Highways & Transport Department and the Water Works Department to the Elementary School Teachers—the difficulties which they have to tide over, never without assistance, I am sure, over the Christmas period; and also the difficulties of those who are paid monthly after their salary cheque has been cashed on the 19th December, and they have to wait for six weeks, until the 23rd or 24th of January before they are in receipt of any further remuneration. Despite the assistance which they get from the Friendly Societies, they draw their salary a week or two before hand, and there is nothing at all left in the three weeks of January until they are paid again.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to place any burden on the Public Treasury by including the more highly-paid Officials in this proposal. Certainly a person who is getting \$200, \$300, \$400 or \$500 a month should be able to look after himself. Everybody likes to receive a present—I do not suppose even the hon. junior member for St. An-

drew, would refuse a substantial present—but there would not be any justification for taking money from the Public Treasury and giving it to those persons who can spend a happy Christmas irrespective of any bonus. Private enterprise is more partial to their highly-paid people and will continue to give 3, 4, 6 and 9 months' salary as bonus. I am suggesting that the equivalent of 4 weeks' wages be the amount of Christmas bonus which the Government should be prepared to sponsor.

I have mentioned this figure of \$1,500, but I am not wedded against \$1,440 or \$1,600, but I think that a figure in that vicinity deals with the persons in that category who have a really hard time at Christmas in order to survive the economic ordeal. It is all very well to say "Happy Christmas" and "Merry Christmas" to everybody, but if we want persons to whom we are responsible for payment, if we want to enable those lower paid people to enjoy a happy or merry Christmas, then there is only one way quite rightly, in my opinion, drawn attention to which would not, in my view, constitute too heavy a drain on the public purse, but it would be a most justifiable measure to assist them at that important season of the year which is the spending season. It would greatly assist the lowest paid persons in the public employment in this Colony.

We know that the Elementary School teachers, the casual workers of the Highways & Transport Department, the casual workers of the Waterworks Department, the Police Constables and people of that class, find it almost impossible to survive at that period of the year. I suppose that every member of this Chamber is asked in the course of the year, "What is being done about the Christmas bonus? Is the House no more enlightened or sympathetic towards this proposal than it was in those black days in September, 1949, when an Address of that kind was defeated by the close margin of 7—6 in the Chamber?"

I do not think it is necessary for me to emphasise the point any more: I think that the actual details can be worked out by the Government. I am suggesting that the equivalent of four weeks' wages or a month's salary as bonus to persons in the salary range of \$125.00 a month or to people who are drawing no more than \$25 or \$30 a week. They are the people who stand in dire need; they have to borrow in early January and pay that back from the January pay cheque. The month of January is one in which nobody can live on less than two months' normal expenditure or salary. Without any more ado, Mr. Speaker, I formally beg to move that this Address do now pass.

6.20 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion for the passing of this Address which has been brought forward by my colleague, I should like to say, first of all, that far too little attention has been paid in this House to the situation of those employees of the Government whose wages and salaries fall below a certain range.

Mr. Speaker, unless Your Honour's memory fails you, you will recall that the Government Party suffered its first crisis in this House over the question of what should, and should not have been paid, to the employees of the Government and it has left a heritage of bitterness inside and outside of this House which will only be removed by the electorate. Here is a chance before that fateful day to see whether it can be removed.

It is, therefore, not a matter which savours of much political controversy, because it is not a political matter at all. In all its essentials it is very sim-

ple. It is a recognition of the fact that Government employs some people who are worse off than some, and those who are worse off are those at the end of the Establishment. It is only common decency that whenever the opportunity offers itself, as it is in this Address, that some reservations should be made to those employees whose cases should be looked into when salaries are revised. The Salaries Commissioner is now going into the pros and cons of this very aspect of Government policy to recommend, if he can, what scale of remuneration should be given for those who are paid out of the Public Treasury.

I should like to express the hope that all the blunders, all the hardships and all the anomalies will be removed; but in the meanwhile, this Address which is more limited in its scope, merely asks that the Government adopt as part of its policy that at least once a year bonus (the particular sums can be arrived at) be paid to the lowest paid employees of Government so that the hardships of struggling with the cost of living will not bear too heavily on them.

The people referred to by my colleagues are people who are members of the working class. It does not matter that because they are postmen, police constables, nurses or teachers, they are lifted out of that category of persons which this Government allegedly represents. They are of the people, and any boon which can be conferred on them will be received not in the belief that something wonderful has been done, but that the principle reached has been upheld. I have therefore great pleasure in supporting my colleague and in commending this Address to the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I think that if you read between the lines of the speeches made by the hon. Mover of the address and the Seconder, you will probably arrive at the real basis of the argument. Implied in the Address is the fact that since workers in this category are underpaid, some reference should be made in some form or the other to give them a more living wage. The hon. Mover of the Address is asking that the deficit should be made up by a Christmas bonus and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has quite rightly, in my opinion, drawn attention to the fact that what is really wrong is that their basic wages are really too low and Government when minded to give an increase of wages to Government servants puts on a greater increase on the people in the higher brackets, and when it gets down to the employees in the lower bracket it gives them more sparingly.

In 1953 when there was the last salaries revision the Government did not see fit to award the workers in this category more than one penny an hour. We on this side of the table demanded at least a four cents increase and after strenuous opposition, the Government made some sort of compromising gesture by adding another cent to the proposed increase. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph, now the Premier, actually told the House that the increase would mean a complete cessation of the Public Works Programme and that we would have to curb our social expenditure. There would be no finances for carrying on the educational programme and the most serious lamentation which came forth from him was to the effect of the financial destiny which would overtake the colony if he agreed to the request of the Opposition and give those workers the increase which was demanded. The hon. member said that the entire Public Works programme would have to come to an end, and yet you will remember after that he allowed the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Robert Turner, who was appointed as

Salaries Commissioner for officials in the higher brackets of the Service, to award the most extravagant increases to Government officials over and above the remuneration mentioned in this Address.

It will be still fresh to hon. members of the House and the public, of course, of the strenuous debate which ensued in this House when the proposals came before us, and it is still a matter for heartburning how unfair was the answer of the Government when it came to giving an increase on the one hand to those higher officials and what it did to those who were lesser paid. So, Sir, by this reminder that the salaries of these workers are manifestly much lower than what they should be, you can very easily understand why the minds of some hon. members on this side of the table should be exercised over the unfair wages paid to the unestablished staff, so to speak, in the Government Service.

Of course, this is not the time to dilate unnecessarily on this matter because at long last the Government has got around to the fact that Government servants are in need of higher remuneration if they are to cope with the higher cost of living. It is a matter for regret that the large bulk of the workers in Government Service gets less than those who are working on sugar plantations. The average agricultural worker when he gets work is paid at a higher day's rate than, say, people who are working on the staff of the Department of Highways and Transport or the Public Works Department, and it is also known that among the members of the unestablished staff there is also a wage scale which does not compare favourably with workers in similar categories in private employment.

6.30 p.m.

Either therefore, Sir, the Government realises the obligation under which it exists in respect of these workers by endorsing the words contained in this Address and giving them this special bonus at Christmas time, or better still, Sir, should endeavour to ensure that their weekly earnings bear a better relationship to employees in the high brackets of the public service who for the greater part are entitled to these high wages, long vacations with pay, holiday with pay, pension rights and so on; and I repeat, Sir, they should endeavour to make their wages bear a better relation to the remuneration of those in the higher brackets by seeing to it that they are paid a salary more in keeping with the abnormal high cost of living. The Government has done its best to increase the cost of living; it has made a special effort to see to it that the cost of living in Barbados is the highest in the area. You will remember, Sir, what they did with the Customs Duties, which themselves were the highest in the area.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now going outside the terms of the Address. He must really keep to the Christmas Bonus, and although the hon. member has admitted that this was not the time to deal with it at unnecessary length, yet he in speaking of the wages of these workers, has repeatedly and at some length dilated from the subject and, I am sure, he should not now further dilate in the matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have no desire to do that Sir, but my recollection in connection with the matter is that the last time it was before the House, the Government members were inclined to treat it very facetiously and there was opposition expressed today on the floor of the House from the Government Benches. One Government member at the time actually called it trash so that my idea today is therefore to endeavour to impress upon the minds of hon. members that so deserving is this type of worker at the hands of the Government in the moving of the

Address, that I can do no better Sir, than to remind the House that the people need this money because of the high cost of living. Far be it from me to dilate today on aspects of the matter which might be more properly considered if and when the actual salary increases come before the House, but for the purpose of the Address before us, it is still highly essential that hon. members should have impressed upon their minds the fact that while it has been pointed out by both previous speakers that these people are now underpaid, the mere fact that the Government has at least appointed a Salaries' Commissioner is an admission that they regard salaries below what they should be; and since these facts are uncontrovertible, then something should be done to redress these unfair balances in so far as this type of worker is concerned. Therefore, Sir, I make no apologies for reminding the House that the cost of living in Barbados is today higher than it is in any other British West Indian Colony in the area. It is higher than the cost of living in Great Britain, it is higher than the cost of living in Canada, and it is higher than the cost of living in the United States of America. Foodstuffs, clothes and the basic necessities of life, cost more in Barbados today than they do in these places. Due mainly, Sir, to the policy of the Government it has directly contributed to the cost of living by increasing Customs Duties; its policy as regards commodities from America is the most stringent in the area where they allow far less than any other West Indian Island. Everybody knows . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now pursuing a different line of argument.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I must Sir, most necessarily. What I want to respectfully submit is: that there can be no argument for giving this bonus on increased wages to this type of worker unless one can prove that the cost of living entitles him to it and I am submitting Sir, that if on the one hand you directly increase the cost of living by taxation policy and on the other hand you purposely restrict the cheapest goods from coming to the market—and that is what you are doing with American commodities—there is no question about it. In the other islands of the West Indies the dollar expended in proportion is far in excess for essential commodities than in Barbados. I repeatedly hear Commission Merchants whose business takes them to the other West Indian Islands marvelling at the comparatively big orders which they can get in a small island like St. Vincent or St. Kitts for American goods in comparison with what they can get in Barbados. There is not one single essential commodity in Barbados today which you cannot get cheaper from America than from Great Britain.

6.40 p.m.

Even when allowance is made for the difference in exchange for putting sterling on a par with the American dollar, even the basic commodities, every single one can be obtained cheaper from America than from Great Britain. The policy of the Government is to see that the minimum amount of goods is bought from the American market, but goods are obtained mainly from England.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has well elaborated on that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I regret very much that I am not allowed to say anything more on the matter because I have some facts for the House which are astounding. Be that as it may, since the Government is directly responsible for the actual existence of this type of worker, and since the Government is adding an unnecessary burden to the back of this

type of worker, then the obligation falls on them, as I said earlier, to endeavour to make this burden as light as possible for the worker.

If, for the future, that is to say, if after the salary revision, we may expect some more reasonable scale of remuneration, then as some sort of gesture for all the years that these people were underpaid and exploited, the Government might well endorse the suggestion contained in the Address. Whether you call it a Christmas bonus or not, they should make some adequate lump sum payment to this type of worker between now and 31st December. As I said, we expect that when the salaries are revised, the wages will commemorate with the ability of the Government to pay, considering the enormous wealth which is extracted from the Country, and if the wages are going to be reasonable in the future, let them discharge that responsibility for the past by doing something along the lines indicated in this Address.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, while I see many good points in what the hon. Mover of the passing of this Address has said, especially with regard to the lower brackets of the Unestablished Staff of the Civil Service, yet, I am not in favour of the title of the Address. With regard to the question of an incentive bonus, I believe that most of the personnel in charge of Departments could make note of all the points of efficiency or working conditions and those points could be considered by the Departments, and an incentive bonus could be given on that Scale, if you like, at Christmas time. I am quite sure that the money thus spent would be money well spent if that system were adopted, but I certainly cannot conceive the idea of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy proposing that this Christmas bonus should be given in this way. I do not think that any rational person could conceive of it. I will support the Address if hon. members would insert an amendment along the lines I have indicated.

Mr. BARROW: I do not regard it as a sound economic policy to withhold the just reward of their work from the workers for eleven months of the year and then give them something at a time when it is highly unlikely that the workers will be able to reserve any of the money which is given to them for purposes other than those of their own advancement. At the same time, human conduct being what it is, certain economic habits of seasonal spending are deeply ingrained in this Colony. I would be the last person to oppose the idea that at the very time when the demands on the resources of the working class man are at their highest, his purchasing power should be increased in some measure in the way in which the purchasing power of the clerk who is fortunate enough to work with a big business firm is increased.

We all know that in certain business undertakings in this Island, the employers pay big bonuses to their workers including themselves, because they consider themselves, by some peculiar act of mental gymnastic to be workers, although they may be sitting in chairs and doing absolutely nothing all the day long; but in order to cover up their reluctance to pay into the Treasury of this Island, the excess profits which they are making from time to time, especially under a so-called Labour Government they have adopted the device of paying fantastic bonuses in the region of \$7,000, \$8,000 or \$9,000 to themselves as Directors, and therefore, as employees of the firms which they control, varying in inverse proportion to the rank of the particular worker in the firm down the Scale to bonuses of \$300 and \$400 a month.

Some firms pay as much as 10 months' bonus, some 5 months, some 2; some of them pay 10 months' bonus to Directors, and some 6 months' bonus to the junior managerial staff; they pay various amounts dependent on the amount of excess profits which the Control Board and the Labour Government have allowed them to accumulate in the space of eleven months of the year.

7.00 p.m.

Now, their ability to make large disbursements at Christmas time does not spring from any conversion to christianity on their part; its springs, as I have said before, from the desire naturally, on their part, because of the hegemony under which we are suffering at this time of our history to pay as little money into the Public Treasury as they legally are allowed to pay. That is their first instinct and this instinct is engrained in the economic life of every citizen, so to speak, during the last five years. They are saying: "I am not paying into the Public Treasury more than I have to pay because it is going to be squandered." In the second place, they are able to pay this large bonus at Christmas time for the simple reason that there is an increment incurring to the financial assets of the firm during the course of the year which is not provided for even in their wage structure or their demands for mortgage and capital outlay; in other words, the excess profits are due to the fact that they are paying out to the workers less money during the course of the year and the Christmas bonus then becomes a deferred payment of wages.

In so far as the Government is concerned, the only undertaking which it has of a commercial nature is the Transport Board and we all know that that Board will not be able to pay out a bonus this year. We know that Government is not of a commercial nature and the people who work in Government cannot stake their claim to a deferred payment on the same consideration which would prompt the clerical worker in Broad Street to make his demand. But there are other considerations. This Government has thought fit that any one working for \$180 a month, whether he be in a profit making concern like the General Post Office or in a department like the Education Department or the Waterworks Department which operating on a profit and loss basis cannot possibly pay for itself—without any distinction between Department and Department—has elected in its wisdom and succumbed to the blandishments of certain officers of the colony a few years ago and top-ranking Civil Servants to pay to those particular officers working for more than \$400 a month a deferred payment so that they can go on holiday. I challenge anyone to say that it is not a deferred payment you pay him every three and a half years in the form of leave passages for himself and his wife. Leave Passage means a minimum of £400 given to those employees who get over \$180 a month for every three and a half years of service. Let me say that before the Labour Government came into power in Barbados, no one thought that the climate of the colony was inimical to the upper branches of the Civil Service so that any one of them could claim, as they do in Africa, that the climate is so inimical to them that they need this deferred payment by the granting of a leave passage to allow them to go back home to recuperate. We have a policy laid down by this Government that the basic needs of a human beings are food, shelter and clothing. You get this Government deciding though it had said so, that Civil Servants who work for more than \$180 a month should have a deferred payment of 25% of their salary given to them once every four years; that is, at the end of 3½ years they go on six months vaca-

tion and get something like £400. By simple arithmetic it works out to 25% of their salary per annum.

This Government has also decided to give to another section of the people of the colony, the agricultural workers, especially at election time, a 19% deferred payment although they are represented by a strong and virile Trade Union; therefore we take it that they get the maximum to which their labours entitle them, taking into consideration the state of the sugar industry.

Now, let us start with these assumptions. We start with the assumption of good wages being paid because of the revision of wages among the sugar industry. You start with the assumption that the Trade Union is already getting for the workers a fair and just proportion of the profits which were and are being made by the sugar industry of Barbados, and at election time you get Government seeing to it that the sugar workers get this 19% deferred payment. Speaking of that new principle which Government has established, we have then at one side of the stage, the Government deciding for their own employees a deferred payment. We have as well a permanent system in the sugar industry whereby the agricultural workers get a deferred payment. Whether they get it in September or December (it is for some mysterious reason not unrelated to the election date) is a matter of supreme indifference to me, but it is a fact that after June they get a deferred payment although they are well organised in a Trade Union and although their average wages are far in excess of the average cantonnier who working for the Barbados Government gets less than \$11.60 a week of which \$1.60 is cost of living bonus. I will not refer to people like janitors because they get less than \$7 a week.

It is elementary, Mr. Speaker, that human requirements being more or less similar between person and person, and country and country, that when a man has an income which will provide him with the basic requirements and leave him with an excess over and above his basic requirements, he has an element of choice in the disposal of that part of his income over his basic requirements. It may sound to some hon. members as if I am theorising but I am quite serious. A man who is working for \$6.50 a week has no element of choice in the disposal of his income because he has no excess income. A man who works for \$180 per month has an element of choice in the disposal of his income, but a man working for \$45 per month has no element of choice in the disposal of his income.

7.10 p.m.

His income is disposed of for him the minute he wakes up in the morning and demands his breakfast because his whole purchasing power is consumed by basic requirements. If we accept therefore the fact that we are living in a Christian community and that we have acquired the habit of increased spending at Christmas time, and that you recognise moral obligations both to your friends and to your family and to those who work for you and with you at this time of the year which you are content to ignore for the rest of the year, it means a man working for \$11.60 a week—and I would go so far to say a man working for less than \$180 a month—cannot give play to his desire to participate in the season of goodwill to the extent to which he would like or at all. He has not got any scope to allow himself to feel the same human being as the man who gets a leave passage every four years or three and a half years; he does not get leave passage at all; he has not got that to look forward to. Every year in the United Kingdom, so great is the increase in the circulation of British Treasury notes that the Treasury has to issue £25 million at the beginning of December which they call back in during the

second or third week in January and destroy; but there is this terrific temporary inflation, this terrific desire of every single person in the community to spend more money than he has been spending during the rest of the year; and if I may come back home to my original proposition, I would like to say this: in the light of the talk of making appointments to the higher branches of the Civil Service, in the light of their elevation into the Sugar Industry and that the payments are in an undesirable state of affairs, it should not be computed with weekly workers that there should be this lump sum payment which is usually disgorged before Labour Day or before Election time; they have expected these deferred payments, whether you call it leave passages or production bonus or Christmas bonus for that matter; deferred payment is a principle which has not only been endorsed and accepted by Government but initiated by them, and no other person, in so far as Government spending is concerned.

Now, I would like to draw a reference to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew for his not particularly liking the way in which the Resolution is framed because he would prefer the payment to be called an incentive. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew says that he would agree if it were called an incentive, but I would like to say this: that any payment to a worker which makes him feel happier and more content in the job that he is doing is an incentive towards doing the job better; it must stand to reason and I would like to know whether his lieutenants and the other captains of industry alongside of him call their Christmas bonus an incentive payment or whether they call it a Christmas bonus. In the last analysis, whatever you call it, whether you call it Christmas bonus or production bonus, is it not really and truly an incentive payment made to the worker in order to make him feel he is getting a bigger share of the product of his labour than he would be if he did not get it at all? So it is no argument against the Resolution moved by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy that he has not elected to call it an incentive payment. I will go so far as to say it is an incentive, but it would be a mispayment for the simple reason that incentive payments should always be based on time rather than a period of time during which you have worked. I would like to say this before I sit, that even when you take the people who are working for only £1,000 in the Government Service in Barbados, you will find that with that £1,000 a year when they get leave ment to the lower branches of the Civil Service—and I hope the hon. member for St. Lucy would accept an amendment to let that run from £425 per annum downwards, because that is the lowest salary level at which leave passages are given; therefore, since you have given everybody over £425 a year leave passages, I feel it would be a good point, a point chosen by Government themselves, to grant new dispensation to the lower salaries of the Government service, and I would like to point out that a month's salary at Christmas time is only eight and a half or more correctly eight and a third per cent. of their salary while sugar producers are getting more, and people with leave passages are getting 10%, 15% or 25%. They are drawing that amount over and above their salaries at the end of three and a half years, when a man in the service would get leave passage for himself alone not including passage for his wife and children. In other words, since they believe in the principle of maintaining differentials, it is almost as obnoxious a term as floating economy because that economy is not going anywhere at all, it is like a cork bobbing up and down. The Address of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy

would preserve the principle of wage differential, because that would be giving the workers 8%, whereas people getting £1,000 get 10% at the end of the year and those getting £4,000 are getting 25%. Whether you call it incentive payment production bonus, Christmas bonus or otherwise, the principle must be reduced to the lowest common factor.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will not be long. I voted for the Address in 1949 and I will vote for it again today. I have risen to offer congratulations to the Government or to commend the Government because of what the Hon. Premier has said. On the last occasion, the Hon. Premier made a very witty speech, and said that we should have amended the Address so as to include persons who wanted to go on a week-end spree, or who wanted to have a birthday party and so on. I am not making any lengthy speech today; I am voting for the Address on the assurance which the Hon. Premier has given to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, that the matter is now before the Salaries Commissioner, and it would be taken care of.

That seemed to be quite contrary to the Hon. Premier's opinion on the last occasion. The Hon. Premier has inferred that they are in favour of this Address; he said, when he asked if the hon. senior member for St. Lucy would give way to him, that the matter is before the Salaries Commissioner. I take it that the Government is in favour of the proposal contained in this Address.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of explanation I am too old to be caught in any trap. [A MEMBER: You are caught in it now!] I have not expressed any opinion whatever. When the Salaries Commissioner has the complete position before him, he will report to us: then we will be able to say to what extent we agree with him. I am not saying what is the opinion of the Government towards this matter, because we have not discussed it yet.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Salaries Commissioner must have had terms of reference of some sort. I might be a fool, but you could not accuse the hon. senior member for St. Lucy of being a fool. But how else could anybody interpret the Hon. Premier when he got up after the hon. senior member for St. Lucy began to move the passing of this Address and asked the hon. member to give way to him? From what the Hon. Premier said, well, if he were poking fun, I do not know; he might have been making fun, but he asked the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to give way to him, and he said that the matter is before the Salaries Commissioner. We all know that the Hon. Premier would not waste any time in putting before the Salaries Commissioner anything with which the Government was not in favour. I take it that the Government is in favour of the payment of this Christmas bonus as set out in this Address, and if the Salaries Commissioner recommends 15%, the Hon. Premier will recommend 10%. I am glad indeed to know that the Hon. Premier, who is really the Government, has been converted and feels [Mr. TUDOR: He has not said so]—well, the Hon. Premier says that the matter is now before the Salaries Commissioner. I say that I am supporting this Address, and I am glad to see from the expression of the Hon. Premier, that the Government is in favour of it.

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

Ayes: MESSRS. VAUGHAN, [laughter], BRANCKER, BARROW, TUDOR, CRAWFORD, ALLDER, HAYNES, GODDARD and E. D. MOTTLEY.—9.

Noes: Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SMITH, Mrs. BOURNE and Mr. MILLER.—7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, nine hon. members voting "Aye," and seven hon. members voting "No." I declare the "Ayes" have it. I ask the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to present this Address.

Mr. BRANCKER: As Your Honour pleases.

### THE BARBADOS LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY (PUMPING STATION) BILL

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 8 as the next Order of the Day.

*There being no objection, leave was granted the 7.30 p.m.*

*Haynes, the House went into Committee on the Bill, The Preamble was postponed.*

*Clause 1 and 2 were called and passed.*

*Clause 3 was called. It read as follows—*

"3. The company is hereby authorised to construct and maintain two or more pipelines beginning at a place near the shore of Grave's End in the parish of St. Michael in this Island to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, thence continuing on or under the fore-shore and along the sea bed to a place in the sea to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of conveying sea water to be pumped from the sea into the company's circulating water pumping plant and thence returning to the sea by such pipelines.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, Clause 3 is to the effect that the company is hereby authorised to construct and maintain two or more pipelines beginning at a place near the shore of Grave's End in the parish of St. Michael in this Island to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, thence continuing on to or under the foreshore and along the sea-bed to place in the sea to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of conveying sea water to be pumped from the sea into the company's circulating water pumping plant and thence returning to the sea by such pipelines. I want you to read those lines carefully.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if any member of the Government would like to get up and inform members of this House that they not only approved of this matter before it passed the House but that the pipelines were being laid down some three weeks ago approximately sixty-five feet north of the canteen that is there, and along with that, they have entered into an agreement already for the purpose of putting down that pipeline. As a matter of fact, if you go up to Graves End, as you are accustomed, you are likely to fall down and break your neck because of the two-foot diameter pipelines, which are lying on the beach. It is something which any hon. member can check for himself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to tell the hon. member that this House has already passed a Resolution on this same thing.

Mr. BARROW: But I am speaking on Clause 3

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am only telling you that this House has passed the Resolution to approve of the lease of this land at Grave's End to the Barbados Light and Power Company.

Mr. BARROW: I am saying that not only have we agreed to the Resolution to approve of the lease

of the land, but that the honourable junior member for Christ Church has introduced this Bill in this House when all of that had been agreed to already, so that we are only going through a Gilbert and Sullivan farce of passing something which is an accomplished fact. In other words, this Chamber is reduced to the level of a school debating society because it has no power to disallow or disapprove of anything which is against the public interest.

I do not want to go into another aspect of the matter now, because I have already talked at length on that, but I do not like us to be going through the mockery of passing a Bill in all its stages when the Executive has already agreed to lease the Barbados Light and Power Company the land. As a matter of fact, they have seen and shown us the plan, a privilege with which the hon. junior member for Christ Church has not been vouchsafed.

I want to say to this Committee: do not ask me to support you in giving permission to any retrospective thing which they have done in connivance with the Government or on their own. As it appears to me, it is not necessary for them to come to the House with this Bill to authorise them to lay down pipelines which were not manufactured in Barbados and which are about 20 to 24 inches in diameter and which they have already laid out on the foreshore of Graves End, where they are to be laid down. These pipelines have come all the way from England and must have been ordered over a year ago. This matter is a fore-gone conclusion and I am not participating in any mockery like this. If this Company was owned by the people of Barbados as should have been done according to the terms of the Barbados Light and Power Company, it might have been alright, but I think it is an effrontery on their part and whoever assisted them to put down the pipelines. I strongly object to it. I can never vote for it because, in my opinion this whole thing is a hollow mockery; the way in which public affairs in this Island are conducted is a mockery both to the rural law and Parliamentary democracy.

*The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Clauses 4 to 10 inclusively were called and passed.*

*Clause 11 was called. It reads as follows:—*

"This Act shall continue in force until and inclusive of the day of 1977."

Mr. GODDARD: I am asking leave to fill in the spaces, the first with the word "thirty-first" and the second with the word "August."

I beg to move that Clause 11 stand part.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*  
7.40 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to move that Clause 12 stand part.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*On the motion of Mr. GODDARD seconded by Mr. ALLDER the Preamble was passed.*

*On the motion of Mr. GODDARD seconded by Mr. ALLDER, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Mr. GODDARD seconded in each case by Mr. ALLDER the Bill was read a third time and passed.*

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say in connection with Order No. 9 of Private

Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. When he gave notice of this, it occurred to me that the honourable member would find considerable difficulty in getting a successful answer if this Address passed or was even forwarded. I made the necessary enquiries and I am sure that there is no chance of having the hon. member's request complied with, and I am suggesting that he does not proceed with this Address because it would be rather embarrassing, to say the least, if the House of Assembly passed an Address asking for something to be done if the answer is going to be "No". I believe the honourable member sees the sensibleness, if I may coin a word, of not proceeding with it and I wanted to make that statement so that the hon. member may be clear on certain things which however much we may like, are not just done and this, I am sure, is one of the things, Sir.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I have heard with interest the statement of the Hon. the Premier and I am glad to hear also that a check has been made before hand to ascertain the feasibility of the passing of this Address in this House. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to sponsor an Address in this House, non-controversial as it is, which might be visited by a rebuff of this House. The Address itself is of course non-political in character but still very serious I will tell you what I will do, Mr. Speaker, I won't actually withdraw it from the Order Paper, but I will just leave it there so that I can satisfy myself by an independent check of it in the House of Commons and other interested parties as to whether the procedure envisaged was as wrong as it is alleged to be.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I hoped the hon. members would have understood the explanation given. I took the trouble to make enquiries so that he would not be in the position of not knowing what the answer was going to be. I have seen some such questions asked, but of course if the hon. member is going to get a member of the House of Commons to ask the question, he along with that person would be made to look silly.

Mr. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, I never said I would get a member of the House of Commons to ask the question, I said I would have an independent check in the House of Commons.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I could not do more than I have done through the most appropriate channels. I found out what the answer was going to be and the hon. member said he was going to make enquiries.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon senior member for St. George a few moments ago made some remark in connection with the Bill under consideration of work being done in advance at Graves End. The Minister of Communications and Works is trying to find out if that is correct and he will know next Tuesday.

*The Order Paper having been fixed.*

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until this day week at 3.00 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*  
7.40 p.m.