

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd July, 1951

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs T. O. BRYAN, F. E. MILLER, M. E. COX, D. D. GARNER, F. L. WALCOTT, H. A. DOWDING, E. K. WALCOTT, K.C., J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., J. A. HAYNES, B.A. and F. C. GODDARD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 12th June, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable the Legislative Council a Message returning the Bill intituled an Act to provide for the Regulation of Public Utilities with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker.—I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor a Message as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 17/1951

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to the Address from the Honourable the House of Assembly dated the 22nd of May, and to inform the Honourable House that, as soon as the circumstances relating to the death in Capetown of Mr. Milton King became known, urgent representations

were sent to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, with request that he should arrange for the interests of Mr. King's dependants to be closely watched. A further Message will be sent to the Honourable House on the receipt of the Secretary of State's reply.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
20th June, 1951.

MESSAGE FROM HIS HONOUR THE GOVERNOR'S DEPUTY

Dr. CUMMINS: I also have the honour to present from His Honour the Governor's Deputy Messages as follows:—

MESSAGE No. 18/1951

*His Honour The Governor's Deputy
To*

The Honourable The House Of Assembly

His Honour the Governor's Deputy has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that His Excellency the Governor has taken note of the sentiments of the Honourable House concerning the present racial policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa, which were set out in the Address from the Honourable House dated the 6th of March, and forwarded a copy of the Address to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies in accordance with the wishes expressed by the Honourable House.

R. N. TURNER,
Governor's Deputy.

Bridgetown,
29th June, 1951.

MESSAGE No. 19/1951

*His Honour The Governor's Deputy
To*

The Honourable The House Of Assembly

His Honour the Governor's Deputy has the honour to refer the Honourable the House of Assembly to Message No. 31/1948 of the 25th October, 1948, forwarding a copy of the Economic Co-operation

Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, and to the reply from the Honourable House dated the 23rd August, 1949, concurring that the Agreement should be applied to Barbados.

2. In Message No. 10/1950 of the 7th February, 1950, the Honourable House was informed that the Economic Co-operation Act of the United States of America had been amended by the Congress of the United States of America, and that there had been a consequent exchange of notes between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America. This exchange of notes constituted an amendment to the Agreement to which this Government is a party, and the Honourable House was accordingly invited to concur that the exchange of notes should extend to Barbados, and that this Government should remain a party to the Agreement.

3. His Honour has been informed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that the Congress of the United States of America has effected further amendments to the Economic Co-operation Act which are set out in the Appendix to this Message and that His Majesty's Government have, in an exchange of notes, informed the Government of the United States of America of their adherence to the principles and policies of the Economic Co-operation Act as amended, subject to the following reservations:—

- (a) The United Kingdom Government consider that the obligations into which they have entered in Article 1 of the Statute of the Council of Europe and the statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 2nd November, 1949, to the Council of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (O.E.E.C.) made the United Kingdom position perfectly clear and appear to them to be not inconsistent with the wording of the Act in Section 102 (a).
- (b) In expressing their adherence to the principles of Section 102(b) as amended, the United Kingdom Government regard the reference to "restrictive business practices" as referring to harmful restrictive business practices.

There is therefore no change in the position of His Majesty's Government as regards references to "the unification of Europe" in Section 102(a) from that set forth in the exchange of notes referred to in Message No. 10/1950.

4. Since the exchange of notes constitutes a further amendment of the Agreement to which this Government is a party, the Honourable the House of Assembly is invited to concur that the exchange of notes should be extended to Barbados, and this Government should remain a party to the Agreement.

R. N. TURNER,
Governor's Deputy.

Bridgetown,
2nd July, 1951.

(PUBLIC LAW 535—81st CONGRESS)
(CHAPTER 220—2D SESSION)
(H.R. 7797)
AN ACT

To provide foreign economic assistance.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Economic Co-operation Act of 1950."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 102. (a) Section 102 (a) of the Economic Co-operation Act of 1948, is amended by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof "trade barriers" and inserting in lieu thereof "barriers to trade or to the free movement of persons"; and by inserting in the fifth sentence thereof the word "further" before the word "unification".

(b) Section 102 (b) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting a comma and the phrase "increased productivity, maximum employment, and freedom from restrictive business practices" after the word "production".

GUARANTIES AND LIBERALIZATION OF TRADE BETWEEN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

SEC. 103 (a) Section 111 (b) (3) (ii) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) the Administrator shall charge a fee in an amount determined by him not exceeding 1 per centum per annum of the amount of each guaranty under clause (1) of subparagraph (v), and not exceeding 4 per centum per annum of the amount of each guaranty under clause (2) of such subparagraph, and all fees collected hereunder shall be available for expenditure in discharge of liabilities under guaranties made under this paragraph until such time as all such liabilities have been discharged or have expired, or until all such fees have been expended in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph; and"

(b) Section 111 (b) (3) (iv) of such Act is amended to read as follows:—

"(iv) as used in this paragraph, the term 'investment' includes (A) any contribution of capital goods, materials, equipment, services, patents, processes, or techniques by any person in the form of a loan or loans to any enterprise to be conducted within a participating country, (B) the purchase of a share of ownership in any such enterprise, (C) participation in royalties, earnings, or profits of any such enterprise, and (D) the furnishing of capital goods items and related services pursuant to a contract providing for payment in whole or in part after the end of the fiscal year in which the guaranty of such investment is made; and"

(c) Section 111 (b) (3) (v) of such Act is amended to read as follows:—(v) the guaranty to any person shall be limited to assuring one or both of the following: (1) the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies received by such person, as earnings or profits from the approved projects, as repayment or return of the investment therein, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof; and (2) the compensation in United States dollars for loss of all or any part of the investment in the approved project which shall be found by the Administrator to have been lost to such person by reason of expropriation or confiscation by action of the government of a participating country. When any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency, credits, as-

sets, or investment on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title, claim or cause of action existing in connection therewith."

(d) Section 111 (b) (3) of such Act is further amended by striking out the words between the second and last provisos therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "It being the intent of the Congress that the guaranty herein authorized should be used to the maximum practicable extent and so administered as to increase the participation of private enterprise in achieving the purposes of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to issue guaranties up to a total of \$200, 000,000".

(e) Section 111 (c) (2) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200,000,000".

(f) Section 111 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sub-section:

"(d) The Administrator is authorised to transfer funds directly to any central institution or other organization formed to further the purposes of this Act by two or more participating countries, or to any participating country or countries in connection with the operations of such institution or organization, to be used on terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, in order to facilitate the development of transferrability of European currencies, or to promote the liberalization of trade by participating countries with one another and with other countries."

PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC ECONOMY

SEC. 104 (a) Section 112 (a) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "and (3) minimize the burden on the American taxpayer by reducing the amount of dollar purchases by the participating countries to the greatest extent possible, consistent with maintaining an adequate supply of essentials for the functioning of their economies and for their continued recovery."

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 112 of such Act are hereby repealed.

(c) Section 112 (1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:—

"(1) No funds authorized for the purpose of this title shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination quality, and terms of payment. A bulk purchase within the meaning of this subsection does not include the purchase of raw cotton in bales."

(d) Section 112 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the pricing provisions of section 112 (e) of this title and section 4 of the Act of July 16, 1943 (57 stat. 566) shall not be applicable to domestic wheat and wheat flour procured under this title or any other Act providing for assistance or relief to foreign countries, supplied to countries which are parties to the International Wheat Agreement of 1949 and credited to their guaranteed purchases thereunder.

"(n) It is the sense of Congress that no participating countries shall maintain or impose any import, currency, tax, licence, quota, or or other similar business restrictions which discriminate against citizens of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States, engaged or desiring to engage, in furtherance of the purpose of this title, in the importation into such country of any commodity, which restrictions are not reasonably required to to meet balance of payments conditions, or requirements of national security, or are not authorized under international agreements to which such country and the United States are parties. In any case where the Department of State determines that any such discriminatory restriction is maintained or imposed by a participating country or by any dependent area of such country, the Administrator shall take such remedial action as he determines will effectively promote the purposes of this subsection (n)."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 105. (a) Section 114 (c) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, Than in addition to the amount heretofore authorised and appropriated. there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title not to exceed \$2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951: *Provided further*, that \$600,000,000 of the funds appropriated hereunder shall be available during the fiscal year 1951 solely for the purpose of encouraging and facilitating the operation of a programme of liberalized trade and payments for supporting any central institution or other organization described in subsection (d) of section 111, and for furnishing of assistance to those participating countries taking part in such programme: *Provided further*, That no more than \$600,000,000 of such funds shall be available during the fiscal year 1951 for transfer of funds pursuant to subsection (d) of section 111: *Provided further*, That in addition to the foregoing, any balance, unobligated as of June 30, 1950, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated for carrying out and accomplishing the purpose of this title for any period ending on or prior to that date is hereby authorized to be made available for obligation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and to be transferred to and consolidated with any appropriations for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for said fiscal year."

(b) The last sentence of section 114 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The authorizations in this title are limited to the period ending June 30, 1951."

(c) Section 114 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(h) The President is authorized to transfer to any department or agency any portion of the funds allocated for assistance to Germany from appropriations authorised by subsection (c). This portion may be used for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet responsibilities of the United States related to the rehabilitation of occupied areas of Germany, including the furnishing of minimum civilian supplies to prevent starvation, disease, and unrest prejudicial to the objectives of the occupation.

This portion may be expended under authority of this subsection or any provisions of law, not inconsistent herewith, applicable to such department or agency and without regard to such provisions of this title as the President may specify as inapplicable.

"(i) As agreed upon by the Secretary of State and the Administrator, a part of the German currency now or hereafter deposited under the bilateral agreement of December 15, 1949, between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, or any supplementary or succeeding agreement, shall be deposited into the GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) special account under the terms of article V of the said bilateral agreement. In quantities and under conditions determined by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Administrator, the currency so deposited shall be available for meeting the responsibilities of the United States in the occupation of Germany."

COUNTERPART FUNDS

SEC. 106. (a) Section 115 (6) is amended to read as follows:—

"(6) Placing in a special account a deposit in the currency of such country, in commensurate amounts and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States, when any commodity or service is made available through any means authorized under this title and is furnished to the participating country on a grant basis: *Provided*, That the obligation to make such deposits may be waived, in the discretion of the Administrator, with respect to technical information or assistance furnished under section 111 (a) (3) of this title and with respect to ocean transportation furnished on United States flag vessels under section 111 of this title in an amount not exceeding the amount, as determined by the Administrator, by which the charges for such transportation exceed the cost of such transportation at world market rates: *Provided further*, that such special account, together with the unencumbered portions of any deposits which may have been made by such country pursuant to section 6 of the joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war (Public Law 84, Eightieth Congress) and section 5 (b) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, Eightieth Congress), shall be used in furtherance of any central institution or other organization formed by two or more participating countries to further the purposes set forth in subsection (d) of section 111 or otherwise shall be held or used for purposes of internal monetary and financial stabilization, for the stimulation of productive activity and the exploration for and development of new sources of wealth, or for such other expenditures as may be consistent with the declaration of policy contained in section 102 and the purposes of this title, including local currency administrative expenditures of the United States within such country incident to operations under this title: *Provided further*, That the use of such special account shall be subject to agreement between such country and the Administrator, who shall act in this connection after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems and the Public Advisory Board provided for in section 107 (a): *And provided further*, That any unencumbered balance remaining in such account on June 30, 1952,

shall be disposed of within such country for such purposes as may, subject to approval by Act or joint resolution by the Congress, be agreed to between such country and the Government of the United States;"

(b) Section 115 (e) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall also encourage emigration from participating countries having permanent surplus manpower to areas, particularly underdeveloped and dependent areas, where such manpower can be effectively utilized."

(c) Section 115 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(j) The Administrator shall utilize such amounts of the local currency allocated pursuant to subsection (h) as may be necessary, to give full and continuous publicity through the Press, radio, and all other available media, so as to inform the peoples of the participating countries regarding the assistance, including its purpose, source, and character, furnished by the American tax payer."

PAPERS LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: I have the honour to lay on the Table the following Papers:—

Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st, May 1951.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the period ended on the 31st, March 1951, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

PETITIONS

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present a Petition from the Vestry of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorise them to borrow a sum not exceeding \$7,200 for the use of the parish. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

Mr. DOWDING presented Petitions from the Vestry of St. George and the Highway Commissioners of that parish respectively, praying the House to pass Bills authorising them to reduce the rate of Commission payable to the Parochial Treasurer and Collector of Rates of the parish. In each case he said that the Petition was respectfully worded and asked that it be taken as read.

The Petitions were taken as read.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$36,800 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part I, current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 12, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$17,400 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part II, Capital, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 13, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution that the sum of \$480 be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive

Committee for the purpose of making a loan to Mr. A. L. King, an Elementary School Teacher, who is now in the United Kingdom, to cover the cost of his passage from the U.K. to Barbados.

Dr. CUMMINS: A Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the direction and supervision of the election of members to serve in the General Assembly of this Island, the procedure at such elections, the expenses at such elections and for other purposes in connection therewith.

Dr. CUMMINS: A Bill intituled an Act to provide for the constitution for a Public Service Commission and matters incidental thereto.

Dr. CUMMINS: A Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the protection of wages of workers.

Dr. CUMMINS: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Labour Department Act, 1943.

Dr. CUMMINS: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children Act, 1938.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which I have just given notice.

Private Members' Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. GODDARD: A Bill intituled an Act to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to raise a loan not exceeding \$7,200 for the use of the parish.

Mr. DOWDING: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Vestries Act, 1911—5.

Mr. DOWDING: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1900—5.

REPORT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on Message No. 15/1951 from His Excellency the Governor relating to the establishment of a Farm Institute in Trinidad.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

A Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the direction and supervision of the election of members to serve in the General Assembly of this Island, the procedure at such elections, the expenses at such elections and for other purposes in connection therewith.

A Bill intituled an Act to provide for the constitution of a Public Service Commission and matters incidental thereto.

A Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the protection of wages of workers.

A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Labour Department Act, 1943.

A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children Act, 1938.

On the motion of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. WILKINSON, the Bill to authorise the Vestry of Christ Church to raise a loan not exceeding \$7,200 was read a first time.

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

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900—5 was read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MR. WILKINSON

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—Before you proceed to call the Orders of the Day, I am asking for leave of absence from to-morrow until the end of October.

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

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—With the honourable senior member for St. Joseph away from the island and my leaving tomorrow, only two members and yourself of the Printing Committee and the Debates Committee will be left. They will form a bare quorum of those Committees, and, as you know, Sir, there is a lot of work to be done by the Printing Committee. I am therefore moving that the hon. senior member for Christ Church be appointed to act as a member of the Printing Committee in my absence.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

TRIBUTE TO MR. GARNER'S DECEASED FATHER

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—Before we enter upon the business of the Day, I want to make a few remarks relative to the passing of the father of the hon. senior member for St. Philip which took place since we last met. Speaking for myself, and I believe for most of us on this side of the Table, it was unfortunate that we did not know of his death until a late hour—we did not know until about 7.30 o'clock—and therefore we were unable to pay our respect in the usual manner. However, in accordance with honourable precedent, it is fitting that on this occasion this House should show its condolence with the honourable senior member for St. Philip in the loss of his father. I knew the old gentleman: I have had the opportunity of speaking with him on many occasions and from my knowledge of him I can attest that he was a practical christian. He was not one in theory, he was a practical christian. He was revered in the parish of St. Philip generally and I know that the people of that parish feel that they have lost a father. I beg to move that this House place on record its sympathy on the occasion of the passing of the father of the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that. Unlike the hon. mover, I did not have the pleasure of knowing the father of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, but I knew the hon. senior member for St. Philip for years and I have great respect for him. I add my quota of condolence with the hon. member in the loss which he has sustained.

The question that this House place on record its sympathy on the occasion of the passing of the father of the hon. senior member for St. Philip was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, hon. members standing in their places at Mr. SPEAKER's request.

STATEMENT re COST OF LIVING

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—With your permission I want to make a statement on behalf of the Government. It is a statement in connection with a matter which is exercising the minds of Civil Servants generally—the matter of the cost of living. The Government want to state that we have been informed that the Civil Service Association is in the

process of preparing a Memorandum for presentation to the Government, and as soon as that document has been presented to the Government, the Government intend to consider the matter actively and expeditiously.

STATEMENT *re* WATERWORKS PROGRAMME

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—Before the business of the day is entered upon, I am asking leave to make a statement in connection with the water programme. Your Honour will remember that on the last occasion when we were discussing the question of the water programme, I promised the House that I would present it with a Progress Report in the near future. I have that Report in hand now and I should like to lay it and also ask that it be printed and circulated.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION, PRICE STABILISATION AND LABOUR WELFARE) ORDER 1951

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to take Order No. 7 on the Order Paper as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Order, 1951," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 17th day of May, 1951, under the Provisions of Sections 3 (1) (c) and 4 (3) of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Act 1947, (1947—13) as set out in the Schedule thereto.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—This is the annual Resolution which comes before this House by virtue of the Act which we passed in 1947 dealing with the levy on sugar and fancy molasses and the allocations in respect of Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare Funds. There is not very much for me to say at this stage, but at this particular time I think I should make some explanations. From what we have heard from some politicians, I think it is well for the Government to state its position quite clearly. I have read in the Press a statement supposed to have been made by one of the prospective members of the Opposition Party, and I would like to know if when members of that Party reply, they are going to back up that statement which was made both in the Press and at a public meeting. As hon. members know, the levy which is made on sugar and fancy molasses is allocated to three Funds, namely, Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare. Hon. members will remember that a reply was given to the hon. junior member for St. James some time ago when he asked a question in respect of the Labour Welfare Fund; the hon member has not debated the reply, but to-day he has the opportunity of debating it. The Price Stabilisation Fund stands at the amount of \$3,021,806.72, and that money is to be used to cushion the sugar industry in lean years which we hope will not come. The amount of the Rehabilitation Fund is over two million dollars; allocations have been made from time to time, and the last balance sheet shows an amount of \$759,278.10. The balance brought forward from the previous year was \$93,780.55; the amount paid out to manufacturers was \$675,366.74; expenses incurred in carrying out

the provisions of the Act amount to \$1,154,64 and the balance carried forward is \$177,287.27. As regards the Labour Welfare Fund, the amount which has been paid in is \$1, 197,373.23. As hon. members are aware, the Government has agreed to allocations on the basis of \$300,000 in respect of playing fields and \$750,000 in respect of housing. The allocation in respect of housing was originally \$400,000 but it has been increased to \$750,000. At present there is a Good Offices Committee which is going into the structure of the sugar industry in a very scientific manner so as to ascertain all the relative financial and economic facts, so that any change which is made in any of the allocations to the Funds in relation to the sugar industry will be made in the light of financial facts, and not on hearsay or guess. Members of the Government will welcome that because we feel that having regard to a staple industry like the sugar industry, no one should be afraid of letting the full facts of the industry be known in order to erase any doubts or suspicion from the minds of those who are doubtful or suspicious; we want to put matters above-board so that the most suspicious can see the facts. Hon. members will be aware of the fact that the Government has no intention to alter the allocations to these Funds in view of the fact that the Good Offices Committee is going to ascertain all the relative facts. Anybody who knows anything about these matters will know that you do not make changes while negotiations are taking place; but when the negotiations have been completed then you make all the necessary changes.

As regards the statement made by a prospective member of the Opposition Party, that not one cent of the money which has been loaned out of the Labour Welfare Fund and which has accumulated, should be paid back, I am sure that honourable members of the Opposition would have to agree that that is an irresponsible statement to make; it is a statement which is calculated to do harm to the people whom the person who has made it says he wants to represent. The members of the Opposition were a party to this matter and they had the right to make that statement on the floor of the House. (Mr. MOTTLEY: A decision was made in Executive Committee). I want to remind the honourable senior member for the City that it is a matter for the House to approve as to whether this money should be a loan or a gift; but this is Election year 1951, the Elections are just around the corner and you find that a statement is made about these Funds. As we know, the position as regards housing is very precarious: the people who are asking for loans number more than 4,000, the amount of the Labour Welfare Fund is \$1,197,373 and if the Government attempted to give all these people this money, you will see how few people would be able to get it. Anyone who has been taking any notice of the sugar industry will realise that the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank was started on the basis of \$80,000 and if the money loaned to the planters were given to them, what would be the position of the sugar industry today? If the statement to which I have referred were made by an irresponsible person I would have to look it over; but when such a statement comes from a prospective member of a responsible Party, we can see where we are heading. It is not a question of who is right but what is right. The honourable junior member for St. Philip has brought forward an Address which will be dealt with in Executive Committee, and I would say here that it rests with the people who send in claims for loans to state what they need. I do not think that the Manager of the Peasants' Loan Bank has ever refused to make loans to people for repairing their

houses; this Government is one of the first in the West Indies to set aside money for purposes of housing and other colonies are following Barbados. We have taken the lead in this matter. I might mention here that the Executive Committee have examined the question of assisting peasants with the use of tractors and the House will hear more about that question. That was the substance of an Address which was passed by this House. There is no peasants' organization in this colony, so that the peasants are not a coherent body, but just a number of individuals scattered all over the colony. No person can speak with authority on behalf of the peasants as a body; he can speak from his knowledge of the peasants, but he cannot speak of them as a body because they are not organized. You cannot advance any argument authoritatively on behalf of the peasants and say that they want this or that; however, I repeat that the question of helping the peasants with the use of tractors has received the attention of the Government and honourable members will hear more about the question.

I am glad to say that the Government is pleased with the progress which is being made with regard to the housing loans, but we cannot say that we are enamoured with the position in respect of the playing fields. The major responsibility in respect of the playing fields has been given to the local authorities but, in the main, these authorities have either not been geared or they have not got the personnel who know sufficient about playing fields and community centres as to implement the schemes for which the funds have been earmarked as quickly as they should implement them. They cannot tell what amounts have been spent so that honourable members can get a picture of what is happening. The amounts which have been allocated to various parishes in respect of playing fields are as follows: St. Michael, \$16,908; St. Andrew, \$11,373; St. Joseph, \$4,320; St. George, \$2,640 and St. Philip, \$17,320, making a total of \$52,561. Honourable members will see the progress which has been made in connection with these Funds; I will say that there are many desirable schemes to be carried out in regard to Labour Welfare and the Government has not yet touched the fringe relative to the housing programme. Over 4,000 people are asking for money which has been allocated to Labour Welfare and honourable members will see that the Fund should be built up so as to be able to tackle the programme of housing. We cannot advance a community unless we improve the social conditions of the people who live in that community. With the explanations which I have just given to this House I feel that this Resolution will be passed in the usual form. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WARD entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Resolution is one with which I think every honourable member is fully acquainted and I would not have risen if the honourable introducer had not asked for some sort of reply from the official Opposition. I do not claim to be the spokesman in the presence of the honourable Leader of the Opposition; it may be that I am on the younger side but I take the opportunity of making a brief reply. It is illuminating that the honourable senior member for St. Peter should have referred to the Opposition as persons of responsibility and it is surprising that he should have raised a matter in connection with a political platform on the floor of the House when dealing with this Resolution. We on this side are still in the Opposition and at least we are not prepared to make any state-

ment on the question raised by the honourable member on the floor of the House as yet. I want to remind the honourable member that while I have not at any time been a member of the Government, there are some honourable members who, if they are not members of the Government, are supporters of the Government and some of the most reckless and indiscreet things have been said by people on that side of the House who now form the Government in view of gaining the position which they have gained. Up to now the honourable member has not attributed to us that irresponsibility which would make people say things so as to gain the reins of Government. We on this side of the House are not prepared to make any statement as to the question raised by the honourable member and I am sorry that he has raised it.

As regards the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Act, it is true that while honourable members agreed to the policy formulated by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and brought down to this House, I have heard promises made on political platforms relative to the Labour Welfare Fund, promises which it cannot be claimed were fulfilled. I am not going into the matter of the loans made from this Fund because it is not becoming to do that now. I say this; while the Executive Committee might have formulated the policy as regards these Funds and that policy has received the approbation of this House, if after honourable members have seen how any particular scheme has operated, would it be anything wrong if they thought that the principle upon which the scheme has been operating should be changed? I do not see that there is anything wrong with that. You will find that many of us have agreed to legislation being passed in this House and then when we are taken to task by persons who are familiar with the operation of such legislation, we realise that we have made an error. The honourable senior member for St. Peter has said that he is proud to say that the operation of these Funds is going on well. Speaking for myself, I always like to know that things are working well in Barbados, but the honourable member regretted to say that matters in respect of the playing fields are not working so well.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order. What I said was that I am not as enamoured with the progress made as regards the playing fields as I am with that in connection with housing loans. I should like the honourable member to quote me correctly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not say exactly what the honourable member said, but he mentioned that the position with regard to the playing fields was not working as well as that with regard to the housing loans. If the honourable member realises that while the local authorities throughout the colony have been entrusted with looking after the playing fields, they have not got the personnel who know sufficient about playing fields, why does the Government not take the responsibility for looking after these playing fields out of the hands of the local authorities? I say that we, in this parish, would be only too glad if the Government would take the responsibility of looking after the playing fields out of the hands of the local authorities and place it in the hands of the central authority. I urge upon the honourable member that the Government should set up their own Board to deal with these playing fields and if they want the local authorities to administer them, let them do that. These authorities have had their way of doing things; some of them have been ultra-

conservative, and it is difficult to get them otherwise, but in their way they mean well. I suggest strongly to the honourable member who holds the portfolio in respect of these matters, that the best thing for him to do is to take the responsibility for looking after these playing fields out of the hands of the local authorities. We in St. Michael, are only too willing to let people of more integrity than what we possess undertake this responsibility, because if you are not a member of the Government you are lacking in integrity to carry on these matters. I ask the honourable member, whatever be his fears, to believe that the members of the Opposition possess as much influence and as much astuteness for running political campaigns as the members on that side of the House or anybody else; we are not possessed of as much billingsgate as they, but we can have that overnight if we must have it. Do not let honourable members over there get worried; we are on the threshold of a new campaign; many things have got to come and let honourable members appreciate that we have weathered many political storms. We have had to survive many reckless, irresponsible attacks from people, but I always feel that righteousness and justice will prevail. I repeat; we make no statement in reply to the question raised by the honourable senior member for St. Peter, but we say that when we are ready we will not hide our policy under any bushel. We will go as a team to the people with our views.

Mr. SPEAKER: I allowed the honourable member to reply to a particular part of the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Peter, but now the honourable member is going on to something which is not of interest to the House. I would be glad if the honourable member would continue with what is before the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I always appreciate the latitude which Your Honour gives. (Mr. SPEAKER: Too much sometimes). When the Government indulge in political stunts you always give us the latitude to reply. However, I sit down by telling the honourable senior member for St. Peter that time is yet there and we will come out with what our conviction is.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I crave the opportunity to say a few words in connection with this Resolution. We are here to discuss this matter as fully as we can. The comparison has been made between these Funds which have been created by the Act of 1947 and an amount which was given by the British Government nearly 50 years ago to rehabilitate the sugar industry in the West Indies. Of that amount, Barbados got \$80,000 and the authorities of that day decided to utilise that money in the establishment of a Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank which would finance the industry in the years to come. In passing I should like to say that during the 1914-18 War the sugar industry of this colony gave back one-half of that \$80,000 to the British Government; we gave back the British Government \$40,000 in sugar free. It is true that that sugar was said to have been very bad sugar, so bad indeed that the British Government protested against it and said that they could not use a lot of it. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the sugar industry in Barbados attempted to repay the obligation which it owed to the Mother Country for assistance rendered 30 or 40 years before. It is completely beside the point to compare that money which was given by the British Government, or the use to which it was put, with these Funds which are now before us. That money was given to the sugar industry as a whole, but these Funds are part and parcel of the

price paid annually for sugar by the British Ministry of Food. If the price paid for sugar is \$32.00 per ton, and we gave \$4.80 to the Rehabilitation Fund, \$6.00 to the Price Stabilisation Fund and \$2.40 to Labour Welfare, it means that every year out of the price we get for sugar, these Funds get their own specific allocation. Money out of the Rehabilitation Fund is given to the sugar industrialists on the basis of the amount of sugar they produce; if a factory produce 3,000 tons of sugar it gets \$4.80 per ton as an outright gift for rehabilitating its machinery. In other words, the owner of a sugar factory gets his free gift to which he is entitled out of the Rehabilitation Fund. The peasants, who also produce canes, should also share in that Fund; but, up to now, they do not share in it because of the regulations. Unless you can prove that you have spent money on machinery you cannot get anything from the Fund. Bear in mind, the British Government itself agreed to this allocation because of the fact that it knew full well that the price of machinery for the sugar factories had advanced and the machinery would cost so much more than the pre-war figure to the sugar industrialists that it would be hard for them to get their machinery from Britain without being given special assistance. The peasant land owners have to pay added costs for labour and cultivation and they should also share in this special Fund for rehabilitation. We ourselves have agreed to review the conditions under which the peasants will share in this Fund, and the statement is made nowadays that money accruing to peasants should be used for the purchase of tractors and other agricultural implements which the peasants could use. If that is done, the peasants will benefit indirectly from this Fund, but not to the same extent as the sugar industrialists. We have to bear in mind that this Fund is not a special gift like the \$80,000 which was given to the industry as a whole; this Fund is a part of the price for sugar, which is based on production costs. The peasants have to face the same increase in labour and cultivation costs as the big sugar industrialists, and it seems to me that we will have to remove the complications which now operate against the peasants obtaining their share of the Rehabilitation Fund. We must abolish the system relative to giving money for rehabilitation where peasants are concerned and give them their share of the Fund as an outright gift. If the sugar industrialists can obtain an outright gift, the peasants are also entitled to the same, whether or not they make out a case that they will use the money for capital expenditure. After all, we have got to remember that the British Government is concerned with the part of the matter which deals with capital expenditure, since we cannot import any machinery from anywhere else, and it also has to be borne in mind that no peasant can by a tractor or a plough.

The argument will be advanced that we have agreed to the allocations being made in the past; but if it becomes evident that some change should be made, then by all means let us make a change. Honourable members on my left have claimed that money from the Labour Welfare Fund should be made an outright gift to the peasants.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of explanation. I never said anything about any gift being made to peasants: the honourable member was not listening to me. I said that a prospective member of the Opposition had used the argument that the loans which have been made in respect of housing should be given to the people. I wanted to know if honourable members would agree to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I am saying is this: Honourable members on my left are reported to have said that this Fund from which loans are being made to estate labourers should be given to them as a gift, and that they should not repay one cent. However, those honourable members have decided not to say one word about their new policy as regards this matter, but to keep it for the soap box. The question in this Chamber today is not whether or not it is political to say what we intend to do; the question is whether what we do is all right. The honourable senior member for the City has said that many promises which have been made to the people of this colony in connection with the Labour Welfare Fund have not been fulfilled. That is true. People have been told that out of this Fund they will get a certain amount of money free, and a certain amount of money will be given to them as a loan if they have a certain amount of money. That has been said all over this country. In so far as the actual disbursement of the Fund for housing is concerned, as we know, the labourer must have a certain amount of money or a house before he can get a loan. The result therefore is that many labourers in the sugar industry have never benefited from this Fund and they never will benefit from it, because they neither have that certain amount of money required nor a house in order to obtain a loan. It can be argued with considerable justification that so long as these conditions obtain, one half of the labourers will never get anything out of the Fund. The question arises that since money from funds created out of the price of sugar is given outright to some participants in the sugar industry, why should not some more comprehensive method be adopted for ensuring that the greater number of sugar workers, if not all of them, benefit from the Fund which has been set up to benefit them. It can also be argued with considerable justification that the setting up of playing fields and housing should be assisted by funds from the Central Government under special schemes created for the purpose. Housing should be the concern of a Housing Authority and it should be financed from Government revenue; playing fields should be the concern of the Government and they should be financed from Government revenue as well. It is difficult to argue or make out an effective case that we are justified in taking part of the price for sugar, which by right should go directly to the people engaged in the sugar industry and use it for setting up playing fields and housing.

In the beginning both the Government and the Legislature agreed to the present scheme; but nothing that we do here is like the law of the Medes and Persians, and if, after the scheme has been in operation for a certain period, we find that we have made a mistake, we owe it to ourselves to make the necessary revision. It is absolutely inexcusable for anyone to state that we are justified in not endeavouring to see that every cent of these Funds reach the people for whom they were designed to benefit in the most direct manner possible. The only answer which one could give against such a claim is that everybody agreed to do what we are doing now; but that is not good enough. If on more mature reflection we find that we are not doing right to the people concerned in the sugar industry, let us make any fundamental change which is considered necessary. I am not convinced that I did the right thing when I agreed to these allocations; now that they are in practice, I see that the peasants and the workers in the sugar industry are not getting their fair share. The only people who are benefiting from these allo-

cations are the sugar industrialists and the British Government is getting back the benefit from them when they buy the expensive British machinery. The allocation in respect of Labour Welfare is \$2.40 per ton of sugar produced and although it serves a very useful purpose for the setting up of playing fields and providing assistance for housing, yet these are separate matters. If we had not agreed to disburse this allocation to Labour Welfare in the way we are disbursing it now, the money would have been added to the increased price of sugar which was given because of increased production costs, and it would have been paid out in increased wages. Machinery, manure, and so on cost more money—the cost of producing sugar has therefore been increased—and it costs more money to live because the necessities of life are imported mainly from the sterling areas and they are the most expensive in the world. Therefore I am not at all satisfied in my mind that we are justified in continuing a policy as a result of which a great proportion of the small holders and workers in the sugar industry are not getting one cent as benefit from money which is theirs by right. It is stupid and childish to address sarcastic remarks to anybody who questions the wisdom of maintaining the present policy. Honourable members who are supposed to represent the working classes in this colony should feel a bit ashamed that they have to be put right in this matter; honourable members on my left have no grouse in this matter because they are getting their share from the Rehabilitation Fund and they have absolutely no quarrel about the manner in which the Fund is being disbursed. All they have to do is to produce so many tons of sugar and they will get their money; but the peasants produce their canes, sell them at a loss and they cannot get any money from the Fund because they do not put down any machinery. Their only manner of benefit is if they have a certain amount of money or own their houses they will get a certain amount of money to repair their houses. The only other angle from which they can benefit is that if a playing field has been established somewhere their children or grandchildren can play on it. It is not an easy matter to interfere with the present allocations to these Funds; it is very likely that we shall have to get the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to change them, but I do feel that the matter needs further revision. In my opinion, rather than attempt to play politics with this matter, rather than keep our real feelings about it for expression on the soap box, every honourable member should express freely what is in his mind as regards this highly important matter.

Messrs. GILL and LEWIS entered the House and took their seats while Mr. CRAWFORD was speaking.

Mr. DOWDING: I regret that a certain amount of political hearsay should have been brought into the debates of this honourable House. However, there is one point on which I would like the honourable introducer of this Resolution or the Deputy Leader of the House to enlighten me. From the figures which were read out by the honourable senior member for St. Peter, it strikes me that while the parish of St. George has not got as large a population as the parish of St. Philip, it has a much greater sugar-producing area than that of St. Philip; and the amounts allocated to these parishes for the purpose of repairing houses are by no means in any sort of ratio. I see that the allocation to St. Philip is \$17,320 and that to St. George is only \$2,640. My point is that with the allocations which have been made so far, by the time you get around to some parishes there may not be any money left for people who

are entitled to some of it. I feel that allocations from the total amount of money should be made in ratio either to the population of the parishes or to the amount of sugar produced in the area. I do not think it would be fair if, after this matter was wound up, we were to find that allocations have been made in this same ratio as we have heard. Even the honourable senior member for St. Philip will agree with me that, taking into consideration the amount of sugar produced in these parishes and the population of the parishes, these allocations are not in any ratio.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of explanation. The allocation and release are too different things; the allocation to the parish of St George is \$10,000 but the release is \$2,640. Nothing is released until schemes have been sent in. We have not released anything to St. Thomas, for instance, but that does not mean that the parish will not get anything; it means that no scheme has been sent in and you cannot release money on imagination.

Mr. DOWDING: If the honourable member would tell me what is allocated to the parishes I would know how the money is going.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member must realise that the allocations could not be in respect of five parishes; there are eleven parishes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member want the allocation for each parish?

Mr. DOWDING: I cannot judge how the money is going unless the honourable member gives us some idea of the amounts which are allocated to the various parishes. In other words, I want to find out if the money is allocated fairly to all persons who are entitled to it, so that one parish does not get more than that to which it is entitled. There is a certain amount to be put into the Treasury and there is a certain amount to be taken out; if you start giving out money to the various parishes without any regard to the ratio in which it is given, I fail to see how you can reach any proper solution, I hope the honourable senior member for St. Peter will bear that in mind.

Messrs. BRANCKER and REECE entered the House and took their seats while Mr. DOWDING was speaking.

Mr. GARNER: I have always spoken on Resolutions of this nature. There are certain things which I have said before and I will repeat them today because I have not yet changed my mind in respect of the matter. This Resolution can be taken in a dual capacity; it serves some good in some quarters and it does not serve any good in others. I feel that when the local Committee sat and considered this matter they were not aware as to what the future repercussions would have been. The matter has been given a trial, I think a fairly lengthy trial, and I heard a member of the Committee criticise what the Committee did in the past. That member perhaps is now being wise after the event. I feel, Sir, that we have one good aspect in this Resolution, and that is in respect of the Price Stabilisation Fund. As a cane grower, I am speaking for all cane growers in this colony and because I know that sugar cane is our real staple crop. We feel that the price of that commodity should be safeguarded against hard times; therefore I acquiesce in that Fund. However, when you come to the Rehabilitation Fund which deals with money for the sugar factories, that is not right especially when you see the amount which is allocated to the factories and that which is allocated to the sugar workers. I have said from the beginning that you cannot begin to rehabilitate the wealthy people before you rehabili-

tate the masses, and that is what this particular Resolution does. Of course, some people tell me that by rehabilitating the factories you also rehabilitate the cane growers. I have not seen that result up to now; when I see that result I will gladly switch over. As I have said before, if you are giving the workers 10/- and you are giving the factories £1 you are all wrong. Knowing Barbados as I do, knowing the plight of the mass of workers in this colony as I do, the workers should have been seen after first. The workers should have been rehabilitated first and out of what is left if you wanted to put new machinery in the factories, you could do that. I want to state here that Great Britain is not giving the colonies anything because the price of machinery is so high that she gets back the money she pays for sugar. I do not want to say what I really feel about this matter; if the people who had anything to do with the matter knew what they were doing, and they were thinking of the masses in Barbados, the position here would not be as it is. Who stand to benefit from the present position?—The factory owners. I have said that where you see a dilapidated factory, the owner has got the money, because he will purposely let his factory get into a state of dilapidation. I want to say emphatically that any conscientious person who sits in Committee in connection with these Funds should first and foremost see that the workers get proper living and working conditions; but, apparently, those things have been left out.

My colleague spoke at length on this issue on which he and I did not see eye to eye. I do not think that this money should be given to the workers free, gratis and for nothing; that is irresponsibility. Perhaps the political side is all right, but I will speak as a statesman. The money which is being spent in the way of housing loans is well spent; I am not saying that everybody can get this money at this time because it is not enough; but in the parish which I have the honour to represent, it has done a good deal of work, a few houses having been erected. I do not want to praise myself, but where families were living in 6 x 8 houses, I was instrumental in their being able to add another house and make living conditions better. But if you give this money to every individual worker, it would pass through the shops in beer, sardines and ham cutters. The money is too small and it cannot do any good. I have always maintained that the making of these loans should be continued and people be given the chance to repair their homes and let them believe that they are being thought of by somebody. I am in favour of a bold housing scheme being embarked upon by the Government, but, in the meantime, let them go on in the present manner. I feel that this question of the allocations to these Funds should be investigated; let us find out exactly what the position is and see what changes can be made. Some time ago I asked some questions in this House concerning the Rehabilitation Fund and the Government answered those questions. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will acquaint the House as to the questions. I asked:

1. "Is the Government aware that there is general dissatisfaction on the part of the peasant proprietors with regard to the funds allocated them from the Sugar Industry Rehabilitation Fund?"

2. In view of the fact that it is extremely difficult for small holders to satisfy the conditions demanded for applications for assistance from this fund, will the Government consider the advisability of making these terms less onerous and more within the capacity of the average small-holder?"

I think you will remember, Sir, that when this Resolution was first brought down, it was sent back to the Government and they had to do something for the peasant proprietors. I think that they allocated 15% to the peasants, but I also think that the number of peasants who drew this money could be counted on the fingers of your two hands. The reason for that is that there are certain conditions which have to be met and the average peasant cannot meet those conditions. The average peasant needs to buy new machinery or some animal which will be used for working the land. The peasant who has a horse has to care it, but what sort of machinery can he buy? I say that the Committee which dealt with this matter made grave mistakes; if you are going to help the peasants, why put so many strings around them? The peasants were given 8 cents a ton and up to now very few of them can get that 8 cents a ton, while the factory owners are drawing their money *ad lib*. The poor peasant who is hungry and who wants his money to buy manures and pay his honest debts cannot get that money because the Committee has made the terms so exacting that he cannot get it. The position is almost like that of the fox and the stork. I am willing to see something done about this matter; the factory owner can draw his money as soon as the crop is over, but the peasant, from the time the scheme was initiated, has not been able to draw one cent. Why should any honest Barbadian Committee sit in connection with this matter and decide it in this way? Any Barbadian who knows his Barbados and makes such a decision in Committee should be censured. The Government replied to my questions as follows:—

"No.

2. The Government is at present giving active consideration to the details of a scheme to provide tractors for small holders out of the capital Rehabilitation Fund."

Well, Sir, that justifies my argument. If you make it easy for the factory owners to draw their money and put strings around the peasants in their getting what is theirs, you should be willing to repeal what you have done. Some people have made a mistake and they are not willing to give in to their mistake. That is why I am disgusted with this Resolution; the people who should come first do not get the assistance which they should get. Perhaps the British Government wants more sugar and perhaps the case has been put that the factories need more machinery. Mr. Speaker, at this stage I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

On the re-assembling of honourable members:

Mr. SPEAKER: At the adjournment the honourable senior member for St. Philip was speaking.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think that there is much more that I can say. I think I have spoken at length, but there are a few points that I shall clarify. I want the Government to take notice of these things, because they are things that are causing uneasiness throughout the length and breadth of the island, and they should be remedied by a responsible government. There is grave dissatisfaction, and I want the Government to realise that. It is true that the peasants who should share in this scheme are not getting anything from these allocations, and there is great dissatisfaction because there are a goodly lot of peasant proprietors who are a respectable lot. No case that can be made out can be too strong on behalf of the peasant proprie-

tors. They have to face the heat and the rain, and it is unfair for Government to put this legislation through without taking into account the claims of these people; this Government which I think should be a responsible Government, and which before preached the doctrine of Socialism. No Government can be strong without a strong peasant proprietorship. The peasant proprietors of the colony are the bulwark of the colony. When you ignore these people year after year, there is bound to be general dissatisfaction. When they hear year after year that this money is being granted, when they hear a manager boasting that he has just bought a lorry because of money from this fund that was granted to him, when he sees a factory making repairs because of this fund, while he is a poor forgotten man, it is bound to cause grave discontent. I want Government to consider this matter seriously and see that they do not come here year after year and vote money for the factory owners and the agricultural workers, while the poor peasant who contributes his quota gets nothing. The peasant proprietor sweats and toils during the day, and even at twilight when they should be resting some of them are still in their land. It is not my duty to represent the people who own factories. I represent the masses of the people. I represent the peasant proprietors. If you are going to rehabilitate the factory owners, you should divide up this money, and the sooner the better. I anticipate criticism from the other side, but in spite of that I will repeat that it is not fair to give all to the factory owners. Their standard of living is far removed from that of the peasant proprietors. This thing is too wrong to be right. It is a farce. Some of these peasant proprietors cannot even pay for their manure. The land of some of them is being abandoned. You are giving them a lousy eight cents a ton and they cannot collect it. That is the thing. You are playing hide and seek with the peasants. "I bet I give you eight cents; I bet you don't get it." I wonder if the Government is really listening to me to-day. The peasant proprietors need the money. The price of manure has gone almost up double the price. Tell me of any planter who does not know that the peasants pester them every day for manure. And here it is that these peasants are to get eight cents a ton and they cannot even get the money; and the Government does not see fit to change these conditions. If these conditions are made at the Colonial Office let the Colonial Office know what is happening. Is the Colonial Office only doing this so as to be able to sell their machinery in England? I say that all cane growers should share in this scheme. I asked a question on this matter ever since the 14th of August, 1949. To-day the Government has the audacity to bring back this Resolution just as it came down years ago. Do you want to tell me that I should acquiesce in giving the factory owners almost twice as much as is given to the Welfare Fund, and then on top of all that you give the peasants nothing. This thing is shocking when you really think of it. At one time I asked that a similar Resolution be sent back to the Government to let the Government do something about it. I failed then, and I think I would fail now. But I do not think that we should sit here day after day and year after year without protesting to the Government that this thing is in bad shape and wants changing. I am not against the Stabilization Fund. As a responsible citizen I know that some day the price of sugar may break, and that Fund will help tide us over the dreary years. But on the other hand, if we are going to be generous to one class and leave out the masses I cannot agree with that. It is not fair to the peasant proprietors

of this colony. I say that with a full sense of responsibility, and every well thinking person who knows his Barbados will agree with me. I am going to sit now; I think that I have said enough to warn the Government that they are making a mistake, and that they are carrying out a policy that is totally wrong. You cannot have any scheme which is supposed to help those who are engaged in the manufacture of sugar and leave out the responsible section. Therefore I am protesting to-day against bringing this Resolution to the House year after year without amending it. Indeed, I do not know whether to vote aye or no where this Resolution is concerned. Some parts of it are alright, others are not. I am absolutely fed up with the administration of these Funds. I do not know how to vote. I cannot agree that factory owners should be rehabilitated before the workers. Not when we know our Barbados; not when we know that the workers do not have good houses. If the Government do not take what I am saying seriously and do something about it, they must know that they will have the peasant proprietors of this country to reckon with. They are a sturdy and hard working people; people who work in the sun and rain and produce their food, people who have to maintain their families and people who have to depend on nature for what they get. Nature is sometimes kind and sometimes unkind. It is more often unkind than not. So when you are talking about peasant proprietors you are talking about people who only when nature is extra kind manage to do more than eke out an existence. Any other help that they can get, therefore, they deserve. I hope that a case has been made out for them. There is another point that I want to make. It was said here sometime ago by an honourable member replying to me that if you rehabilitate the factories, the cane growers would eventually get the benefit of a better price for their canes because of the greater efficiency of the factories. But this rehabilitation has been going on for a number of years, and I have not seen any improvement. Although there was a price of \$2.10 this year for last year's crop, I still hear a little whispering campaign that we are not likely to get any more this year for canes than last year. It is being said by certain people. I want to warn people who are thinking about entering into such a scheme because they will only bring down the wrath of the workers and of certain politicians on their heads. It is time to call a halt to this foolishness. It is a number of years that this Rehabilitation Fund has been in existence but I have not seen any marked improvement in the price paid for canes. It is alright for Mr. B who is a big plantation owner and who also has shares in a factory owned by Mr. A; because the plantation owner will have shares in the factory, and so will have nothing to quarrel about where the price of canes is concerned. He will get the benefit from the factory. But it is not so with the peasant grower, because he will not be sold shares in a factory. So if we are passing on this money to rehabilitate the factories and make them more efficient, we must see to it that some of the benefit is reaped by the peasant growers. I have heard this whispering campaign, Mr. Speaker, and if it is true I will jump on the band wagon. This money is gained by the sweat of people; and when people toil for money that way you know how it is Sir. You are dealing with razors and knives. We have come here today to hear something about this money. A certain section of the people are not getting anything out of it. People who are poor are being ignored. Let the Colonial Office know that

these things are wrong. Government is asking me to vote for this Resolution. How can I vote for it when the peasant growers are not getting anything out of it. When they ask me about it I will not be able to answer. I do not always like to stigmatise the Government. But what am I to do? The peasants tell me the factories are getting all the benefit, and I feel so small. Am I only a ghost? A shadow? This is a matter which should be remedied, and Government will have to get down to the task of remedying it. I am not going to vote for the Resolution. I cannot vote for it as it stands. I am in agreement with the Stabilisation Fund. I am not in agreement with the Welfare Fund because I do not think it is enough. The Rehabilitation Fund for the factories should be where the Welfare Fund is. I am asking the Government to have this whole matter rectified. To show my disapproval of these conditions I will not vote for this Resolution. I am a man who likes to see first things put first. It is alright if we want to have efficient factories. But pass on some of the benefits to the peasant growers. Rehabilitate the workers first. I am sure that a lot of people, if they were losing money, would take up some of their cash money and make their factories better. I represent the peasant proprietors and the masses of the people. The factory owners will be taken care of. The people whom I represent have been all left out. When I did try to make the Government see that they had made a mistake, they sent back to tell me that it was not so. Anyone who cares about the welfare of the people of this colony will know that when you leave out that honest section of the community, the peasant proprietor, you are doing a social injustice to a great number of the population.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker—I am worried about some of the remarks made by the last speaker. I feel that something should be taken from the Stabilisation Fund and the Rehabilitation Fund and given to the Welfare Fund. It was my intention to vote against the Resolution if the conditions were to remain the same. But we have been told that a Good Offices Committee is working on the administration of these Funds. This question of the peasant grower has been one of great concern to me. The peasant grower probably represents about 15 per cent of the Industry. Unless you make a change in the whole system, I do not know that you can pay 40 per cent to the peasant growers whose contribution is around 15 per cent. Can it not be a rotating fund like the Welfare Fund? If he represents 15 or 20 per cent of the Industry you cannot pay him 40 per cent unless you take it from the Welfare or the Stabilisation Fund. There is another thing. St. George had an allocation of 1.50 per head, something like \$21,000, and only \$2,600 could be used. If the Vestry of that parish was interested, we could have had toilets, baths etc. It is still customary to see people at the standpipe bathing. Surely it is cruel that they can only use \$2,600 out of \$21,000. Then take St. James who have not asked for anything at all, while the people live in hovels. For nearly three years I have been writing the Vestry of St. George asking and beseeching them to bring petitions. I remember that I took the Acting Governor, Mr. Perowne, with me to the parish. I asked them to put some cribs by the trees near the Church. The money is lying idle while the people are suffering. But I am still grateful that they have used \$2,600. St. James has done nothing at all.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker,—I am speaking on a point of explanation. The position is this. The Vestry of St. George started building to the extent of the

amount allocated so far. They started to build a pavilion and buy grounds for a playing field.

Mr. MILLER: I was not thinking in terms of the money released. I was thinking in terms of the \$21,000 that the parish could have used. I have been told by the member of the Government who is handling this Resolution that this Good Offices Committee will decide whether we can take some of the money from the Stabilisation and the Factory Rehabilitation Funds and apply it to the Welfare Fund. So I have got to accept this Resolution until I know what is the position.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I made no specific remarks. I said that this Committee was going into the question of the financial position of the Industry as a whole and therefore no change could be made in these funds, as it is an elementary principle in negotiations that you do not change any of the conditions until the negotiations are over.

Mr. MILLER: I did not insinuate that the honourable member made any specific statement. I said that I came here with certain ideas about this matter, and I was told that a Good Offices Committee was working on this scheme. Do not go off with the idea that I was repeating a statement made by the honourable member. My hope is that when this Committee has finished working on the scheme we will be in a position to ask for a change in the conditions. For that reason I am prepared to vote for the Resolution as it is.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,—I am in agreement with the principle of this Resolution. But on the 24th of April I asked a question about the Labour Welfare Fund and widening the scope that it had. Up to now I have got no answer from the Government, although I thought that in an important matter like this the appropriate member of the Government would have replied by now. I cannot see why Highways and Transport workers who are just as important to the Sugar Industry as agricultural workers cannot be included in the benefits of this Fund. It may be an oversight, but I think that the sooner it is rectified the better it will be for everyone. I am hoping, sir, that something will soon be done in the matter.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—If it is true that a Good Offices Committee is going into the administration of this fund, I think it is very appropriate that this Resolution be postponed until the findings of the Committee have been released. What I do expect is that this Committee will report too late. We may have to wait for another year or two before we know their findings, and before their recommendations are implemented, and during that time the Welfare Fund may suffer tremendously. I am told that five years ago the then House agreed to these various allocations. I do feel that if these allocations had been submitted to the House at any other time they would not have been agreed to. Certainly I do not agree with the allocations inasmuch as the housing situation in this island is definitely too acute. No one realised how difficult the situation was until workers began to submit applications to the Labour Welfare Department to get funds for the repairing of their houses. It was surprising, Sir, to hear that you get 12 people living in a 12 x 8 house. Therefore, when these facts are put before the public so glaringly, any representative Government interested in social reform would readily agree that that fund should have a greater contribution from the whole amount given by way of the increase in the price of sugar towards the rehabilitation of the Industry. Furthermore, a large sum has been allocated to Price Stabilisation. We have been told that the British Government has given us a guarantee of a stabilised price for a couple of years. That means that within

the next couple of years it does not seem as if we will need to use the Stabilisation Fund at all. In view of that, and in view of the fact that while the grass is growing the horse is starving, I would like to know what the Government intends to do with that large sum of money which it will not be called on to use for all these years. At the same time we are told that the demands for assistance under the Labour Welfare Fund exceed the supply. How are we going to swell this fund? What is this House going to do as regards forcing the hands of the Administration and forcing the hands of the members of the Committee to arrive at a definite solution to this problem? There is no peasant proprietor who feels himself obligated to thank the Government for what it has done as regards these allocations, and similarly some of the workers are dissatisfied. Every factory owner when he wants to acquire a new piece of machinery, or buy a new tractor or plough or motor lorry can get the amount he wants released without any red tape. Mr. Speaker, I am only mentioning what I have heard spoken, and some of the members of this House have said it. They say that the Labour Welfare Fund has got a lot of red tape around it. It took nearly five years before it could be released to the people, and yet during all that time factory owners could go and get theirs. With all the assistance supplied to the factory owner the peasant proprietor is still in a sorrowful plight because he does not know how much he is going to get for his canes. I am saying that the Government is responsible for this failure of the peasant proprietor to know how much he is going to get for his canes. It has been left to the pleasure of the factory owners who realise that the Government has no real figures as to how they arrive at the price. They therefore decide that they are going to give what price they feel they can afford without hurting themselves. That has been the whole history of buying peasants' canes and running the Sugar Industry in this colony. So the peasants are still uncertain as to what they will get, and the factory owners change their decisions overnight. When we were told that they would get a good price this year, we suddenly heard about the increased rainfall which brought about an increased tonnage per acre, and the peasants need look for nothing more than they got last year. Every member of this House, including the members of the Executive, felt some time ago that the peasant proprietor was not getting as much for his canes as he should. As a result of that feeling I thought that some step would be taken to see that they were assured of a stabilised price. Government could easily find out what it takes a peasant to produce a ton of canes. They could have ordered the Manager of Seawell Plantation, or the Manager of the Pine or the Manager of the Government Industrial School to find out what it costs. Government should have found out those details because of the non-co-operative attitude of the factory owners. Government could have done something about the matter as late as last January. Knowing the facts as I do, I am sure that the Government cannot exonerate itself from the accusation that it is responsible for the peasant proprietors being in the plight in which they are placed today. As regards the Labour Welfare Fund, I am sure that during 1946 I heard it said that if a worker had \$100.00 he would be given another \$100.00 and also loaned another \$100.00. When these allocations were put to the public, some were disappointed, because in truth and fact every Government should apply itself to the re-housing of the unhoused masses, whether they are in the Sugar Industry or not. Whether you extract something from their weekly earnings to

swell a fund from which you can spend in their interest, you still have an obligation to them, because if the island was not a sugar-producing colony and you suffered from the same housing conditions, you would still have been obligated to solve the problem by finding money from somewhere to house the people. So when you argue that it would have been a very small amount if you had had to extract a contribution from the weekly pay packet of each labourer, that is not the point. The point is that the earnings which he would have got weekly, you tell him that he cannot handle them for himself, so you will spend it in housing for him. In addition to that, the fund has been built up not with money contributed by any government, but by money contributed by the worker himself. So you are in the position of asking him to borrow money from himself. Then you are asking him to pay interest on this money for which he has worked so hard.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—I did not want to remind you, but what the honourable member is criticising is the result of a Resolution already passed by this House. The honourable member should not make speeches reflecting on resolutions that have been passed by the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are quite right. If the honourable member does not understand that gentle hint, I will have to repeat it.

Mr. ALLDER: I will come off that point about the worker having to pay interest. I am still saying that if this thing came down five years ago when honourable members did not have a chance of sizing it up fully and seeing any hitches that it might contain, surely seeing it in practice for five years should have given you a chance to see its rights or its wrongs, and in the latter case you should be man enough and strong enough to say that history has made you realise that the allocations were wrong, and therefore we are not too proud to change them. It is said that this scheme was sent down here by the British Government. Surely if the case were properly put to them; if they had been told that the housing situation was so acute, and that the factories, although they might not be up to standard yet, are not so bad, therefore you would like to change the allocations, the British Government would have agreed. No attempt has been made to do that. It only shows that those members who agreed to these allocations want to see the same old time system perpetuated, by which the workers get the least of the benefits of production. Many people who made applications under this fund are somewhat frustrated when they find that they cannot get what they have asked for. I do not know what internal regulations are exercised by the particular department; but I do feel that where the situation is very bad, some priority should be given to the applicant. I am only drawing to the attention of the Government complaints that reach me daily. I feel that the Government should hurry up and if necessary throw into this fund additional money from some other source so as to accommodate these applicants. As I have said, sir, we have experience of how long committees take to present their findings. The only means of forcing their hands that I see would be the rejection of this Resolution or postponement of our agreement with it, since it is said that this committee is now sitting. They might report tomorrow, or they might report next year. If we pass this Resolution now, and then the committee reports soon after that they agree that the Welfare Fund should be increased, we would have already passed this Resolution, and therefore we might have to wait until next crop to implement the findings of the committee. During that time this fund will have suffered tremendously;

suffered even more than the members of the Government Bench would like to see it suffer. There is another very acute problem, Mr. Speaker. Because of the loan of this money to labourers, many of them are putting up new homes. But the trouble is that after they have got the house framed they find it difficult to get a spot on which to put it. If you take a drive through the country districts you cannot fail to see houses being framed one on top of the other. If you are tackling the housing problem and if you want to give room to accommodate the increasing population, you should be able to give the workers in every parish the guarantee that they will get house spots so as to prevent them from suffering from lack of house spots as they are suffering now. While I do not want to say anything about the unmannerly behaviour of the honourable senior member for St. Peter, I know that you would not mind if I drew your attention to his behaviour now. If you are looking into the Rule Book, observe that the honourable member is expected to allow the proceedings to go on in a way that it is proper that the proceedings of such an ancient and honourable Chamber should go on. The honourable member makes himself a nuisance, and in this case he seems to feel that he has latitude to do so. He wants to win his arguments by bad behaviour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must not speak like that of another honourable member unless he brings to my attention something that the other has done.

Mr. ALLDER: I drew your attention, sir, to the behaviour of the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I observe that his conduct is improper I will deal with it according to the Rules of the House.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, I hope that you will observe his conduct and observe the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is going a little too far.

Mr. ALLDER: I have seen at this time, sir, that it is the practice of Government in every sphere of commerce to have controls, especially when it comes to the small trader. I have often read in newspapers where a woman, say, from St. Andrew, who sold something for a half cent more than the scheduled price has been carried to the Court and fined three or four pounds. But Government allows the factory owners and managers in this present day to continue to exploit the peasant to such an extent that the latter can get no compensation from his land for the work or the materials that he puts into it. In colonies where copra is produced, attempts have been made to discover at what price it can be sold so as to ensure the producer what he really deserves.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am indulging the honourable member too much when I allow him to speak of copra.

Mr. ALLDER: I am only comparing the methods of determining a fair price where copra and where canes are concerned.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: These Funds that we are discussing have nothing to do with the price of peasants' canes. They are created by a Resolution dealing with the Sugar Industry.

Mr. ALLDER: There is a Price Stabilisation Fund to which the price of sugar relates, and the price of sugar is related to the price of canes. Any one who looks at this thing from an impartial angle will know that the peasant has always been exploited, is still being exploited, and it seems will be exploited perpetually. It is time that those of us in this House who have been studying the situation as regards the

price that the peasant gets for his canes and the difficulty that he finds himself in should tell the Government to take the lead and give him a better hope.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has said quite enough about the price of peasants' canes.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not see why I should be curtailed in the expression of my views.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of the price of peasants' canes is not here.

Mr. ALLDER: If you deal with the price of sugar you cannot help dealing with the price of canes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am giving a caution and warning to the honourable member. If in spite of my warning he persists in discussing the price of peasants' canes and the inability of Government to do this and that in that direction, I will rule him out of order and he will have to sit.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, I have received your threat.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will sit. I have made no threat. The honourable member must withdraw those remarks at once, or I will call for a substantive motion from the floor of the House. It is an insult to the Chair.

Mr. ALLDER: I would ask that the word "admonition" be substituted for the word "threat."

Mr. SPEAKER: You have not yet withdrawn it.

Mr. ALLDER: If you ask me to, I will, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. ALLDER: There is another point. St. John is among the three parishes which produce the greatest tonnage of sugar in the island. St. George comes first, St. Philip comes second, and St. John is third. I have noticed that we are given \$1.50 per head of population. St. John has 10,000 souls. That means that they are getting around \$15,000 for social amenities. Now you get St. Michael which produces the least of all the parishes, and has a population of around 84,000, including the population of the City. That shows you that an injustice has been done, not forgetting that these rural parishes suffer to a greater extent from lack of social amenities than St. Michael. This is not the first time that I have drawn the attention of the Government to this injustice. There is a tendency that whenever improvements are to be made for the metropolitan area to be considered first. Then the Vestry of St. Michael is more progressive than the rural vestries, and therefore social amenities are extended to a greater extent in St. Michael than in the rural parishes. I regret very much that there are not sufficient members here who would be mindful of having this Resolution postponed. I am still hoping that the Government will see its way to make a change in these allocations, and bring some relief to the sufferers in as short a time as possible.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker—I must start off by saying that I feel a bit worried about how this Resolution has been mixed up from time to time with the price of canes and housing. As far as I remember this was a special allocation made by the British Government to the Sugar Industry of this island five years ago. It had nothing directly to do with the negotiated price of canes. At that time it was arranged between this Government and the British Government how these allocations were to be made. To show that it is nothing to do with the negotiated price of canes, I think that this Rehabilitation and Reserve Welfare Fund is limited to 1953. After that, as far as I know, it will be re-negotiable. The honourable senior member for St. Peter said that a Good Offices Committee is sitting on the whole Sugar Industry. He did not say on any specific

fund, but on the economy of the Sugar Industry. He has made no direct statement as to whether one Fund is to be increased or another reduced. I am dealing now with the Welfare Fund—the levy of 10/- in the ton. Personally I feel that that is nothing to do with the Government's Housing Scheme. This is a Fund given by the British Government to the workers of the Sugar Industry, so that certain social amenities could be made available to them. We had a committee sitting on this Fund for quite a while and eventually they decided that the money could be spent in no better way than in repairing the houses of the workers which were in a very bad state. As I said, this Fund is nothing to do with the Government's Housing programme. It belongs to a specific set of people. I feel that it was a wise idea when the committee decided that this money should be used to put the houses of some of these people in a better state of repair. A man who is not in possession of at least a house frame cannot receive any help under this Fund. I have loaned labourers money free of interest so that they could build a frame so that the Fund could be applied to them. When they receive their money from the Fund they will repay me. I have heard it recommended that Highways and Transport workers should also benefit from this Fund. If that is so, why not the workers of the Waterworks Department also? They supply water to the industry. And why not the stevedores? I feel that those statements are rash statements made without proper thought. A person should be confident that he has the facts before he starts accusing anyone. We have been talking so long on the same matter that one is bored sitting here. I only got up so as to make a few explanations. Now we come to the Stabilisation Fund. This was created so that if there is a break in the price which the British Government pays for our sugar, instead of the repercussions hitting the island in one year, we will be able to come down gradually, thus giving the people an opportunity to meet the fall in the cost of living. In my opinion when the British Government made this gesture to the West Indies, their idea was to get more sugar. That was the specific reason. They found themselves in a position where sugar was in the open market and they would have to pay more than the West Indies were charging. It was to encourage the West Indies to accept their price that these funds were created, and the British Government benefited. It allowed the standard of living to go up. Now Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot of talk about this £1 per ton for factories. I would like to let honourable members know that the factories do not get £1, they get 85 per cent of that. The cane growers get 15 per cent, and that is so whether a grower has an eighth of an acre or a thousand acres. But we must bear in mind that the British Government gave us this Fund with the idea back of their minds that they wanted more sugar, and it was a very sensible idea that they should try to rehabilitate first the source where you get the big loss. Now making the factories more efficient is a thing that is to the benefit of the island as a whole. Not only will an increased production of sugar mean more employment, but imagine, inefficient factories take 12 tons of canes to make a ton of sugar. Imagine a factory in Barbados doing that. One would realise that that would mean loss not only to the individual but to the island as a whole. You would be simply throwing away four tons of canes out of every ton of sugar you make in a year. When you get \$12.00 a ton you will see what the island will be losing. I would like the honourable senior member for St.

Philip to realise that. I do not feel that anyone is satisfied. I am not satisfied. Everyone would like to have more. The peasant and the worker and the cane grower all benefit from this money that the factories get. It may not be seen directly; but when the factory is improved the peasant will get more for his canes. He would realise that if this Fund was stopped he would get less. If it was stopped the factories would get back into a dilapidated state, and instead of keeping up their efficiency they will go back to taking ten tons of canes to the ton of sugar. The labourers will get the benefit also, because when you improve your machinery, you produce more sugar and you employ more people. The reason why the peasant growers cannot benefit as they should from this 15 per cent, is because they work as single units. They will only benefit by amalgamating and buying say a tractor or a few motor lorries. I must blame the peasants for their present condition. They must learn to co-operate and form co-operative societies, whereby they can become a force. They must realise that today if they want to improve their economy and their conditions they must act as big units. Small units are useless. The peasants must realise that the same way they see the estates joining together they must do the same. If all the peasants, say, in St. Philip, joined together in a co-operative unit they would be able to send in 13,000 tons of canes, and get their quota from the fund. So you must lay the blame at the right door. Although as I said, the peasant would like more money, he must realise that the British Government has done a great lot of good in the island. I feel that the Government of Barbados has done its best. There may be discrepancies in the Labour Welfare Scheme which can be straightened out, but getting up and abusing everyone does not get us anywhere. If we could get something that would please everyone, this island would be a happy place to live in. But if you neglect the factories where you get the biggest loss, everyone else will suffer as well. I cannot follow the arguments used by the honourable senior member for St. John about the price paid for canes. I feel that if proper negotiations were carried out some terms would be reached. It is impossible to know what price you will give before you start to reap the canes. You have to take nature into account. You may have an exceptionally good year, but the juice content of the canes may not be good. Therefore, instead of taking seven tons of canes to a ton of sugar, some factories may take ten tons of canes to make a ton of sugar. I would like the honourable senior member for St. John to realise that every man is entitled to his own opinion, but sometimes a man has the wrong opinion. Surely when it is shown to him that his opinion is wrong he should be man enough to say I will reconsider my view. I can assure the honourable member that if what the honourable senior member for St. Peter said is true, that the economy of the whole industry will be gone into, he need have no fear. If the British Government continues to make these funds possible, we may be able to say later that the factories are in a fairly good condition; give us a little more for the Labour Welfare Fund. But at the present moment I do not see how any good can be done by postponing it. I counsel the honourable member that whatever may be his opinion he should allow the Resolution to pass until we get the report of the Good Offices Committee.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker—I think we should be grateful to the last speaker for his careful pres-

entation of the facts relating to this matter. It seems that many honourable members do not appreciate the facts relating to these funds, and know nothing about the Act by which they were created. If they would take the trouble to read the preamble to the 1947 Act they would not make rash statements. This Act imposes a levy on the sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this island, to create funds for the benefit of the Sugar Industry in the island and to provide for the administration of these funds. The first fund under this Act is the Capital Rehabilitation Fund. The last speaker has dealt with that so fully, that even the honourable senior member for St. Philip cannot say that he does not realise that when the machinery of the factories is more efficient you will get better production and more money will be in circulation. We have a good Trade Union, and there is no doubt that the manufacturers of sugar who have received help under this scheme will have to pay to the workers the maximum wages possible without detriment to the safety of the Industry. If they do not, it will be the fault of the Trade Unions, and I do not think that they are so oblivious to the interest of the workers as to allow the manufacturers to get everything for themselves and pass on nothing to the workers. The second fund is the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund. The last speaker also dealt fully with that. I want to support what he said about the desirability of the peasants banding themselves together in large units so that they will get more out of their land. The next fund is the Labour Welfare Fund. On that we have heard many statements. The honourable senior member for St. John mixed it up with the housing problem. The honourable senior member for St. George brought in playing fields and the allocation to the Vestry of St. George, and he actually mentioned that that Vestry had not submitted schemes to the full extent of the money allocated to it. That shows colossal ignorance of the matter under discussion. I think we will all agree that in a matter of this sort we should all stand together and work together. All three branches of the industry — the manufacturer, the grower and the worker — must stand together. As the last speaker has told us, these funds have been only arranged for up to 1953. After that time the allocations to the relief funds will I feel be changed, and for this reason: up to now the emphasis has been on the improvement of factories. As soon as those factories become improved and the output increases, there will be no need for help to such a large extent under that heading, and the emphasis can be shifted to social amenities for the workers in the industry. In addition, as we have been told, there is a committee considering the working of the whole Industry, and these funds will also come in for consideration. There is one last thing; some honourable members have had the temerity to suggest that this debate should be adjourned and the Resolution postponed until the Good Offices Committee makes its report. Honourable members who think that, should not be members of this House. You and I know Sir, that at times committees take a long time to report, and when they do report, it is sometimes a very long time before any action is taken to implement their report. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker the Act tells you that there shall be published in the Official Gazette not later than the 31st of January each year statements by the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Board and the Sugar Industry Price Stabilisation Board. So, if you look into the Gazette at

that time you will see exactly what is being done by these two Boards.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker—As the member who last year moved the postponement of this Resolution, I think that I am entitled to say something on the point. The last two honourable members who spoke seem to have thought that two members were confused. But they are just as confused. The money that goes into the Labour Welfare Fund is given for playing fields. The honourable member cannot be *au fait* with what is happening with the Vestry of St. George. However, what we are dealing with is the principal section of this Act that creates these funds. That section says that you can make regulations governing the Labour Welfare Fund. I would like to say that I quite agree that the plight of the peasants is due either to the fact that the politicians have not been alive to their interests to organise the peasants, or that the peasant is unorganisable in this country. Whatever is the reason, the peasant has suffered a great deal as a result. If they came together and proved that they were losing money, they would have to be given an improved price. The peasants have themselves to blame. Now, if there are a few things that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy is wrong about, the first is that the British Government is so mixed up with these Funds that if they say they are to be administered in a certain way, that cannot be changed.

Mr. WARD: I did not say that. I said the use of the funds was as the result of a recommendation from the British Government.

Mr. LEWIS: What he said amounted to that. When you hear talk about people in St. Michael and the City benefiting from the Welfare Fund, you must remember that the levy is on the sugar manufactured in this island and not on the sugar exported. Therefore when 8,000 tons is consumed by the people of this country, you must remember that the people in St. Michael and the City consume the most of it. The agreement with the British Government was that these funds should be created; not how much was to be put to each. That is why I agree with the honourable senior member for St. Andrew when he brings in the Highways and Transport Workers. He should bring in everyone. The Government controlled Housing Fund is part of this Welfare Fund therefore it is pertinent to this discussion. The honourable senior member for St. Lucy makes a dangerous mistake when he says that rehabilitation of the factories means increase in employment. That is not true. Rehabilitation of the factories means a drop from about 52 employees in a factory to about 25, and you will continue right down to about five. You will be employing less people because of the labour saving devices in tillage and manufacture. Where the Labour Welfare Fund is concerned, I do not propose to take the same line that I did last year. We have been given an assurance by the honourable senior member for St. Peter that negotiations are going on, whereby the labourers, peasants and others in the Industry will get something out of it. I would be the last one to go at this stage to alter the money of these funds if it can be shown that they form part of the price paid to one set of the negotiators. I hope that the Housing Scheme from the Welfare Fund will extend to the people of St. Michael and the City as they are undoubtedly entitled to some of it. I feel that if you rehabilitate the factories these funds will get more money, because it will take less canes to make a ton of sugar. When you think of the colossal amount

of money needed in the Welfare Fund compared with the small amount that is going into it, I think that the whole situation needs reviewing. Therefore I welcome the announcement today that a Good Offices Committee is going to consider the economy of the Industry as a whole. I hope that our confidence today will be justified.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—In fairness to the Government I must reply to some of the remarks made by honourable members. We have heard that the Government is allowing people to be exploited. When it comes to the question of Government perpetuating the system of exploitation of the peasants I would like to say this: Government cannot perpetuate the system of exploitation of the peasants.

Mr. ALLDER: I did not say that. I referred to the members who sit on the committee. The Government does not buy canes. Government might have been guilty of allowing them to be exploited.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not call the honourable member's name; but I excuse him. An Address was passed here saying that the House would like Government to examine the question of getting tractors and ploughs for the peasants out of the Labour Welfare Fund. The Government looks favourably upon that scheme. It is merely a matter of implementation. I want to make it clear that as far as the funds for this are concerned, they are allocated to the peasants on the basis of what they represent in the Sugar Industry. I hope that honourable members will see that it is not the intention of the Government to take away anything from one group of people. As far as the housing loans are concerned, the honourable senior member for St. Lucy has already explained that this should not be mixed up with the question of housing in the whole island. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew can rest assured that when the Government sends down a Bill for housing loans for those who work in the Government Service, the workers in the Highways and Transport Department will be included; but not under this Resolution. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. John will understand what I am saying now. It is nothing complex. As far as the Government's loaning money to people to build houses is concerned, the Government is not endeavouring to put any difficulties in their way by saying that they must have a big area of land. Once you can show that you have enough space that is an end of it. Government has no intention of trying to deprive anyone out of the benefits of this fund. If the Government had placed too many restrictions they would have been accused of making it too complicated. I regret very much that you have been kept so long. Sir I am sure that you realise what this time means. As elections draw nearer, your time will become longer.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the House and agreed to on the declaration of the Speaker that the Ayes have it.

REPLY LAID

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT with leave laid the Reply to Question No. 82 standing in the name of the Honourable Junior Member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker).

RESOLUTION RE REGISTRATION OF VOTERS

On the Order being called for Dr. CUMMINS to move the House into Committee of Supply the honourable member moved, seconded by Mr. Cox, that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the

House go into Committee of Supply. The motion being carried *nem. con.* His Honour left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Resolution that the sum of \$3,700 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 11, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman—This Resolution is to implement the amount paid to the Assistant Registering Officers and also to Parish Supervisors in connection with the registration of voters. A case has been made out that the work that these men had to do was more onerous than was expected. I must pay tribute to the manner in which they did their work. It was a tremendous feat to register almost 94 per cent. of the people in the island. In addition to that, in the course of the registering they were called upon to do some clerical work that was not at first anticipated. It is true that a suggestion was made to the Government that these men should be paid for people who refused to register. Government did not agree with that suggestion, but

felt that it would be better to increase the stipend. So they will even come off better than if they had been paid for those who refused to register. I move, sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman—I want to record that I think that these men did a tremendous job. I want to express my appreciation.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put to the Committee and agreed to *nem. con.*

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Chairman reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

On separate motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The motion was put and carried *nem. con.* and Mr. SPEAKER, adjourned the House accordingly.