

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9th October, 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. E. L. WARD, Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. WALCOTT, H. A. DOWDING, T. O. BRYAN, and J. A. HAYNES, B.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 25th September, 1951, having been circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker — I have the honour to present from His Excellency the Governor Messages as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 35/1951.

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to His Deputy's Message No. 21 of the 12th July, 1951, addressed to the Honourable the House of Assembly in connection with the proposed membership of the Scotland District Conservation Board and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the Director of Highways and Transport has been added to the list of members set out in that Message.

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
5th October, 1951.

MESSAGE NO. 36/1951.

*His Excellency the Governor
To*

The Honourable The House Of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that his attention has been drawn to an error in paragraph 1 of his Message No. 34/1951 of the 2nd of October, on the subject of the Domestic Sugar Agreement, in the reference to the different organisations concerned.

2. His Excellency has the honour to notify the Honourable the House of Assembly that paragraph 1 of Message No. 34/1951 should have read as follows:—

“His Excellency the Governor has the honour to invite the attention of the Honourable the House of Assembly to a Memorandum of Agreement dated the 13th September, 1951, which, in accordance with its terms, has been submitted to the respective organisations mentioned therein for their consideration and which, it is understood, has been confirmed by these organisations. Copies of this Memorandum of Agreement are being laid in the Honourable the House of Assembly to-day.”

ALFRED SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
9th October, 1951.

PAPER LAID

Mr. ADAMS: I also have the honour to lay the following Paper:

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

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

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$52,963 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52 Part 1—Current, as shown in the Supplementar

timates 1951—52, No. 30, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to make it lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to James Winston Hinds that parcel of land, abutting on Bay Street but otherwise surrounded by the lands of "Murray Lodge" the property of the said James Winston Hinds, situate in Upper Bay Street in the parish of St. Michael and containing by admeasurement twenty-one perches.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the protection of Third Parties against risks arising out of the use of Motor Vehicles and for purposes incidental thereto.

Mr. COX: Bill intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Mr. ADAMS for Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Bill intituled an Act to impose a special levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this Island in certain circumstances.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and amend the laws relating to Immigration.

Messrs. ALLDER and MAPP entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

INTERIM REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE PRESENTED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker — I beg to present the Interim Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a Draft Reply to Message No. 16/1950 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly inviting the views of the Honourable House on the recommendations contained in the Reports of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee and of the Commission on the Unification of the Public Services in the British Caribbean Area.

Messrs. GILL, GARNER, CRAWFORD and GODDARD entered the House and took their seats.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the protection of Third Parties against risks arising out of the use of Motor Vehicles and for purposes incidental thereto, as read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill intituled an Act to impose a special levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this Island in certain circumstances, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill intituled an Act to consolidate and amend the laws relating to Immigration, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS: I am moving that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended; I propose to deal with the Bill intituled an Act to impose a special levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this Island in certain circumstances as the first Order of the Day. Honourable members will then be able to speak on the first Order of the Day as it is printed; in short, they will be able to speak on the whole

Memorandum on the Domestic Sugar Agreement. Instead of having two debates on the same thing we will have one debate. I therefore beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION, PRICE STABILIZATION AND LABOUR WELFARE) (SPECIAL LEVY) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to impose a special levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this Island in certain circumstances.

Mr. ADAMS: I hope that honourable members have been able since last Tuesday to read carefully the Memorandum of Agreement which has been reached between the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados and the Barbados Workers' Union affecting the sugar industry in respect of wages and profits of the industry for the next three years including this year. I hope that honourable members have read this Memorandum of Agreement carefully, because it is of great importance, and there are points on which, doubtless, honourable members may differ; but as a Legislature, we are only concerned with whether we are going to approve of the transfer under certain conditions, of some of the Price Stabilization Fund to Labour Welfare, which is one of the terms of the Agreement between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union. It is proposed that there should be imposed a levy in these three years out of the profits of the sugar industry, and that that levy should go to the Labour Welfare Fund. That is all that is before the House. It is necessary that honourable members should have before them the whole Agreement out of which this Bill has arisen, and it is with the object of officially putting the Agreement before honourable members that the Legislature has been furnished by the Governor with a copy of the Agreement—an Agreement which has been reached privately between some of us representing the Barbados Workers' Union and some gentlemen representing the Sugar Producers' Federation.

As honourable members will see from the Memorandum of Agreement and from the preliminary Agreement reached between these two sets of persons, there was only a tentative Agreement; neither side could bind its own organization, but they promised to persuade their organizations to accept the Agreement arrived at privately between the nine or ten persons concerned. The Sugar Producers' Federation have accepted it by a majority vote just as the Council of the Barbados Workers' Union has accepted it by a majority. I say that specially in order that it may not be thought that an Agreement of this sort with all its implications, could readily have met with universal approval on all sides. If honourable members will study carefully all that has been arrived at in this Agreement, I think they will agree that it is one of the most outstanding—possibly in modern times the most outstanding—Agreement between employers and employees, not merely as regards what you might call the material advantages which might be gained on one side or the other, but also as regards the results which it must necessarily have in continuing peace in the sugar industry for a period of three years. Barbadians are apt with justifiable pride to remember

sometimes that industrial relations in this island are, on the whole, more devoid of friction than our less fortunate neighbours in the Caribbean area, and it is because of that free spirit which has been created in the past 10 years or so, that it has been possible to achieve such a stupendous Agreement in the history of relations between any class of employer and employee in any part of the world. Such an Agreement is certainly almost phenomenal in an island like Barbados and in an industry like the sugar industry which is an example of free enterprise to the eighth degree, of capitalism which has been in existence for the 300 years of the life of Barbados.

At this stage I must say that in some respects I have been surprised that this Agreement has taken place; because if I had the misfortune to be born a capitalist, a rich man, a sugar planter with three centuries of complete, absolute dictation as to what terms I am going to employ people on and how much money I am going to make out of the sugar industry, I too, might have had the misfortune of not wanting to complete an Agreement of this sort which limits my profits.

The first outstanding thing about this Agreement is that it is the first big or small comprehensive Agreement for profit sharing. The effect of it is that the profits of the sugar industry will be limited, a contribution will be made to a higher rate of production bonus than has been given for the past two years and to a cess on sugar or its equivalent manufactured in this island in order that in the special circumstances set out in the Memorandum of Agreement a certain portion will go to the Labour Welfare Fund and a certain portion will be earmarked for a Harbour Fund, if and when the Government decides to proceed with the construction of a Harbour.

This Agreement has been the subject of negotiations existing for roughly nine months; it is perhaps something more than a coincidence that the period of gestation in respect of this Agreement should coincide with the period of gestation in respect of the human race. However during this period special negotiations took place on behalf of the workers in the sugar industry and, naturally, there has been much give and take. This final Memorandum is only one of several drafts which have had to be made from time to time, just as a point had to be yielded there and added here, and so on. I do feel the House will agree with them that profit sharing is a fair thing; profits should be shared between employers and the workers who helped to create those profits. The establishment of that principle is in itself an outstanding achievement.

In one respect it might be said that this idea arose as a result of the comparative stability which a long-term Agreement with the Ministry of Food to take West Indian sugar brought with it. It was felt that if there was in existence a long-term Contract with the British Ministry of Food and you know that they would give "X" pounds for sugar for the next five years there should be some stability where production was concerned. On both sides fundamental points were agreed to; it was agreed that there should be reasonable wages paid and reasonable profits made in the sugar industry in relation to an average crop—an average crop having been taken as 120,000 tons for some years now—that when the sugar crop exceeded that average crop, the extra profits made should be shared and that the Price Stabilization Fund should be carefully guarded when the crop did not exceed the average crop.

There are two other points to which I have not made any reference so far, but I shall make reference to them now. It was also felt that something should be done to bring a sense of stability to peasants as far as the price to be paid for their canes is concerned and perhaps equally outstanding and an equally great concession, if I may use that word, is that the public should be given information of the financial position in the economics of the sugar industry. I am endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute where tribute is due, although the temptation to remind the people in the sugar industry of how long and burdensome the struggle has been, is a great one. Honourable members will remember that when the Moyne Commission came out here the people in the sugar industry promised—at least some of the representatives in the industry declared that they had no objection to publishing for the benefit of the public, figures showing what the industry was making so that employees in the industry would be able to see that the representatives in the industry were speaking the truth when they said that they could not afford 1/6 or 2/- a day or what not. Since then every year they have forgotten that promise until now. I have myself appeared at some of the discussions as to what increased wages labourers should be paid; on the last occasion I had to say that it was an utter waste of time because you may be groping in the dark when you ask 12s. or 15s. or 20s. because you do not know what the industry was making and what it ought to pay in consequence. Seventeen of the twenty-four local factories we approached have finally agreed, after some persuasion and much persuasion in some cases and little or no persuasion in others, to allow their figures to be seen in order that from an investigation of those figures you would be able to see that a reasonable profit was made and what could be earned by way of increased production bonus and then the levy for the Labour Welfare Fund and the Harbour Fund could be assessed. These factories have gone further and have agreed to the publication annually of figures showing the average expenses and the profits of those factories. It is to be hoped that these 17 factory owners—I have no doubt that they will do their utmost just as those who represented them in the initial negotiations did their utmost—will persuade the others to abide faithfully with the decision of these 17 to come into this Agreement. It would have been perhaps an easy matter over a period of a year, for this Government to have proceeded by way of legislation to attempt to get done some of what has been done voluntarily. I think we will all agree that it is an excellent thing that this Agreement has been made voluntarily, and I hope that those factory owners who are not among these 17 will see that voluntary agreement is preferable to legal compulsion.

Now Mr. Speaker, I will deal with what is primarily our concern—the allocation of monies to these separate Funds. It has not been easy as regards this particular part of the Agreement to get general agreement; as a matter of fact, if it were not that the negotiations had already lasted a pretty long time, it is conceivable that we would still have been negotiating for some modification of what we eventually agreed on. It appears to me and this Party that one of the objects of stabilization originally was to provide against bad years, not merely as regards drought or disease, but bad years as regards price. I hope that this debate will not be political and I do not want to take any more credit than I can legitimately claim; I think, if anything, credit is to be given to those employers who have eventually agreed on this matter because it would certainly have been almost

blasphemy to make these suggestions years ago. These employers have come a long way since 1938. However, when the idea of stabilization was first discussed in this island as far back as 1940 when Professor Shephard was here, one of the chief reasons for it was the uncertainty of what we were going to get for our sugar, and it was felt by those concerned with the sugar industry that in good years some money should be taken and set aside so that money would be available in bad years chiefly as regards price. Now that we have an assurance of the Ministry of Food for a long period, there seems to be no feeling of the same pressing necessity for a Stabilization Fund against the uncertainty as regards the price of sugar, although there is always the necessity for putting aside something for drought and disease. If I may disclose some of the things which happened during the negotiations, those concerned with the sugar industry seemed fearful about touching the Price Stabilisation Fund at all. One can well see that if we had the reverse of what we have been getting in the last few years, if we had very short crops, it is easy to see that if we did not have a substantial amount in the Price Stabilization Fund, we would have labour troubles and disputes. One of the chief points of difficulty was whether the Price Stabilization Fund should be touched at all; but it was eventually agreed that over an average crop, accepting a five-year average, the industry, out of its profits, could afford to pay \$1.80 per ton to Labour Welfare, and, in addition, we could take a further 5/- out of the Price Stabilization Fund. If the crop in a particular year exceeds the previous five-year average and is above 120,000 tons, that sum was agreed upon as the sum to be taken out, and it is with the object of implementing that proposal that this Bill is before the House. If, on the other hand, the crop does not exceed the five-year average but was above what we now feel to be the average crop production, namely 120,000 tons, only half a crown will be taken from the Price Stabilization Fund and put to the Labour Welfare Fund; if the crop falls below 120,000 tons, the Price Stabilization Fund will not be touched at all. The Price Stabilization Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund are two aspects of the same thing; under the Labour Welfare Fund you will get money for the purpose of repairing your house, you will get the benefit of a loan.

I hope I have made the position sufficiently clear to honourable members. I repeat that with a crop under 120,000 tons, there will not be any transfer from the Stabilization Fund. Above 120,000 tons, but below the average of the preceding five years, there will be a transfer of 60 cents. If the crop is above the average of the preceding five years and over 120,000 tons, there will be a transfer of 5/- from the Stabilization Fund in addition to the 7/6 which comes out of the profits and is added to the Labour Welfare Fund; so that this year the crop being above 120,000 tons and above the five year average, 7/6 per ton from the profits and 5/- from the Stabilisation Fund will be added to the Labour Welfare Fund. That is more than double the amount for loans and playing fields under the Labour Welfare Fund.

If I may make a further point, I think honourable members will agree with me that if we went back to a crop of 78,000 tons, and we got the price which the Ministry of Food is giving nowadays, the effect would be just as bad from the point of view of wages as if we had a large crop and went back to the old days when we were getting £12 10s. or £15 a ton. I should mention that as regards the crop bonus, we might pay tribute to the late Labour Commissioner and the honourable senior member for St. Peter for working

out the details. This matter of production bonus is something new in industrial relations in Barbados, and an analysis of the figures leads us to the conclusion that the industry can afford to increase the percentage of that bonus. It is felt that on crops which are 5,000 tons in excess of the average of 120,000 tons—on a crop of 125,000 tons and over provision could be made for a production bonus of 1% and so upwards; on a crop of 165,000 tons the bonus could be 13% and on a crop of 180,000 tons and over the bonus would be 17½%.

I now come to the third allocation of profits, the principle of which has been accepted by the Sugar Producers' Federation—a contribution to a Harbour Fund. If we have a Deep Water Harbour undoubtedly the sugar industry will benefit from it as much as anybody else, and more than the merchants and hotel keepers. If the Harbour is built it is going to cost us certainly more than five million pounds and it is only fair that, with the necessity of having to find this huge sum of money, the people who are going to benefit most from it, should pay for its construction over and above the average taxpayer. That principle has been accepted by the Sugar Producers' Federation and the sum assessed is no less a figure than \$2.00. However, agreement has been reached that in view of two facts, firstly, that the Government has agreed in principle to examine carefully the possibilities of constructing a Harbour with its financial implications, and secondly, that this Agreement has only been reached recently—about a month ago—a matter of this sort with its repercussions on other people besides the large landowner should be presented to the public for discussion before it was implemented this year. It is for that reason mainly that we are not proposing today to ask the Legislature to have that portion of the Agreement implemented. I will use an expression which will bring a smile on the face of the honourable senior member for the City; after the Fiscal Survey has been analysed—nearly everything depends upon the Fiscal Survey—because we cannot go to England and borrow five million pounds unless we can say that we have our head well above water. The Fiscal Survey is almost ready; that is as much as I can say in that respect. What I have just said is another consideration which has caused us to agree in principle to this amount of \$2.00 in respect of a Harbour Fund, but not to ask for its implementation today.

I have endeavoured, and I think I will succeed in this initial address at any rate, to try to be persuasive rather than yield to the temptation of saying something which will stir one or two honourable members to wrath. I will say this; Election or no Election, it is not playing the game to start rumours and try to induce fears in any section of the community in connection with a matter of this importance with all its implications. It is not honest or playing the game in trying to persuade peasants that this Agreement is doing them everlasting harm; I will wait and hear what is going to be said on that point. I am not saying anything which will detract from what is due to the sugar industry of this island; a certain measure of praise is due to the people concerned in the sugar industry for having gone so far in this Agreement voluntarily. For 300 years we have never had profit sharing in this island; we have had profit sharing among shareholders, but we have never heard of profit sharing among those who work for you. In any case it is better for me not to anticipate what is going to be said. If peasants think that the factory owners would have given them more for their canes this year but for this Agreement—the factory owners have been tricking them for at least 100 years; none of us knows what has been

happening in the past, and we who have seen a little more than the average member of the public has seen, can only guess what has been going on in the sugar industry up to this year. As I have said, I do not want to detract from what is due to the factory owners; for them to say that they are willing to disclose what their books contain, they must be at last reforming. I can see the sort of argument that will be used affecting peasants, but there could be no guarantee that the peasants would get one half cent more for their canes if we did not have this Agreement. Lower Estate might give more than its neighbour because of competition; not because of love for the peasants. I do say to the man who wants to give the assurance that the peasants would be better off but for this Agreement, let him prove it and not merely say it on the floor of this House.

On this question of peasants' canes, having regard to the figures given by these factories, even if you did zoning, nobody could say that we could produce a Bill which would not work a hardship on some people so as to save the peasants from possibly getting less for their canes than they would normally get. Obviously the price paid by a factory taking 9.34 tons of cane per ton of sugar as its recovery will not be the same as a factory taking 7.60. For anybody to suggest that it was possible to introduce a comprehensive Bill which would work in fairness to the peasants is to suggest something which could not be proved to be true. However, we had to go on an average crop production and we have got this Agreement by which peasants will be paid at least the same thing as estates not connected with factories are paid. That is something gained because it has been the complaint for years that a plantation would get 50 cents or a dollar more per ton for its canes than a peasant would get for his although being in the same area.

Honourable members have a copy of the Resolution which was passed at a special meeting of the factory owners held on the 2nd May this year while these negotiations were going on. It was considered in February that peasants should get what the estates unconnected with factories are getting; then there was the special meeting of factory owners and the Resolution which was passed forms part of this Memorandum. That Resolution reads as follows:

"That the same price calculated on a crop average recovery shall be paid for peasants' and estates' canes (not being shareholders or suppliers under written contract) it being clearly understood that neither shall have priority of delivery.

PROVIDED that where owners of estates other than those who are shareholders of the factory or are supplying canes under a written contract, supply canes in excess of 500 tons to a factory (the delivery of such canes being if required spread over the whole period of the crop) the factory shall be at liberty to pay such estate owners an additional price ranging from 5c. to 35c. per ton.

PROVIDED also that where a Co-operative Society of peasants supplies canes in excess of 500 tons to any factory (the delivery of such canes being if required spread over the whole period of the crop) the Society shall be paid the same extra price which is paid to outside estates ranging from 5c. to 35c. per ton for similar quantities."

Of course if peasants supply canes in excess of 500 tons to a factory, they will get the same extra price; and in respect of a Co-operative Society, naturally a factory will pay the same thing to people who combine and supply canes in excess of 500 tons. Although a promise has been made it will not necessarily be carried out, and you cannot pass any law on earth, that somebody cannot get around if he feels like being dishonest. I am told that legislators will pay a shilling

a pound for fish and a sixpence extra for the fishermen; (A MEMBER: More than that) so that you can only legislate and hope that people will obey the law. You cannot make people obey the law; I am told that there are certain factories which do not want to pay the production bonus. Well, I can only say that the Barbados Workers' Union is still alive. Some of the factory owners have agreed to these terms but all the factory owners should abide by this Agreement.

I am trying to give an outline of this Memorandum and what we arrived at. There are lots of figures which I cannot go into now, but if in the course of their addresses honourable members desire to have any information and I can supply them with it, I shall be pleased to do so. As I have indicated, the figures as regards recovery for the factories range between 7.60 as the highest recovery and 9.34 tons of cane per ton of sugar as the lowest recovery. The manufacturing expenses range between \$24.85 and \$35.46 per ton of sugar, the average being \$27.73; there are some figures which honourable members themselves know, but I shall be pleased to give anything else that I can give. It has been agreed to publish figures in connection with the sugar industry from time to time, and the figures which have been published and which honourable members have before them will show with regard to these 17 factories the average price paid for canes in 1950. I want to say that until there is more efficiency in the industry the difference in the price paid for canes will be felt and it will be very marked in some cases.

Before passing completely from this portion of the Agreement, I would like to say that the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Government regret that there is not a strong peasants' association in Barbados. Nevertheless, the peasants were represented in all of these talks; their interests were naturally considered. I must say that at one time it was made clear that all negotiations would break down if the minimum demand affecting peasants were not granted; that is, that the peasants should get what the estates were getting. I say that lest it should be thought that because the Barbados Workers' Union sees after the interest of the agricultural workers, therefore the interest of the peasants would be neglected; anyone who knows the attitude of the Union towards agricultural labourers and peasants would know that, as a matter of fact, we represent the peasants. We know that the peasants have to pay what the plantation pays; of course the agricultural labourer sometimes feels that he is doing the peasants a kindness to work for them at all, and he says: "I get regular work at the plantation and therefore you have to pay what the plantation is paying." It is, of course, hard lines on peasants to have to pay increased rates which have been got for the agricultural labourers by the Workers' Union and to pay something more too. I hope that somebody who is interested in the peasants in a practical way like the honourable senior member for St. Philip, will use his influence, time, energy and persuasiveness (Mr. GARNER: Money too) and of course, money, to start and keep alive a strong a peasants' association. In every single negotiation affecting the sugar industry, the peasants should be strongly represented by some of themselves and not merely thought of by other parties to the negotiation. Just to digress for a moment. I am glad to see that retail shopkeepers can form their association and in the mad scramble for higher mark-ups by merchants, they might have a share too.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the publication of these figures which speaks for itself. It is a great achievement that the factories have at last agreed to carry out what they promised 13 years

age, that is, to allow an independent audit of their books. It is all very well to say that without any definiteness, but the Government hopes to have for this purpose an independent auditor, probably an accountant, who is not concerned with the sugar industry and possibly not a West Indian, let alone a Barbadian, so that there may not be any suspicion in any one's mind that he is only another partner of a well-known firm saying that he is auditing these books on behalf of the Government. The Government will see to it that no one will be selected as accountant to do this independent auditing, who could be remotely accused of being connected with the sugar industry of Barbados. These accounts will be audited and published from year to year in order that the public may see what exactly is the financial position—the cost of producing a ton of sugar and the allocation of prices for canes, wages and profits. I may say I know that there are some persons who feel that the allocation to the three Funds which are before us now has been wrong from the beginning, and some would go so far as to say that the allocation to the Rehabilitation Fund is too much. The Government does not think that the Rehabilitation Fund should be interfered with, but it feels that the Labour Welfare Fund should have more money allocated to it and that is why we have made this Agreement. We do not propose to touch the Rehabilitation Fund, because the more efficient the factory is, the better it will be in the long run. I am told that in some cases, factory owners are actually using their own money from the banks against future allocations to the Rehabilitation Fund which is being exhausted.

Before I sit down, there are one or two figures for which honourable members will ask and I will give them. The Price Stabilization Fund out of which practically nothing has been spent, has a balance of just over four million dollars. The Labour Welfare Fund stands at approximately \$1,300,000 of which \$750,000 has been earmarked for housing; everybody knows that the present allocation of 10/- to this Fund is far from being sufficient. Up to about a year ago more than 3,000 people applied for housing loans and only about 2,000 have been assisted. We are hoping that for the next two years the crop will turn out as good as it appears it will be. As the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill read, Mr. Speaker, the Bill is to give legislative effect to those portions of the Agreement which deal with the levy in respect of the Labour Welfare Fund, taking some of the allocation to the Price Stabilization Fund and adding it to the Labour Welfare Fund. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Messrs BETHELL, BRANCKER and MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats while Mr. ADAMS was speaking.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: We have to thank the honourable senior member for St. Joseph for his long, clear and interesting speech; we have to thank him for giving praise to people other than those who belong to his Party.

Mr. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the honourable member, I should like to say that, as has been set out in the Memorandum of Agreement in respect of the levy for the Harbour Fund, if the levy is taken next year or the year after, and the Government decides not to proceed with the Harbour Fund Scheme, that money will be paid into the Stabilization Fund.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: To continue my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think from my point of view if not from the point of view of all of us on this side of the Table, there is one point which we

are likely to complain of and to vote against; that is the proposition contained in Clause 3 of the Bill which deals with the additional levy of \$1.80 which it is proposed to raise and allocate to the Labour Welfare Fund, on what is now the cost of the manufacture of a ton of sugar. I will deal with that in due course. Perhaps it would be better if I follow more or less the order taken by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. As he said, it is a matter for congratulation that, in this island, you can find interests concerned with the sugar industry coming together and arriving at an Agreement which is proposed to last for at least three years. I think the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has been heard to say after he has had experience of the rivalry and opposition in the sugar industry in neighbouring islands, that the Barbados planter might be regarded almost as a Leftist. I think the honourable senior member for St. Peter, who is not now in his place, I am going to say something complimentary, has been heard to say in 1947 that there was never found to be much difficulty in negotiations between the planters and the Barbados Workers Union when they came to discuss—which they had to year by year, and very often after the crop was finished—the question as to what bonus, if any, should be paid in respect of the wages which were earned in the sugar crop. I think it was in 1947 when the honourable senior member for St. Peter made that statement, and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will remember that it was when a Committee was sitting to discuss the question of wages and whether or not a crop bonus should be paid and how much it should be, whether 12%, 10% or 20%.

That brings me to the first point, In so far as the sharing of the profits of the sugar industry is concerned, the bonus is bound to be held as a share in the profits and I think the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will agree with me that certainly to my knowledge, since 1947 the question has always been dealt with between the Sugar Producers' Federation and the Barbados Workers' Union, although it has sometimes gone to a Commission of Enquiry or its equivalent to determine what the exact amount was likely to be. Again it was in 1947 when the honourable senior member for St. Peter drew to the attention of the Sugar Producers' Federation that it would be most difficult for him to address the workers and tell them whether or not the sugar producers could pay a bonus of 10%, 12½% or 15% or more unless he, or somebody in whom he could trust, was authorised to see their books. I think it was also in 1947 that the Sugar Producers' Federation, although not allowing an inspection of their books, yet, after a speech made by the honourable senior member for St. Peter, they did put before the Labour Union the figures as to the profits which had been arrived at as between certain factories which, as in this case, had been subject to audit by one of the persons who were giving evidence before the Commission. A copy of these figures and of the profits was handed to the honourable senior member for St. Peter, and I well remember that after the enquiry was completed that the copy was handed back. That copy was treated as being confidential, but for the purpose of the calculations to be arrived at, there was no doubt about it that it was offered and accepted and dealt with. Therefore, when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph regards what has been arrived at here as a great achievement, with which opinion I heartily agree, yet I think he will be the first person to admit that since 1947 to my knowledge, he has found no

difficulty, nor has the other side found any difficulty in recognizing the position as regards the sugar workers and the sugar producers; the workers were given some benefit where a profit was being made.

I agree with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that an Agreement like this, as I understood him to say, is largely possible because at last Great Britain was prepared to give us a suitable price for sugar. As we know, the cost of living will require an increase in the wages of labourers. At the time of the Commission held by Lord Olivier, the attempt was made to draw to the attention of the British Government that it would be impossible for Barbados to flourish with the price of sugar as it was. The major difficulty in the sugar industry was the fact the sugar producer had to rely on good weather so as to get a good crop and he did not know what price his product was likely to bring in the markets of the world. I think that it was sometime in 1936 that Great Britain limited the amount of sugar which we would be allowed to export. I leave that question alone because it is a bitter question. However, until the next few years, we are in a position where the sugar industry has been made stable so that we know what we are going to get for sugar.

On the question of the percentage of bonus to be paid, I think I am right in saying that this is not the first year that bonus has been paid, but this year the bonus has been increased as shown by the figures given at the top of page 2 of this Memorandum of Agreement. Although this is a great achievement, it is not such a great achievement because three years ago it was recognized by both parties that where you were lucky enough to get a suitable price for sugar and to have a good crop, you could pay to those who work in the industry something in addition to the basic wage because of the profit which you made in the industry in the circumstances. There is no doubt about it that last year and again this year, we have been blessed with good weather which means a good crop.

I pass on to the next paragraph of the Agreement; that is a most desirable thing—one which will facilitate the arrangement with Great Britain over the price of sugar, because the prices for labour and materials are considered by Great Britain in arriving at any price which may be paid. It is obviously desirable that with such conditions you should have representatives of labour present before you make any proposals to the British Government.

As to the next paragraph of the Agreement, I do not agree with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph: I do not agree with him on this point about taking this additional \$1.80 per ton and transferring it to the Labour Welfare Fund. If you were making this transfer to the Labour Welfare Fund from profits, that would be another matter; but this money is an expenditure where the manufacture of sugar is concerned, or, to put it more plainly, this is something which is removed from the price of sugar before the producer of the sugar gets it at all. If you take this \$1.80 per ton more and add it to the Labour Welfare Fund, all you are doing is reducing the price of sugar that goes to the producer by that amount; you are not taking it out of any profits at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: If honourable members intend that I must hear more than one speech at a time I will adjourn this House.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I do not believe that the honourable member will be persuaded on a point like this either here or hereafter. Honourable members will learn in due time what will happen in connection with this question, but it seems to me to be

a very simple matter; the only person from whom you will ever get that amount of money is the cane-grower. The rude interruptions of honourable members over there will not put me out; this money is coming out of every cane-grower, not merely the small cane-grower. There is only one way in which you could get this money out of the profits, and that is, after you have arrived at the profits, you take it by way of income tax. As regards the amount of \$2.00 per ton to be paid into a Harbour Fund, perhaps that might better be left over until legislation in that regard is brought before the House. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that the sugar producers were willing to agree to this levy of \$2.00 per ton in respect of a Harbour Fund; I defy any honourable member to find anything which is more necessary or valuable to the whole community than a Harbour, because it has to be used by everybody for the benefit of all; but so far as I am concerned, I will mention now that I am voting against this proposal as I will vote against the proposal to raise this additional levy of \$1.80 per ton of sugar produced, to be applied to the Labour Welfare Fund. This Fund is not a gift to anybody; this is a Fund which will continue to grow, and in the circumstances in which it is applied it cannot sink because it is a question of money being loaned with interest attached. This Fund must be increased so long as proper precautions are taken with respect to the loans; it is not a question of taking something from one Fund and putting it to another Fund in the sense that the money will be lost. This Fund stands at over a million dollars of which \$750,000 has been applied to housing. I may say that I applied to the Government to let me know how the applications have been made, how they have been dealt with, and I was informed that that was a matter for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and not a matter for me. However, I do not quarrel about that now; I have not got that information and I will not argue about that now. But since these loans will have to be repaid, this Fund should not need any augmentation; the Fund is not a gift and so the money will not be lost. In any case I hope that honourable members have appreciated the point I have made; this additional levy of \$1.80 per ton does not come out of the profits, it could never come out of the profits and it is not intended to come out of the profits. I defy anybody to show or prove that this \$1.80 is taken out of profits; it is taken out before there is any question of profit and the man who has to pay this money—the only man who will have to pay it—is the man who produces the cane. The factory or merchant will not pay one cent of this money; nobody else is going to pay one cent of it, but the man who grows the cane will pay it all.

I pass on now to the other points with which I agree. I congratulate all those who helped in the negotiations so that a matter like this could be settled. After all, we Barbadians speak for ourselves and we let it be realised that whatever matter we may bicker about we must try and arrive at some decision on the question of sugar because sugar is our all. Paragraph (1) (d) of the Agreement says this:

"Whenever the Island's crop exceeds 120,000 tons of sugar or its equivalent but is below the previous five-year average, then the present rate of cess of £1 5s. per ton payable to the Price Stabilization Fund shall be reduced by 2s. 6d. per ton of sugar or its equivalent, and the amount of such reduction shall be transferred and added to the present rate of cess payable to the Labour Welfare Fund."

I agree with that and I do not think that anybody on this side of the House disagrees with it. The hon-

ourable senior member for St. Joseph has reminded his own members that the proportions between these Funds were a matter of agreement between the producers, and if there is any change I understand that the producers are quite willing—

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Whatever the honourable member might have been told, there is no question of not giving the figures. I did not know that the cyclo-styled copies were not handed out; I have them here before me to be distributed to honourable members.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I was referring to the variation of the amount which will be paid to these Funds in case the Island's crop exceeds 120,000 tons; when the crop exceeds the previous five-year average the amount payable to the Price Stabilization Fund will be reduced by 5/-. I understand that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has reminded his members that that was a matter of agreement: any change in the allocation is a matter for them to look after. As far as I am concerned, I agree with this allocation; if there is no likelihood of a lower price being paid for sugar, or of any loss being suffered by the industry, there is no reason why they should not do what they have done by agreement, that is, to increase the present rate of cess payable to the Labour Welfare Fund. The more you add to the Labour Welfare Fund in this way, the more reason there is as to why you should not have to apply this \$1.80 to this Fund, which will have to come out of the price of canes: because you will be getting 2/6 per ton sugar or 5/- per ton sugar as the case may be, according to the amount of canes which is in the sugar crop.

I have not got to say anything much about the next paragraph of the Memorandum and so I go to paragraph 3 which deals with the price of canes. Personally, I have never agreed with a factory paying less for peasants' canes than it pays for plantation canes. The answer I have always been given, but which I have not been able to prove, is that the custom had grown up here to take off the peasants' canes first and leave the plantation canes until after, with the result that the canes which are sold at the beginning of the crop invariably contain more water and weigh more than if they are taken off later. I am not surprised that the factory people have put that in the Agreement because on page 4 of the Agreement in respect of a resolution which was passed, they have stated this:

"That the same price calculated on a crop average recovery shall be paid for peasants' and estates' canes (not being shareholders or suppliers under written contract) it being clearly understood that neither shall have priority of delivery."

Mr. Gittens of Christ Church was known to be one who had tried to start a peasants' association; he did not succeed for various reasons. But I remember that he told me in argument one day that what was worrying him was that he had tried an experiment and found that what would be 36 tons of canes at the beginning of the crop would not be the equivalent of 28 tons a month and half later. Unless he could ensure priority of delivery he would not be doing anything. That argument does not apply to the delivery of a certain amount of canes such as 500 tons, the factory obviously depends upon a large quantity of canes so as to be able to cover its overhead expenses, and the man who can supply 500 tons would be better than the one who supplies five tons, because he is ensuring to the factory that there is a profit, whereas it is not necessarily so in the case of one who supplies five tons; hence there are two provisos to the Agreement which has been arrived at.

It is welcome news to know that this Agreement has been made and I venture to say that

competition will assert itself, and that the peasants' canes will still have priority of delivery. I hope that we will be able to retain that competition. I was a member of the Executive Committee when Dr. Saint tried to plan some system of zoning and we tried to insist on the same price being paid for canes. Eventually a Bill was brought before the House but it was not put into effect. You will find that whereas one factory may take 9 or 9.5 tons of canes to manufacture a ton of sugar another factory may take 7 or 7.8 tons. I think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was guilty of a slight error which can be remedied by reading this Memorandum; he said that the efficiency of the factory was one of the main reasons why certain factories could not pay more. I see from this Memorandum which has been accepted on both sides, that on paragraph 5 at page 2 of the Memorandum, this is what is stated:

"While it can be said that there is some difference in mechanical efficiency between factory and factory this factor is not a predominating one. The fact that one factory takes 8½ tons cane to make a ton sugar and that another factory took 8 tons does not mean that the former is less efficient. Thus in examining the results of these 17 factories for 1950 we find the largest and one of the most efficient taking 8.64 tons cane per ton sugar while one of the smallest took only 7.88 tons to make a ton of sugar. The first mentioned was in the high rainfall area where the yield per ton is highest with a lower sucrose content, and the second in a drier area where the field per acre is lower but the sucrose content is highest. Thus while factory efficiency has some weight in recovery it plays a minor role. The two main factors are therefore quality of cane and manufacturing expenses."

Paragraph 6 of the Memorandum dealing with "Quality of cane" states this:

"This largely follows the area of the Island from which the cane is delivered and the order is as follows:

Black Soil Area—(a) The sweet belt.
(b) Other areas.

Red Soil Area.
Scotland Area."

And figures in connection with these areas are given.

Then in paragraph 7 dealing with "Manufacturing Expenses per ton of Sugar" the Memorandum states:

"There are also very wide variations in manufacturing expenses the extremes being: \$24.85 and \$34.46 per ton of sugar. Speaking generally it may be said that the manufacturing expenses are largely influenced by the factory output. Between any two A Class factories there will be differences in manufacturing expenses in a particular year."

I do not think that at this stage I can say anything more in connection with this matter. In so far as the Bill is concerned, of course we agree to the second reading; and as I have already said, there is only one section that we are likely to complain about, that is the section dealing with the \$1.80 per ton to be applied to the Labour Welfare Fund. It is welcome news that the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation have been able to get together in dealing with these arrangements; it is, however, regrettable that there was no representative or there were no representatives of the small peasant proprietors to express their views as to whether they would agree to all or part of this Agreement which has been made. I think it has been our experience in the past that the sugar producers have undoubtedly followed the lead and I

would be surprised to hear that any factory owner would go behind an Agreement where negotiations have been happily settled.

Perhaps it would be appropriate for hon. members if I moved the adjournment for tea at this stage. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. REECE entered the House and took his seat while Mr. E. K. WALCOTT was speaking.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second the motion for the adjournment.

The question that this House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption of honourable members—

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I am asking leave to give notice of an Address to His Excellency the Governor which comes from the Debates Committee. The Address asks the Government to send down legislation to provide for a gratuity to the widow of the late Official Reporter of the House, to bring the emoluments of the Official Reporter of the Legislative Council equal to that of the Assistant Reporter of the House of Assembly, to provide money for the indexing of the volumes of the Debates for the years 1944—51 and to provide money as payment to substitutes for the late Official Reporter of the House and for bringing his arrears up-to-date.

There being no objection leave was granted.

AMENDMENT TO ST. LUCY LOAN BILL

Mr. SPEAKER:: I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning with an amendment the Bill to amend the St. Lucy's (Barbados) Loan Act, 1949 (1950—6).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—I am asking leave under Rule 262 to deal with the amendment of the Other Place to the St. Lucy Loan Bill forthwith.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—The amendment of the Other Place is the insertion of a preamble to the Bill. It escaped our notice that there was no preamble, and maybe the honourable junior member for St. Lucy thought that it would be more modern to omit it. I beg to move, Sir, that the amendment be read a first time.

Mr. BRANCKER seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. BRANCKER the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the adjournment the honourable senior member for St. James was speaking on the motion for the second reading of the Bill to impose a special levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this island in certain circumstances.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I had closed my speech, Sir.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker—As I happen to represent a constituency which has a large number of small cane growers I think it incumbent upon me today not to register a silent vote on what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has called "this most stupendous matter". I cannot for the life of me understand how anyone reading this Agreement and knowing anything about these things can fail to realise that when \$1.80 per ton of sugar is taken out of the price of sugar it must affect the small

cane grower with his four tons of canes or else the big cane grower with his four thousand or more. I have sat here and heard one honourable member after the other praise an Address asking for more money for cane growers; and now we are faced with an agreement to take away money from them. I cannot understand it. My point is that as long as you raise the cess or whatever it is called to \$1.80 a ton you must take it away from the cane grower. You cannot take it from anyone else. Perhaps if this was brought before the new House there might be some reason for it because as you know, Sir, there are Sugar Delegates in England making arrangements about the price of sugar for next year. The price of sugar is negotiated yearly, and that money will probably be added to the Stabilisation Fund, the Rehabilitation Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund. But this year, like a thief in the night, when cane growers are looking for the factories to make up their books and looking forward to getting an addition to the price of their canes they are to be told they cannot take all, and be faced with this Agreement. The next point that I have to make is relative to the Labour Welfare Fund. As you know, Sir, sometime ago I asked a question about the Organisation that deals with this Fund and queried as to how far it could be extended. I was told that the benefits of that fund could not be extended to Highways and Transport workers because they were not connected with the Sugar Industry. That is an amusing thing to me. This island is about one of the only places where nearly every ton of cane that is grown had to go over the public roads of the island. Other places have private railways. Nearly all of ours has to go over the public roads, and I do not see why these three or four hundred people should be debarred from the benefits of this fund. It is only due to the good service of these workers that we get roads at all. I appeal to the Government to see that that is a reasonable point of view. If our sugar was drifted down canals or transported by railways it would be something different. I really cannot understand how this Fund is worked. The money is given to improve houses, and yet it has to be paid back. It is beyond me. I had the pleasure of discussing this matter with the Manager of the Labour Welfare Fund and he told me that he has not taken out one chattel mortgage on any of these houses. I will tell any of them not to pay back a cent. It is an absolutely wrong principle. I would love to see houses in this island protected against hurricane. I did not get an Address relative to that passed in the House; but I know it would be a means of workers having security for their houses, not only dry houses, but houses secure from the ravages of storm and tempest. As far as I can see Government will soon own all these houses because they will repair them gradually and they will then belong to them. We have heard about "soaking the rich", but it now appears to me that we are "soaking the poor"! (Laughter). I can never agree with it; not under these conditions. There are other honourable members who will be able to speak more fluently than I can on this matter. But I could not remain silent. I had to let the Government know how I feel about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker—The honourable member who introduced this Bill has said that the Agreement upon which it is based is a stupendous achievement. What I would say is stupendous is the glib manner in which he says that it limits the profits of the sugar producers of this colony. He is apparently merely repeating what someone else has told him without actually reading the agreement thoroughly and carefully. It is inconceivable that the

honourable senior member for St. Joseph could have read the Bill before the House and then get up in this Chamber and say what he has said. Listening to him I wondered what had happened. I could not understand how any member on that side of the House could make the mistakes that he made. That he could have said what he said earlier today is to me stupendous, phenomenal and almost miraculous. Before I get down to the Bill itself, I will preface my remarks with one or two observations to clear the atmosphere. There has been a lot of talk during the debate on this Bill about peasants' canes, and the arguments for peasants as adduced by the honourable introducer of the Bill are to be found in that part of the Agreement which deals with paying peasants the same price as that paid to plantation owners. I think it is well that we should first try to appreciate the fallacy underlying these statements before we examine the others. Now the agreement says that the same price shall be paid for peasants and estate canes etc. Then it goes on to allow you to pay more for estate canes where the estate sends in canes in excess of 500 tons, when you can pay 30 to 35 cents a ton more. Under this you will pay more for estate canes because no estate sends in less than 500 tons. In the second place the agreement says that the same price shall be paid for estate canes as for peasants' canes where the estates are not shareholders in the factory. Now there is hardly any estate of any size which does not have shares in the factory near it. The factories like that because it guarantees them a proper supply of canes. So these two provisos are not worth the paper on which they are written. They rule out any suggestion that peasants will get the same price as estates. There is another small point to which I think we should direct our attention in the early stages, and that is with regard to the complaint that peasant proprietors are affected unduly by this Bill. I want us to get these facts in our mind's eye: Anything we do to reduce the price of canes in this island affects not only the peasant proprietor, but the agricultural workers themselves; because there is hardly an agricultural worker who does not himself sell canes every year. Almost every agricultural worker who does not own his own land rents a piece from the plantation on which he works. So the agricultural worker is as interested in what we are paying today as any small peasant proprietor in any part of the island. With regard to the memorandum relative to factory returns, that has been prepared by the Accountant of the Sugar Producers' Association. With regard to what should be paid to the average peasant proprietor for a ton of canes this memorandum is an absolutely useless document. One assumes that the figures in that document were sent to the proper authorities; and that a government which calls itself a Labour Government could have by implication agreed to the principles on which this document is drawn up is in itself amazing. Let us before we get to the core of the matter before us clear up these points because they will help us to better understand the kernel of the matter we are debating. Do not let any honourable member fool himself that this memorandum to which I have referred will assist the peasant producer in any way. The principle on which the whole document is drawn up is unjust in so far as the small producer is concerned, and one wonders how the great Socialist Government of Barbados could have signed it. The remarks of some of the honourable members on my left as regards the peasants producers are correct. But I am not suggesting that the hon. members on my left have any deep and abiding sympathy with the small producers. From the time I

came to this House I have never ceased to say that the prices paid for peasants' canes by factories bear no relation to the value per ton of sugar. I for one, Sir, have been concerned all along with getting to the root of this matter. When earlier in the year I understood that a very high official had almost to beseech members of the House to be silent on the matter because he wanted to get some figures etc. I hoped that after all these months something of value would have been produced. What has been produced? On page 2 of the Memorandum we are told that the main factors to be taken into account in assessing the price to be paid for canes are the quality of the cane and the manufacturing expenses. With regard to the quality, I only want to say this in passing: I know from my own experience this year that there were two sugar factories within a stone's throw of each other processing canes grown in the same district. Early when the crop started—in February—we had an unusual amount of rain. It was claimed by many factory owners that these rains lowered the sucrose content of the cane and they reduced the price they were paying for canes before the rains came. These two factories to which I have referred were paying \$11.00 a ton for canes before the rains, and when the rains came they reduced the price to \$10.00 a ton. The rain stopped, and presumably the sucrose content of the cane went up again. But the factory with the lower recovery and less efficiency put back on the dollar, while the factory with the greater recovery ended the crop paying \$10.00 a ton. Both factories were in the same area, and grinding canes grown in the same district, but that fact apparently did not influence the price which they paid for canes. As regards manufacturing expenses, let us read for ourselves what this remarkable document tells us: "There are very wide variations in manufacturing expenses. Thus Factory A may have heavier overhead costs than B, and the position may be reversed the following year." Are you going to tell me that the honourable members on my right subscribe to the view that because a factory may spend more money on overheads this year that it should pay less for canes and if the following year another factory spends more they should pay less? Are we accepting in principle the theory that if in any given year a factory owner feels like spending £10,000 and another feels like spending £1,000 that we will let him pay less for canes? Is he to recover in one year all that he spends instead of recovering it over a period? It is sheer lunacy to say that just because a factory owner may spend more on machinery this year that he should be allowed to pay less for canes, especially in these days when factories overhaul their machinery not out of their profits, but with money specially allocated to them by the Rehabilitation Fund. Every sugar factory is allowed for new machinery £1. 0. 0. per ton of sugar produced. Yet we are now prepared to accept the principle that because a man spends much more money in any given year than another man he should pay less for the canes that he processes in that year. It is the most remarkable thing that I have ever heard. I think, Sir, at this stage that we should examine the claim that when we levy this proposed \$1.80 as a special cess we are limiting the profits of the sugar factories. Anyone who says that is woefully ignorant as to how the calculation as to the price paid for canes is made. Both the Bill and the Memorandum are carefully worded. One has to pay due tribute to the originators of these two documents. They have been able to mix up the question of production with that of these levies, and for purely obvious reasons. According to the Bill, unless the crop in any given year exceeds a certain tonnage

you will not get the \$1.80, and if it falls below a certain amount you will only get 60 cents; then if it falls below another certain amount you will get nothing at all. What does that mean? It means that the year that you have a crop of 120,000 tons the Sugar Producers will realise that they have made a reasonable profit, and so they will not mind contributing a little amount of the excess profits to these funds. It does not mean that they alone are doing it; it means that every cane producer is doing it. The whole thing is a blooming farce.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: I rule that the word "blooming" is unparliamentary. I rule the honourable member out of order, and I ask him to withdraw that word.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Would Your Honour prefer me to use the word "blinking"?

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: Has the honourable member heard what I asked him to do?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is absolutely immaterial to me whether the word "blooming" is withdrawn or not.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: The honourable member will please sit. I am now addressing this honourable Chamber. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has made use of the word "blooming". I am calling on him to withdraw that word. If he refuses to withdraw it I will call on this Chamber to move a vote of censure on this honourable member.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I see that honourable members are inclined to the view that although they may not disagree with me that the word "blooming" is not unparliamentary, yet in order to maintain the even tenor of debate and in order to refrain from creating further offensiveness in this debate, that the word "blooming" might be substituted for by a word which might be less offensive to Your Honour's peculiar sensibilities.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member to withdraw the word "peculiar".

Mr. CRAWFORD: "Peculiar" is a word of many different interpretations, Sir.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please sit. I am again speaking to this Chamber. The honourable member in speaking to me referred to my sensibilities as being "peculiar". I called on the honourable member to withdraw that word in reference to me. If he does not I will call on the House to move a vote of censure on him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If Your Honour also dislikes the word "peculiar" which is capable of so many different interpretations I can also withdraw that word and use the phrase "Your Honour's sensibilities." With regard to the word "blooming" perhaps you might prefer the word "colossal". Therefore, Sir, I propose to go on and say that to say that this Bill limits the profits of the sugar producers is a colossal farce to anyone who knows how the calculations are arrived at in fixing the price for peasants' canes. So far as I know what is done is this: You get the possible value of a ton of sugar which includes the value of the molasses, and the preference certificates and the Canadian payments that they used to get. You deduct from the possible value of a ton of sugar certain manufacturing costs, which up to now have been estimated by factory owners themselves. You allow the sugar factories a certain amount for depreciation of machinery, and you allow them to offset the amount for profit. Then you subtract these figures from the total value of a ton of canes and you divide the remainder by so many tons of canes that it takes to make a ton of sugar. The

profit which has been fixed for a sugar factory making a ton of sugar for some years is in the vicinity of \$1.80 a ton, sometimes slightly more, sometimes slightly less. It is more or less static. But there will be no attempt if this Bill is passed to do anything but subtract \$1.80, or with the Harbour Fund included, \$3.80 from the total value of a ton of sugar. It cannot be worked otherwise. No one in his right senses would suggest that it could be. As I said earlier the suggestion about production merely means that the sugar producers would never agree to contribute their share of the value of a ton of canes except they feel themselves already covered by a crop of 120,000 tons. The minute you fall below that figure there is nothing doing. Therefore, all that this meaningless verbiage means is that if nature is kind and we get a good crop of 120,000 tons or more the sugar producer will put his hand in his pocket and give a little something to this fund and the Harbour Fund; and the small cane producer does the same thing and so does the agricultural worker. What is phenomenal about that? It is just as if I was running a grocery in Bridgetown and I said, "Anytime that I make \$5,000 I will give the Baby Welfare League something. If I do not make that, the babies can be dumped in the sea." The honourable senior member for St. Joseph refers to that as "phenomenal and stupendous" and it has been bruited abroad for the last eight days that a miraculous event has occurred; and that for the first time they have made the sugar barons limit their profits, draw their belts and give something to the Labour Welfare Fund. It is so ludicrous that it does not bear repetition in this Chamber. It is alright for the soap box, but I am surprised that the arguments could be repeated within the solemn confines of a legislative chamber in which members are supposed to speak after sober reflection, and after careful consideration of what they are saying. Now, Sir, at this stage we might pay a little attention to this whole question of the sugar cess, because the idea behind this whole thing is this: In 1947 when the British Government decided to give an increase in the price of sugar, it gave it on the condition that we should deduct certain amounts from it and put them to certain funds, the funds being the Labour Welfare Fund, the Stabilisation Fund and the Rehabilitation Fund. We began sometime ago to use money from the Labour Welfare Fund for housing for sugar workers. Naturally, after decades of bad housing conditions in the colony, with people working for wages which hardly gave them enough to eat far less to see after a shelter, housing conditions were so bad that after a time we found ourselves without any money in that fund. We are now proposing to carry on by increasing the fund by the method proposed in this Bill. The Royal Commission recommended a cess of 2/- per ton on every ton of sugar. The money so derived was to be used for labour welfare along the lines of the Miners' Welfare Committee in Great Britain. In that country the miners subscribed to the fund to the extent of a penny to every ton of coal produced. Now as regards the Miners' Welfare Fund you are restricted by law from using one cent for housing, and therefore it might be assumed with some justification that when the Royal Commission suggested a levy of 2/- a ton of sugar they had it in mind that the money derived from this cess would be used for rural amenities, playing fields, etc. The Royal Commission was careful to suggest in its recommendations that the Government should work out this cess in consultation with the sugar producers. It might have been possible with such a small cess of 2/- per ton to really take it away from the

profits of the sugar producers. But no one in his right senses would expect that any sugar producer would agree willingly and voluntarily to give \$3.80 per ton on the one hand to these funds and then a production bonus for a certain average production. After all every sugar producer who agreed to those conditions would be seen walking around town with a pair of wings. It is because he knows that he is not doing that, that he agreed to this memorandum. I brought in the point about the Miners' Welfare Fund in order to say this: If the Government in this Bill before us were really going to take this money out of the profits of the sugar producers it would be alright. But rather than penalise the agricultural workers and the peasant proprietors who also grow canes by making them get less money for their canes, Government should have looked for other means of increasing the amount in the Labour Welfare Fund. Let us bear in mind how these three Funds operate. The Rehabilitation Fund is an absolute gift to the Sugar Producers. They do not pay back one cent. At the end of this year the estimated amount in that Fund was over a million dollars. At the end of last year the balance was \$176,000 odd. At the end of this year the Stabilisation Fund which still remains untouched will amount to over four million dollars. Are you going to tell me that if you want to increase the Labour Welfare Fund for a good purpose like Housing you must take away from the worker or peasant money to which he is entitled by this price for canes, lend it to him, and then ask him to pay it back to you? Are you going crazy? While we appreciate the general picture of Housing and that this money is lent to help people repair their houses thereby helping the situation generally, strictly speaking it is not illogical to say that this money belongs to the workers as a right and should not be a loan. The Labour Welfare Fund is the only one of these three Funds in which the beneficiaries have to pay back money. This is only justifiable on the ground that you are trying to do the greatest good for the greatest number. To go further and take money from the price of canes which the peasant and agricultural worker are entitled to, lend it to them and ask them to pay it back is something that calls for a lot more consideration than has been given to it. That is why I find it incredible that the honourable introducer of this Bill really devoted to the Agreement the time and attention which he did, and to some extent has not gone by hear-say; because there is not a single line in any part of it which can justify the praiseworthy things said about it.

What I believe Government might, with some reason do, if they want more money for the Labour Welfare Fund, is to borrow it from the Stabilisation Fund. The money in the latter Fund is still lying there in its virgin freshness. We are assured that for another two years we will not have to touch it unless there is some abnormal climatic condition; because we have a guaranteed price for sugar until 1953. So since we have the Stabilisation Fund of over four million dollars lying idle, we could borrow, say, two million dollars from it and allocate it to the Labour Welfare Fund; because after all the Labour Welfare Fund is lent out and will be repaid. Even if there is some slight deficit because someone defaults, the Government might well make it good. Rather than reducing the already low price paid for canes, I think there would be more justification for making a loan from the Stabilisation Fund to the Labour Welfare Fund. We would not be decreasing by one penny the amount which should accrue to the Stabilisation Fund. Another matter is that these Funds have been in existence from since 1947, and the rehabilitation of sugar factories has been going

on all that time. So there may be some justification for reducing the amount given to the Rehabilitation Fund. Our Government, Sir, our great Socialist Government, if it paid proper attention to this matter, might well come to the conclusion that after all, rehabilitation of sugar factories cannot go on forever. Year after year, for some years now, factory owners have been getting their machinery improved. There was an abnormally good crop this year. Let us take the \$1.80 from the Stabilisation Fund and put it to the Labour Welfare Fund; do not take it from peasants' canes. As a matter of fact, if there was no Rehabilitation Fund there would be nothing wrong in the Government itself lending the Labour Welfare Fund a million dollars from Central Government Funds. It is not a gift. You will be only taking it from the Treasury and lending it to the people. They will have to pay it back. Those are the alternatives which I think could have been adopted.

Of course, what has happened is that the honourable members on my right somehow became obsessed with the idea of limiting profits, forgetting how the limiting operation is, and they are really taking steps which must penalise the small producers of cane in this country. If there is any doubt in their minds as to the actual effect of this Bill on the price to be paid for canes, let us wait and see what price will be paid for the last crop. There are some factory owners who are saying that if you do not look sharp the people who receive \$11.00 a ton may have to give them back some if this Bill goes through.

Do honourable members feel that anyone would sit down with equanimity with a situation like this? Government itself must have had a suspicion that all that glittered was not gold. We were told by the introducer of the Bill that it was felt that the question of \$2.43 for the Harbour Fund might well be ventilated and the public allowed to express an opinion on it before it was done. If we are so sure that the whole thing comes from profits of the sugar producers we can be sure that the public will welcome it without the need for ventilation. Government must have had a sneaking suspicion that it would be better not to push these two things at the same time because something might go wrong. But even with the \$1.80 for the Labour Welfare Fund the people may get hit too hard. My suggestion therefore is either to borrow this money from your Stabilisation Fund, or get it by reducing the Rehabilitation Fund, or borrow it from Central Government Funds; but do not get it by the method suggested here. I will say too that the honourable members on my left who are also opposed to putting money to the Labour Welfare Fund by this method are doing it not because they have any real deep concern over the position of the small producer, because they know what it really means. But they know they will get a lot of blame for doing it. If you started to pay for canes this year under the terms of this Bill you would probably see riots outside factory doors; and although those honourable members were not the authors of the Bill they would share the general condemnation for putting these prices into effect. They are far-sighted enough to realise that they should not touch this thing with a ten-foot rod. They cannot afford to do it, because many people will say, "the factories are robbing us," and may even forget to blame the Labour Government that brought down the Bill. In these circumstances one can appreciate the honourable members on my left opposing this Bill.

One further point is this: while it might be true to say that labour relations in this colony generally may proceed along more harmonious lines than in neighbouring colonies, it does not necessarily mean that everything is "hoity toity," and since mention has

been made of the fact that there is this production bonus agreed on for agricultural workers in the Industry, and since that has also been cited as an instance of the remarkable generosity and the complete reformation, and the exreme morality of the Barbados Sugar Producers, let us pay for a few moments some attention to that aspect. The Sugar Producer in this country has always had his pound of flesh. Like every business man in every part of the world he wants his share of profits, and if he can get more, he will take more. This production bonus for the workers is not the result of any special munificence on the part of the sugar industrialists in Barbados. In 1945 there was a big disturbance in the Sugar Industry. Arising out of that, the Labour Commissioner, Mr. Guy Ferrin, took certain steps. Among those steps was the establishment of a number of Conciliation Boards. These Boards functioned until 1948, when there was another disturbance in the industry, and neither the Sugar Producers' Association nor the two Labour Organisations could agree on the price to be paid for agricultural work that year, and the arbitrator was Mr. Burrowes who was Agricultural Adviser to the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation. The definite understanding was that the only reason the demands of the Labour Organisations were not met was because in 1948 there had been a very bad crop, and had there been an average crop, the full demands of the workers would have been met because they were justified. What was done that year was on the basis of the 1947 rates plus 15 per cent. The additional five per cent. was refused because of a poor crop. But 1949 was a good crop year and the wage rates remained the same.

If you go through the figures since then carefully, and note the price paid for sugar, the increase given by the Ministry of Food for labour in the increased price for sugar, the actual increase in wages given and the bonus of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. last year and $19\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. this year you will find that at the beginning of this crop, with the Ministry of Food including $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for labour in the over-all sugar price, that the workers of this country were entitled to a $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase in wages. You will also find that the increase in the value of molasses from eight cents for the first quarter of the total production which was sold to 18 or 19 cents for the remainder would have entitled the workers to another $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase. If you break down the $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. given at the beginning of the crop and the $19\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to which I have referred, you will find that at the end of the year the workers are still owed about $13\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It is out of that — and the Sugar Producers know it — it is out of that that you find this willingness to give \$1.80 for the Labour Welfare Fund and \$2.40 for the Harbour Fund if and when you get a crop of over 120,000 tons, and the decision in the agreement to give 60 cents to three Funds if certain conditions obtain, and nothing at all when other conditions obtain.

It is impossible, Sir, to come to any other conclusion than that the proponents of this Bill have not given it the consideration which a very important matter like this deserves. It was to be expected that once we started spending money from the Labour Welfare Fund on a matter like Housing it would be difficult for the supply to keep up with the demand. It is therefore also to be expected that if the work is to go on, in the absence of any large scale Housing Plan we should have to find more funds from somewhere. Funds can be found, and must be found; but I want to emphasise that the method proposed in this Bill — the levy of \$1.80 — is the last method that should be adopted. I have read and re-read this

Agreement. I have studied it carefully; and I can see no reason for the supreme optimism of the honourable introducer of this Bill. He has definitely made a mistake somewhere along the line, and I think that on more sober reflection even the authors of the Bill will realise its shortcomings. When we get into Committee, Sir, some pertinent points which should be raised with regard to this somewhat controversial Clause 3 might well be attended to.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I want to make a contribution to this debate. First of all, my vote will be worth as much as the vote of any factory owner or peasant in this House, and next I know absolutely nothing about the subject. I would like to speak early. I am sorry that I did not speak before the experts on that side — there are many experts on both sides to assist me in coming to a conclusion and voting the right way. I would like to deal with the Agreement, and if there is one thing that I must say strikes me is the decision that the crop year of 1948 will be taken into account in calculating for 1951—52 the average of five years. That will push the average a way over.

Let us take what the honourable senior member for St. James says. He says that the members on that side of the table will vote against the \$1.80 a ton for the Welfare Fund because we are making the mistake of thinking that it will come out of the crop; while it will really come out of the price that is paid for the raw material so to speak. I am not in a position to say where any of these cess funds, or production bonus, or anything will come from; and there are not many members of the House, including some factory owners, who will be able to tell you. They usually have people to make up their books and tell them if they have a profit or not. Have we by this agreement got anything at all for the workers of this country? I say that we have. Only last night and the night before I heard there were labourers on the sugar plantations who got more in production bonus than they worked for in the entire crop. From that angle I have to say that the Agreement has worked in the interest of the workers in this Industry, and that is my concern; because I am absolutely sure that the people who own factories and those who grow canes either protect themselves or employ people to protect them.

The honourable senior member for St. James tells us that the \$1.80 is going to be taken out of the price for peasants' canes because of the method of calculation. I do not think that he knows the method of calculation because he has not said it. I defy any member of this House to say what the factories would have paid for canes if this \$1.80 was not taken out, or what they will pay if it is taken out. The only thing they will tell you is that it is likely to be 20 cents less; but 20 cents less than what? Less than \$10.00, \$9.00, or \$9.60? They do not know, and if they knew they would not tell you. I do not care where it comes from so long as we get it; because without this Agreement, without someone to negotiate on behalf of the workers, they would keep every cent. That is how the Industry is run. The hon. senior member for St. James fell into a trap. He said with regard to the Harbour Fund that it will benefit everyone. He does not disclaim that that will come out of the cane grower and peasant.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I never said that all. I said that would be dealt with later; but it was just as wrong. It should be taken from general taxation. That is the exact opposite of what the honourable member is quoting me as saying.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not care how it is taken out, and as I have said, there is not a member in the House who is willing to say whether the two dollars

will come out of the peasant or not. The honourable senior member for St. James made mention of the name of someone who said some disgusting things in his Report on the Sugar Industry in Barbados. He must have seen and known the discontent. He must have known the ingredients that would produce an explosion. He said that one of these days Barbados is going to blow up. Why did he say so? He must have said so because he knew there was discontent nurtured by injustice that one day would come to light. The hon. senior member for St. James also said that it would have been a first class Agreement two years ago. But as I said, I am ignorant of the matter.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I never said so.

Mr. LEWIS: I am willing to let that pass. I got that impression and I wondered why he himself did not agitate for such an Agreement then. At this stage I would like to make this point. Three honourable members have spoken against this Agreement and the details of the Bill resulting from it. All the factories in the island are not in this Agreement. Let us wait and see what the ones outside of the Agreement will pay for canes, and what those in it will pay. Here I want to say that if the locally consumed sugar also has to contribute to the Welfare Fund, then in my humble opinion every worker in the island is entitled to a loan from the Fund for the repair of his house. I say that, because in no other island does the locally-consumed sugar contribute one farthing to these Funds. That is why I thank the honourable junior member for St. Andrew for saying that workers of the Highways and Transport Department should benefit from the Labour Welfare Fund. But I cannot follow his argument about the small cane grower being so penalised by this Agreement. I repeat that there are no members of this House, and few people outside of the House that can tell you what would be paid for canes. It is impossible for anyone to say that the peasant will get less because of this Agreement unless he could say beforehand what the factories intended to pay. He should be able to state authoritatively that he knows for a fact what the factories intended to pay for peasants' canes this year; and even if anyone predicted that, he would be given the lie directly when the factories paid.

I feel it is time to get something; something for the workers and something for the Labour Welfare Fund. The plantation owners should be glad of this Fund. It will save them from losing the money which they lend workers to repair their houses. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew said the Labour Welfare Fund should not be a revolving fund. He also says, and I agree with him that this money belongs to the workers. But because you lend it to them and they pay it back are you stealing it from them? When more than £80,000 came to the plantation owners did they not create a bank with it? The bank is virtually a revolving fund; and they borrow money from it. Why did they not take that money and lick it out? I have no doubt that they would have done it if someone who was not a planter had not shown them a better way. That is an example that was followed in these circumstances. There are hurricanes around here, and you may repair a house today, and a hurricane may blow it away tomorrow. It seems to me that these people who own plantations and factories would not like the worker to have his own Fund from which he can borrow money. They would prefer him to borrow from them. I do not know what to say when I hear all these conflicting remarks from experts in the Industry. What I am saying sounds like logic to me, and until someone can upset it, I will have to vote according to my conscience. What about

the honourable member for St. Philip? He has me more confused than any other member; because I remember, Sir,—and he himself reminded the House about it—that he was a strong advocate of laying a cess on the Industry for the benefit of the worker. I wonder if he realised then that the peasants who voted for him would have been getting less as a result of the Bill creating such a cess. What I want to ask is this: Do the peasants supply the factories with more canes than the big plantations? If you are taking something from the peasants and some from the big land owners for the benefit of the workers in the Industry what harm is there in that? The big plantation owner is the man making the sacrifice because he is not getting back anything. But the honourable member who said that also said that most of the agricultural workers are peasants. The reverse of that is that most of the peasants are agricultural labourers. If that is so, it means that while he will get 20 cents a ton less for his canes, he will also get 19½ per cent. production bonus where he works, he will get a loan from the Welfare Fund to repair his home and he can still get a loan from the Peasants' Loan Bank. What I am saying is that one peasant may send in more canes than another because he has more canes. On that same basis the plantation will get more too. But they will both be paid on the same scale for the canes. No one can say if that is true or not. You can only take their word for it, and you have to regard it as a good method.

The honourable senior member for St. James said that we know nothing about the Industry. But if I had had the time I would have brought in a debate about one or two years ago on the Order fixing the allocation between the three funds known as the Order made under the Sugar Industry Price Stabilisation, Rehabilitation and Labour Welfare Fund Act of 1947. You will remember, Sir, that I was at pains to point out that everyone who ate sugar contributed to the three funds. I drew to the attention of the House then the fact that the money in the Labour Welfare Fund was infinitesimal in relation to the demands for repairs to houses. I also drew attention to the fact that the Rehabilitation Fund allowed the factories to put in labour saving devices to put people out of work, and you should contribute to their welfare. I said you should take away from the Stabilisation Fund because you would not need that for a long time. The argument of the honourable junior member was that we should not interfere with that Fund because it was the Price Stabilisation Fund and it should be kept to cushion the wages of workers if necessary. I said that there were so many people in the Industry that some would be sure to die of starvation before you got the wages cushioned. It is a surprise today to hear the same honourable member say that we should take something from this Fund because the Ministry of Food has guaranteed the price of sugar for two years. But he goes one better and says that the Labour Welfare Fund should be given to the workers and not lent to them. Then he makes the startling suggestion that what you could do is to borrow something from the Price Stabilisation Fund for the Welfare Fund. If you carry out his suggestion you will be borrowing money and giving it away. I do not know how he will get all these methods rolled into one and then straightened out so that the people whom he affects to represent will get the same benefit from it.

I think, Sir, that the criterion by which this Agreement should be judged is whether it will be of any benefit. I know that the Welfare Fund is of inestimable benefit to the workers of this country, and as long as I have a say in the matter I will see that it is built up and will try to see that it is extended to all the workers of this country. Even if you

restrict these benefits to the people who work in the Sugar Industry, the people who live in Bridgetown and who ship sugar and molasses are entitled.

I know that people with special knowledge of the Industry can pick holes in this Agreement; but I can only judge it from the tangible results which I can see. So I repeat, it does not matter where the production bonus comes from as long as I know that the worker gets it. I know that the workers are satisfied people tonight because they have been able to draw some back pay as a result of this Agreement, and that, I say, is the method by which I have to judge it. The plantation owners cannot get away from this question: when they say the peasants will lose 20 per cent., they mean that the big plantation owners will lose, and I do not know which they are really talking about. I am unable to represent the big plantation owner because I do not know his needs. I know that the peasant may get 20 cents less; (but he will get 19½ per cent. on his wages. I am going to sit now in the hope that some of these exports who own sugar factories will be able to help me if I am wrong.

DINNER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,— I am going to speak at length. I therefore beg to move at this stage that the House adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. MAPP seconded and the question having been put and agreed to *nem. con.* Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was debating the motion for the second reading of the Bill intituled an Act to impose a special levy on sugar and fancy molasses manufactured in this Island in certain circumstances. The honourable senior member for St. Peter, who moved the adjournment, is entitled to speak now.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I am very sorry that my voice is such that will make it difficult for me to make it audible to all honourable members, but I would like to begin by drawing attention to what the honourable senior member for St. James had to say. The honourable member said that at one time he was a member of the Government; it is true that at one time he was Attorney General of this island, and during the time when as Attorney General, he was the Government's chief Adviser, there were in this island disturbances which the Governor knew nothing about. We are very glad to-day to find that the honourable member, as Leader of the Opposition in this House, can look back on a very broad past in the agricultural industry, but on a very dark one, and to see that we are entering into a little light out of the gloomy darkness. The honourable junior member for St. Philip could not have ended his speech without attempting to show to the House that with this Agreement the workers of this island are worse off as regards wages because he has had nothing to do with the matter; but no one would expect the honourable member to agree with any Agreement which is made by members comprising the Government and sent down to the House. The honourable member attempted to show how stupid the honourable Leader of the House was, that the time should have been taken from someone else, but he never attempted to explain what should have been done. The honourable member said that part of this Memorandum was that of one of the main accountants in the sugar industry. It is not my point to deal with the Agreement between the Barbados

Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation with respect to production payment because I am too much involved in that; but the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, who is now pleading with the Barbados Workers' Union not to have him and others in St. Andrew making the production payment, should have been the last to have spoken.

Mr. HAYNES: On a point of order. There was a private discussion as to the Scotland District not being put on the same basis as other districts because of the difficulties of the area.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member finds that a specific part of the Agreement is too hard. I want to say that the honourable senior member for St. James who was the Leader of the Government at one time—

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I have never been the Leader of the Government; I have never been in that happy position of Leader of the Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The honourable member was Leader of the Government.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I repeat; I have never been in the happy position of being Leader of any Government.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Well, Sir, the Attorney General was Leader of the House. The honourable member led in the debates and as Chief Adviser to the Government, his advice meant a lot to the Government. However, if the honourable member is objecting to the statement that he was Leader of the Government, I will grant him his objection; but he was one of the most forceful personalities of the Government between the late 30's and the early 40's. Naturally, the honourable member feels that he should know all, and if anybody says anything, he would regard it as nothing. As a criticism of what the honourable Leader of the House has said, the honourable senior member for St. James began by saying that this levy of \$1.80 per ton will be taken out of the price paid for canes. But the honourable member should realise whence the profits come; are you not going to get profits out of the price of canes? Whatever is the final figure for canes, the profits must come out of that. I should like to ask; what was the position of Barbados in 1939 when there was a bumper crop? No production payment existed; the workers in the industry got no advantage from the higher production and it has always been the claim that higher production means lower costs. Without this Agreement you could never touch any of the profits on crops above 120,000 tons.

We had Professor Shephard down here to report in connection with the price of sugar canes, and as a Doctor in economics he was able to go into the intricacies of the matter. Although we did not agree with his recommendations this is what he had to say in his Report and this is what we cannot deny.

"There is a wide year to year variation in the size of the crop and the average of the preceding three years will almost invariably differ from that of the following year. The magnitude of the crop has an important influence on costs of production. Certain items of cost such as harvesting cane, represent a fixed or relatively stable charge per ton of cane, but other items are independent of yield. Hence, in a year of exceptionally low yields, the cost of producing a ton of sugar will be exceptionally high. There may arise a demand from cane suppliers for special consideration in respect of cost of production in a year of exceptionally low yields, but it must be remembered that similar factors will operate in the case of manufacturers of sugar."

What this Agreement says is that when you have a high production above the normal production this cess will be taken. The unaware will be caught with the suggestion that we are putting a burden on the peasant or cane producer, but what burden is placed on the cane producer when you give him what is his? If the crop is below 120,000 tons, the Government will not put any cess on that production. The honourable senior member for St. James in a *sotto voce* remark gave the impression that this cess of \$1.80 would still be taken if the crop is 75,000 tons; but the honourable member must bear in mind that in the Barbados Workers' Union there are people who realise that if any attempt such as what he has suggested is made, it will cause chaos in this island. This Agreement means more than financial benefit; I would like this House to understand that the Organization I represent has a lot of influence in the sugar industry, but we also have a sense of responsibility. Our sense of responsibility has made us realise that if the sugar industry can create greater profits, then these greater profits should be shared. The honourable junior member for St. Philip who is not now in the House, tries to get figures from people and pretends that he knows what he is talking about; but what figures has he quoted? What analysis did he make? He said that in 1948 when an arbitration took place and the amount of 15% was given, 5% was left back; anybody could say that. He said that in 1949 nothing was given; he did not say if the Ministry of Food did not offer any increase that year or if the matter was the subject of arbitration. I will not sit around a table with people who will write the word "Union" on paper, but who do not represent the workers. In 1949 the matter went before Professor Beasley who gave 6% as production bonus but no actual increase was given because the Ministry of Food did not give any increase.

This House is full of Labourites now; the General Election is in December and everybody represents the poor man. It is surprising to see that suddenly in this Chamber everybody represents the poor man. I should like to say that this Government would be very stupid to agree to something which we know would not benefit the sugar industry; we have an increased production and we say that now we have an opportunity of providing money out of the increased production we are taking advantage of it. Anyone who looks at the signatories to this Agreement could ask; what would the representatives of the Barbados Workers' Union have to benefit by making it hard for the poor peasant, and what would the representatives of the Sugar Producers' Federation have to gain by making it hard for the people over there? In the bright idea of the honourable junior member for St. Philip, the amount of the levy should not be loaned to the people, but it should be given to them. If the Government had brought a proposal down here to give the people this money, the honourable member would have asked: what is the use of giving the people this money when you know that it can only serve a handful of them? The bright idea of the honourable member is that we should not use this money for making loans, but we should borrow money from another source for that purpose. That is his idea of economics; we have a levy which we can use, but we should not lend people this money which is their own money; we should borrow money from another fund and lend it to the people: Nobody can say that what the Government has brought forward is not a bright idea; there are those who believe that the peasants are hard hit but that is not the case.

The benefits which are going to accrue from this Agreement will be applied to the Labour Welfare Fund, and in this connection the Government has

provided playing fields which are a gift to the people. As far as the peasant is concerned, honourable members can see that in this Agreement he is an independent man in the sense that he does not join with others in the formation of an organization, and there is no question of his organization failing to represent him. We can always appreciate that any planter in the world must have some sort of representation and I would counsel honourable members that instead of their using their energy in this House on behalf of the peasants, they should join hand in hand with people and go throughout the length and breadth of this country in trying to form a co-operative organization so that the peasants can have their representation. There are 18,000 peasants in Barbados; they are part and parcel of the population of this island. The majority of peasants are working as agricultural labourers and for that reason they are entitled to the benefits which are going to accrue to the workers under this Agreement.

The honourable junior member for St. Andrew expressed the bright idea that the workers at the Road Board should be entitled to benefit from this Agreement. In an agricultural community you can say that any worker is entitled to this benefit, but the line of demarcation must be drawn somewhere. I do not think the honourable member is functioning as well as he used to function some years ago and we must dismiss his remarks as not being very serious. However, he is in the unfortunate position of having a factory in the Scotland area, and it is not the Government's fault that the geographical situation of the Scotland area is what it is, because that is an act of nature. I would like the honourable member to realise that while one can appreciate his difficulty, not in the sense that he cannot afford to pay, it does not mean that in this Agreement we are doing something which is basically wrong. I am appealing to the commonsense of honourable members to see that the financial benefits received by the workers in Barbados are second to none anywhere in the British West Indies, and we have a measure of industrial peace of which any country should be proud.

Honourable members who are attempting to vote against this Bill should see themselves in their true perspective. What honourable members should remember is that the peasants will receive benefit from these funds. What this Agreement has done is to make a beginning for the general public to see what the sugar industry can really afford; and not only for this year but for each year, according to the Agreement, you must let the public see and know the position with regard to the vital industry of this island. The honourable junior member for the City has mentioned that some time ago the then senior member for St. Philip who is the junior member for St. Philip today and who will be an ex-member of the House tomorrow, strongly advocated that there should be made a levy on the sugar industry just as a levy was made in the coal-mining industry for the benefit of the miners in England; but if you make a levy on the sugar industry for the benefit of the peasant who produces cane, a part of the price would be taken out. There is the unfortunate position in respect of all the sugar-producing countries in the world; that instead of working forward you work backward; you never say what it costs a man to produce a ton of canes, you say what it costs the factory to manufacture a ton of canes into sugar and you work back what the factory must pay for a ton of canes. You do not ask what it costs to produce the raw material;

you want to know what it costs to produce the finished article.

The honourable junior member for St. George operates a sugar factory and he knows that in any manufacturing industry in the world, where you are not producing the raw material in large quantities, you are forced to pay more so as to get the raw material into the factory. Lower Estate factory is an instance of what I have in mind; the Belle is just a few steps off, Bulkeley will not send its canes to Lower Estate and out of necessity that factory will find itself in the position where it will have to pay more for canes. That is one of the difficulties which we have to face in attempting to stipulate for the island what price should be paid for a ton of canes. It is a known fact that if circumstances compel a man to pay more, he will do so.

I should like to ask this question; would anyone in this House knowing the members of this Government, knowing the reason for this Agreement, begin to say that it is something which is intended to penalise the peasants or the industry? In connection with this matter of profit sharing, I am sure that any of the colleagues of the honourable senior member for St. James could tell him that if there is no production payment there is no guarantee or certainty that the peasants would have received what is going into these funds. Money is one of the hardest things to leave people's pockets. I do not blame honourable members for debating this matter because the Government had a long time in coming to this conclusion; but when the honourable junior member for St. Philip insinuates that he was astonished to think that a Labour Government would have produced anything like this, which would put a penalty on the small producer in the industry, that is unthinkable. I often wonder if the honourable member reflects on any statement which he makes in this House at times. I do not know if the honourable member is one of those individuals who think that because they did not give any thought to something, therefore it is wrong; because the honourable member is not a member of the Government, therefore what we have produced is wrong and it is not worth the paper on which it has been written. I feel sure that the opponents to this Agreement cannot see in it that it has done any harm to the worker or the peasant at all. Moreover, the honourable senior member for Christ Church is a merchant and in addressing my remarks to the merchants generally, I would like to say that the merchants should be very pleased to see that this Agreement has been made because you could not get any room to walk in Bridgetown due to the fact that the poor people had money. You can carry this Agreement to the country and you will see who will vote for it: you have an indication from the state of affairs in Bridgetown as to what the position is. We would be returned with a mandate from the country.

I hope that the honourable senior member for Christ Church who represents a rural constituency will be able to speak on this matter because some of the workers up there voted for him. He will be able to see the impressions of the workers because the emphasis on this Bill has been that it is something which is unfair to the peasants. I should like honourable members to realise that when production costs go up they go up for the factory owner as well as the peasant, and when production costs come down they come down for the factory owner and the peasant too. Mr. Speaker, I will not make any further infliction on you or on myself, but I endorse the remarks of the honourable Leader of the House. No matter how much we are ridiculed

in respect of this Agreement, it is one of the most important documents that have come before this House for a very long time because it has brought a measure of confidence, goodwill and prosperity to the vital industry of this colony.

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of personal explanation. More than one speaker has referred to the fact that I have on previous occasions suggested that a levy be imposed on the Sugar Industry. I want to remind the House that it was a recommendation of the Royal Commission that the Government of each colony should be invited to take early steps in consultation with the Sugar Producers with a view to the imposition of welfare levies at the rate of 2/- per ton of sugar produced to finance Labour Welfare Schemes similar to those established for workers in England. I have also on several occasions suggested that the Government should attach to the Department of Agriculture a sugar chemist, who as Professor Shephard suggested, would collect data from the Sugar Industry in order to enable the Government to arrive at the price to be paid for peasants' canes. I have never had it in mind that if that levy were to be imposed it would come out of the price to be paid for peasants' canes. But even if it did, the levy of 2/- per ton of sugar which would in reality be 6 cents per ton of canes would not penalise peasants to the extent that is suggested in this Bill.

MR. E. K. WALCOTT: I should be allowed to explain what I said. If you are taking a penny or three cents the same principle is going to apply, because you are taxing sugar; and it will have to be taken into account that this is not something that you are receiving.

MR. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I would second the motion for adjournment of the House; because I would prefer to hold my fire; but I would not like to lose the chance of speaking. We have listened, Sir, to what was at times an interesting debate, and we have heard some revealing things especially from the other side. We have heard from the honourable senior member for St. Andrew that this Bill savours of "soaking the poor". It is remarkable that he stopped at the word "poor" and did not say poor what. I do not know if he was referring to people like himself—the poor factory owners and plantation owners; because I remember that the late senior member for St. Andrew used to ask questions of the Government as to whether they knew that a particular factory in that parish had made a return of no profit, and whether they would do something about it. That particular factory belonged to the now honourable senior member for St. Andrew. I do not know if he is referring to his poor self who owns that factory, and who owns besides that a number of estates, not only in St. Andrew, but also in the adjoining parish of St. Joseph. It is remarkable how poor we can be on certain occasions.

Sir, while I think there is little to add in a general way to the speeches we have heard tonight, there is yet a very fundamental part in this Agreement to which I must make reference, and on which I must dwell at length because I feel that if the section which honourable members on the other side are opposing is deleted, we will be doing a severe injustice to the working classes of this island as a whole, and to the agricultural workers and peasants in particular. The other side put up the argument that when the factories pay \$1.80 per ton of sugar towards the Labour Welfare Fund, that will mean that the peasants will lose. The honourable senior member for St. James did not refer to peasants alone. He said that all the sugar growers would lose \$1.80 divid-

ed by nine which is on the average 20 cents per ton of their canes.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER takes the Chair.

Now Sir, that is a very subtle argument. I hope to show how subtle it is, because there are certain members around this table who are being led into an alley way which may be exceedingly dangerous to themselves, and which may be of very grave consequence to an agreement which is certainly historic when we consider the history of the Sugar Industry in this island. If you look at the figures supplied in this Agreement you will see that of the total amount of cane purchased by the factories of this island 58.5 per cent are from shareholders in estates, and 25.5 per cent from other estates. Does the honourable junior member for St. Philip feel that members on the other side are safeguarding the peasants, or even the other estates? They are safeguarding the factories when they try to oppose this section.

Lengthy evidence was taken by the Commission which inquired into the working of the Sugar Industry. The delegates of the Sugar Producers were subjected to a lengthy cross-examination by certain members of the Commission. I will ask your permission, Sir, to quote a few lines from the evidence. One of the witnesses connected with the Industry was asked what was the difference in the price paid for peasants' canes and that paid for plantations' canes. The reply was that you cannot take what the plantation or factory owner pays himself for canes in judging what is the real price of canes because you have no basis to go by. If a man owns a factory and some land he can pay himself; he can make the factory show a huge profit, or make the land show a huge profit. The honourable junior member for St. Philip was so eager to show how well he intended to protect the peasants' interests; and yet he gave himself away by opening his mouth when the honourable senior member for St. James was speaking, saying that not the peasants alone, but also the estates will lose that 20 cents a ton. But no one is being deluded. Both knew what they are doing. One might be unwittingly playing the other's game; but the other is playing the game well because he knows when he says delete that section he is protecting 58.5 per cent of the estates—that is, estates which have shares in factories and in reference to which the witness before the Commission said that the owners can make the factories show a huge profit, or the land show a huge profit. It does not matter either way, because all belongs to them. The argument of the honourable senior member for St. James is that you are not taking it out of the factories profits, but out of the little estates. That was dishonest because he was only telling half of the truth—

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I must object to that.

Mr. MAPP: Let me finish the sentence. He was only telling half of the truth because he did not add that the shareholders' estates cannot lose, since it is bound to come out of the profits of the factory.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In spite of the explanation I will ask the honourable member to withdraw the word "dishonest."

Mr. MAPP: I dislike the word "dishonest" myself. I will withdraw it and say that he did not say all the facts.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: That is adding insult to injury.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable member to make a complete withdrawal of the word.

Mr. MAPP: I withdraw the word "dishonest". Let us say that we are keeping the debate at a high level and objecting to any words or explanations about ourselves, when we are trying to cut out a section that will add much to the Labour Welfare Fund, or when we are trying to protect certain estates while trying to show that we are protecting individual estates as well; when we are trying to cut out the fundamental section in the entire agreement because estates are going to lose an average of 20 cents a ton of canes when you know that 58.5 per cent cannot really lose. I think that the greatest effort on our part should be to arrive at some honest figures and facts, trying to see whether we are hitting factory profits or those of the peasants, or the estates. If there are members who feel that the peasants will be hit unduly by this Agreement, that the price they receive for canes will be affected by it, it would be far better if they asked the Government—bearing in mind the difficulties which the Leader pointed out—to get to grips with the situation if the factories decided to pay any lower figure for peasants' canes than they should. I need not repeat my arguments about how the factories if they lose one way can gain another, so that those who fall for the arguments used by members on the other side are unwittingly playing the game of the Capitalists.

There is another point I want to stress. We called it smart when we heard it said *sotto voce* by the honourable senior member for St. James—I do not know if he will object—

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Does he want me to object? If he is putting a bad meaning to the word "smart" I will object.

Mr. MAPP: It would not surprise me if the honourable member objects to the whole of my remarks. It does not matter how many meanings he puts to the word "smart."

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I take it that he means it in a good way. If by "smart" he means I am clever I will accept it as from one honourable member to another.

Mr. MAPP: I am very glad that the honourable member has interpreted what I meant. It is very obvious from the speech made by the honourable junior member for St. Philip that while trying to criticise the Bill in one way, he did not quite know how to do so without making it appear that he was doing it. Therefore in one way he agreed with the objects of the Agreement to increase the amount in the Labour Welfare Fund—he even said we should borrow money from other Funds for the purpose. But on the other hand, he started out by saying that this Agreement was a dastardly one, and that it was no credit at all to the Labour Government or the Labour Party. There was a big argument about whether the Labour Welfare Fund should be a revolving fund or not. But the method of how all these funds should be applied was laid down since 1947, and has been discussed every year. It is nothing new in this Bill.

I do not want to get away from the fact that when you give a bigger production bonus it must come out of the factories' profits. It is a method of profit sharing because if you have X tons and in any one year you produce X by 4, that four will make greater profit than you would get from X. When you pay bonus out of that it will come out of the profit that you are making. That is a most welcome addition to the wages of workers in the

sugar industry of this island. In spite of the efforts of the honourable junior member for St. Philip to deride this Agreement, you should also bear in mind that many of the peasants who are also labourers will benefit under the Agreement.

I do not want to tire the House any longer. I have not heard any arguments that will make me agree to the deletion of this section. I hope that other members will not fall into the trap of believing that by deleting this section they will be protecting the peasants. They can protect them in a much better way than by safeguarding the interest of 58.5 per cent of the Sugar Producers. I believe, Sir, that the Agreement under this Bill will produce a welcome means of profit sharing in the Sugar Industry.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I begin by saying that I came here with an open mind. I wanted to hear both sides. When I read the Agreement in the newspaper, and when I received my official copy, I did not run amuck, nor did I have any pre-conceived ideas. I have talked to some of the peasants and some of the workers. I made investigations; and now I am glad that I am free to speak because not only do I represent Labour, but I do belong to the Peasantry of this island, and their interest and mine is very closely connected.

I take it that the Union of which the honourable Leader of the House is President had a job of work to do in the Sugar Industry, and that this is the best they can wring from those people who control that Industry. In 1945 the then Congress Party made a move to help the agricultural workers of this colony by asking them to strike for better wages. Many people did not see eye to eye with us then; but I think that we were on the right track then, because what is being done to-day, comes from what we did then. That is no idle boast. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. When I look back over the years and remember our activities and our preachments to the people, I cannot say anything adverse on what is being done today. I feel, Sir, that we owe it to the workers of this island, especially those who work in the Sugar Industry.

I for one have always felt that the amounts of money distributed by the Ministry of Food are not in keeping with what I would call socialism. I have always felt that we should rehabilitate the workers of the Industry before we rehabilitate the owners of the factories. I think that what is being done by way of this Agreement is just bridging the gap that was made by the recommendations of the Ministry of Food, and the delegates of the Sugar Industry. They did not give the Labour Welfare Fund enough money, and they are trying now to bridge the gap by taking \$1.80 from the Sugar Growers to add to this Fund.

Before I go further, Sir, I should say that I am in hearty agreement with the Housing Scheme which the Government has inaugurated. Speaking for my parish I know of a good many houses which have been repaired because of this money which the people can borrow from this Fund. Many people who only had one house to house six or eight members of the family have had the chance to add another house. I would not want to do away with this Scheme. I heard many arguments as regards giving the people this money. I think that would be unwise. It is much better to keep it as a revolving fund. If anything can be done to enlarge this Fund, certainly it would be worthwhile to do it but I also feel that the time has come when we should create a similar Fund for persons other than workers in the Sugar Industry. We have been so

accustomed to the plantation system in this country that we cannot get away from it. It is often said that if you do away with the plantation system here you will cause economic chaos. But I am sure that my argument still stands good that if you cannot make people land conscious it is time to offer them an outlet. I do not want to wax warm on this subject tonight. I will confine my remarks to the Bill before us.

I take it, Sir, that we cannot get at the magnates in this colony. The only man capable of getting anything done in that connection is Joe Stalin in Russia. The semi-capitalists around here only touch the edge of the thing. As long as you have capitalism of the plantation system you cannot touch the factory owners. You can only get at the cane growers. I want to tell the Government that they are not getting at the factory owners with this Bill. You will have to declare something from his profits after he has taken out all these expenses and funds. That is the only way he will arrive at the proper price of canes.

I have taken time to read some of the history of the Sugar Industry in this colony. I do not think they will give in to anything. In this Agreement we have been able to wrest a little from them by way of bonus; but they will still make money, Sir. You cannot stop them, neither can you interfere with their profits. It is peculiar, Sir, but whatever else is consumed in this colony you make laws and regulations to govern the price, the profits, etc., but when it comes to the Industry on which depends the livelihood of every person in the colony you cannot touch it. You can touch the consumers; but the actual manufacturer seems to be exempt. I think it is a sad state of affairs that the Peasant Proprietors are not organised, because they have taken no part in the Agreement before us; and they form a considerable part of the sugar producers. There are about 14,000 peasants. A strong, virile peasantry is always desirable in any country; but when you negotiate and leave that particular section out of your negotiations, then I think there is room for some sort of criticism. You cannot dismiss the peasant lightly; because he has been bearing a great burden all through the years. He has always been robbed. Not being organised, no one took any notice of him. There is a feeling that peasants have no right in the Sugar Industry. A prominent agriculturalist told me that sugar cane growing was never intended for the peasants. Their business was to grow vegetables, and if they took the risk of growing canes they should be satisfied. I have been told that. But the peasants have failed to organise themselves, and even when others have tried to organise them there has been that doubt and suspicion and that lethargy which always bring people to ruin and disaster.

If as time goes on all these funds and these various things have to be taken from what little they receive I can see nothing but ruin for the peasantry. They will have to be organised. What I am saying is a fact. They do not get the same price as the plantation owner. They are unable to pay any bonus. They now have to pay a lot more for manures; a lot more for labour. Therefore, when you are going to fix this contribution from the big cane grower and you make the same thing apply to the peasant, you are sentencing him to death, more or less. How long he will be able to stand it, I do not know. If I had to do anything with these negotiations I would have asked if you are eliminating all the peasants in this colony. I do know why the

members of the Sugar Producers should object when they know the plight of the small man.

Speakers have said that this is socialist legislation; that the peasant will benefit in some way and therefore he should contribute his share; but when you see that he is not able to lose, you see the other side of the picture. Are you sure that he will get the material benefit which will compensate him for what he will lose because of this scheme? I feel that there should be some provision whereby the peasant would be excused for this year. The Harbour Scheme not being dealt with now, I will not pass judgment on it now. If we are going to have a Deep Water Harbour at all I think that all the inhabitants should pay for it. You cannot take very much from the peasant who has nothing. Even by volume the big man makes money while the small peasant can only grow a limited amount which costs far more because of antiquated methods. The Sugar Industry of this colony is coming into its own. From what I know of it, mechanism of the Industry will help them to get more profits. There is no doubt about that. Production is getting higher and higher, but the peasant cannot share in that higher production because he cannot get his land plowed etc. It seems to me that you have to draw a line somewhere between the plantation owner and the peasant. The farmer, because of the volume of his production, gets a fair amount from the Rehabilitation Fund with which they can buy machinery.

It is only on behalf of the peasants that I am speaking to-night. They have never been fairly treated. From the time that I came along I have seen agricultural labourers living in the worst conditions that human beings can live in. I saw them not getting a square deal and not eating a square meal. If you can negotiate something for them now, I see nothing wrong with that. I feel that all the people who work in the Sugar Industry should share in the profits. How far this Agreement will succeed in profit sharing I do not know. The peasants contribute in a large measure to the Industry and they should share in the profits too. I want to make it clear that the workers will have to be taught by the Union that is getting this money for them to give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. This should be no one-sided thing.

There is another thing: I think that the Union should teach the workers for whom they are getting these increased wages to save their money and not to squander it. They will have to be told that they cannot expect to get these various benefits and still expect the plantations to do things for them. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot expect the plantation owners to pay these increased wages and loan them money too. Only this week I was in Bridgetown and town was in an uproar with people squandering this money. People want a little more independence. They should no longer look to the plantation owners as the slaves looked to their masters in days of yore.

I think that I have said enough on this matter, Sir. I am in entire agreement with the way in which the Labour Welfare Fund is being worked. My only regret is that the Department is not properly housed. The present offices are not in the best condition, and I think it works a hardship on the staff. I believe the Government will do something about that at a latter date when they are in a better position to finance their building programme.

I believe, Sir, that most of us are going to vote for this Bill. I will vote for it. I am sorry that the peasants were not represented; but they can

still be exempted because you can provide that only people with over a certain amount of tonnage will have to contribute. There are certain socialistic things that we have to do for the people. Limited as we are with land space, we cannot create an independent peasantry. So from time to time we will have to devise ways and means of relieving this land hunger, and perhaps when people learn to be a little more thrifty, we will be able to formulate some scheme whereby they can benefit themselves. I want to repeat that now that the Union has succeeded in getting something for the workers it is its duty to get something for the peasants. The workers are getting benefits now, but they are getting them at the expense of the peasants. While I believe that the unionists intended to get more out of the cane growers and the factories especially, I think they have had to accept this, because this is the best that was offered. They took what they could get out of the bargain with the hope—I am assuming this, Sir,—with the hope that at some time in the future they will get a little more.

I repeat that something must be done for the peasants too. There are some workers who do not care anything about the peasants at all. It is going to have repercussions in this island soon. The price of cane is not fixed before the crop begins, and I have heard some labourers say that they are not going to cut any peasants' canes because they will not get any back-pay from them. I am one of the peasants myself. I will not be one to help liquidate them. When they are liquidated you will have another burden on yourself. The workers should be discouraged from indulging in loose chat about not working for the peasants because they will not get from them what they will get from the plantations. We must get down to earth and face facts; because sooner or later when a man makes promises which he cannot fulfil they will overtake him. I will not sit here and do anything to liquidate the peasants who form a respectable group in the community, and who should be preserved at all costs. It is from such families that we get our leaders from time to time. When the factory owner or plantation owner can pass on this 19½ per cent at the end of the crop and the peasant cannot I know how hard it will be for him to carry on in the future.

I just want to place on record my feelings towards the peasants, while I am glad that the agricultural worker is coming into his own. I am glad that he is getting something out of sugar although all of us have to pay for it. He is not getting anything out of the factory owner. Be that as it may, I think we have made a good start, and we must compliment the leaders of the Union for what they have been able to get. But until you redeem the peasants of this country you have not done anything. The peasants are the backbone of any community. Let us make their position secure; let us make them independent.

I will vote for this Bill. This Agreement is not as much as the Union hoped to get; but it is what they had to be satisfied with, and I am in sympathy with them.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—The honourable member who has just sat down has convinced me that I should add my quota to this debate. He started off by complimenting the Government on this Agreement and then goes on to give the most accurate reasons why he should never agree to legislation such as this. Does he even suggest that at some future date the peasants in this island are going to be paid this amount? The honourable member knows that if this matter is agreed upon here tonight, he

cannot gain favour in so far as the peasants are concerned. It is obvious that some scale should be adopted here; just as you have the man in the lower income tax bracket paying a small rate, the man in the lower bracket where cane production is concerned should also pay a low rate. This Agreement came before me on the 27th of last month and from then until now I have done nothing but to cogitate if it is right; I have come here this afternoon and I have listened to the debate because I was not convinced that it might not have been wrong. I give credit where credit is due; there is no doubt that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph with his Union has done wonders for the people of this island. As far as the sugar industry is concerned, the fact that the Union is now learning the facts of the situation, is changing that attitude which has been adopted in this island for the 300 years of the existence of the planter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the honourable member says that this Agreement came to him on the 27th of last month, I take it that it came to him as a member of the Sugar Producers' Association.

Mr. DOWDING: The Agreement came to me as a member of the Sugar Producers' Association. There is no doubt the honourable senior member for St. Joseph with his Union has achieved no small amount of success in so far as the labourers in this island are concerned; but a great amount of that success is also due to the workers. At the meeting of the Sugar Producers' Association on the 27th September, when this Agreement came before the Association, there was not one member of the Association who did not agree with the first part of the Agreement; matters such as the bonus production and the publication of the figures for record were all discussed at that meeting and agreed to. But, Sir, there were a vast majority of people at that meeting—the honourable junior member for St. Andrew and the honourable senior member for St. Lucy can substantiate my remarks—who disagreed entirely with the latter part of this Agreement. The latter part of the Agreement is that which requires a levy of 1.80 per ton in the case of the Labour Welfare Fund, and \$2.00 per ton in respect of a Harbour Fund and this levy is to be taken from the cane grower which is the point brought forward by the honourable junior member for St. Philip. This levy is to be taken at the same rate from top to bottom. The peasants of this island handle, according to Mr. Halerowe, approximately 7,700 acres of sugar cane and 5,600 acres in other crops. The number of people whom this Agreement will affect is 125,000, according to his estimate; is it fair when as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph says, the peasant has to pay an increased cost for labour and manure and all these increases, but because his production has reached 5,000 tons, he must pay this \$1.80 out of the money which any honest factory owner has to pay for canes, to be applied to the Labour Welfare Fund? In my opinion, the position has been reached where the backbone of the colony is being depleted on account of the circumstances which exist today. If you take this year's crop produced by peasants which is 288,806 tons of canes and we take the basis of 8 tons of cane to a ton of sugar you will find that that crop would produce 36,100 tons of sugar, and at this levy \$1.80 per ton, the peasants would be called upon to pay the sum of \$64,580. I regret, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am unable to give the House the figures for which you are asking, but as far as I am concerned in my business, I intend to try and pay. During the last week we paid out over \$13,000 and that amount has to be accounted for before the manufacturing expenses for the past crop can be arrived at.

The system adopted for working out the profit on canes is explained in this Memorandum, and as far as I know, it is the system adopted by all factories in this island. I wonder why we should be in the position in which we find ourselves today; I hope that when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph replies he will give us the full information as to how these negotiations started and explain thoroughly the full procedure in these negotiations. I repeat that in so far as all matters regarding the Union and the employers were concerned, there was wholehearted agreement at the meeting of the Sugar Association; but when it came to matters affecting the Government and the people, there was no wholehearted agreement.

I am speaking here tonight particularly on behalf of the cane growers in the lower brackets; we would all fully agree that the wishes of the workers have been granted and quite rightly so, but, Sir, as one who stands on behalf of the peasants of this island, I do not think that justice has been done in their case. I sat here until I was convinced by the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Philip that justice had not been done. I want to give credit where credit is due, but the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Peter was the least enlightening on that side of the House at this meeting. I would like to carry this argument further in respect of the peasant; the year in which we have a bumper crop and the man with 400 acres gets 10 tons per acre, he has got 4,000 tons; but the man with 10 acres, even supposing that he has the facilities at his disposal, he will only get 100 tons. Is it fair for the man who gets 100 tons to be paying at the same rate as the man who gets 4,000 tons? Is that fair to the peasants of this island? No, I cannot see it. Nobody in this House has yet been able to convince me that that is fair to the peasants of this island; in this matter the cause of the peasant has been forgotten in the ardour of the members of the Government—who are also members of the Labour Union—to serve the workers.

I hope that honourable members will study carefully every word I have said and every word that the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said between the beginning and the end of his speech. In the history of this Agreement there has never been any representation of the peasants; the peasants had not been called together and had the matter put before them before this Agreement had been made. The honourable senior member for St. Philip says that this money is coming out of the profits of the factory, but he knows better than the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that that is not true. I feel that in this matter the peasantry of this island should have been called to a meeting in Queen's Park, for instance, in the same way as the shopkeepers were called, to discuss a question which affects them. I repeat that in something which benefits the large majority of people in this island, the peasants have been completely forgotten. I am not suggesting for one minute that the Government has intentionally moved in this matter without any consideration whatsoever in so far as the peasants are concerned; but I am saying that due to their hurry and anxiety and desire to reach this Agreement on behalf of the workers of this island, the cause of the peasants has been, and still is, overlooked.

For many years I have had the privilege of dealing with the peasants of this island and I know their problems by heart. I know the difficulties which are attached to the reaping of their canes; they will have more difficulty now because this Agreement is tantamount to saying to the factories that the peasants' canes shall be offered for the whole period of the crop. That is another difficulty which will arise.

I have read and studied the "Advocate's" Leader in connection with this matter which is before us and that has not convinced me; I came here still with an open mind. The speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter left me in my normal mind, but the hon. senior member for St. Philip who knows the facts of the case, has convinced me that regardless of what happens afterwards and my voice be the only dissenting one, I shall maintain the stand which I have taken on behalf of the peasants with whom I am concerned. I have attempted to put to the Government something which I feel that they have forgotten in their anxiety and ardour to serve one class of people.

Mr. MILLER: I have just a few words to say in connection with this Bill. I happened to be one of the members of a Committee which started in March to work out some basis of payment for workers. Tonight, Sir, I think it is correct to say that, with a small exception, we have come from the peasantry, and it is only fair to say that we should be conscious of the suffering of the peasants. I repeat that hon. members sitting around this horse-shoe came from the peasantry and, thinking of the remarks of my colleague, they really leave me a bit disturbed. The figures reveal that up to last year shareholders got \$11.00 per ton for their canes, other estates got \$11.28 per ton while the peasants got \$10.74 per ton. That is before the Government had anything from the peasants; now, for the first time, the peasants are going to be paid on the same basis as shareholders' estates. The peasants are responsible for about 90% of our essential requirements; they produce all the meat and much of the milk. I speak with deep feelings on this matter and I am asking that an amendment be made to this Bill to the effect that peasants who hold up to five acres be exempt from this cess. As I said, we have come from the peasantry and I am making that suggestion on their behalf. Up to last year the peasants were paid 26 cents per ton less for their canes than shareholders' estates and today it is being said that they will be robbed. The peasants have been experiencing a hard time all along and tonight we are told that they will be cheated out of this Agreement to some extent. Some hon. members have to agree that they started off with a quarter of an acre of land or by working somebody's land; we are now told for the first time that peasants can repair their houses with money from the Labour Welfare Fund, but for centuries it has been known that the peasants have been cheated at the scale beam. Even today when we have the Inspectors you will find that the peasants still suffer loss at the scale beam. It is the peasants who have been producing the cabbage, lettuce, milk and so on; it is the peasants who have been producing all the meat and during the War years it was the peasants on whom the country had to rely.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—In spite of the lateness of the hour this is too important a debate for me not to reply. There have been one or two grievous fallacies in the arguments of some of those honourable members who are opposed to this Bill. I am going to be charitable and forget that there is an election coming on although I think that most people who have persuaded themselves that there is something wrong in what is before the House would not be so persuaded if they happened to be here next March or April.

Let me start off by reminding honourable members of what I said. It is so long since I have spoken that they may have forgotten. This is not a Government measure thought out by some Heads of Departments. This represents nine months of hard bargaining with the necessity of giving away some-

times and not giving away on other occasions. Government's part in it results purely from the fact that we have on the statute Book a Bill dealing with the funds which this Bill affects. The Sugar Producers would, we have no doubt, have kept to their agreement, and we in the Union would have kept to ours. But purely because the Funds are affected you have to amend the law. Honourable members must completely forget the arguments that the Government has done wrong in doing this, that and the other. They are only implementing what is a general agreement. So honourable members who are criticising the Government must completely change their views about this Bill, and remember that the Government is now asking to have it passed merely in order to carry out the wishes of the Sugar Producers' Association on the one hand and the Trade Union on the other. Of course, inasmuch as the Government happens to be a Labour Government, it was necessary to get the approval of the Labour Party, and that party has given its approval. Whatever criticisms there may be, one should remember that in bargaining you never get all that you want.

As far as the price of peasants' canes is concerned, my view is—and this is the view of the Labour Party—if the peasant finds it impossible to produce a ton of canes for less than \$10.00 he should get \$10.00 plus. We had to bargain on the basis of the present formula by which factories arrive at the price of canes. I hope I shall not be misunderstood when I say that; and let it be clearly understood that from the Labour Party's point of view the price of peasants' canes has not been fixed. I suggest to the Sugar Industry—I am dealing now with the price that peasants should get—that they should tell the Ministry of Food that their manufacturing expenses have increased and that they have to pay more in taxation. They should not arrive at what profit they are going to make by taking a formula which may make the peasant sell canes at a cheaper price than it takes him to produce them.

I make my position and the position of the Party quite clear. This is the best bargain that we could get and we are seeking legislative approval to carry out our part of the bargain. We have tried, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be fair, and to give praise where it is due. I therefore do not intend—although some of the speeches that I have heard tempt me to reply in the same vein—I do not intend to accuse honourable members of making pre-election speeches. I cannot believe that this rather eve of election concern for the peasants is genuine. Now why has it taken the Workers' Union ten years to reach this stage? Some employers have genuinely reformed and they try to meet us half-way and to use methods of conciliation. But many of them, regrettably, still have to be fought hard and long. I do not wish to withdraw what I said. Human nature is human nature, and after 300 years of undisputed sway they cannot easily give up that power. It is not surprising that it took nine months to bring these negotiations to an end.

I now wish to reply personally to some of the points that have been made. The honourable junior member for St. Philip did not succeed in persuading even himself. He is so possessed of an almost fanatical hatred of the Labour Party—I will not say anything of myself personally—that he says things which, if he had reflected he would realise that they rule out things which he said previously, and the stupidity of saying that we should make the Labour Welfare Fund a gift has been exposed by more than one speaker. But he keeps on saying what is absolutely reckless.

The whole basis of these figures is that the manufacturers should not get more than £1. 0. 0. profit.

Honourable members will remember that as far back as the time of the enquiry by the Royal Commission sugar manufacturers had to be reminded that they were taking out the same portion of manufacturing expenses twice. Figures can be made to show anything. It is only the fact that after much trouble we have got them finally to produce their books and have been fortunate enough to get an accountant to look at these books and to advise us that we have been able to make this Agreement.

I again repeat that we welcome the spirit of those who have seen the light and agreed with us. But the spirit of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable junior member for St. George will not help their own class. When I see conciliation on the other side I will be moderate. We tried for years to get holidays with pay and we had to come in here to get it. If we are forced we will do everything that way. Instead of telling —

Mr. HAYNES: I have not refused to pay the 19½ per cent. My books are already made out, and it will be paid on Thursday.

Mr. ADAMS: I am glad to know that the open threat I made a few days ago is bearing fruit. I have actually told a public audience that I would force the honourable member to show his hand, and I have done it. Now that he has set an example I hope that the other producers who are also unwilling to pay the 19½ per cent will see that they have to pay it. The honourable junior member for St. John has rightly kept quiet. This is not a race-horse dispute.

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that to ask the peasants to believe that we have done them a great wrong with our eyes wide open is not fair. What is the value of arguments like the one raised by the honourable junior member for St. Philip which keeps saying we are hitting at the peasant growers and a lot of them are agricultural workers, when it is the latter who will benefit by the Labour Welfare Fund being increased in this way.

Now I am going to put a question to honourable members which they can answer if they like. I will ask them, remembering how this whole agreement has come about, what guarantee would we have had this year, when we had none during all the years of our existence, that the peasants were getting all that the industry would afford to pay. If I were machiavillian I would hope that this Bill would be thrown out and we would win by an overwhelming majority. But I do not want to see it thrown out. Suppose for example, that this Agreement was torn up; what guarantee would we have that the industry would pay the peasants this 20 cents? They have never honestly paid the peasants. Last year did they give the peasants \$14.00 a ton for canes? Would they give them that if this Agreement was torn up? Do not try to fool the peasants that they are losing 20 cents which they would have got were it not for this Agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if honourable members had not brought up this question of harming the peasants, it would not have been necessary for me to do more than to say that the Legislature comes into this matter only by accident. Allow us to carry out this Agreement by changing the law. But the moment you get this talk about the poor peasants you have got to look below the surface. The honourable Junior member for St. Philip made more points to be replied to than any other member; but inasmuch as he is not in his place I will not continue to reply to him. As far as the honourable junior

member for St. George is concerned, it would only be that he hoped to have an opportunity of criticising some people and things which normally he would not have an opportunity of doing. I hope it was wrongly reported that when these negotiations were in progress the honourable member was in opposition, and told the peasants in St. George what would happen to them if this thing got through. If that was what he said he should not have repeated it here.

Mr. DOWDING: The first time that I have seen or heard anything of the matter was when I went to the Sugar Producers' Association meeting on the 27th of September. From then on I took the matter up.

Mr. ADAMS: I will have to accept the honourable member's word for it. But how then is it that the honourable member, who went to the meeting to discuss it, and must have been told the origin of the negotiations, and how they were carried out, is asking me to tell him. If he knows and is still asking me to tell him he must be making a political thing out of it.

Mr. DOWDING: The whole thing was explained at the Sugar Producers' Association meeting on the 27th of September.

Mr. ADAMS: If the whole matter was explained, how is it that he wants me to tell him from the floor of this House? What took place at the Sugar Producers' Association meeting was not secret; you would hardly have a secret between 52 people. I take it that every member knows how the negotiations started, how they continued and what the results were. If there is any advantage that we on this side have it is that they may not know how the Labour Party Council voted or—

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I know that. We do not use an espionage system.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is not only a gallant ex-captain, but he has a gallant ex-captain with him. The only reason why we are alive is that the British spy system was better than the Germans'. I apologise for being drawn off the track, sir. I do appeal to all honourable members not merely to vote for this Bill, but to enable us to keep as long as we can the good relations existing between Capital and Labour in this country today. Let us get together in the same boat and try to keep the boat going ahead on an even keel; and I suggest to the honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew not to wreck the boat. There are riots in Antigua; riots in Grenada; people with revolvers in Jamaica. Let us try to forget all that here. Help us to get this Agreement carried out, not merely in the letter but in the spirit.

It would be ungracious not to pay tribute to those employers who have at last seen that simple justice to their employees is their duty as members of a Christian community and as mere men. If we go on like that, the good relations that exist between employers and employees will continue. But if they want to start trouble again let them beware lest their method of starting it turn out to be a boom-crang.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox His Honour the SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Clause 1 and 2 were read and passed.

Clause 3 was read.

Mr. ADAMS: I move, Sir, that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman—For reasons that I gave earlier, nothing to do with the benefits which will accrue to the Workers' Union, this Clause is the only thing in the whole arrangement that I am objecting to. It is the only thing that I think is wrong.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—If this clause is deleted the whole Agreement is finished. Everything that has been done and all the figures arrived at make a composite picture. We start on the basis of £1.0.0 per ton profit. From that basis we have arrived at this figure for this, and this figure for the other. Take out this clause now and everything is upset. If this were not in we would be discussing a higher production bonus. From our point of view it was fair to push this \$1.80 because we wanted the Labour Welfare Fund to be much bigger than it was. We have agreed to this on the plain understanding that both organisations would agree. As far as the Workers' Union is concerned, we who represent the Labour Party must also agree. The position is clear.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—I do not know if I can help. I wonder if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph would consider deleting the words "provided that payment may be made not later than the 30th November, 1952." I think it would be much fairer with that amendment. If we can get this matter settled I think that this will be a good Bill. I am only trying to get things going. I am not an obstructionist. I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph could call me that. I am appealing to him to consider my suggestion.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—When the Order under the Act settling these three funds was made several of us on this side of the House disagreed with the honourable junior member for St. Philip for opposing it then. We decided to leave it until some adjustment could be made. We on this side of the House are always willing to have something more in the Labour Welfare Fund. We agreed to vote for the Order at that time. If you have a bumper crop, an exceptional crop, and the Government wants more money in the Labour Welfare Fund, and you have already agreed to the normal allocation, is it fair to ask us now to waive that of a crop of 187,000 tons for this year? The honourable member has everything. He has his Order by which he gets £1.10 per ton under the stabilization Fund. Now that we have this bumper crop we should try to get something for the Labour Welfare Fund. Who is to say that next year's crop will not be ruined by an act of God. After the labourers have planted the canes are they to be told that they cannot get this additional money put into the Fund to help keep the rain off them when they are in their homes? I am not saying that the honourable member is an obstructionist but he may not have thought of the matter that way.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman,—I must attempt again to convince the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that I am not trying to wreck any of the boats to which he has referred, and that I will always give credit where it is due. I regret that he has seen it necessary to cast reflections on me. He says that if we take out this clause the whole thing is ruined. Cannot some clause be put into it which will say that it will operate only in respect of persons, who deliver 100 tons of canes and over, and thereby try to safeguard the people in the lower brackets? I appeal to the honourable member again. I have given him credit, and his Union

credit; but let us look a little further into this. Production bonus is coming out of manufacturing expenses. Everyone agrees to that. But to go further and make the people in the lower brackets take another 20 cents a ton out of the money they get for canes is not fair, in my opinion. If some scale could work out, I feel that it would be much better. No one objects to the Labour Welfare Fund, and I agree with honourable members who are trying to see that that Fund is in the healthiest condition possible, because the housing conditions of agricultural workers in this island are definitely laid. But if that Fund is a loan fund and the money has to be repaid, surely there is no harm whatsoever in borrowing something from the four million dollars that stands to the credit of the Stabilization Fund.

Those are two alternatives which should be considered. I would also like to mention this: One of the honourable members on that side who sat through the negotiations has been man enough to admit that in negotiations such as these you cannot see every detail.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I had a conversation in the lobby with the honourable member and I said that you could not see every detail. But I will say this now: Where you have finished arrangements based on figures for the whole crop you cannot come now and step out of those arrangements by taking out a clause which will upset those arrangements. You cannot do that at this stage. The point raised might be something for future consideration. I told him that I would be glad to see the day that the peasants represent themselves. The peasants should realise that they must become organised. But it is obvious that we cannot accept at this stage the suggestion that has been made.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—Some of us feel that changes can be made in this Bill without materially affecting the workers. I am convinced of that. I believe that the method being pursued in this Bill to get more money for the Labour Welfare Fund is the wrong method. If they want more money they could get it in another way. My contention is that this Fund is bound to get bigger over the years. I have some figures here that I did not have when I spoke first. There have been 2,008 applications under the Fund and \$538,422 was spent. There have been allocations to the extent of \$750,000 which leaves not quite \$200,000 in the fund. I do not know how much of the money they have got back in yet. The arrangements in clause 4 and 5 will amount to further \$1.20 a ton and I believe I am right in saying \$2.40 which will be \$3.60 on a tonnage of 187,000 tons which means that you should get in \$550,000. If I am right in that, you should have your Fund somewhere in the vicinity of \$750,000. That is not money that is going out and not coming back in. It has to be repaid. It is a revolving fund. In the near future you will find money coming back in and swelling this Fund. Well you should get in \$550,000 next year. You may have to meet, say, 2,000 applications, but you can meet 3,000 applications on the basis of what your present applications are. Next year even if money did not start coming back in from the loans you will find yourself with another \$550,000. The year after the Fund will be more. This is really a Fund with big revenue and no expenditure. Therefore in taking this money I cannot help feeling that some honourable members are missing the point, which is that the factories will not pay one half cent towards this. It is the cane growers. You still have 41 per cent. of cane growers not interested in factories. They are the people who are going to pay.

As I said earlier the material parts of this Agreement are not contained in this Clause. That is my feeling. I am so convinced that I am right that I will vote against it if I vote alone. This clause does not go to the root of this valuable Agreement which has been reached between the parties concerned. That is how I feel.

Mr. ADAMS: I am being asked to change something that took us nine months to negotiate. I would repeat the point made by the honourable member for St. Peter. As a result of our bargaining the whole picture of this Agreement hangs together. All the figures have been worked out on the basis of what we are likely to get from the Ministry of Food whether the crop is an average one or not. I hope that the members of the Committee who are prepared to accept what I have been trying to tell them will see the point. Even if I were in a position to agree to any amendment here without reference back to the Sugar Producers' Association or negotiating again it would undoubtedly entail an amendment of every other item. Let me say for the last time, take the Bill as a whole or vote against it.

The question that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Messrs. MILLER, MAPP,

LEWIS, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS and Dr. CUMMINS—9.

Noes: Messrs. DOWDING, HAYNES, E. K. WALCOTT, GODDARD, GILL and REECE—6.

Clauses 4 to 8 inclusive were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. ADAMS: I am moving the adjournment of the House until Thursday of this week at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I warned hon. members that we would be meeting twice this week, because there are certain things which will take a long time to debate, just as this Bill was an all-night session, and we want to get them off the Order Paper. I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 3 p.m.

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