

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th September, 1953.

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. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mr. C. E. TALMA and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mrs. BOURNE entered the House and took her seat.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 30th July, 4th August, 18th August, 25th August and 1st September, 1953, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Statement of the Revenue and Expenditure for the period 1st April 1952 to 31st March, 1953 of the parish of St. Andrew.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay the Report of the Department of Education for the year ended 31st August, 1952.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Barbados Publicity Committee from 1st April, 1952 to 31st March, 1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—On behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the Regulations made by the General Board of Health under Section 4 of the Public Health Act, 1908—8; also

Bill intituled an Act to amend the Medical Registration Act, 1911.

QUESTIONS

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

Is Government aware that the duty payable on Barbados Rum in the U.K. is so prohibitive as to render this essential commodity in Britain, a luxury, and as a result practically unsaleable?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider appointing a Delegation (comprised of Two Delegates, who have been rendering great service to the Island in securing higher prices for our sugar, and another who should be a Rum Manufacturer or Exporter) to bargain with, and make representations to the British Ministry of Food and other appropriate Government Departments, whereby the Duty imposed on Barbados rum would be reduced to a reasonable sum to enable this commodity to be released to the English Public on a competitive basis with their locally manufactured Whisky?

If the Answer is in the Negative, will Government please investigate the matter through the Assistant Trade Commissioner for the West Indies, at present stationed in the U.K.; or through some other independent source?

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

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Bill intituled on Act to amend the Medical Registration Act, 1911, was read a first time.

Mr. MAPP entered the House and took his seat

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the temporary indisposition of the Chairman of Committees, I would like to move that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas be Chairman of Committees until the return of the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. MAPP being in the Chair.

Mr. GODDARD came into the Committee and took his seat.

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE \$5,500 FOR LIVESTOCK INSEMINATION

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, This resolution seeks to provide funds of \$5,500 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953-54, Part II—Capital, for a scheme that was given notice of in the Five Year Plan for a programme which is known as Livestock Insemination. The note appearing under the Schedule to this Resolution is a full one and because of that, I would only just give honourable members a brief background of the history and change of the scheme.

As honourable members are aware, notice of this scheme was given in the Five Year Plan of Development and Taxation and in that it was stated that this scheme was being run in conjunction with the one dealing with the natural method of fertilisation of livestock. However, recently, it has been drawn to the attention of Government by the Livestock Officer that many of the bulls at the Livestock Station have contracted venereal disease; therefore, it has made it a greater urgency so far as Government is concerned to proceed with artificial insemination. What has been said is that artificial insemination removes the very danger of contracting and spreading venereal disease in the animals and also eliminates the wastage in maintaining a large number of bulls for the specific purpose of natural service. This method of artificial insemination will thus relieve Government of maintaining so many bulls and at the same time, you will be sure of the semen which you get from the bulls because you will be in a position to examine the quality. In that position, stockbreeders will be getting a better service for their animals because they will be getting a better quality breed for their animals.

In the original note the sum of \$40,000 was earmarked for the scheme of which \$25,000 was to provide for capital expenditure, \$10,000 to provide for additional bull pens at the Central Livestock Station and \$5,000 as a Revolving Fund. Since this recent development, it has been found necessary to remove all the bulls from the District Agricultural Stations to the Central Livestock Station without further delay and while this would mean that the recurrent expenditure that would be needed for the upkeep of these bulls at the District Agricultural Stations would be no longer necessary, that would not affect the resolution. However, the position is that because Government is forced to provide more accommodation at the Central Livestock Station for these bulls and other matters connected therewith, there will be increased expenditure at the Pine for this provision. It therefore means that there will be an alteration in this year's expenditure, the amount

of \$5,500 being needed to supplement this year's vote of \$24,000. According to provisions already \$10,000 was provided by a supplementary estimate of 1952-53, and of that \$5,000 having been spent, there was a revote of the other \$5,000 with an addition of \$19,000 in this year's Annual Estimates which brought the total to \$29,000. This was what was estimated to be spent up to the end of this financial year. Now this addition of \$5,500 according to this resolution will give the Agricultural Department what can be termed as a full scheme so that it can implement everything that is necessary to adjust the scheme to suit the present needs without further delay.

Some other points I would like to draw to honourable members' attention. It is proposed to keep twenty bulls at the Central Livestock Station and these will be made up of 14 bulls of the various grades and six pure bred bulls. Another important feature which honourable members should know at this stage is that Government does not propose under this new scheme to increase the present fee of 72 cents which is now charged for the service of these bulls. This will be the fee charged to those stockbreeders who bring their animals to the District Agricultural Stations. In case the inseminator has to carry around his stuff to the holdings of a private person, the fee will be \$5. As in the case of the old service, an additional service will be given free in case the animal is returned within the required time. Because the Central Livestock Station will be the centre for all bulls, it will be necessary for the inseminator to distribute fresh semen at all the District Agricultural Stations at least three times a week. I should also inform honourable members that the scheme of artificial insemination is proving worthwhile because over the past twelve months, 1,270 cows have been inseminated. The experts in this matter have stated that one ejaculation from a bull can serve about 250 cows.

I think I have covered the salient points that have impressed me but in case honourable members would need more information I would be glad to supply. As I have said, the notes in the addendum to the resolution is very explanatory and I do not think honourable members will need any repetition of what they can see before them. I therefore beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. ALLDER came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. WALCOTT was speaking.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important matter. Not because I am an agriculturist myself but because of the other people who own livestock in the country districts, I would like to draw attention to the difficulty that might be entailed by the removal of these bulls from the various District Agricultural Stations and the getting of the inseminator to come around the various districts at regular intervals. However, I see in the addendum that \$3,000 will be provided for obtaining a motor jitney and \$3,000 for equipment and I hope that by this means of transport the inseminator will be able to bring around fresh semen at regular intervals at all the districts and that there will be no delay in keeping the cows which are waiting on it. This is the only thing which I see that will prevent the success of the scheme and I am hoping that it will not happen.

Mr. MILLER: I support the remarks of the honourable Junior Member for St. Peter but I would like to give and get a bit more information on the \$5 per service which will be charged when the Officer in charge of the Central Livestock Station is asked

to send around the inseminator I think if you continue to charge this fee of \$5 per service it will defeat the purpose. I am not saying so because I do not believe in insemination; I do believe in it; in fact, I will say that all countries that have properly equipped livestock departments like ours do not use their bulls for natural service, they artificially inseminate all the time.

Another point I would like to make is that since you will be forced to remove all your bulls from the various District Agricultural Stations, it will create a further hardship on peasant proprietors who used to send their cows to these agricultural stations for service but now will have to pay \$5 for getting the inseminator to come to his holding. It must be remembered that your primary reason for starting these district agricultural stations was in order to raise the standard of breeds of cattle by peasants by giving them a better service for their cattle at a reasonable fee. I believe you will probably make more money if you continue to charge 72 cents for this service. I know that the honourable mover of this resolution would like this Department to bring in the fullest benefits to the country but I think that if he overlooks things like what I have stated, it may prove disappointing. I hope the honourable member will give me further information on this matter of fees.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had made both of those points clear. There was some noise going on during the time I was speaking and that disturbance might have prevented the honourable Junior Member for St. George from hearing me precisely. I also think that the honourable Junior Member for St. Andrew did not hear all that I have said. What I said in my opening remarks was—and I think this will answer the fears of the honourable Junior Member for St. Andrew—that the purpose of this service is to send around semen from the diseased-free bulls at the various District Agricultural Stations at least three times a week. This would mean that this service will be available three times a week, so nobody needs to fear that they will not get a good service. As regards to the last point raised by the honourable Junior Member for St. George on the cost of this service, I will say that what it is worth is out of proportion to the prices charged. You cannot estimate its worth by what is charged. It is a subsidised service, even when the natural service was carried on at the various stations. As I have said, Government proposes not to increase the fee by this new service. It will still be three shillings per service when you bring your cow to the station and \$5 when you require the inseminator to come to your holding or on your plantation. If you want the semen to be brought to your plantation, obviously, you will be required to pay a fee of \$5. You must bear in mind that the inseminator must have something to travel in to carry him to your plantation. When you pay \$5 you will be getting service on the spot. I do not regard \$5 as anything dear. The Government is subsidising this service because when the overall cost is taken into consideration it is out of proportion to what is received by way of service.

Mr. MILLER: I do not in any way think the fee of three shillings is too exorbitant, neither did I say so. What I am worried about is that if a peasant has to take his cow to an Agricultural Station for service, it may cost him a few dollars very well if he has to take it by lorry. I think that the Officer in charge of this department can more or less encourage peasants to take advantage of this offer by allowing the inseminator to carry this semen in a district where the peasants live three or four miles from the station. I feel that the peasant should not be obliged to take his cow to the District Agricultural Station so long

as the inseminator is travelling in the immediate area. It is also correct to say that a single ejaculation can fertilise 250 cows and that is a breakdown in the cost of the natural service. I feel that Government can persuade people to take advantage of this good service in the manner which I have just stated. I hope the honourable junior member for St. Peter does not infer that I said that the price of three shillings was too dear but I do think that the price of \$5 for taking the service to the holding is too much.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it must be borne in mind that this service is subsidised and though a stockbreeder may be a poor peasant he should pay something for this service. I am not a believer in doing something more than what is reasonable. If you give these people something which is reasonable, then you have done your best. The honourable junior member for St. George must remember that this service is not worked out according to what it costs. If the Government worked it out on that basis it will not be anything like three shillings per service at the agricultural stations and \$5 when it is supplied on your holding. Now that the Government is resorting entirely to artificial insemination, it is doing so owing to two reasons. The first is that it is trying to control and eliminate this venereal disease in the cattle which renders both bulls and cows sterile and secondly, by so doing, you are sure to get a better breed of stock and at the same time prevent wastage. Taking all these things into consideration, I think the fees which are now charged are reasonable and I do not believe they will defeat the purpose of the scheme.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, It has been the practice for resolutions like this to be sent down without sufficient notes to make them explicitly clear, especially when such resolutions deal with the construction of buildings as in this case. I therefore would have preferred if the honourable senior member for St. Peter had given us an idea of the dimensions of these buildings that are in the course of erection. The reason why I would like that information is because I happened to visit the Central Livestock Station only a couple of days ago and I saw a huge building under construction.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What buildings are you referring to. The honourable member must be more specific than that. As a matter of fact, I see no mention of buildings in this resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Yes Sir, I am referring to bull pens when I say buildings. I was saying that this resolution shows that \$15,000 is to be spent on bull pens and I feel that this amount could have been more easily substantiated if the honourable member handling the resolution were able to give the dimensions of these buildings and how many heads of stock were to be kept in them. On my visit to this Station, not only did I see some huge buildings to house staff but also to house stock and I feel that these stock pens are really too elaborate for their purpose. I am thinking that there could be cheaper structures and yet they would be just as serviceable as these huge ones which I have noticed. I do know that it has become the accepted principle of modern architecture to erect buildings of 8 or 9-inch blocks if you are putting up a substantial structure and you even use the 6-inch block when you are putting up one of a lesser structure. However, I see on my visit there that Government is still continuing to use 18-inch blocks for building and I see no reason why you should have an 18-inch thick wall for a cow stall. I feel that an 8 or 9-inch wall would be as durable. There are at present certain dairies in the island which are operated by private persons and I am sure that these persons have not allowed their stock

buildings to cost as much of their capital expenditure as what I see here in this resolution. I can only look at these matters from a business angle. I feel Government structures for this purpose are too elaborate.

What is more is that I was given the impression that the enclosing of these pens as they are built without much ventilation was conducive to greater production of milk but on further investigation, I have been told that this is a fallacy. I notice that these stock pens of Government are so dark that they have to be lighted artificially during the day time even though the constructions are set on a hill. That suggestion seems to be wrong advice and I raise the issue now in case that there is a possibility of changing the present construction of these buildings, it should be done so as to lower the cost and at the same time afford more accommodation.

Certainly, Sir, as these things are set down in this addendum to the resolution, you cannot follow them fully. You can only vote for them because you are expected to do so. Really and truly, you cannot understand sufficiently the purpose for which they are proposed to fulfil.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, Certainly the honourable member must bear in mind that the House of Assembly is a serious place and not a debating society. He must remember that whenever an honourable member of this Chamber asks a question or debates something he does so because it is vital to the point at issue. If the honourable senior member for St. John were paying attention, I do not think he would have got up and made those remarks or if he were taking his business seriously, he would see that the details given are the entire estimates on the question, part of which is contained in the Current Estimates. If he looked into the Annual Estimates, he would have seen that we have passed \$24,000 towards the 1953-54 expenditure on the scheme, \$5,000 on which was a revote from the 1952-53 resolution that was passed to expend during that year. Because this change has taken place by the animals contracting venereal disease and the cause for immediate control by concentrating all these bulls at the Central Livestock Station and the abandoning of natural service and supplying service by insemination only, this \$5,500 is needed to put the scheme to that position. The details are fully set out in the addendum.

Is the honourable member really serious when he says he wants to know the dimensions of buildings and cubic measures of these bull pens to see if it may be too much to accommodate the 20 bulls before he can vote for this resolution? Certainly the honourable member must display some intelligence in dealing with these matters. The information which he is asking should have been asked when this House was dealing with the item under the Head in the Annual Estimates. This honourable member seems to have a lot of spare time. He can visit Agricultural Stations and it seems as if he went to the Pine Station and even was advising the people in charge of works how these bull pens should be built. He asks me to give him the measurements of these bull pens. I cannot give him the measurements, but if he feels that the measurements of these bull pens can more or less influence his voting on this resolution, then he can exercise his right as suits him best. I am looking for the honourable member to ask me some day: "What is the amount of nails and the amount of cement which will be used on a particular building?" If you must give to this House all this sort of information when it is irrelevant, I cannot promise any honourable to go into such minute details. I will

council the honourable member to pay more attention to matters when they are being introduced.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not think the honourable member needed to be so irritated over my question. From what he said in his reply, he does not understand the point that I have made. He definitely is not listening attentively. I am not against the extension of the present buildings. I only suggested that instead of using 18-inch block stones for building to use a 9-inch or 12-inch block. The honourable member said that he was unable to give the dimensions of the various buildings which are to provide these bull pens for which this resolution is to provide. If he thinks that is a feather in his cap, he is mistaken for he has only shown his incapability of dealing with matters with which he is entrusted. For a would-be minister who is handling a resolution to provide for funds to put up buildings and does not know what are the dimensions of the buildings nor for what each is to accommodate, he is just showing that he is incapable of handling fully what is expected of him. It seems to me as if the honourable member is more eager to create a noise than to listen for any suggested points which may arise. Certainly that attitude does not help the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable senior member for St. John get on with this resolution? I will handle the noise.

Mr. ALLDER: I was saying that the reason why the honourable junior member for St. Peter will be able to get this resolution pass this Chamber is because he knows that there are sufficient members here under his control to have it passed. The honourable member knows that he should give more information than he has done and if he does not wish to give any more, he should be armed with the relevant facts in case he is asked concerning that particular point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable senior member for St. John say what information he wants on the resolution? I am appealing to him.

Mr. ALLDER: Sir, I am asking the honourable junior member for St. Peter what are the dimensions of the proposed buildings? I would be sufficiently gracious if he does not have the information and he gets up and says so to excuse him. He need not be irritated. The honourable member can tell me if he gets up again. I also suggested that instead of building with 18-inch block stones as I have seen when I visited the Pine, that a 9-inch or 12-inch block could be used so as to reduce the thickness of the walls by half as well as to lower the costs of these buildings.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Sir, I do not want to prolong this debate because I have explained already in reply to the point raised by the honourable senior member for St. John. I do not want to use the phrase which the Leader of this House has coined on this honourable member's behaviour, I will only say that the honourable senior member for St. John has fallen into the trap of according knowledge to himself and telling other people that they are incapable. I think he should ponder over this failing or take introspection before he tells other people that they are incapable. I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks that the greater part of the provision for this scheme have already passed the Legislature. I am not seeking approval of this scheme; it has been approved by the Legislature already. As can be seen in the Schedule accompanying this resolution, the sum of \$2,400 has been voted under the Current Estimates to meet the expenditure on this scheme for this financial year. The sum of \$5,000 has been spent on

the scheme before. The only reason why this resolution is before the Legislature is because of a revision in the scheme owing to venereal disease having been discovered in the animals and provision being made to remedy it as quickly as possible. As has been fully explained in the addendum, the revolving fund will not be used any longer and because of that you will have to increase your recurrent expenditure. This is no new scheme as regards to putting up a new set of buildings. What was proposed to be done will only be carried through with more speed.

The honourable senior member for St. John wants to know the dimensions of these buildings. As I said earlier, this information would be necessary information to give to get approval of the scheme. It would have been information to give when the matter was first introduced. The position now is that you have passed that stage. The honourable member is criticising now what has been already approved. If he wanted to criticise the buildings, he should have done so when the matter was first introduced. I will again say if that information is not available at this time it is because it is unnecessary to deal with this resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. F. L. WALCOTT was replying.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not want to referee this verbal bout between the honourable senior member for St. John and the junior member for St. Peter in any way, but certainly the honourable junior member for St. Peter is not completely right in his statements. He says that this is a revised scheme so as to provide for more pens at the Central Livestock Station for the bulls which are now kept at the District Agricultural Stations owing to the discovery of venereal disease in many of the bulls at these stations. Now, if this is a revised scheme, you cannot say that the House has agreed to this scheme. The addendum to this resolution says that more pens are required and if more pens are required, we cannot say that we have agreed to that. The honourable senior member for St. John is entirely within his own right if anything is before the House dealing with buildings to ask for dimensional details. We have insisted in the past in asking not only for dimensional details of buildings but also for seeing of the plans and knowing the amount which is proposed to be spent on labour as well as building materials. This scheme is not for fifteen cents to be spent on buildings; it is for \$15,000 for provision of bull pens, let alone the other amounts to be spent on extension of offices and laboratories and providing shelter for motor jitney. The honourable junior member for St. Peter must remember that any comment which any honourable member may make is influenced by two things primarily. First, it is his right to pass on any common-sense idea of his on any matter which comes under his legislative preview; and secondly, he is entitled so to do because he has been elected a guardian of the public purse. Therefore, if any honourable member feels that \$15,000 is too much to be spent on bull pens, he is entitled to ask for dimensions of those buildings. Of course, the answer to the suggestion of not constructing the bull pens out of 8-inch blocks is that an 8-inch thick building would be useless to pen a bull. I cannot imagine the honourable junior member for St. George constructing a bull pen on his plantation with 8-inch blocks because bulls are strong animals and require to be housed in strong buildings. I think that is the answer to one of the questions which were raised by the honourable senior member for St. John. On the other hand,

it does not mean that the honourable member is not entitled to the fullest explanation on the other point which he raised.

Sir, for myself, I am not at all satisfied in my mind that this revised scheme will operate to the satisfaction of small cowkeepers. When this House passed the original scheme, the idea was to extend the practice of artificial insemination to the District Agricultural Stations. In other words, you were prepared to artificially inseminate, but only up to a certain point at the Pine and at the District Agricultural Stations. Now, you are revising this plan so as to concentrate all your livestock at the Pine and you are getting a motor jitney for \$3,000 as well as equipment costing another \$3,000 to send around your inseminator. Among the expenditure is \$1,000 for shelter for the motor jitney and \$15,000 for bull pens. One assumes that the Director of Agriculture has specialised knowledge on what he is doing and it is he that has sent this matter to the Executive and the members of the Executive from this House have brought it down here. Nevertheless, this scheme must be subject to all scrutiny by honourable members of this House before it is passed and for the two reasons which I have given earlier.

The alteration of the original scheme means that all those expensively built bull pens at the district Agricultural Stations will no longer be used. That means money wasted. It means that more bull pens will have to be erected at the Pine and on top of that getting a motor jitney to carry around the inseminator to all of the various agricultural stations at least three times a week. With my little knowledge, I do not see how this revised scheme is going to work properly. I visualise the difficulties which will be encountered by small cowkeepers in St. Thomas or St. George in districts that are far removed from the District Agricultural Stations when they want service for their cows owing to their being no bull at the stations. Bear in mind that semen is highly perishable. As far as I am aware, the life of it is not more than 24 hours; therefore, the District Agricultural Stations cannot keep it for any length of time. Even if it is kept in cold storage it has a limited life of potency. It therefore does not appear to me to be the right idea to have all the bulls at the Central Livestock Station and to depend on a jitney to carry around an inseminator because by the time as he arrives at the various stations or the peasant's holding, the cow may no longer be ready to be serviced by the bull. I am not saying this because I am not a believer in artificial insemination. I well remember that I got up in this Chamber about eight years ago and suggested artificial insemination and a well-known planter laughed at my suggestion. To-day the question is being debated extensively as well as it is being practised in the colony and as far as I learn with an appreciable amount of success.

Mr. Chairman, if you can keep twenty or more bulls free from disease at the Pine, why cannot you keep one bull free from disease at each of your District Agricultural Stations? Mind you, on the original scheme the proposal was to have your bulls concentrated at the Pine and those at the District Agricultural Stations reduced to a number sufficient to carry out artificial insemination. Now, because there is widespread infection among the bulls, it is proposed to carry all of the bulls at the Pine. I cannot see how a bull can be infected if it remains at an agricultural station because the proposal is to do away with the natural service entirely. My suggestion is that instead of spending

\$15,000 on new bull pens and creating a hardship on cowkeepers by inconveniencing them by they not being able to get their cows serviced at the proper time, that you keep one bull at each district agricultural station and save building these additional bullpens at the Pine. I am not saying that the Director of Agriculture with his more specialised knowledge does not know what he is doing, but it does appear to me as a humble layman that what I have suggested would be the best course to adopt.

Sir, there must be some answer to the argument that at least one bull should not be kept at each of the District Agricultural Stations. Unless we can be given more reasons for adopting this revised scheme and abandoning the original scheme, I cannot see myself supporting this resolution.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, You will have to excuse the honourable member who has just spoken because it is a fact that he was not in his place when I introduced this resolution. If he were present, he would not have said what he did. His last point is very wrong because his assumption is that owing to the revised scheme we are now voting \$15,000 for the erection of bull pens.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I pointed out that this revised scheme was to give effect to the concentrating of all the bulls at the Central Livestock Station and that can only mean that more pens will be required at the Pine.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I think I can better answer the honourable member by pointing out the original scheme from the memorandum on it in the Five Year Plan. It states: "Artificial insemination 'is at present carried out at the Central Livestock Station on a small and experimental scale. The immediate proposals are to extend this work to the District Agricultural Stations; but, in the event of a more intensive dairy industry being developed in the island, the demand for this service will increase and a distribution centre will be needed. The Director of Agriculture has suggested that, in the first place, an attempt should be made to ascertain whether the Centre could be operated as a private organisation of cattle producers. Since, however, small cattle owners may be a large proportion of those who would use the Centre, it may be difficult to raise the initial capital privately, and perhaps Government could assist by means of a loan. Under the scheme, the bull would remain the property of Government and be housed at the Central Livestock Station (the present number at the Station is sufficient for the first 3—5 years), from whence semen would be supplied to the Centre at a price to cover recurrent costs, and thereafter distributed by the management of the Centre at a reasonable insemination fee. The initial capital expenditure is estimated at \$25,000 and \$5,000 would be required for working capital. The cost of additional bull pens and other equipment at the Central Livestock Station is estimated at \$10,000, and annual maintenance at \$250"

Now, Mr. Chairman, when this matter was originally brought to the House, that same information was given and it was agreed to. The sum of \$10,000 was voted for in the first resolution and as \$5,000 was only spent at the end of the last financial period, the amount of \$5,000 lapsed. It was revoted in the Current Estimates and along with that \$19,000 was also voted to carry out the scheme to the end of this financial period. This amount included expenditure for the purchase of the motor jitney, the equipment, the extension of the offices and laboratories at the Pine,

the shelter for the bull pens and the erection of bull pens. It does not necessarily mean that because you may have to put a few more bulls at the Pine that you will have to put up a different construction. You may only have to put in more pens. If the honourable senior member for St. Philip was aware of that, he would not have made the speech he did.

Coming to the point made about insemination, how can we accept the advice of the honourable member? He says that you should keep at least one bull at each of the District Agricultural Stations and all because you have these bull pens there already. What the honourable member must bear in mind is that these agricultural stations will not be abandoned. Cows will still be kept there. It is only because you are forced to take this course now in the interest of the island that you are doing now what you intended to do in the course of time. The original scheme was to reduce the bulls gradually at the District Agricultural Stations. Because this revised scheme is necessary owing to the infection in cattle, it means that fresh semen will have to be taken to the various agricultural stations three times a week so as to keep them in constant supply. With regard to the point raised by the honourable senior member for St. Philip that because you have expended money in building pens so as to keep bulls at the District Agricultural Stations, therefore, you should retain at least one diseased free bull at each station, there can be no justification for that suggestion. There would be some justification for the suggestion if the honourable member could really prove that because of the reduction of bulls at the District Agricultural Stations there will not be a better service. The honourable member cannot argue that successfully. His suggestion is purely a matter of his own opinion. The honourable member also says that he will not be able to vote for this resolution because of his opinion. Sir, this is not a subject which you can take the opinion of a layman. I do not think the honourable member can regard his argument as conclusive. If it were as simple as he says, what would be the point of having these people to direct us. The original idea was to carry out artificial insemination along with the natural service until the people caught on to artificial insemination. As soon as the people caught on to it, the intention was to abandon the natural service. Artificial insemination is no new thing. There are veterinary surgeons doing the work of inseminators in large countries like Denmark. We are not experimenting in the sense that we are experimenting with something which is new to the world. We are only experimenting in so far as getting our people accustomed to the service. When the honourable member says that we must keep at least a bull at each of the District Agricultural Stations because the provision to keep bulls there has already been made is a weak argument for this ultimate course of artificial insemination. The honourable member cannot show points where this revised service will break down through the removal of the bulls from the Agricultural Stations. It is not even a case that these bulls will cost more to maintain at the Central Livestock Station than at the District Agricultural Stations. I am sure that the honourable member would not give this Government any credit for accepting opinion such as he has given against the opinion that has been stated here by the people who should know. This Government needs not be ashamed of this advice because it is advice that any Government would have to take.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not suggesting for a moment that we will not have to maintain these bulls if they are kept at the District Agricultural Stations. The honourable member has also to bear in mind that

because it has been decided to abandon keeping bulls at the District Stations, it does not mean that it has decided to abandon keeping cows there, so if you decide to keep a bull at each of these stations with the cows there to be maintained, that is neither here nor there.

All I want to say is that if the honourable member feels that with this new scheme the people who own cows in the districts will not meet with any difficulties through the unavailability of bulls at the District Agricultural Stations, it will be all well and good. That was one of the main points of my argument. So long as you can ensure that there will always be a fresh supply of semen at these District Stations on all occasions, I will agree to trying out the revised scheme. As I have said, artificial insemination is no new thing; it is practised in England and other cattle producing countries. It is now practised here and from what I have seen, it is done with a certain amount of success. In St. Philip I think more cows are artificially inseminated than in any other parish. It has passed the experimental stage in that parish. My point is: will there be a ready supply of fresh semen at all of these agricultural stations at all times for the public in the rural areas when this new scheme is put into operation? If that will be so, let us try it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I can assure the honourable member that the people will not be hard to catch on to this new scheme because there is a trained inseminator at each of these stations.

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

On the motion of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, seconded in each case by Mr. Cox, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 5 ORDER.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— I am asking leave to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution that the House of Assembly approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1953."

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— This resolution seeks to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1953," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 27th day of August, 1953, under the provisions of Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949. Its purpose is to provide for the post of Secretary to the Public Service Commission to be placed in the Executive Grade and for the consequential reduction of the number of Long Grade Clerks by one.

As the addendum has stated, it was not quite clear at the time of the institution of the Public Service Commission what would be the precise nature of the duties of the Secretary, and it was decided that until experience had been gained the status of the office should be that of a Long Grade Clerk. The Pub-

lic Service Commission unanimously feels that this officer's duties are so important that he should be elevated beyond that of a Long Grade Clerk and has stated that the appropriate grade for the Secretary is the Executive Grade. This is the object of this resolution and is asking that this House give sanction to it. I therefore beg to move that this Resolution to now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— I propose to take Order No. 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1953.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This is a resolution which is asking this House of Assembly to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order 1953," made by the Governor on the 22nd day of August, under the provisions of section 2, subsection (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947.

If honourable members will look at the Schedule of the Order, they will see the officers which are effected by this Order. At the Post Office we are adding the Inspector of Postmen to the Schedule of the principal Order; at the Registration Office, we are adding the Chief Clerk and at the Legal Departments, we are adding the Clerk, Assistant Court of Appeal and the Chief Probation Officer and deleting the Assistant Probation Officer. In the last mentioned item, it will be seen that it is only a question of change in title of the office. There are some other such cases. If you take the next item: "Prisons" you will see that owing to the title of the Governor of Glendairy Prison having been changed to Superintendent of Prison, there will be such an amendment to the Order. If you take the last item "Airport" you will also see that owing to the original titles of "Manager" and "Assistant Manager and Control Officer" having been changed respectively to "Controller of Civil Aviation and Airport Manager" and "Assistant Manager and Chief Control Officer" there have been such amendments.

I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion.

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

BILL TO REPEAL THE UNDERGROUND WATER ACT, 1922.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael: Second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to repeal the Underground Water Act, 1922.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, This Bill is very simple as honourable members will see. It merely seeks to repeal the Underground Water Act of 1922 for the reasons given. For some time now the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department and the Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas have been finding difficulties in administering these regulations due to the incompatibility which exists

between them. They have pointed out, as have been stated in the objects and reasons of the Bill that there is a conflict between the regulations made under the Underground Water Act, 1922, and those made under the Petroleum Act, 1950, and after expressing willingness, they have got together and have suggested the repeal of this Act as the purposes for which it was passed can be achieved by regulations made under the Petroleum Act of 1950. They have accordingly provided amendments to the Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations, 1950, which in their considered judgment will work satisfactorily and at the same time remove the anomalies.

As honourable members are aware and as those two officers have pointed out, the designation "Manager of the Waterworks Department" no longer exists, the designation having been abolished since 1949 and changed to "Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department." The regulations of the Underground Water Act still refer to the Manager of the Waterworks Department to whom the authority is delegated; whereas under the 1950 Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations, reference is made to the Governor-in-Executive Committee instead. As I have said, these officers have recommended certain regulations to amend the Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations of 1950 which they feel will remove the anomalies. These Regulations are not properly before the House and that being so, I cannot explain them as is necessary but if honourable members will look at them—they having been laid on the Table of this House a fortnight ago—they will see what they propose to do and I need not remind honourable members that if these regulations are not disapproved after forty days they will remain in force and become the law of the land. These Regulations will be inserted immediately after Regulation 18 of the Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations, 1950, and are numbered (18 A).

If honourable members are more or less acquainted with the Underground Water Regulations of 1922 and also the Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations of 1950 and would look at the regulations that were laid recently, I am sure it will be unnecessary for me to say anything more.

I now move that this Bill be read a second time.
Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion.

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

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF TRADE COMMISSIONER DISCUSSED ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: In moving the adjournment of the House I want to draw the attention of the House to an article which appeared in a recent issue of the

"Trinidad Guardian". That article made reference to a rumour which apparently exists in Trinidad that the honourable Mr. Albert Gomes was going to be proposed for the post of Trade Commissioner to the United Kingdom, and it went on to say, with a headline which went further than the body of the article, that Barbados is behind the proposal. If that were all, it would not matter; all journalists and non-journalists know that when you are hard up for something to write, you write anything and you write something sensational so as to sell the newspapers. However, I think it is my duty to draw to the attention of the public that the article suggested that Barbados is backing this proposed appointment for the same reason that it was suggested that Jamaica was backing the appointment of another person, whose name was mentioned, in order to keep him out of local politics. I want to say in the most emphatic way possible that this Government will not stand any allegation of untruth. Barbados is not a land of "bob-all"; it is not true that Barbados has considered that gentleman's name as Trade Commissioner for the West Indies in London, or the names of the two learned members of the legal profession, which were put up. This Government is backing none of the three names in view of the fact the gentlemen are politicians and not businessmen. In view of the fact that I made a statement on the floor of this House affecting Mr. Gomes and Barbados has not backed down from that decision, it is only fair to say that this Government cannot be accused of changing its views let alone for the contemptible reason given by that newspaper that it is desirous of getting out of the West Indies somebody who may or may not be popular with this, or that Party or this or that Government or people in this area.

I regret that it is necessary for the mouthpiece of the Government to take notice of a matter that appears in a newspaper outside this colony; but if we are getting together as a West Indian nation it is essential that when grievous accusations of that sort are made against the *bona fides* of any Government, that Government should make it clear at the earliest possible opportunity that those accusations are completely without foundation. In moving the adjournment at this stage I take into consideration the fact that the distinguished honourable junior members for St. James and St. Andrew find it difficult to sit late at night and I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m. I should like honourable members who may desire to bring forward Private Members' Business for next Tuesday to indicate it now and let us fix the Order Paper with that in view.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Speaking on the motion for the adjournment I desire to make some comment on the statement which brought the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to his feet, that is, he desires to dissociate the Government from supporting anybody's application or desire to be Trade Commissioner for the West Indies in the United Kingdom. But the statement that we are entirely opposed to backing any individual for this post because he is a politician—

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I made that point clear. The fact that a man is a politician is not against him for this post; what is against him is that he is a politician and not a businessman.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Who is appointed as head of the Trade Department in Great Britain? Is he not a politician? I deprecate sending out to the world that this Chamber dissociates itself with this appointment because the individual is a politician. Politics embraces every department of national life. It might

be that the House is opposed to backing any Trade Commissioner if he happens to be a politician, but I, personally, desire to dissociate myself from that point of view. As a matter of fact, when it comes to representing the business interests of an entire region, this post is a political post in the widest sense of the term. Politics is not just appealing to the electorate at voting time; the appointment of a Trade Commissioner for an entire area is a political matter. Unless a person has a sound grasp of politics, in my opinion, he would be a failure as a Trade Commissioner. He must be aware of the tariff policies of the various parties.

Mr. MAPP: On a point of order. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is in order in debating this question. According to Rule 115 which, I think, applies to the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who is personally involved in this matter because he was a member of the Regional Economic Committee. I cannot see that the hon. junior member for St. John is in order in debating. I am asking for a ruling in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. MAPP: With all due deference to your ruling I ask, what is Your Honour's interpretation of Rule 115?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is speaking on the motion for adjournment.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Who decides what the tariff should be?—The politicians. I cannot therefore associate myself with the statement that Barbados refuses to back an application for the post of Trade Commissioner for the West Indies because the applicant is a politician. This is the second occasion on which the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has risen in this House to make a statement like that, and I desire to state emphatically that the impression must not go out to the world that this House of Assembly is so narrow in its conception of West Indian trade policy that it would only support a businessman as Trade Commissioner. Who is the extraordinary businessman who has made such a successful Trade Commissioner without being a successful politician? You would have to go a long way and search far and wide to find a businessman who could make a greater success as Trade Commissioner than one who is a sound politician. The word "political" embraces mankind and all its interests. This is a question of being biased against the appointment of a Trade Commissioner who is a politician; I would like all honourable members to know that and therefore I protest against the implied acquiescence of this House in deprecating the appointment of any individual as Trade Commissioner who may happen to be a politician.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for St. John has made the mistake of taking the statement of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph too seriously. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is saying that either he or the Government would not back a politician for the post of Trade Commissioner unless he is a businessman, and it is most unfortunate in this case that Mr. Gomes is the person under reference. The fact remains that in a post like this Mr. Gomes would make a better success than seven-eighths of the businessmen in the area. That does not mean that I would back him for the post, but for his all-round ability it is undeniable that he would make a better success in this post than some businessmen in Barbados or Trinidad or other West Indian Islands. The statement by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is merely an attempt to discover an excuse for not supporting this particular

person; does the hon. member really and seriously suggest that the only person who could be appointed to this post is a practical businessman and there is no politician in the area who could make a success of it? In every single Chamber in the West Indies you will find businessmen as politicians and the mere fact that a man is a politician does not mean that he has no business sense; the hon. junior member for St. John is quite within his right to dissociate himself from any such suggestion. I do think that anybody should take the suggestion of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph seriously; my opinion was that the members of the House should deny the observation in the "Trinidad Guardian" that Barbados was backing Mr. Gomes for this post. However, it is a fact that you can easily find both a politician and businessman for this post if you want to do so.

Mr. ADAMS: I should just like to say this; the notice which was sent out in connection with this post stopped certain people from applying for the post, because it called for people of long experience in trade and business. When certain people heard that politicians were applying then they threw themselves into the ring. It is for Barbados to say that we do not see the necessity for two people representing the West Indies and we vote for nobody; we do not see that there is sufficient work in Great Britain for two people. We say that with a long-term policy in respect of sugar we are throwing away money in having two people. People can censure the Government of Barbados if they like and when the hon. senior member for St. Philip with his usual mind talks about finding an excuse for not supporting somebody, I say it is an absolute throwing away of the taxpayers' money to have two people and pay them fantastic salaries for sitting down and doing nothing. We must have a Trade Commissioner but we do not need two £3,000 a year men to see about a long-term policy in respect of sugar, bananas and cocoa. A politician who has experience as a businessman would be an excellent man for this post, but not a politician who is merely a politician. I say that a man like the former junior member for St. James, Mr. Wilkinson, whether he was born in England or Honolulu—a politician with his business experience, if he were a young man, he would be the sort of man to appoint to this post. The fact that a man is a politician should not score against him, but if he is a politician alone, he is not the man for this post. If we were appointing a High Commissioner, yes, he has to be a politician, but not if we are appointing a Trade Commissioner.

I have said what I have said because it is only fair for the Government of Barbados, even although it may sound self-righteous, to tell the world that we are not taking part in anybody's game. If I have spoken with some warmth, I say this even of former Governments who may have helped their friends in a general way; when it comes to graft and corruption Barbados has been singularly free. To suggest that the Government of Barbados would do something with some ulterior motive is something which I strongly deprecate, and I think it is right for the Government to draw attention to the absolute unfairness of accusations of this sort. Before I sit down I will say that the honourable junior member for St. John is a successful politician but he is not so successful a businessman; the honourable senior member for St. John deals in second-hand business, he is a second-hand politician and makes a success of both. I am not suggesting that you cannot combine the two things—politician and businessman—but if you are a politician alone you should not get this job of Trade Commissioner.

Mr. ALLDER: I would only say that the honourable member need not worry about my politics. I do not know that the honourable member should inflict the House with this discussion; while the Regional Economic Committee is financed by the West Indian Governments including the Barbados Government, it holds its discussions and excludes the public. Not even the members of the Councils of Government in this colony know what discussions take place; the members of this august Body know nothing and that is ungracious. The honourable member only gives the impression that he is using this honourable House as a weapon to fight his battles.

Mr. ADAMS: I object to that. That is accusing me of the most disgraceful behaviour possible; I am asking the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: The last sentence of the honourable member does reflect discreditably on the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and inasmuch as the Rules of the House are against such a thing I ask the honourable member to withdraw that last statement.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not see anything in the statement to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules of the House are against any discreditable reflection by one honourable member against another honourable member and if I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement he should withdraw it.

Mr. ALLDER: I withdraw the statement at Your Honour's suggestion but I must give the reason why I arrived at that conclusion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member would be repeating what he said; I cannot allow that.

Mr. ALLDER: I feel that this discussion was unnecessary and unjustified. Hon members of this Chamber do not know what takes place at these R.E.C. meetings; no information is passed on to us by the Administration. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is one of the few members who represent the Barbados Government on this R.E.C. Body and anything which he opposes at that Body and he fails or appears to be failing in his desire, he uses this House—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must not appear to be casting any aspersion against any other member.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member raises this question in reply to what he has seen in the *Trinidad Guardian*, and when his utterances go forth from this Chamber it must be taken that the Barbados House of Assembly shares the opinion as expressed by the honourable member. The honourable member knows that he could have given a private interview to

the Press and what he said would reach the proper quarter; he could have written a letter and sent it to the Press; but when he makes refutations here against what he might have seen in the Press of another colony, it does appear as if the honourable member is speaking on behalf of the members of the Barbados House of Assembly and they agree with it.

I must compliment my colleague the honourable junior member for St. John on taking exception to the points raised by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph: if my colleague had not done that, it might be accepted that the members of this House agree with the honourable member's views. We do not know the pros and cons—we do not know the reasons for the rejection or acceptance of any proposals which may have been brought forward at the R.E.C. meetings. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph wants us to be interested in the battles which he carries on in the interest of the Barbados Government, he should have seen to it that the Press is given admittance at these meetings and the discussions would be known to the public and to the members of this House. On the other hand, the honourable member should have seen that copies of the discussions and decisions reached at these meetings are presented to honourable members, otherwise we cannot join with the honourable member in any West Indian struggle which he might be carrying on; it would be expecting too much of us to do that.

As regards who should be selected as Trade Commissioner for the West Indies in the United Kingdom I do not want to go into that matter now, but there are members of this West Indian community who have shown by their hard work and determined effort in the West Indies and in broader fields that they are very much suited to represent the West Indies as Trade Commissioner or anything else. The name which has just been mentioned is that of one of those persons who have given me that impression; I feel that Mr. Gomes has been very vociferous in London and elsewhere whenever he was obliged to represent the West Indies, whether it was purely a question of politics or commerce, and I say that we cannot join in the expression of anything which would cause it to appear that we have petty prejudices against anybody when we should have a cooperative spirit in these parts.

The Order Paper under the Head "Private Members' Business" having been fixed,

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.