

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2nd September, 1958.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; and Mr. L. St. A. THORNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

AMPLIFICATION OF CHAMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the Clerk proceeds with the usual opening, I have the honour to inform hon. members that, as they will see today, an amplification set has been installed. I understand that the microphones which hon. members will see in front of them, because of the contract, at a later date are to have an extension tube run into them so that they will be more easily adaptable to members. The set is live at the moment and I hope that this test which we are doing today proves successful.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay Message No. 19/1958 regarding the appointment of Mr. Luther St. Aubyn Thorne as Minister of Education with effect from the 1st September, 1958.

The Message reads as follows:-

Message No. 19/1958.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO

THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that, on the Premier's

recommendation, he has appointed the Honourable Luther St. Aubyn Thorne, M.C.P., to be Minister of Education with effect from the 1st day of September, 1958, and, under the provisions of the Executive Committee Act, 1891, to be a member of the Executive Committee.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL.
Governor,

Government House,
Barbados.
1st September, 1958.

Hon. M. E. COX: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay Message No. 20/1958 re allocation of the portfolio of Education and Public Library of the portfolios of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Social Services respectively to the Minister of Education.

The Message reads as follows:-

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, after consultation with the Premier, he has reallocated Education and Public Libraries, which were formerly in the portfolio of the Premier and in that of the Minister of Social Services, respectively, to the portfolio of the Minister of Education.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL.
Governor.

Government House,
Barbados.
1st September, 1958.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

• Reply to question No. 4/58 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on 3rd June, 1958, regarding the acquisition of Branchbury Tenantry, St. Joseph.

• Reply to question No. 5/58 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on 10th June, 1958, regarding the acquisition of land from Lammings Plantation, St. Joseph, for the provision of a housing scheme, communal bath and latrines in that area.

• Reply to question No. 6/58 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on 24th June, 1958, regarding the

re-siting of houses of the residents of Malvern Tenantry, St. Joseph.

* Reply to question No. 10/58, asked by the hon. senior member for St. John on 29th July, 1958, regarding water supply in the districts of the middle avenue of Sherbourne, and of Rosegate in St. John.

Reply to question No. 11/58 asked by the hon. senior member for St. John on 29th July, 1958, regarding the provision of water standposts in the districts of Pot House and Pool Tenantry, St. John.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions:-

To enquire of the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

1 Is Government aware that there is grave dissatisfaction on the part of the workers of the Department of Highways and Transport in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew through lack of proper supervision and administration and a continuity of regular employment in these parishes?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider immediately the advisability of appointing a Resident Engineer for these parishes who will be able to administer the work of the Department in these parishes, and so avoid or remedy such disharmony before it reaches such proportions.

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:-

• Is Government aware of the fact that the Housing Authority has been unable in the parish of St. Joseph to keep to the schedule of their building programme, due to the difficulty of finding a suitable area of land for their purposes?

Will Government consider the substitution of a number of smaller plots in several districts of the parish which may be more easily acquired, and which would be better from the point of view of would-be residents, and thereby speed up the housing programme in this parish?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

* Is Government aware that peasant proprietors experience great difficulty and incur heavy expenses in having their canes processed owing to the paucity of sugar factories in the Island?

(2) Will Government consider the advisability of purchasing one of the abandoned factory sites for the purpose of erecting a Central Peasant Factory?

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the island.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1958-59 No.20

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave of the Committee that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture deal with this Resolution in the place of the Hon. Premier.

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

12.25 p.m.

HEAD IX - MARKETS

Head IX - Markets - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with a number of things which we are very eager to have done in order to be able to open the new markets which are being erected and which will soon be put into operation. I think I should say at the outset that the new market on Fairchild Street is almost completed; there are only certain finishing touches to be done there, and it is the desire of the Government to open this market officially on the 15th of this month. These small items are found to be necessary and this amount of money is being asked for in order to get the appropriate funds for the acquisition of these things.

For instance, there are needed certain items of furniture such as tables, chairs, safes and scales, and for the Six Roads Market, we need certain slaughterhouse equipment such as gambles, stunners etc.. I do not think that this is a very debatable question inasmuch as both of these markets are new and they require new furniture. I do not think that I should stress too far the point that these markets will serve a useful purpose in this community. I feel that this money is being well spent; although at this stage the Government is spending a lot of money on markets and we are called upon to subsidise these markets, because of the low charges which the users of the markets will pay for the services rendered, we feel quite sure that this is a step forward and we are now going to pursue our policy of erecting markets throughout the island.

I beg to move that Head IX - stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has said that they are called upon to subsidise markets. I do not know if he is of the opinion that private people should build markets and the Government be requested to subsidise them. All over the world, Governments provide markets for people and they do not talk about subsidising markets. The Hon. Minister also said that they are going to open the new market on the 15th instant. The Director of Public Works is a very able man, but I would have liked to see the provision of a side-walk whereby some of the pedestrian traffic on the streets would be taken off and the people given some place on which they could walk. I do not consider that when we have a place like this market with so much space available, a suitable sidewalk should not be provided. I am not an expert, but I would suggest that there is nothing improper for them to provide a sidewalk in order to enhance the beauty of the place and also to provide the necessary facility which is provided in any civilised community.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I should like to inform the hon. member that a car park and a sidewalk are to be erected. The hon. member will observe that, because he spends more time around that street than most of us here and perhaps he wants to help us to beautify these surroundings. (Mr. WALCOTT: We are building too.) As I say, Sir, we are erecting a car park but the hon. member will not be able to park his car there unless he is making purchases. (Mr. WALCOTT: We are going to have a building there too, and it will be a reflection of yours.)

The question that Head IX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXI - SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE

Head XXI - Science and Agriculture - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this Head is in respect of the Department of Science and Agriculture. As hon. members will see from the note, the sum of \$600 was provided under Head XXI, item 110, in the current

Estimates for the purchase of the Booster Pump to replace the present pumping equipment at the Central Livestock Station. What has happened is this: they went ahead and had a certain estimate for a certain type of pump, but perhaps on reflection and further investigation, it has been found necessary to get something of a better quality and of a different type altogether. We have therefore come back to the House and asked for an additional \$665 which will increase the amount to \$1,265 in order that we may be able to get the right type of pump. That has been suggested by the Government Electrical Engineer and now this is a two-fold thing - we are asking for a revote of the \$600 and for the sum of \$665 additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is a debatable matter. We must have this pump in order to water the land because, as hon. members know, a lot of the grassland is irrigated and vegetables and canes are irrigated and we cannot do without a proper pump to water the land.

I beg to move that Head XXI stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

The question that Head XXI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXII - PUBLIC LIBRARY

Head XXII - Public Library was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: This Head is in connection with the Public Library. As hon. members will see from the note, "The new Branch Library and Post Office in St. George is now under construction. Provision is required to meet the cost of an initial stock of books, furniture and equipment which are needed for the Branch Library."

As the position stands now, we must have money to do these things. I think that this is a very worthy service which we are rendering to the people of this colony and I do not think that we will have any dissentient voice in this matter.

I beg to move that Head XXII - stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it was only last week that we were discussing a Resolution to provide some money for this building, and you will remember that I suggested to Government, as I have so often before suggested, that in respect of the Branch Library, they should see to it that it was opened at night, as I have suggested in respect of the Public Library that it be made available to persons of the working classes who have no time to spare during the day and who want to avail themselves of the reading room, which of course is an essential part of any proper Public Library. So I would like to ascertain from Government if they have given the matter their consideration and are disposed so to equip this Branch Library and in fact other libraries in this island - first and foremost the Public Library - with an adequate staff and a reading room, so that until at least 10 p.m., if not 11 p.m., this Library will be available to those people who have done their day's work, gone home and had their dinner and come back about 6 p.m. to avail themselves of the very valuable facilities of the reading room at the Library.

I suppose, Sir, if the Library is taken seriously by the present Government, it should be placed under the Head of the Minister of Education, because there is nothing closer to education than books and a Library, and even if it is not under the Head of the Minister of Education, - we have only had one since yesterday and I must publicly congratulate Government on making the best choice of the material available, and so far I am referring to the Minister - I am sure the Minister of Education will agree with me and will prod his Cabinet colleagues into taking some action to ensure that there is (a) a reading room and (b)

that that reading room is opened at night, so that people who cannot use it during the day will be able to use it at night. There is plenty of material available for Library staff; there are so many unemployed products, female and male, of the secondary schools suitable for such posts in the Library, that there is no reason for not having it staffed. The building will be provided, the room will be there and there are plenty people available for staff. As a matter of fact, I think it would be most suitable for the parish of St. George to start with a Library and reading room opened at night.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I seem to believe that the Branch Library in Speightstown which I know quite well now operates at night. It is a matter for the Public Librarian to carry out experiments to see when the reading room might best be used. As far as I know, the Branch Library is opened at night now.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to inform the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that there is absolutely no need for me to think of having to prod Government on this matter, because I am pleased to be able to report that I have discovered that it is Government's intention to provide wherever possible the necessary facilities for having these libraries operate at night up to reasonable hours. It might not be expected that libraries in the country could be opened as late as the City Library for various reasons, but wherever it is possible we shall make such provision.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, while thanking the Hon. Minister for that expression of sentiment, may I remind him that he used the words "Government's intention", and that those words were used three years ago in reference to the Public Library in the City by the present Premier in respect of opening at night.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, it is really interesting to see already an improvement in the way which hon. members are answered by the new Minister of Education, and in addition to prodding Government into opening Libraries at a reasonable hour at night, he can also teach his colleagues to be a bit more tolerant and to be a bit more respectful to the Opposition.

I have no fear, Mr. Chairman, that any matters pertaining to the increase or the improvement of knowledge in this community will meet with the wholehearted support of the Hon. Minister of Education. In addition to the fact that this matter concerns the Minister of Social Services too, I am sure he will use his good offices now that they have been made available to the community in a more lofty sphere to improve not only the literacy and intelligence in St. George, but also in other parishes where Branch Libraries are very sadly needed. After all, Mr. Chairman, you will agree that the purpose of a Library is not only to disseminate knowledge as well as to increase in people a desire of reading, but a healthy community depends on how widely read the inhabitants happen to be. We therefore welcome this new venture in St. George, and we hope that the Minister will also see that the other constituencies have equal facilities.

Of course, I take this opportunity as I was not in the Chamber before to offer my personal congratulations to the new Minister of Education on his promotion and elevation, and to wish him the best in what I would consider a very important portfolio in this country, which places such great emphasis on its educational attainment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, in extending my felicitations to the new Minister of Education, I should like at the same time to wish him a very successful tenure of office. I was rather concerned, Sir, to hear him insinuate that the opening of rural Branch Libraries at the night would not be as late as in the urban area. I see no reason why this should be so. Reference to the record will show that some years ago.....

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: On a point of order. I should like to inform the hon. senior member for St. Philip that I said "might not" and not "would not".

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not accuse him of making an

indirect statement, but I said that he insinuated. The implication was that there was a possibility that the Libraries in the urban areas would be opened later than those in the rural areas. In case this possibility is likely to become a fact, I merely want to remind him that the percentage of readers of popular books in some rural parishes is almost as high, if not as high, as in St. Michael. If he refers to the records of the House, he will discover that some years ago when I was endeavouring to get a Branch Library in the Parish of St. Philip, I pointed out then in the form of some questions which I tabled, that the percentage of readers in St. Philip was the highest of any rural area, and compared very favourably with the ratio in St. Michael.
12.45 p.m.

All that, therefore, means is that since the thirst for knowledge in the rural areas is manifestly as great as in the urban areas, there can be no justification even for the suggestion that the possibility is that reading hours at libraries in urban areas might be more extended than those in the rural areas. I see no reason, Sir, why there should be any differentiation at all. Insofar as staff is concerned, people are available in both areas, and all important things being equal, I am of the considered opinion that, in arranging for an establishment of libraries throughout the Island, the hours of the opening should be the same and that all facilities should be equal so far as is possible.

The question that Head XXII — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXIII - MEDICAL (1) DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES

Head XXIII — Medical (1) Director of Medical Services — was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to increase the emoluments paid to two dentists who now service schools throughout the Island. Representations have been made to Government that their salaries and other emoluments are inadequate and Government has approved of increased salaries and increased emoluments; hence, this Resolution.

The Note in the Addendum sets out very clearly what the Resolution seeks to do and you will see that the retaining salary of \$480 per annum is doubled, that is to say, it goes from \$480 to \$960. Government is very happy to be able to meet the demands of these two dentists who, we believe, are doing a good job in attending to children's teeth and so on. As you will also see set out, they not only do extractions but fillings as well, so by that they try to save teeth. I think it is a very good service which is rendered to the children of tender ages, and I do not think any hon. member will have any criticism to level against it.

I shall say in passing that I have observed we shall have also raised the fees. Heretofore extractions were done at 24 cents, each but they have now been increased to 40 cents each. I think that everybody should be happy over this Resolution, and I beg to move that Head XXIII — Medical (1) stand part.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the information we heard is quite correct, because from the notes which I have here, the extractions which have been increased from 24¢ to 40¢ are supposed to be in respect of expectant mothers and not school children. I do not know whether it is an error in the Resolution or on the part of the Minister.

However, the Hon. Minister has said that the Government is very happy to be able to double the retaining fee. I sincerely hope that the Government proposes to extend that happiness in dealing with the other Government servants. If it makes the Government happy, to increase by 110% the retaining fee for dentists, it ought to promote a certain amount of ecstasy on the part of the Government to be able to pay, for instance, cantonniers double their \$13.20 a week. I am merely concerned with promoting more ecstasy on the part of the Government.

I do not know what are the annual earnings of these dentists because there is no attempt to explain that here. We are merely told that formerly the retaining fee was \$40 a month and now it would be \$80 a month and certain fees have at the same time been increased. It would be welcome news to the Committee if the Committee were told what approximately are the earnings of these two gentlemen so as to be able to get an idea if the increase in fees would have brought the annual income of these two gentlemen to a reasonable figure. The extraction fees are small but certainly the retaining fee of £100 a year if the earnings are considerable is by itself all right. If an increase is needed, may be, a normal rate of increase may be more justified than 100% increase if, simultaneously, you are going to increase the fees.

The important point which I want to make is this: the Government must not be too circumscribed in its desire to promote its own happiness. If the main ingredient is to pay more money to employees, well, the more money you pay out the happier you would be. We of the Opposition would like to see a happy Government, especially in this case where the happiness of the Government comes through the paying out of more money; but let the cause of this happiness extend right down the ranks of Government employees, especially among the lower brackets, and let us see such 100% increases being spread all over the lower ranks of the Government Service and I hope we will also see at the same time happy, beaming faces of the Government happy at the thought that they are paying good salaries where they are needed and even in some cases double the salaries which they are now paying out. I do feel that the Committee should be given some idea of what the annual earnings are in respect of these two posts.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I too, like the hon. senior member for St. Philip appreciate the logical way in which the Hon. Minister put it, because it is the sort of argument I would have to use if I were making a claim for an increase in wages, may be, of people who work with dentists.

Now, it is true there is no absolute rightness about this amount of money for a retaining fee, whether the retaining fee is \$40, \$60, \$70 or \$80. The point which the hon. senior member for St. Philip raised is something to which we do not get any answers. The fees are negligible, but you have to determine what the dentist earns by such fees to be able to determine if by charging such a retaining fee it is worth the officer's charge.
12.55 p.m.

Where I part company with the hon. senior member is not on the fundamentals, because I like to see that happiness expressed by the Government in other branches too; but how could he expect the Government not to say what they have said, when these two dentists have to travel all over the Island to the various Elementary Schools and then you hear that they also have to travel to the Maternity Hospital and the Health Centres? I do not think that they are paid travelling allowance. If the Government Ministers get a travelling allowance of \$90 a month, I cannot look upon a dentist in his professional capacity charging what is less than what the Ministers get for travelling, when the dentists have to travel throughout the Island. I think that in travelling the dentists must have a strong claim in making out that they should have a retaining fee of \$80 a month. Apart from the professional duties, on the basis of what the Government has already established, they would be deserving of this money.

I take the Government's basis as a cue. It would be impossible for any person to be satisfied — any person like a dentist — to be called upon to travel in the performance of his duties and to accept less than the figure I have quoted. The Government is paying him a retaining fee in order to retain his services; otherwise, you would have to pay him for each job he is doing. It is good for every professional man to know that if you want to retain his services you cannot pay him less than £200 a year, because that is merely regarded as putting gasoline in his car. I am not worried about that, because we have already set the standard.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I hope he does not mean to suggest that I am saying that £200 a year for a retaining fee is necessarily too much. I said that I do not know whether it is too much or not, because I do not know what the actual earnings are. I said that if the actual earnings were made available, then £200 or £250 might be a proper retaining fee.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are not at cross purposes. I agree with the hon. member's argument, but why I agree that the earnings of these people should be stated is this: for example, last week, or two weeks ago we heard that they were changing the system relative to the Crown Law Officers because they were paying the Barristers too much money by way of fees. We would like to know how much they are paying the dentists and we are asking if they do not think the time has come for appointing a whole-time dentist. That is not a criticism of the hon. senior member for St. Philip because I am in complete agreement with him that we should have some idea as to why we have to increase the fees. It is not a question that they are not doing a good job because we feel that everybody who is working for the Government is doing a good job. If they are 26,000 children in these schools, we want to know what percentage of them are using these services; we want to know if the children are making use of these services as free services, whether the parents are taking them to the dentist whenever they need dental treatment or whether it is only a question of poor people who cannot afford these services being given the benefit of these services.

In the United Kingdom, these services are provided and it is not a question of providing such services on the basis of how much you can pay; it is a question of providing social services for the community. I do not think that the Hon. Minister is wrong in saying that they feel happy about this matter. I believe that the Hon. Minister is conscientious in his remarks: otherwise he could not justify paying out \$90 a month for a service on the one hand and not paying \$80 a month on the other. If he were not happy, then I would join hands with the dentists in making a protest. I say that these two dentists would have to do more travelling than the Minister without portfolio in the Other Place would have to do.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, we all agree that this is an indispensable service and I wonder if the Government has yet given any consideration to the appointment of a whole-time dentist instead of having two part-time dentists. These are two private practitioners with private practices of their own. I do not know who the individuals are or whether they are qualified dental surgeons or, as the Note puts it, dentists. Whatever they are, one is likely to get better service from one whole-time officer than he would get from two part-time people. This is a matter for consideration in the near future.

On the question of the increased remuneration, I am wondering if it would not be more reasonable to make the increase in respect of extractions and fillings. The only increase in respect of extractions is 40 cents each for expectant mothers for whom 24 cents each was previously paid. The other increase is for the retaining salary. That retaining salary would make the mouth of every member of the legal profession water when it is heard that a retaining fee of £200 per annum is proposed for these dentists. A retaining fee or salary simply means that you are given that fee or salary at the beginning of every financial year irrespective of what work you are called upon to do. The fee or salary is given in order that you cannot refuse to provide your services on being requested to provide them. You do not have to do one single stroke of work for a retaining fee but your services have to be available. In other words, if there is not one stroke of work to be done, the retaining fee will still stand. In the absence of a whole-time man, I think it would be necessary to consider a greater increase for the actual work which is done than merely having the retaining fee. I am sure that there is hardly a dental surgeon or dentist, as the Note says, in this Island who would not regard £200 per annum as a retaining fee as being adequate. We, on this side of the House, look forward to the extension of such a service as this.

1.05 p.m.

I think if we start off with one whole-time man, we might well arrive at the stage in the very near future that two whole-time men at least would be indispensable. It would be worthwhile, Sir, if the hon. member who has introduced this Resolution would give us the earnings of each of these dentists over the past twelve months or so or even for this financial year, from the 1st April, 1958; those figures should be available because as the notes says "it is now proposed to revise the rates with effect from 1st April, 1958", so I take it that Government would be in a position without any research at this stage to let us know from 1st April to the end of August what were the earnings of each of these dentists in respect of their work at the schools, at the Health Centre and at the Maternity Hospital. I am sure he will be able to supply that information without having been given notice of it and without any research, because this Resolution says it is to come into effect from the 1st April, 1958. What would each have drawn for these five months from April to the end of last month?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions on this matter which is indeed a very simple one. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture handled the Resolution but did not have the opportunity to study the file. What actually happened is that the Minister of Health and Social Services received representation from the two schools in connection with adjusting the retainer fee and the rates paid as compared with that paid to the dentists.

Mr. CRAWFORD: By whom was the representation made?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I said that representation was made to the Ministry of Health and Social Services - it is essentially a Health service - and on study and examination, we discovered for a number of reasons, unfortunate and otherwise, that the retainer paid to the school dentists is fixed at \$480 a year as against the dentist on a part-time basis at the Hospital at \$960. A closer study revealed that the adult service which is offered at the General Hospital by the dentist was based on a rate of \$40 cents per extraction. It was again unfortunate that the two school dentists who operated at the Maternity Hospital - thinking in terms of the adult and expectant mothers at that institution - were paid at the rate of 24 cents; hence, the adjustment was made.

In attempting to answer some questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, with regard to the average earnings of one of these travelling dentists, he makes something like \$2,800 a year, an average of \$235 a month; another question from the hon. member is whether or not we pay travelling expenses to these officers. I can say "no"; no rates have been made and no travelling allowance is paid, and they travel an average of 280 miles per month. The number of persons handled by these visiting dentists is something like 8,000, that is, 16,000 for the two, based on the statistics for 1957.

The whole idea aback of this is to bring him in line with the provisions made for the dentist at the General Hospital who receives a retainer of \$960 a year. The approximate cost for this increase is \$1,423 and to round it off we are asking for \$2,000 to cover the cost for the year 1958-59. I am very anxious to reply to any further questions, so please feel free to ask for any information which you require on this matter.

The question that Head XXIII (1) - Director of Medical Services stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PEASANTS' LOAN BANK

Head XXXVII - Peasants' Loan Bank - was called

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, Head XXXVII has to do with the Peasants' Loan Bank. There are a number of changes which have taken place at this Bank. This Bank is now beginning really to serve the peasantry of this island to a greater capacity, and because of these numerous activities, the demands on its finances are much greater.

During the last Estimates we thought we had voted enough money to carry on the finances of this particular Bank in all its aspects, but we have now been faced with a shortage of money and we are asking today that this amount as voted in the 1958-59 Estimates be increased by \$48,000.

I think, Sir, that the Committee should be appraised of some of the work which this Bank is doing; it is rendering a very useful service to the agricultural community and the services are being extended year after year, and perhaps I can say month after month. It is a good thing that it should have an infusion of new blood and new energy and perhaps a different approach to things agricultural. The Bank is now giving a greater amount of manure to the peasants; it is now lending a greater amount of money on agricultural land for cultivation and other purposes and it has under very active consideration a proposal to increase the ceiling price of land. Heretofore they had a very low ceiling price on land, and when people wanted to pay for mortgages, according to present day land values, the amount which we loaned them was infinitesimal. We have decided to increase the amount to these people who want to repay mortgages or who want to acquire a piece of land in accordance with true present day land values. I think that the land values against which they operated are outdated, and we are seeking now to bring the picture more nearly home to present day conditions. I think, Sir, that it is wise for Government sometimes not to boast of what it is doing, but at least to publicise some of its activities. Some people, I know, do not really know what these services mean and how they can be acquired. 1.15 p.m.

It is true, Sir, we have there two inspectors who go out to do some work among the peasants but I do not think quite enough of this work is publicised. We propose in the future to have district meetings so that people in every district will know what services are rendered by this Department. This Bank is really to promote good cultivation and agricultural practices in the island among peasants, to take some of the burden of the peasants and to give them a fair amount of working capital so that they can develop their land. I think it is serving a very useful purpose and I know personally that we intend to extend the scope of activities of this Bank.

I hardly think that there will be any criticism of this amount for which we are asking, because I know every hon. member around here is eager to help the peasants of this colony. I, therefore, have great pleasure in moving that this Head do now stand part.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Resolution, Sir, calls for an increase in the amount of capital in the Peasants Loan Bank over and above the \$252,000 which we made available to the Bank at the beginning of the current financial year. In other words, the Bank will expend a total of roughly \$300,000 to peasant proprietors during the financial year. At the moment, I have not got available the total numbers of peasant proprietors in the Island nor the total number of people who rent land, because as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, for over ten or twelve years many of us have consistently agitated for a releasing of the activities of the Bank especially with the people who do not own land, but only rent land.

In the original Act, loans were only extended for cultivation to people who owned land and had the title deeds to them. Then there was some disquiet over that policy, because some of the people who owned land could not provide title deeds. After that hurdle was surmounted, there was the question of further extension to assist people to cultivate land who occupied land, and because of that, naturally, a large expansion has taken place in the scope of the Bank and therefore, more money will be needed. Apart from making loans to these different categories, there was the question of making loans in order to buy livestock as recommended by agricultural experts who came to this country like Mr. Wakefield and others, and also for the question of buying manures and even for the paying of the purchase price of land and for

repairing houses on the land itself. All these and other activities of the Bank would of course mean that the Bank would have to be provided from time to time with an increasing amount of capital. But it should be interesting to compare the extent of the amount advanced annually by the Bank to peasant cultivators, owners or occupiers or otherwise, with the amount advanced by the big Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to the proprietors of the 300 odd plantations which comprise the agriculture area of the island.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, in Barbados the ratio of small cultivators to the big land owners is very heavily weighed in favour of the latter because, as you know, there is no land settlement scheme here, and roughly about two-thirds of the entire arable acreage is divided between plantations and only one-third between small holders. So, apart from making a reasonable amount of capital available to small land owners for cultivation of their land, one of the things which incidentally any Government of Barbados would have to consider in the very near future is the possibility of making some more of this arable land available to a greater percentage of the population in order that the profits made from agriculture may be divided on a wider basis. I say that merely in passing because I do not want the Committee or the public to believe that merely because we are advancing in the vicinity of \$300,000 to small cultivators we are really doing all that we can or should on behalf of small cultivators in the island.

Another point, Sir, which has to be borne in mind is whether the total amount advanced to small cultivators for the cultivation of an acre of land is adequate. I believe that there are between 16,000 and 18,000 acres owned by peasant proprietors. I doubt very much whether the figures are available of land rented by small cultivators and I have no means at my disposal immediately to get an estimate of what is the acreage rented to small cultivators; but if, Mr. Chairman, the \$300,000 were divided among an estimated 30,000 acres, you will see, Sir, that it would mean an advance of about \$10 per acre in favour of the peasant proprietors. 1.25 p.m.

The actual figures advanced to small cultivators and to large plantation owners by the respective Banks I will deal with in a moment; but I certainly want to submit to the Committee now that the amount per acre advanced to the small cultivator is too small and bears little comparison with the amount advanced to the plantation owner. Of course, one has to bear in mind all sorts of things. It is a fact that the plantation owner by reason of his more advanced security is in a better position to repay any loan than his smaller counterpart, the peasant proprietor; to my recollection when money was advanced by the Peasants' Loan Bank annually to small peasant proprietors, the incidence of the repayment of the money was just as high as the incidence of repayment among the large plantation owners. In other words, the peasant proprietors who used to borrow money were just as honest and quick to repay the loans to the Peasants' Loan Bank as the big plantation owners were to repay their loans to the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. The Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank advanced between \$150,000 and \$200,000.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have allowed the hon. member to make the comparison which he has made in so far as the two Banks are concerned, but the details which the hon. member is now attempting to go into do not come into this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not made any comparison at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member referred to the ratio of money loaned to the Peasants' Loan Bank and you compared that with the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not made any comparison yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is permissible for the hon. member to deal with the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank in this Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Can I not show the difference in the amounts advanced by the banks.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You did that already. What I am saying is that I do not wish the hon. member to go into details in so far as the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is a question of what is permissible in a debate like this. I have not cited any figures at all. I may say that the details of the comparison may cause some dissatisfaction on the part of the peasants, because people do not know to what extent the big planters are allowed to borrow money as in the case of the small planters. I cannot conceive of any real reason why the figures should not be quoted in any Parliamentary Chamber. I have already spoken at some length, I am afraid, and viewing the matter dispassionately, I would say that any Banker or any Government would naturally want to make allowances in terms of ceilings on advances in favour of larger and greater security. As a counterpart of that, I have pointed out that the incidence of repayment of owners was just as good in the case of small peasants as in the case of the big planters, but the small peasant cultivators for whom this Resolution seeks to provide money, have even higher expenses in cultivating an acre of land than the plantation owners. The peasant pays more for labour per acre than the plantation owner because he has not got the mechanical equipment and he pays more for fertilisers because he does not buy them in large quantities—he pays more for every aspect of his holding than the big plantation owner is called upon to pay; therefore, when the Peasants' Loan Bank gives him \$100 an acre, if he is an owner, and \$70 an acre, if he is a tenant, and the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank gives \$200 an acre, that is twice as much, nearly three times as much, as is given the tenant, who is a peasant, there is a case, I submit, for an early inquiry into the ceiling amount being advanced by the Peasants' Loan Bank to the small cultivators.

I am not for a moment suggesting that the Peasants' Loan Bank or the Directors should make any advance to the peasants entirely out of proportion to their security; but bear this in mind, Mr. Chairman: by and large the price of a small holding per acre is very much more than the price of a plantation per acre. In 1937, the Disturbances Commission discovered that the average price of a plantation was £30 per acre - I am speaking of a big plantation - and today that figure would be somewhere near \$200. I want to say that the price of a small holding has increased just as much proportionately. In 1937, you could get an acre of land for £500 and today the minimum price is somewhere between £2,000 and £2,500; admittedly the security on the purchase price of an acre of peasant holding is infinitely greater than the security on an acre of plantation land based on the plantation price. I think therefore, that a case is made out for the earliest possible review of the amount being advanced by the Peasants' Loan Bank both to the proprietors and to the tenants for cultivation.

1.35 p.m.

I do not know what is the incidence of repayment among tenants. I believe it should be just as good as among owners, but if the position in this respect has given any cause for dissatisfaction, then there is at least an immediate case for review of the \$100 paid to owners to bring it more in line with the \$200 paid to the big plantation owners.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see a Resolution of this nature before us today to further the progress of the peasants and to help more and more peasants to cultivate their land. I know that it is the policy of the Government to prevent these peasants from having to go hat in hand year after year and beg the factory owners and Managers to help them with a loan to cultivate their land. I am sure that the peasants are making full use of this Bank, but they are still left in the hands of some of the factory owners by having to get their fertilisers, because inasmuch as the Banks will help the peasants to obtain manure through the stores in Bridgetown, this is what actually happens: suppose a peasant applies for \$100 to cultivate his land, and then makes application for assistance to get some manure, the cost of that manure is taken from the amount for which he has applied. In other words,

if he has applied for \$100 and the manure costs \$10, they will deduct the \$10 from the \$100 and he will only receive \$90. The majority of peasants, knowing that this is done, does not worry to seek assistance from the Bank as far as the manure is concerned; so they still have to go to the factories and procure their manure.

I know it is Government's policy to keep these people from going to factory owners, but if they want to prevent that fully, they will have to consider increasing the amount per acre. We know that a bag of manure will serve half an acre or an acre of land, and if the person is going to plant one acre of canes, they will have to consider increasing the amount of the loan even to the extent of the cost of the manure so as to help him get the manure, and when he is repaying the loan the following year for the cultivation, he will also be repaying for the manure. There are very few of them making use of the Bank as far as manure is concerned owing to this snag. We are helping them now to grow the canes, but we will have to go further and help them to reap them, because as you may have heard - because you are not representing an agricultural constituency - the peasants from Bathsheba have to send their canes as far as Warrens factory or Lemon Arbor. I know a man from St. Andrew who had to send his canes to Springhall, St. Lucy during the last crop, and the factories are doing it in such a way that the peasants have to engage all the lorries possible in the country to carry those canes, because if A-40 goes into Hayman's with one load, it cannot go back for the day; so these people have to get A-40, A-50, A-90, O-60 and all the others to get their canes reaped because to rely on one lorry, they would not be able to get their canes reaped in haste.

I feel that the time has come when Government will have to consider helping these people by buying a Sugar Factory for them, so as to prevent them from paying through their nose as far as freight is concerned. After paying for reaping they get very little, because in truth and in fact where one could pay \$1 per ton to get his canes reaped, say, at Andrews, he has to pay \$3 to send them to Vaucluse or to Warrens, which would mean an extra \$2 or \$3 per ton for freight; so you can imagine what the remainder to the peasants would be after paying for manure and labour. We are helping them in one way which is very nice, but we will have to go further and help them at least 90% if we are helping them 50% now, because having to send a lorry of canes from Bathsheba up Horsehill and then on to Warrens, the canes drop out along the road - apart from people pulling them out - and I am sure the poor owner loses no less than half ton per load over these long distances. You may have driven through the country and seen the canes along the road, as they are not as long as the plantation canes and are not loaded properly.

We have got to do something of this kind because only if we can take the peasants out of the hands of the factory owners would we be doing them any good. It is a waste of time thinking about a minimum price for canes and all that; you cannot get up to that too easily, and the only remedy for it is to put a factory at the disposal of the peasants, even if you have to put them to run it. Government is not supposed to go right away into it fully, but with competent people and with a competent manager, I am sure that the peasants will be able to run that factory. In other words, in process of time the peasants might be able to own it if it is run carefully, and I am sure it will be run carefully. We will have to go further and help these peasants, and the only way we can help them 100% - and so that there will be no grouse - will be to put a factory at their disposal.

There are a lot of abandoned factories. I do not think I should call the name of one which I know, because if I did, the particular factory by next week would be cleared off and the spot planted with canes. It is a first-class factory which would be able to reap the peasants' canes for the entire island; it would be able to reap canes from St. Lucy, St. Thomas, St. James, St. Joseph and the others, because it is practically central. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is trying to cast some asides which I know cause a lot of trouble: so I will not take him seriously. I will call the name of the factory because those people do not lend money, but even if they did and I had borrowed

some, I would still have to talk because I am not representing the money-lenders; I am representing the working-class people. (*Cheers.*) Now that particular site is Mount Wilton in St. Thomas. There is a building there which would be a first-class site, and I do not think it would cost much to buy it; the highest cost would be for machinery, and I am sure it would be able to take off the peasants' crops, because during the last strike, the peasants saw "H - E and two sticks", and if we had our own factory, while the other big boys were fighting and holding on, the little boys would be able to come through and reap their canes. I hope, Sir, that very soon a Resolution will come before us to buy some abandoned factory so as to help these peasants.

1.45 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had made it quite clear when I opened this debate that it has been the policy of the Government to increase the activities of this Bank and to extend its services. The hon. member who has just sat down would bear me out in this. From the time I entered the Ministry I have attended meetings of the Board in order that we may be able to change the policies which I thought was not in line with Government policy. So eager and humble was I to get certain things done that I condescended to go to them. I wanted to do a service. I went to them instead of asking them to come to me and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph can verify that. It has been the consistent, persistent policy of this Government to increase the services to the peasants of this country. This is one of the acts which we are now performing because of my visit to the Board. The Director of Agriculture has not set up anything; all of these things have come from the Minister and from the Government; therefore for someone to get up and say that we need to review these things in the light of what should be done, I want to say that all of these things are stages but we do not want to embarrass the peasants as such. It is all right to get up and make a flowery speech, but when money is involved, you have to put the brakes on. A peasant can use any amount of money on his land, but do you think we want to encourage him in borrowing too much to put him in trouble and when the year comes he cannot find that money to pay off the Bank? Even though they have money to do this and that today, do you know what happens? Sometimes a lot of shoes are bought and grocery bills are paid for out of this money; so, we do not want to embarrass them. We have to train them how to cultivate their land. Let me say this: peasants are not on all fours with the plantation owners. All of these peasants get money from the Bank with no collateral security. In fact, I can tell this Committee that pretty soon we are bringing a new Act down here, because as it is now, we cannot even go to the factory where a peasant takes his canes and get a guarantee for the money loaned to him on his crop. We are just trusting these people and giving them our goodwill and expect from them their goodwill; but in a business sense, we are not doing to the peasant, especially the tenant, what the big Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank is doing to the plantation owner. There are certain things which the plantation owner cannot buy with the money he borrowed from that Bank and there are Laws and Regulations as to how he must spend that money. We lend peasants this money and they can do as they like with it, and in some cases they do so.

Now, I shall tell the Committee that so far as the peasants who took advantage of the service of the Peasants' Agricultural Bank last year, there were 1,439 owners and 913 tenants making a total of 2,352 persons. The amount loaned so far in regard to cultivation was \$22,000; to purchase of livestock \$7,000; balance of purchase money, that is to repay mortgages, \$20,000; irrigation \$5,000; and loans to co-operative societies, etc., \$5,000.

Another thing which I shall make known to the Committee is this: the peasantry of this island will have to stop being individualistic and must try to work on a more co-operative line, as that is their only salvation. They have got to think co-operatively and think of the value of co-operation. It is done in the big plantations because they work co-operatively; in other words, they have their associations and they meet and discuss matters and so on; but it is hard enough to get an individual planter in Bar-

bados who is a peasant to get together with another peasant and formulate plans whereby they can save themselves money and in order that they can grow better crops and so on. I will also like to say that they also need to save themselves from some of the cheap jibes of the politicians. An hon. member of the Opposition talked of finance and that I did not give them money *ad lib* for them to spend on their land.

I am going to say this. We must help the peasants, but they must help themselves. Most of these peasants work in their spare time and a lot of them do not hire extra labour; so all this helps to boost their income. As I have said, we have no collateral or any security from them and it is a matter of faith and goodwill. Therefore, I do not think it is fair to ask us or press us to dish out to some of these peasants the same amount of money as you would lend to the plantation owner. That is not talking with sense and it cannot be done. Even in business circles, you have the position where a man goes and buys a dozen articles - and I think the hon. senior member for St. Lucy would know this - he would get them at a particular price and the man who goes and buy a gross would get them at a better price, so that you can see that the bigger the money, the more easily you obtain a loan.

Sir, this Government has nothing to be ashamed of, in that it is persistently and consistently doing something for the peasants of this colony, but you cannot rush to do for the peasants what the Sugar Agricultural Bank is doing for the established plantation owner. That cannot be achieved overnight. We have to train peasants to take care of their land and how to use it to their advantage and it is for them to find out what are the best crops they can grow. You will find that some people can plant food crops and get more out of it than canes and there are some people who can plant beans and get more money out of it by so doing.

1.55 p.m.

I speak as a planter. There are some people who could plant beans and other things and keep the cash money in their hands, but because the cane crop is chop and plant and chop and reap, they think that that is the line of least resistance. That is having its effect on the planters and the buyers in this colony. You have people who want to plant all canes, and who do not want to plant any food, but they still have to take the cash money and buy the high-priced goods from the shop. If some of the people who plant canes would plant vegetables so as to feed their families - they would be well advised to do what their ancestors used to do, that is, to put by pigeon peas and guinea corn; and so on down the line. Make no mistake about it; while we are going to raise the standard of living in this colony, we cannot do it by any magic wand; there is no magic wand when you come to dollars and cents; it is the pressure of education and administration and we are trying to educate the people in the right way until they can walk.

Sometimes we get opposition from our political opponents. It is nice to tell a man that he should have better service. Do you not think that we would like to be able to extend these services and to multiply so rapidly that even our greatest enemy would be shocked and frustrated? Can you expend on your services \$30 million when your revenue or economy is only \$17 million or \$18 million? You just cannot do it. I will put another problem to you. (Mr. WALCOTT: Not to us) I am addressing the Committee through the Chairman. We are face to face with a problem such as this; we have 15 children to feed and we have only five apples; what must we do? We have to cut them in order to get them to go around; but if you have 15 apples and only five children, then you can give them three each. I do not care whoever chooses to promise the electors this, that and the other; when we get here, we have to use the maximum which we have and become realistic; otherwise we will ruin this colony. That is a fact. We are not unmindful of our job, but we have to be practical and give the services which we have. We can go on for the time being and improve them as our resources develop. When the time comes we will do anything, because politics is a matter of strategy.

Now, Sir, I do not think I should say much more on

this matter. As I said, there are a number of people who use the facilities of this Bank; I do not want to repeat myself, because I am not a bragger. I could have said in the first instance, what I said in reply, but I will repeat that I know the plight of the people of this colony. I know the plight of the peasants and I took it upon myself to ask the Chairman of this Board to invite me to have discussions with him. He has invited me and we have had very mutual deliberations and therefore, he is always willing to fall into line with what is being done. I have invited him to my office and I think I have told him of certain suggestions which are to be implemented; therefore, it is only a matter of time and hon. members will see what this Government is doing. You can rest assured that, as long as I am the Minister of Agriculture, the community will benefit from my knowledge however limited it may be. Whatever it is, I will place it at the disposal of the people who need it. I am asking the Committee to vote for this matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is, of course, little or no necessity for me to say much more on this matter, because I think that every person of average intelligence understood what I said and appreciated the manner in which I said it. I merely want to say one or two things and the first one is this: people should realise that you cannot blanket every individual suggestion with a generalisation nor should you refer in general terms to specific issues nor should you try to confuse the facts, because you cannot defend the position you adopt. What is the sense of referring to the limited revenue of this colony in the terms of what you have to expend on the basis of social services and otherwise, when we are talking about loans which have to be paid? The two things have nothing in common.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, I should like to remind the hon. member that these funds come from the Treasury of this island and not from Loan Funds and therefore we must budget for them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a country with what is known as surplus revenues No. 1, and No. 2; its security is so good that if you need capital for loan purposes, for cultivation or for any other matter you can get it from a Bank, as we did last week with respect to housing. The point is this: when we allocate money towards Loan Funds, it is money which has to be repaid and therefore you cannot count upon it in terms of capital expenditure only. The point I am making is that the peasant cultivator has to cultivate the same acre of land more expensively than the plantation owner, and therefore every effort should be made to see that he is assisted to the same extent as the plantation owner. Nobody quarrels with a big plantation owner who borrows money from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank at 4% and takes his own profits and lends them out at 6%. Do you think that anybody is naive enough as to believe that when you make a planter a loan on a 300 - acre plantation - a loan of \$50,000 or \$60,000 - for cultivation, that that planter spends all of it on this plantation? He goes to England with his family or buys a new motor-car, and I will tell the Committee further that it is a common practice among plantation and factory owners to borrow money from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank to work their plantations and they take their own actual earnings, put them in the Solicitor's office, lend them out at 6% and pay back the Bank at 4%.
2.05 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. I think the hon. member is misleading the Committee. All of these things have to be shown in the Statement which the plantation owners submit to satisfy the Bank with regard to the loan. All those things must pass through their accounts. I think the hon. member has been a member like myself of this Board and should know the working of it and not mislead the Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What the hon. member has not told the Committee is this: I want to ask him if in any of these Statements there is any detailed account of expenditure more than a general statement for cultivating the plantation. Has he or any other member of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank had before him at any time more than a general statement of expenditure? If a man says that he

spent \$20,000, does he know whether he has spent \$16,000? Does he send all the bills for fertilisers from the Hardware Stores?

I am saying, Sir, that I have no special criticism to make of plantation owners, nor have I got to make any special defence for them. My remarks are purely inspired by this statement of his that some of the peasant proprietors may take the money from the Bank and buy shoes or clothes or pay grocery bills. It may happen, of course, that a peasant proprietor may take a little bit of the money advanced to pay his grocery bill until he sells potatoes to put it back into cultivation or, as he says he may do cultivation himself, but at the same time while we bear in mind that there is the misallocation of funds on the part of small proprietors temporarily, we must bear in mind that the big plantation owners do the same thing, and many of the new cars changed every year or two, and many of the trips to England and back are financed from loans made from the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. It is on all fours, but that is not the point at issue.

The big point at issue is the repayment, and the entire Committee will recall that I was at the utmost pains to point out that in so far as peasant proprietors were concerned, the incidence of repayment was just as good in my time - and, I believe, still is - as the incidence of repayment among the big plantation owner borrowers at the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. In the case of tenants, Mr. Chairman, the figure is three times as high. The tenant cultivator gets \$70 an acre and the plantation owner \$200 an acre. Making allowances for the fact that he has no security, that the land is not his and what not, one still has to bear in mind whether or not the disparity is too big; that is all I am saying. The fact that I began by saying that I would be the last person in here to suggest any irresponsible attitude on the part of loans to any section of the community, and that it is merely a question of going into the matter and considering it on its merits, should have influenced the member from making the remarks he made. The Government, at least not the present Government, is not the repository of all that is true, sound and safe in dealing with the affairs of the colony, but the fact remains that in so many instances they display the utmost irresponsibility, and are willing to squander irresponsibly Government funds in so many instances in certain directions, and when it comes to others, they want to tell us they are careful, they want to say they are true! In reality not only are they being unduly parsimonious, but being unmindful of the best interest of the people concerned at the time, and I am sure that when all the facts of the case are considered impartially and the matter is thoroughly gone into, you will see that there is more justification for my remarks today.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I told you a while ago that the hon. member has just been electioneering to his constituents. Reading from the Sugar Industry Bank Act, 1907, Section 9 (c) (ii), the Law specifically states that "no loan to an owner under this Act made before the first day of June in each year in respect of the agricultural year immediately following the making of such loan shall be a lien against or affect the crop to be reaped or begun to be reaped in that year except such loan be made for the purchase of artificial manure to be applied to that crop or for the payment of taxes.

(iii) It shall be the duty of the Bank to satisfy itself that any moneys lent by it prior to the first day of June in each year in respect of the agricultural year immediately following the making of such loan are expended solely in the purchase of artificial manures and the payment of taxes, and any owner who shall apply any money so lent for any purpose other than the purchase of artificial manure and the payment of taxes shall be liable to the penalty provided by section ten of this Act, as in respect of money misapplied, and such penalty may be recovered in the like manner."

Section 10 reads as follows:-

"Any owner or receiver who commits a breach of condition (b) of the preceding section shall be liable to a penalty equal to double the amount of the sum mis-

applied, to be recovered in a summary manner before a Police Magistrate on the complaint of any person, and to be paid, one half to the Bank towards repayment of the loan misapplied, and one half into the Public Treasury for the public use."

Now there are Laws which govern the activities of that Bank, and I take it that responsible people who have to do business have to see to it that their business is done in such a manner. When it comes to the matter of auditing, the hon. member gave the inference that he is an oracle, a know-all, and nobody knows anything but he.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Perhaps the hon. member will tell the Committee what remarks of mine made that implication.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member implied that he was a member of the Bank, but he was not there if he knew.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: I never said so. The hon. member referred to the Annual Report and I repeat that the Board only has a general statement.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Nevertheless, be that as it may, the fact remains that these plantations' books have to be sent to the Bank to be audited, and the vouchers have to accompany them.
2.15 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will have to ask the Hon. Minister if he has ever seen at any single time any plantation books and vouchers sent to the Directors of the Bank. Ask him if he has ever seen any vouchers or books submitted to the Directors of the Bank.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: If it is the law of the land, they have to do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not the point. What I have said is this: the Directors meet at an average of 20 times a year. He has been a Director of the Bank for several years; therefore, if I ask him to tell me the date of any meeting at which the Directors saw plantation books or the vouchers, he should be able to tell me the date of one meeting.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: It stands for a reason to know that these things do not come to the Directors but that they would go to the Secretary and the Auditors. We get a statement on the accounts, but nevertheless, it is the duty of the Secretary and the Auditors to see that the Law is complied with. It is not fair to say that. I can only say that the Law is there to guide them and they must carry out the Law and I will take people in good faith until otherwise is proved.

So far as I know, they have always tried, especially plantations owners who have Attorneys, to comply with the Law because they want to see that the money is spent in the way it should be spent because they are getting so many dollars per arable acre. Every person who owns a plantation does not manage it. There are many plantations which have Attorneys looking after them in the interest of the owners.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is nonsense.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I expect that from him. I thought I had brought a good thing in here today.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Who said it was a bad thing?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Well, you have to get your little say. The hon. member now says that it is a good thing; so he is trying to get into it too.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, can any hon. member of this Committee get up and say with any degree of conscience that I have said one single word against this measure for the whole day? All I have endeavoured to do is to point you to the direction in which I feel that the Bank can be of further use and assistance. If the Hon. Minister wants to

congratulate himself and pat himself on the back, because a few peasants more want money to borrow, let him do it. It is my duty to tell you wherever the present policy is defective and where it can be liberalised and extended in the interest of the people who are supposed to benefit from the operation of this Bank and that is all I have done.

Mr. WALCOTT: It was not my intention to enter this debate, but the Hon. Minister made some remarks which I would not allow to go like that, because in his responsible position when he makes any statement, it should be clarified. He said that one of the difficulties among the peasants was the lack of co-operation. I just want to let this Committee know that there is no point in making these general statements unless you are prepared to state what you say. Let me tell him that the economy in Barbados is not an agricultural economy. I do not know if you know the difference between a plantation economy and an agricultural economy. The economy of this place is a plantation economy, because people have to cultivate the land in Barbados, and I think the hon. junior member for St. James would understand what I mean.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member kindly address the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Chair and the members of this Committee who do not understand the difference between a plantation and agricultural economy, there is an agricultural economy in Europe and in England where they cultivate land on the basis of farmers cultivating the land and therefore, there are independent farmers having credit facilities and so on; there is no plantation economy in which some people own a plantation. There is a vast difference in having cooperatives and having a plantation. You have peasant farmers living on marginal lands owned by plantations and these are the people who find it very difficult to cooperate. Let me ask you, how many *bona fide* peasants you have in Barbados? You have this glib talk of hundreds and thousands of peasants and they would not cooperate. You have hundreds and thousands of agricultural farmers who are tenant farmers to whom you give part of the plantation to cultivate and those are the people who form the bulk of your peasant population. Wherever you have a man who has title deeds on land wishing to borrow money or where you have a man wishing to borrow money to buy land, he has to go cap in hand to some Solicitor or plantation owner to get it. Sir, if you do not understand the economic situation in which you are living, you should not make these statements. Let me tell the Hon. Minister that you never get cooperatives to flourish in an economy which is a stark mediaeval plantation economy. Barbados has one of the oldest plantation economies in the whole area. We have less peasant farmers than anywhere else.

The Hon. Minister should not make these statements. He said something of a balance of payments. That can mean nothing in Barbados because you can never hope to have a balance in payments. I would like him to take note that in his own agricultural policy, if there is one in the Department, that the very Sir John Saint has laid it down as a dictum that this sort of economy which you have is the only thing which you can make use of when it comes to any question of balance of payments.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I rise on a point of order. I said balance of trade and not balance of payments.

Mr. WALCOTT: Now, Sir, the hon. member says that he said balance of payments. Well, he is correcting that now. Anyhow, when you are talking about balance of trade, you do not talk about this within your own context because you do not have a balance of trade between yourself and yourself. The difference between imports and exports is a different matter.

You said you would like to have a policy in which peasants plant more food crops. I am saying that that is a strong statement which should not be made. I have been elected to this Chamber to pay attention to all matters which need the approval of the Legislature and if I am not prepared to pay attention to matters which come here, then I should not be prepared to ask the electorate to vote for

me. Any member who is not prepared to do that should not be prepared to ask the electorate to vote for him. I will just warn the Hon. Minister to be careful of what he says. Owing to the economy of the island, the planting of potatoes and yams cannot solve the economic problem because you have to think in terms of what is the best exportable product you have to provide you with income.

Those are the things you have to think of; otherwise, you will plant all the Island in potatoes and yams and they will remain there and get weevils and we will not be able to get anything for them.

The question that Head XXXVII - stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XLII - CONTROLS; SUBSIDIES

Head XLII - Controls, Subsidies - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, the Item under this Head falls under the Portfolio of the Hon. Leader of the House and at this stage, I am asking leave for him to deal with this Head.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: M. Chairman, this Resolution is very straightforward. Hon. members will remember that under Head XLII of the Estimates in respect of Controls and Subsidies etc., the sum of \$264,500 was voted in connection with the subsidisation of certain foodstuffs, and the amount allocated to the subsidisation of rice is \$198,000. This Resolution seeks to increase that amount by another \$84,000. The reason for that is set out in the Note to the Resolution. As hon. members will know, we import rice or the major part of it, from British Guiana, but on account of a drought in that colony last year and a part of this year, it was not possible for us to obtain our supplies of rice from British Guiana. Hence, we had to look further afield to the East to Siam and Burma, for our supplies, and we were fortunate, in co-operation with the importers, to get supplies of rice adequately for Barbados. While it is true that in some respects especially from Burma.....

(At this stage, it being now 2.30 p.m. of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and adjourned the sitting until 3 o'clock p.m.)
2.30 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. (After a pause) No hon. member being ready to discuss any questions, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

NOTICE

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am asking leave to give notice of a Resolution which I have had to change earlier in the day.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Resolution is as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House record its profound concern over the incredibly high cost of administration of the Federated West Indies which imposes an intolerable financial burden on the area;

Be it further resolved that since

- (a) the superimposition of the federal governmental structure on the unit administration presents an obstacle to efficiency and expeditiousness in the conduct of public affairs;
- (b) The West Indies Federation with a population of merely three million people and with an annual revenue of \$300 million constitutes the most expensively administered area in the world, having to maintain a Governor-General,

5 Governors, 6 Administrators, at least 5 Commissioners, and not less than 55 Ministers without portfolio

That this House respectfully request that early action be taken with a view to achievement of greater economy in administration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can only give notice of one matter.

REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no other matter under Private Members' Business, the House will now revert to Government Business.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the suspension, the House was in Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was saying just now that this increase is resultant from two factors; (1) higher freight rates have had to be paid in order to get this rice from Siam, and (2) duty has got to be paid on this rice. As you know, Sir, rice coming from British Guiana is free of duty, but from foreign sources duty has to be paid. The duty is something like \$35,000; the remainder, as I said, is for higher freight rates.

We imported something like 53,975 bags from Siam, 6,222 from Burma on which no duty is paid, and approximately 37 tons from British Guiana when we are able to get it. I do not think it is necessary to give more details. If we are to keep down the price of rice - and no doubt this Government is prepared to keep the price of rice as low as possible because it is the food which is used most frequently by people of the working class - it is necessary to increase this subsidy to keep the price at 11¢ per pint.

I beg to move that Head XLII - Controls, Subsidies - stand part.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like a little explanation. This note says that rice is subject to duty from sources other than British Guiana. This entails a higher rate of subsidy on account of the higher c.i.f. cost of rice imported from Siam and Burma, apart from the fact that rice imports from Siam are subject to import duties from which rice from British Guiana and other preferential sources is exempt. I heard the Minister say that rice from Burma is not subject to duty. Burma is an independent country like Siam; it is a Republic and not even part of the Commonwealth, and I should like to know how it is that rice from Burma is duty free and you pay duty on rice from Siam. Maybe this is something to do with the International Agreement, but it is a matter of accounting. If you add the duty and then you pay it back from the Treasury, that is a peculiar way of doing it; you are subsidising something which you are taking out to bring it back to the same price, which means that you are not really paying duty. If you are subsidising to the same amount of duty which you pay, the duty is only paid by the merchant. I should like to know why it is that Burma is treated in this exclusive manner and why rice from Siam is dutiable, when they are both independent territories.

Hon. M. E. COX: I must confess that I did not go into that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot reply in that offhand manner. It does not matter that he has not gone into it; we want him to go into it now. The Addendum says that as a result of the British Guiana Rice crop, most of the Island's rice requirements for the current financial

year have had to be imported from Siam and Burma; so he cannot say that he did not go into it. He said that the rice from Burma is duty free; so he must have gone into it to know that. The Minister should not think that I am asking him any question of a personal nature; I am asking questions on public business. If these are two independent territories, I should like to know why rice from Siam is subject to duty, while rice from Burma is duty free. We would like to know for other reasons.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the frankness of the Minister, but what he should have said is that he did not go into it and that members would get an answer next Tuesday. There is no sense pressing for an answer which is not authoritative. It is refreshing to hear him so honest on this matter, but so knowledgeable on matters which concern other members. He should have said that the member would receive an answer next Tuesday or later in this Session. I would not press him on this matter and would ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter to accept his honesty and frankness on this matter and pass it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is another aspect of the matter. I am sorry indeed that the Minister did not have time to inform himself on this wide difference, especially in view of the fact that unless I am mistaken, we understood him to say that over 53,000 bags of rice came from Siam on which we paid duty, and I think he said that about 6,000 bags come from Burma, on which we did not pay. Assuming that that is correct, would it not perhaps be more profitable to us if we took more of the Burma rice on which we are not paying duty, and perhaps less from the other? That is very important because you may find that if you did that, you would not have to pay so much subsidy. It is a very important point, and I am wondering in view of that whether we are wise perhaps in rushing this particular bit of the Resolution through.

As a matter of fact, the only possible debate you can have on this matter is the one upon which the Minister cannot inform us at the moment, because he has argued and so has the Addendum that the subsidy is necessary because of the increased duty. He disclosed to us that of the two non-Commonwealth sources, the one from which the most rice comes is the one for which the duty is levied, and on the one from which the lesser comes there is no duty. Clearly it is a matter which members ought to press, and I am sure we are justified in not coming to a decision on this matter now until the Minister has gone into it, and can inform us why it is more profitable to take more rice from Siam and less from Burma, and not the other way around. That is the whole issue; anything other than that is just secondary.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew spoke about not pressing the matter. I am not pressing anybody; it is purely a matter of commonsense. 3.15 p.m.

Here it is, we are subsidising something which is coming from Siam and Burma as far away as the Indian Ocean. What is the position? We have to subsidise this rice to a greater extent. He said that the rice coming from Siam is dearer. If that is so, you should try and get as much of the rice as you can from Burma so as to save money. You must bear in mind that when you bring rice all the way from Siam, it means that it is coming from a far country; therefore the c.i.f. cost will be high and the duty will be high; therefore, if you can get all from Burma, it would save the taxpayers some money.

The way in which we are working it is peculiar. The Control Board is paying the subsidy, but the merchants have to pay the duty in advance in order to get delivery of the rice. However, this is necessary in these circumstances for more than one reason. British Guiana has been pressing the West Indian Governments for higher prices for its rice. Because of that, the information which was asked of the Hon. Minister is very requisite. The Hon. Minister said that he was frank and honest. I am not accusing him of dishonesty. He said that frankly he did not go into that matter. What did he go into? That is the only question he has to go into because it is a question of subsidisation.

From reading the note in the Addendum, I do not think I would have known at all that the rice from Burma was also subject to duty because the note says that you have to pay a higher rate of subsidy on account of the c.i.f. cost of rice imported from Siam and Burma, apart from the fact that rice imports from Siam are subject to import duties from which rice from British Guiana and other preferential sources is exempt. We should know these facts. The point which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy raised was one which I was bearing in my mind because you have to consider, if a similar occasion occurs, what direction are you giving to the people who would be doing the importing. Are you going to allow them to import rice from the sources from which you would have to pay a higher subsidy or would only permit them to import from the source which the duty is lower? That is what it means.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I would like the Opposition to realise that if they can suggest anything by way of an improvement in any sphere that the Government will be glad to hear. The Government has sufficient knowledge that the Government can take the lead at any time. What is the point of getting up and asking, why not buy all the rice from Burma if the rice is cheaper there?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I never said that.

Hon. M. E. COX: I think the hon. senior member for St. Lucy made that statement.

Mr. TUDOR: I rise on a point of explanation. My point was, is as the Hon. Minister said that the greater quantity comes in with duty and the less quantity without, well perhaps it would be more desirable for us to get more of the non-duty rice.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is exactly what I was saying. It is a question of moving it from one point to the other. In so far as the Burma rice is concerned, it is definitely cheaper than the Siam rice, but I pointed out in my opening remarks that with the aid of the importers here, after we were notified that the rice crop in British Guiana had failed and it was not then likely that we would get rice anywhere near our requirements, these gentlemen assisted the Ministry considerably in searching for other sources from which we could get rice. We bought rice from Antwerp and America and from any place in which we could get it in order to keep the population in food. Due to the fact that we have not been purchasing our rice from these sources for many years— not since the last war — it was not possible for us to be included in the quota of those countries; therefore, we could not get a quota from any of them and we had to purchase bits here and there, as much as we could from the various places. We bought 6,000 bags from Burma and that was all that we could get.

As to the question of the difference in the cost of Siam and Burma rice, I think I am correct in saying that it is because Siam is a foreign country, the rice we imported from there was subject to duty on imports, where the rice from Burma is on a different scale. That, I think, is the answer. I must confess that I really did not go into the details of that. I just took it for granted that we did not have to pay duty on the Burma rice; therefore, it was no point worrying about that.

The question that Head XLII stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$150,292 do now pass was then put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59, NO. 21 GRASS LANDS DEVELOPMENT

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$30,000. This is a new item and as hon. members will see, it is for the purpose of grass land development. 3.25 p.m.

I think that it is a welcome policy now to be able to institute in the Department of Science and Agriculture a plan whereby we can develop what grasslands we have, not only in the Department, but in the island as well. Everybody knows that grass has something to do with cattle and you cannot feed cattle adequately unless you have proper grasslands.

Now, Sir, hon. members will recall that when I first came into this Ministry I promised most faithfully that I would see to it that the animal husbandry of this island is developed and that we would even go further afield and develop a beef industry. Well, things are now beginning to take shape and one of the first things we have to do is to provide food for these animals. The Department of Agriculture, under the able management of the Deputy Director of Agriculture, is carrying out a number of schemes and among them is one for the development of grasslands in this island.

There is a particular species of grass, which has been developed in some of the other countries such as Jamaica, known as the Pangola grass. From what we have heard of this grass, it is very high in protein. We have been told that animals can do well on it even without balanced feed or anything like that. I am not an expert, but I have to take a certain percentage of what the experts say and use my commonsense in the rest of the matter. We are not to throw away everything that the experts say; otherwise, there would not be any use in having Universities and Colleges. If we are going to discard everything that the experts tell us, why should we have the Universities, the Private Schools of learning, Technical education and analytical training? What is the use of them? I am not an expert myself to say that I know everything; I do not know everything; my education, I confess, goes on from day to day. Therefore, when I come into contact with some of the experts I like to listen and to learn. I cannot always agree with what they would say, but when you have technical people who know, you have to learn from them. Naturally, we know that some of them are only theorists and when we come into contact with them, we treat them as such. If we have given some thought to these matters, we must be guided by the experts at some time.

This Government is a little bit on the modest side. Now, this is a pilot scheme and it is one of my pet schemes. I am very happy, Mr. Chairman, to bring forward this Resolution today. I know that we are now getting somewhere where animal husbandry is concerned. We have visited the Government property at Seawell; Mr. Frampton, my Permanent Secretary, a few others and I, who are interested in agriculture have selected a certain area of land for the development of this Pangola grass in the first place, before we pass it on to the plantations. As far as I know, there are some plantation owners who are willing to fall into line with the rearing of beef, if and when we get the Dairy industry on its proper footing. I shall tell this Committee now that we anticipate the arrival of some people who are interested in the development of industries in this colony. These people are willing to come to Barbados provided we give them certain concessions and so on. We are awaiting the arrival of certain people. All of that has to do with this particular scheme; there is the Dairy industry, the rearing of cattle and perhaps we would have a sheep farm - all of these things go along with agriculture and we want to make sure that we reduce the importation of so much condensed milk and give people pasteurised milk.

We are hoping to do that; we have started on this business; but before we do all of that, we know that it is necessary to provide for these animals. As I said before, there are certain plantations who are willing to fall into line and we want to extend the services to them, so that they will plant some of this grass. When we begin this scheme, when we see that it is becoming successful - and I hope that it will be successful - we hope to make hay from this Pangola grass. A lot of the waste land at Seawell has wild grass and bush on it, and we are hoping to develop that part of the Government land in order to plant some of this Pangola grass. As I said, we may be able to turn some of it into hay according to the local demands.

Accordingly, the Addendum to this Resolution sets

out that in order to prepare this land and plant this grass, it is necessary for us to have certain items of equipment as follows:- "one Fergusson (medium) diesel tractor, one Mounted disc harrow, one chain harrow, one cambridge roller, one fertiliser distributor, one mid mounted cutter bar, one square baler and one side delivery rake." I should like to emphasize that the amount of meat which is imported into this island could be reduced and a lot of people could make a livelihood out of the rearing of cattle, provided that they can get cheap fodder and have an adequate supply of stock.

3.35 p.m.

Now this Government is very mindful that we do not send all of our money out of the country. An hon. member was trying to take me to task when I spoke about farming just now. This is not a Forum where we can discuss this question; we would have to engage on a platform to explain what we mean; it would be a matter of knowledge for knowledge and wit for wit. I made the statement in good faith and I thought he understood what I meant. I am reminded that you can match folly with knowledge. The figures before me are very plain. Last year we imported a matter of 2,206, 564 pounds of fresh meat at a cost of \$679,153; salted meat 1,055,680 pounds at a cost of \$335,450; so far this year for the first six months the figures are almost doubled especially as regards price; the cost price is much higher this year.

We intend as a Government to curtail some of this expenditure out of the island. Let the people here develop and maintain some of their industries; it calls for know-how and education along the line. So many people are trying to get away from the farm. Sometimes I talk to people in Barbados and they seem not to think that you have agriculturists in other parts of the world. As soon as a fellow goes to a secondary school for a term or two and gets a blazer, he is lost to the community. Even in his own father's land he is afraid to get his hands dirtied with a little mud. I stand here four-square to tell anybody that all of the wealth that we enjoy comes from the land, and any people who try to get away from the land are heading for chaos, disaster and perhaps disintegration. You must have an agriculturist in your community; and whether you develop it to the point where the people will work co-operatively, individually or as a plantation system, all these things must be decided on. Let us not think that working in agriculture is anything to be despised. There are a lot of idlers, and if they were in Russia where they talk about Communism, they would be hijacked and put into the field to be productive. Some people prefer to walk about and beg and pimp politically instead of getting work which they can do, and I say that they ought to be given proper employment. What is wrong with a man putting his hand in mud and seeing his plants thrive and living close to nature? I have been a planter; so when people think they can do me harm by getting me out of here, I will be living close to nature and watching my plants grow. I am an agriculturist and I would tell all those boys who are wasting their time to learn agriculture and take an active part in it. Don't the people in this island know that there are white men doing agriculture in America? Do they know that there are white men in England, in Norway and in Sweden doing agriculture? They do not think it is *infra dig* to do those things. I know some people are going to say they work on their farms, but there are those who were born to work with their hands; some were born with academic ability; so do not let us fool ourselves. Some people want their children to learn Law, but the children just cannot inculcate it; they get a pass and come back here and starve, unlike the hon. junior member for St. Andrew who is now making a place for himself.

I want to make it very emphatic that our people are going along the wrong road. A lot of the well-to-do families of this island made their wealth through agriculture, so there is nothing wrong in a little boy who has to go to school helping his father to tend his cow before he goes to school and when he comes back from school help his father pull some grass. If you try to get away from agriculture, you will bring chaos and adversity. It is unfortunate for me to say it, but nevertheless it is a fact. I am reminded of a certain incident that happened in my parish. A poor farmer had a boy whom he sent to secondary school, and one

day the sun was very hot and the man sent a labourer to his home to ask Jackie to bring him a glass-cup of water. The boy said he could not go in the hot sun and asked his father to come for it himself. There you can see that he was finished with agriculture and had turned to his books. That seems to be the philosophy of the young people in Barbados now as regards agriculture. That has nothing to do with academic training, because quite recently I heard over the radio that certain schools were vacant because the students were helping to harvest the crops. Our people are beginning to feel that to help in agriculture is something degrading, but I do not belong to that school which believes that agriculture is associated with slavery. You must have agriculture in every country, because if a country cannot feed its people, it is in for serious trouble; so I would admonish some of the younger people that when they have spare time, even though they are receiving a better education at a secondary school, they can still learn something about the land and help their parents or relatives to do a job of work. Agriculture is a hard job and sometimes a little help from a relative, a son or daughter, would ease the situation very much.

Now, Sir, we are doing these things in order to increase the income of the people. If we succeed in attracting those people who are interested in the establishment of this dairy industry, we will be able to have more stock, and more small people will be able to rear a cow or two and sell his milk; we will get more local beef and hence we will have to look for less dollars to import frozen beef. While on that now, I should also say, Sir, that as time goes on and we create all these schemes, the people will become less accustomed to the old method of using a lot of salted meat with their food.

3.45 p.m.

We are trying to develop the chicken industry too but, unfortunately, the job devolves on me to say some hard things about some of our people, and if I do not say them, I am not worth being here. Our people have the idea that although they are cooking chicken, they must still put in a pound or two of salted meat to cook with it. (Mr. WALCOTT: Yes; to season the pot.) That makes it above their spending capacity. Through it, we are taking good dollars to subsidise the Canadian and American farmer when in truth and fact we could have some nice roast chicken from here and save the 75 cents which we pay for every pound of salted meat. I know when I say that that our people will say that Garner does not want them to eat salted meat.

Sir, we have worked night and day, as well as the hon. senior member for St. Peter too, although he is not working in our direction now, over the length and breadth of this country trying to do something better for the people of this country and trying to create a spirit of brotherly love among the employing class, and we have got to the stage where we have to consolidate our position. The methods we used then, we cannot use today. We have been able to extract from the employing class some amount of consideration but we must now turn our attention on the employees themselves and teach them how to use the money which we have earned for them; therefore, I would have to get up and speak the truth. There is no harm in that you may become unpopular by so doing, but somebody has to do it.

Sir, I think I have covered every point. We need this money to buy this new item and it is due to the development in the agricultural industry. We want to produce some locally grown beef and we want to establish once and for all a proper dairy industry. I will go further and make this statement of fact. Although we expect some people to come here and set up this pasteurisation plant, I would like to let this Committee know that plans are far ahead in my department as far as this pasteurisation plant is concerned. I would like to let this Committee know that if this company which we are expecting does not come and take it over, Government intends to carry it on. We are waiting on them because I prefer private enterprise to carry it on and for many reasons which I am not going to say here now. I do want you to know that if we can get private capital to come in and establish this plant, we would welcome it, with certain safeguards; but in the absence of private capital coming in, Government is going to see to it that a milk pasteurisation plant is established here. I am hoping to announce something soon in this respect one way or the other. I hope hon.

members will see that this department is moving on and that the Government is moving on. But these things take time. We have to get the economics of them and the advice of the experts on them, as well as this, that and the other; therefore, it takes time before these things can come. I assure hon. members that this is one of the many schemes which this Agricultural Department has to offer.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the Hon. Minister began by saying that certain things were now taking place under the able management of the Deputy Director of Agriculture. Does he mean to imply by that that the Director of Agriculture is not an able man?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is trying to pull me out but I have not accused anybody. It so happens that the Deputy Director is in charge of certain matters in that Department and as such, he visits my office. He is in charge of this branch.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not trying to pull him out. I was merely trying to elucidate whether or not the Government feels that the Deputy Director is more able than the Director himself. Be that as it may, Sir, there are one or two other remarks which were made by him to which I should like to draw some attention before I refer to the Resolution itself.

Now, the Hon. Minister has been at pains to castigate the people for the lack of love of agriculture which he claims is rampant in Barbados. I want him to understand that the antithesis to agriculture in Barbados is linked to the plantation system which in itself has a historical association with the system of slavery. Unfortunately in Barbados, after emancipation in 1838 there was not the distribution of land which was common to some of the other West Indian territories like Jamaica, Grenada, Dominica and St. Lucia. In Barbados we retained the plantation and indentured labour system, so that people found themselves sentimentally hostile to the idea of working on a plantation merely because of its traditional association with indentured labour and slavery and what not. Furthermore, there is the undeniable fact that even now in 1958 after more than twelve years of an able regime there has been no additional distribution of land although with the last eight years other Labour Governments have instituted large land settlement schemes. In Jamaica, between 40,000 and 50,000 acres have been distributed and even in St. Vincent large estates have been bought and made available to the public. As you are aware, the basic cause of the awakening interest in agriculture in the West Indian colonies like Puerto Rico is the fact that although there has been no distribution of land as such, yet still there has been the institution of what is known as co-operatives on private farms run by Government sponsored agencies in the interest of the people who work on them.

3.55 p.m.

The people who work in Puerto Rico on the proportionate profit farms not only get their wages, but they share in the profit of the farms. The profit, instead of going into the hands of the big landowner at the end of the year, is divided among the 3,000 or 4,000 workers who have produced it. In my opinion, we are not going to awaken more interest in agriculture in Barbados until, in some way or other, we make more of the land available to the people themselves, or establish a certain system by means of which some of the profit from the land which the people cultivate will go into their own pockets. The peasants who work land in Barbados are hard workers; the average peasant is in his land from about 5.30 a.m. until 7 p.m. He lives so as to cultivate his land, and the more landowners you get, the more will be the love for land.

Before we go any further, Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the Hon. Minister's remarks about poultry raising since it is entirely germane to this Resolution. All of us decry the fact that large quantities of frozen chicken have to be imported into this island annually, and certainly steps should be taken to prevent that. But the Government

of this island is famous for paying lip service to these questions, for merely scratching the surface of, and raising a big hullabaloo about things, and expecting miracles to follow. In certain of the other West Indian islands, the Government stepped in years ago -- about seven, eight, nine or ten years ago -- and brought out poultry experts and took certain other definite steps to increase the production of poultry. Some time ago, in the hope of getting this Government to take similar action, I tabled an Address in this House as follows:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House desire to point out the economic desirability and necessity for an expansion in the local poultry industry with a view to -

- (a) providing additional employment opportunities,
- (b) combating protein deficiencies in diet,
- (c) eliminating imports of poultry and eggs (more especially from hard currency areas),
- (d) assisting in the establishment of another industry-manufacture of mattresses and pillows from feather.

2. The House accordingly suggest that the Government should provide a sum of not less than \$10,000, for free distribution, to appropriate persons, over a specified period, of day-old Rhode Island Red and other chicks from U.K. and elsewhere.

In other words, I asked the Government to allocate merely \$10,000 from any source it liked, to distribute their own Rhode Island Red and other good breed of poultry free to people of this Island who are interested in poultry rearing. You should not at all be surprised, Mr. Chairman, to hear that even a little Island like St. Lucia is now doing that. The Agricultural Department in St. Lucia imports Rhode Island Red or other good breed of chicks one day old and distributes them free of cost to people who want to expand the poultry rearing industry in the Island. I think it was Messrs H. Jason Jones & Co. Ltd., agents for "Purina" Feeds, who, some time ago, imported a number of young chicks for free distribution and from what I have read in the newspaper, there was a tremendous popular interest in this free distribution. Even that, Mr. Chairman, has not inspired the Government to go and do likewise; but we are supposed to take them seriously when they say that they are interested in the expansion of poultry production. The way to demonstrate this interest is by taking some practical step, not merely by paying lip service to the question. It is not too late, nor is it beyond the capacity of this Island even now to allocate a certain amount of money for this purpose.

With regard to these proposals, I must confess to a certain amount of scepticism, and I sincerely hope that the Department of Agriculture has really conducted successful experiments with regard to the production of this Pangola grass. About eight years ago, the Department was very enthusiastic about the cultivation of Guatemala grass. Somebody discovered that this grass was rich in protein, in milk production and what not, and the edict went out that there should be a large-scale production of Guatemala grass. The result was that every dairy keeper and every person interested in fodder began an extensive cultivation of this Guatemala grass. I, myself, fell for the propaganda and I remember planting about five or six acres in Guatemala grass, and in every three years you had to dig up the stools and replant them irrespective of irrigation.

Now, the clamour is for Pangola grass. I am not any expert in this matter, but I sincerely hope that you do not repeat the experience with Pangola grass as we had with Guatemala grass. You cannot really decide on the success of any particular type of grass fodder in three or four years; the particular kind of grass which may be suitable to the climate of Jamaica may be entirely unsuitable to Barbados. I am told that one of the advantages of Pangola grass is that you have not got to reap it; the animals can graze it without doing any danger to the stools, which, of course does not apply to many other local grasses. In the case of other grasses, you have to cut them and put them before the animals because the grazing destroys the roots.

3.45 p.m.

I see from the Resolution, Sir, that we are to spend \$30,000 on this grassland development in Pangola pastures. It is proposed to utilise certain areas of Government land to investigate the techniques of the establishment and cultivation of Pangola grass as well as the economics of grassland cultivation. The Government now has under consideration schemes for the development of the dairy industry, the rearing of beef cattle and the establishment of a sheep farm. If I am to understand that this is an experiment, it is fairly expensive experiment. Unless certain ground has already been covered, unless the Department and the Minister are fairly satisfied that Pangola grass will provide fodder more suitable for cultivation in Barbados, \$30,000 is a lot of money to expend. The Government itself is not sure that this scheme will be a success, and certainly, Sir, you do not need \$30,000 for an experiment in fodder. Government has several Agricultural Stations with irrigation; the Pine itself is well irrigated in certain parts and there is also irrigation at Codrington. Experimental plots should be cultivated and the results carefully examined before any large scale expenditure is undertaken.

As a matter of fact, Sir, if you go a little further back than eight years ago, in the time of Mr. Halcrow, you will discover that there was in his time an experiment with a grass beside Pangola, which apparently was also a failure. These experiments must be undertaken, but their cost should be kept within certain reasonable and practical limits. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in the particular situation of the dairy industry in Barbados, if we really want to improve the dairy industry, experimentation with fodder grass at this stage is the wrong line on which to begin. That is my opinion and I am entitled to it. I am not questioning the theories of any experts, nor am I proclaiming that in my opinion the Government is necessarily wrong but I am submitting my own humble opinion that this experiment at this stage is not the most essential prerequisite to an expansion in the dairy industry.

In 1948 we got a grant from C.D. & W. of £30,000 to establish a Pasteurisation Plant and Creamery. After investigation of agricultural potential and recommendations by experts like Wakefield and Stockdale and the like, we got £30,000 from C.D. & W., and not one single official connected with C.D. & W. would have recommended one shilling for Barbados for a Pasteurisation Plant and Creamery, for at the time we were so lacking in fodder we could not support it.

The Government itself brought down a Mr. Wills shortly after who is an expert in dairy industry, and they sent him up to Jamaica to examine some pasteurisation equipment which was then for sale in Jamaica, and Wills came back and reported very favourably on the equipment up there. He was here for six or eight months doing nothing and every time he sent a memo to the Executive asking for some action on his recommendation to buy the Jamaican plant, he got no reply, and then so far as I remember, he took a job in Brazil and went off there, and the scheme for erecting a Pasteurisation Plant at Lancaster fell through.

Around the same time, Mr. Chairman, we got another grant from C.D. & W. for the erection of a Livestock Station at the Pine. I do not remember off-hand what was the amount of that grant for the erection of the Livestock Station, but I know the cost was somewhere around \$1 1/4 million, and that Livestock Station was supposed to run in conjunction with the Pasteurisation Plant and Creamery, and the service which was going to be offered throughout the island for stiring animals of high milk producing quality was supposed, Mr. Chairman, to lay the basis for providing a sufficiently large number of cows of high milk-producing content within the island. All these things were to happen ten or twelve years ago; we were to erect a plant with C.D. & W. Funds, and at the Pine and other Agricultural Stations, we were to produce fodder under irrigation to support the dairy industry.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Chairman, a few years after that, there was presented on the floor of this House proposals for a Pasteurisation Plant which was passed here and thrown out by the Other Place. On none of these occasions in the past, Mr. Chairman, was it felt that a \$30,000 experiment on the production of fodder grass was an essential prerequisite to the establishment or expansion of

the dairy industry, and therefore I feel justified in saying today that while on the one hand it may be highly commendable to experiment and eventually to discover what types of fodder grass are best suitable to Barbados and our climatic conditions, on the other hand if you want to expand the dairy industry in the island, the immediate item for expenditure is a Pasteurisation Plant and a Creamery. The dairy industry in this colony is dwindling.

3.55 p.m.

In 1948 or a few years before when Mr. Wills was here or in 1946 when Mr. Wakefield made his first survey of the agriculture potential in Barbados, we had in the island more than 5,000 milch cows. Today, we have not got much more than half of that number and only a week ago, I understand that what is perhaps the biggest dairy in Barbados - the Bulkeley Dairy - had either been sold out or closed down or about to be sold out or closed down because of the difficulties in production and distribution of milk. There are only about five, or may be six, dairies of any consequence in the Island today and there is not one of them which is not struggling to continue under the most difficult conditions. In one or two cases - in the case of Bulkeley and Dayrells - they are being run merely as adjuncts to plantations because they provide a certain amount of manure and because they provide the means of disposing of the fodder of the estate and what not. In the case of the third, which dairy is Mr. Springer's Dairy in Black Rock, that is run in conjunction with his butcher's stall at the Public Market and I am sure he would have closed it down long ago because of these same obstacles and general difficulties.

We need greater milk consumption. The consumption of milk in Barbados, considering the value of milk as a food, should be around anything like ten million gallons a year if every person of the population is to have what the experts regard as the basic milk requirement daily. At the moment, the consumption is less than two million gallons a year. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture although he referred to the figures of imports of fresh meat in Barbados, either by error or by design refrained from referring to the milk imports which I can assure him are in the vicinity of two million dollars a year; and if, as he says, we are basically an agricultural community, there is no reason why we should be importing around two million dollars a year in milk.

Now, I know, Mr. Chairman, that more than one person has been knocking at the door of the Government within recent time with a view to establishing a pasteurisation plant and creamery in Barbados. I spoke myself to some Venezuelans about a year ago who were interested in the matter.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, if the hon. member had spoken to anybody, they have made no approach to the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not yet finished. I know that this year there were certain Venezuelans here who were busily scouring the island looking for a suitable plantation to buy on which to rear their own herd for milk production, and it is common knowledge in Bridgetown that Purina Limited had been knocking at the doors of the Government for the longest possible time with a view of establishing a plant like that here. Some years ago, the Editor of the Jamaica "Gleaner", Mr. Theodore Sealy, said to me that the establishment in Jamaica by Nestfield of a milk condensary in his opinion had done more for the economy of Jamaica than the efforts of both political parties combined, because there was no underestimating the tremendous advantage to the economy of Jamaica by its enabling the average landowners or those who were not landowners to have an animal or two and to be sure of an easy and remunerative disposal of their milk produce. Many an idle and unemployed man and agriculturist, as the Hon. Minister claims, who plants cane for sugar, would be more willing to divert his energies and attention to milk production if he were sure that he could dispose of all the milk he produced. Therefore, Sir, I do not think that any hon. member in this Chamber really fully appreciates what it would mean to the economy of Barbados if the Government instead of fooling around with this issue, or instead of keeping people knocking at their doors, would get down

to business and do something in this matter. I have seen myself some of the propositions which people who are interested in this matter have put up, and what they were considering should be asked for before they invested their capital in this matter.

I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, to be quite candid with the Committee, while I personally welcome foreign investment in Barbados, naturally, I prefer if the investors can be obtained locally in this venture because if we can avoid it, we do not want the profits from this investment of necessity to have to flow out of the country. In a matter of this sort, which is neither beyond the business capacity nor the ability, I believe, of the Government, there is no reason why we should allow foreign investment to reap the profits which are there to be made.

4.05 p.m.

The milk-producing service is almost a public utility service and in the absence, of course, of investment either by the Government or from outsiders - may be under the conditions which they want to impose - I believe that the Government could best demonstrate its interest in this matter by reverting to the proposal which was presented to this Chamber and passed here and thrown out by the Other Place; because I doubt whether the Other Place would again dare to dispose of it so summarily and because I believe that the high profits to be made from outside should be made in Barbados. There is no reason why any Venezuelan should make money out of the milk which we drink in Barbados; there is no reason why our cows should be fed with our fodder and the profits therefrom go into the pockets of any foreign investor. If we import \$2 million worth in milk, the milk purchased represents a very considerable part of the national income; and if, at the moment, the profits of this \$2 million go abroad, there is no reason why we should continue to do that. Therefore, although the Government is to be censured and strongly condemned for its delay - its unjustifiable delay - in dealing with its obligations, and what not, in the final analysis, we have the Lancaster Factory still being there and it is not being used for its original purpose although we may have to revert to it if these ominous war clouds break; but it does seem to me that a Pasteurisation Plant and Creamery should be set up, if the Government likes, under its own sponsorship and with local dairy interests.

I say that some of the biggest dairy interests in this colony today are quite willing and eager to assist in the financing of a concern like this, and it is for the Government to get on with the job. We may have to welcome foreign investment in the field which requires technical skill and know-how which we do not possess; but we are not in need of the financial know-how in the field of milk production. I sincerely hope that nobody in this island believes that unless and until we conduct this \$30,000 experiment into this Pangola grass scheme, we cannot embark on a proper milk production scheme. It is farcical even to imply or suggest that. There are large acres of grassland in this country commonly known as sour grass; and, furthermore, if, as has been suggested here today, they have selected an area for this scheme at Seawell, I have to question the experts who have suggested it. Seawell is not a suitable area for this experiment; it is one of the lowest rainfall areas in the island, it is subject to sea blasts and it certainly does not possess the soil on which you or I would experiment in any agricultural matter. The place for this experiment is more a place like the Pine or Waterford, and if the experiment succeeds we can start it all over the island.

I am of the considered opinion that a matter of experimentation on food production at this particular time and in the circumstances should be considered as a necessary experiment being ancillary to an extensive dairy expansion and what not; but it should not be regarded either by the Government or by agricultural experts as something of which we must be absolutely sure before we can go further into the economics or into the technique of dairy expansion. I submit that all of these schemes which I have sought to put before you in evidence, they actually saw the light of day entirely without prejudice to the availability of fodder. I submit that if that is the case, apparently, instead

of going forward in 1958 we are treading our footsteps backward.

There is one further point I would like to make while I am on this question of fodder. In my opinion fodder is indispensibly bound up with the question of irrigation. It would be lunacy, Mr. Chairman, for a dairyman to think in terms of starting a dairy without fodder being produced other than by irrigation.

4.15 p.m.

Last year was a case in point when for months on end we had no rain. A man with a dairy must be assured of a permanent supply of fodder, and that can only be assured either by having his dairy in a high rainfall area - and even that of course is a risk, because there may be abnormal years - or by irrigation, and therefore the Government should well be advised in considering the establishment of fodder areas either, apparently as they believe, as indispensable prerequisites to dairying or even as an ancillary. They should well be advised to consider the Report of Mr. Roddam on large scale irrigation in the St. Philip, Christ Church, St. James, St. Peter and St. Lucy areas - the eastern part of St. Philip, Christ Church from Chancery Lane to Oistin, the low coastal area in St. Peter and St. Lucy and parts of St. James. There is an abundance of sheet water because Barbados, as you know, is blessed beyond comparison with the other islands with regard to water; water is available for large scale irrigation without interfering with that for domestic use, and I doubt if all of us appreciate the abundance of our water supply. In the prolonged drought last year, people were still watering their gardens from domestic taps, and Jamaica with the same drought was beginning to import water from Florida by steamer. Although we had not had rain for months, there was no order from the Water Works Department to stop watering gardens from domestic taps, because the supply of water was still there, and there was no cause for concern in the way Jamaica, Antigua or some of the other islands suffered in times of drought.

Both for fodder as well as for the diversification of agriculture, the Government should begin to pay some attention to the Roddam Report and to think in terms of implementing it. Reference has been made so far to fresh meat and dairy fodder, but hon. members must be aware of the situation with regard to fresh vegetables. The Federation itself is a heavily importing area in fresh vegetables; we import something like \$2 million a year in the ten federated islands of fresh vegetables alone, and in Barbados, there is no reason why we should import carrots and beets in cans from places like South Africa where we cannot put our little finger, much less our whole body. Since the days of Mr. Halcrow, there has been no officer attached to the Agricultural Department sufficiently interested in the question of vegetable production in Barbados. We have a potential market for millions of dollars in fresh vegetables. Trinidad and British Guiana depend to a considerable extent on Holland for six months in the year for all their carrots, beets and what not. In British Guiana the other day, I saw a little experiment with a project for growing vegetables in water, but even that cannot begin to satisfy the demand for vegetables in British Guiana, and it seems to me, Sir, that with a little imagination and a little energy on the part of the Agricultural Department and its officers, much could be done to make the country more self-supporting in fresh vegetables. There is a \$10 million market in Puerto Rico for a simple think like beans alone, and the Government apparently is at long last beginning to appreciate the necessity for agricultural diversification both from the point of view of making the country more self-supporting in foodstuff, milk and what not, and also from the point of view of providing employment.

I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that nothing will more repay their efforts and energy that closer attention to this matter. We all share the concern of the hon. member over the enormous expenditure annually with imported foodstuffs, a great deal of which could be produced locally without harm, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter seems to be apprehensive, to the national economy; and that is to say, since it takes a smaller area of land today with increased agricultural methods to produce our quota and even more in sugar production, it means automatically

that there is more land left for cultivation under appropriate conditions of foodstuffs and vegetables.

Finally, Sir, since this matter before us is specifically related to the dairying and animal industry, I sincerely hope that the Government will reconsider the material submitted to them by the agricultural experts with regard to this Pangola experiment to see whether or not a smaller scale experiment would not be justified in view of experience with other grasses, and pay some attention to the question of making agricultural productivity in the country less dependent on rainfall by tapping for irrigational purposes some of the available sources of water supply in Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister was in a very good mood today and was very agreeable to members as a whole. We hope that will continue even after we go on recess and come back.

Now this is a very good scheme in itself and one which I would like to see put into practice, but the Hon. Minister made some general remarks. I think it is good that in this Session we can have what can be regarded not as an academic debate but an intellectual exercise on his pronouncements. I was very glad to hear him say that he regards each day as another day in which he can learn something, and I hope he will pass on that sentiment to the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour on his immediate right, and that he should not think that a school house is the end of knowledge and therefore you cannot imbibe anything elsewhere.

4.25 p.m.

The Hon. Minister spoke about the eating habits of our people and you will have to bear in mind this. You have to view that against the background of plantation slavery. When you begin from there, you will have a better assessment of the habits of our people towards work. I have to speak to employers about work and I have made a study of white people working in Europe and people working in the West Indies; and it is interesting to note that the Africans - I do not mean the people in the West Indies - have never grown up in any "money economy" countries; therefore working for wages with them is not the same as a man working for wages in Europe. Similarly in Barbados where the average working man or mass of people have to work, work is not regarded as a matter of providing one's self with employment, because work was bound up with punishment in the days of slavery. When you were not punished, you were free not to work; and when you were punished, you had to work. The whole concept to agricultural work is that you are driven to a task because it was, so to speak, a punishment. These facts are based on plantation slavery; therefore, when the Hon. Minister speaks of the dislike by people to agriculture, it is not a dislike of agriculture, but the mental association with something which means degradation to people. Nobody who goes to a secondary school and gets anywhere in his studies would wish to study agriculture as such. The people of this community are rather given to going in for a profession which would make them independent of being a job earner. Because the plantation system dominated the economics of the Island, they know that anyone who takes agriculture as his profession must of necessity come back and look for a job with a man who controls a plantation and knowing the conditions which prevail, such a man would prefer to be a lawyer because he knows that he would be free to go as he likes. Hon. members must bear in mind that the dislike of the people towards agriculture is nothing which we have created; it is because of the economic system under which we were born.

I need not remind the Hon. Minister of Agriculture that Barbados is a classic example of the plantation system. I do not have to call names but there is a case of a comparatively young man who has been given notice to quit work after spending 32 years on a plantation. They told him that he must go and look for another job. This man was in an executive position but because he is a job earner, he was given notice to quit work.

I know that the Hon. Minister does not mean anything wrong when he said that he would like to see greater attention being paid to agriculture from the point of view of the production aspect and because of what it means to the

growth of the country. I agree with him. We would like to remove the stigma not at the lowest level but at the highest level; but he must bear in mind very few people with a technical or secondary education can find avenues in agriculture to give them the security which would make them the men they yearn to be. When a young man goes to work on a plantation, he goes there generally as an overseer; and if he is unfortunate to be of a pigmentation looking like me, he will see the devil to rise higher than an overseer. That is something which has been the sort of preserve for those of a different pigmentation from mine and you have the mass of people in this country looking like me. Can you ask those who come from the middle class and have a better opportunity of education to go in for agriculture? They are not going to work in that field. Let us be realistic about the avenues which our people would like for employment. It is a fact that the average boy would not like to go into the field of agriculture because the plantation system has failed to provide what the mass of people would like it to provide for them. The poverty in this country is part and parcel of the plantation system.

The Hon. Minister referred to the eating habits of our people and I have said all that to let him understand the reason. He appears to be facetious of the Barbadian habits of eating when it comes to "seasoning the pot" but it is part of the slave conditions under which our fore parents lived. When they killed a pig, there were no other means of putting it up to keep than by salting it and putting it in a jar; therefore we have grown up with the traditional idea of cooking food with salted meat. I do not think that the Hon. Minister is unaware that even up to this day, the average agricultural worker does what is called seasoning the pot and he does not buy any other meat but salted meat. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: That is not so.) That is the only meat he eats. Do not tell me that is not true because I have made it part of my business to visit these people. The money which these people earn or have during the out-of-crop period cannot give them a proper meal and the only meat which they can afford to cook with is salted meat. Do not tell me that is not true. If you tell me so, you do not live in Barbados. That is true as John III, 16. The average Barbadian uses salted meat because it is the traditional method of cooking food. I happen to be born in this island of people who cooked food by salting the pot.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, lest I be misunderstood, I just wish to say this because the hon. member is putting it as if I am unaware of what is happening in Barbados. I said that although some agricultural labourers were having a chicken dinner, they were still putting a quantity of salted meat in the pot when they did not need to do it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am a fairly quick speaker but I like my thoughts to be not as quick as my tongue. I am explaining the background of the eating habits of our people. I want to say that you cannot change the eating habits in one week. You cannot change your eating habits as you change your jacket or your shirt. That is part of your background tradition. It is just as some of our people whom we meet on mornings telling you: "I have not had my tea yet." Do you know what he means when he tells you that? He means that he has not yet had his tea, coffee, cocoa, or anything. He means that he has not yet had anything warm in his stomach. He does not mean a Ju-C. That is a part of the eating habits of this community. If you wish to gradually change the eating habits of the Barbadians, you can only change it by the economic rule. The Hon. Minister went to the U.S.A. many years ago. I am sure that the eating habits of the people in the U.S.A. in 1920 were far different from what it is now.

4.35 p.m.

The eating habits in the United States in 1920 were as different from today as it is from the East to the West; the position was such that the average American did not have the means at his disposal to provide him with the type of food which he now eats. The habits of the Americans have changed in such wise that they are about the best in the world today. People are subjected to the traditional habit of eating too much salt; it is the tendency in Barbados to use too much salt, which is not good for us. The consumption of salt is such that people cannot drink their

coffee unless they put salt in it, but when they go somewhere else and people give them coffee without salt, then they begin to get into the habit of drinking coffee without salt. If you are changing bad eating habits, bad, not only to health, but also to the economic conditions, that is the best thing you can do. The average working-man eats as a matter of bulk more than the human system would need to carry, but he feels good when he has finished eating it. When you come to this scheme, I am one of those who agree with any aspect of industrial development, although I may tell the Hon. Minister that if he makes a careful analysis of the things which have taken place in his Ministry - and in passing I would like to ask him what has become of the pig-breeding scheme; how is it getting on? I do not know if it is working satisfactorily or not, because I do not hear anything about it.

The Hon. Minister will find that a lot of these things can be regarded as factual, and he should be paying attention to such things. These *ad hoc* methods of dealing with matters are due to the fact that we are afraid of the plantation barriers which still exist and this country is still on the basis on which some people would like to run it. Any scheme which impinges on the agricultural policy of the Island is one in connection with which the Government must take a very bold step. The Creamery, which ought to have been established at the Pine, had the blessing of all the experts. Every expert was in favour of it; yet there is no milk scheme today. There were many abortive attempts made to get the milk scheme started. If you set about this development without getting the views of people, you will not get what can be regarded as mass public opinion which forces the community into action along a certain line. I am satisfied with what the Hon. Minister said earlier today in respect of the organisation of the plantation owners in this Island; they are so strong an organisation that I would have to refer to them in the way in which reference was made in Laski's book on Trade Unions in which he made reference to what President Roosevelt said in the United States of America, that when any private sector becomes so powerful that it challenges the very state, then it is time for people to call a halt. The position in Barbados today is that the agriculturalists are so strong an organisation, that they challenge the State itself in any economic development which the State proposes to carry out, and democracy is in danger when you get a state of affairs like that. The experts say that a Creamery should be established in Barbados, but the agriculturists decide that they would not co-operate and that scheme has not yet seen the light of day.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order. During my time as a Minister, I have found that they are willing and ready to co-operate.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, Sir, the hiatus between the former Minister of Agriculture and the present Minister taking on the Ministry might have been a period of 24 hours. The Hon. Minister has not told us today that the Creamery is something which can function; can that be done without the co-operation of the agriculturists today? When you have that state of affairs as it is, when you do not have co-operation among these people - you cannot run any Government on the basis of non co-operation where certain people dictate the economic life of the people. That is why I said that the Hon. Minister should not chide the community too much for part of what we have grown to see.

We feel that the plight of the workers in Barbados is not a happy one. Nobody wants to go cap in hand to any Manager and put his future in that Manager's hand. The people who have an inclination to study agriculture do not want to go in for it, because it does not provide the necessary future. I should like to tell the hon. member this, and I want what I say to be fully understood - I do not believe in any type of dictatorship. I despise the dictatorship of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie or the one in the middle. What I am prepared to say is that the Russian experiment in its industrial revolution has given the world some knowledge in so far as the proletariat has anything to do with the productive force in the country in which he lives; that is something of which we should make a careful study.

4.45 p.m.

Whether we believe in their philosophy or ideology, the Russian experiment as regards developing a country is

something that we should watch. There is no country in this century which has made the development which the Russians have made; so let us bear that in mind. You use the good things in a country and the bad ones you do not use. I hope I am not mistaken when I say that; but even if I am mistaken, I do not have to apologise to anybody, because I have very few friends, and apart from my constituents I have no Party bosses to whom to say I did not mean it this way, I meant it that way. We are glad that what can happen in Russia from the point of view of dictatorship cannot take place here. What we would like to see is the transformation of the thinking of people, because in a country where the proletariat is in power, it means that the outlook of the people is re-orientated. The hon. member cannot expect a society like Barbados in which capitalism is still the greatest economic force to have the same outlook.

You cannot expect in a stark capitalist society which in some respects is more capitalistic in its outlook than Britain ruled by a Conservative Government - because the pressure of the Labour Government and the Liberal Government forces the Conservative Government not to change certain policies which they have laid down - the same things, in a community like this where the plantations are owned by a few who dictate the economic life of the people. You can see this by the amount of people who go to work on plantations, and you can see it through the houses they live in. How do you expect their eating habits to change when they are still working under those conditions which do not border on anything we are doing now? I say that so that the hon. member may not believe that we are going to change. He lives in a rural area, and I would ask him when he is going home or coming from it tomorrow to look into the area and see the answer to these problems and why people do not like the land, because those who like the land are forced after three hundred years still to live in an 18' x 10' in order to eke out an existence. There is nothing edifying about that.

I agree with the hon. member when he seeks to improve the industrial cake, so to speak, so that we can get more from it. I am a believer in that, and I go further. When I spoke about the agricultural and plantation economy, what I meant was that we are today forced in these underdeveloped and backward territories to keep the agricultural methods of the agricultural and plantation economy where there were different backgrounds and outlooks. We have to use all the mechanical methods that they used when a man and his daughters and sons are working on a farm; we do that because we find that the old hoe and fork method cannot get the best out of the land, and the pressure of the population on the land is not the same. If you take a place like Europe, there is winter to contend with, and a man with his daughters and sons have to cultivate the land on mobile units because there is a limited time in which you must get in the crops and you must do it speedily by mechanical power in order to get the best from the land. When you come to this area in which slavery has been the background and where there are plenty of people like stones on a seashore and they are just washing up, if you use the same methods, the net result is not the same. If you make a serious study of it, you will see it. I will tell the hon. member for St. Philip that my note of reservation is that the pressure of population on the land in Barbados is something which you cannot ignore, and you cannot check it by any method other than economic methods, because when you put more money at a man's disposal, he will get the better things in life; more things are opened up to him; but if you keep him in the same dirt, none of the negative methods on this question will ever solve themselves. That is why I am in agreement with any aspect of industrial development, and as this is agricultural development, I feel that the experiment which you are carrying out is something I would not despise.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip made a point on which it would be necessary for me to make a slight comment, and it is with respect to carrying out this investigation as against some of the others you have had. I agree with him that some of the experiments which we have carried out already have not proved fruitful, and on the face of it this is likely to prove expensive, but why I would grant the Government the right and privilege of

carrying this out is because if you do not carry this out, then they are likely to say you did not give the Government the opportunity to carry out this scheme which they stated was a scheme aimed at industrial development, and there is something in this Addendum which I am forced to read in order to find out what they mean by it. It reads as follows:- "The Government now has under consideration schemes for the development of the dairy industry, the rearing of beef cattle and the establishment of a sheep farm." What I should like to tell the hon. member is that I do not go for these things unless you are prepared to bring statistics. I am in favour of industrial development, but I am brutal when it comes to bringing figures and just leaving them there. It is of little point to me to tell me that you import \$X million of beef, milk, eggs and any other dairy product and that you propose to do A, B or C, and then cannot bring me the statistics to say how much grassland is available to you; even if the scheme works, what would be the amount that would accrue from the grassland?

No matter what the expert has said, you cannot produce meat in Barbados to accommodate the population unless you stop growing canes. I am making that dogmatic statement. You import beef dairy milk and other things; but the people who produce meat in this island are not plantation owners. The hon. member said he will make plantations do it, but let us get down to this analysis.

An acre of land has a value. Seven years ago I asked that question when I debated this question for academic purposes. One expert told me that there was not enough pastureland to supply you with the fodder to feed the kind of cattle and to produce the milk which the hon. member spoke of, because you have to produce that milk economically.
4.55 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I cannot allow the debate to go on like this when the hon. member is misquoting me. My words were these. This would serve as a means of reducing the importation of meat from abroad and thus establish a saving in hard currency. I can be just as ruthless and brutal as any fool but I will not be the fool; I will be decent and refined. I am called to a higher position.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister cannot make references to me like that. He is not in that invidious position. I see the Clerk moves around to you or to the Speaker whenever debates are going on. I have nothing to offer him but if he cannot move around to both sides, he had better keep quiet. The Hon. Minister rose on a point of order. I was not making reference to him at all. He was not listening to the debate. The hon. junior member for St. James left his seat and went to him and gave him some advice and then he gets up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As I understand the Hon. Minister of Agriculture when he rose on a point of order, he was making no reference to you as both ruthless and brutal. It did not strike me so.

Mr. WALCOTT: He rose on a point of order to correct something I was saying. Then he said that he was called to a higher position. I hope one of these days I would be called to a higher position but not the position which he is talking about because I am a man who believes in God. Anybody calling me to a higher position down here does not make me good. I specifically said that I did not agree with the hon. senior member for St. Philip and if the Hon. Minister was listening to the debates, he would have known what that hon. member said as regards milk production. I said that before I entered this Chamber I had a discussion with experts on this matter and was told that the pasture land available to Barbados could not give you the amount of grasslands even if you cultivated it to give you anything to speak of as regards a milk production.

The Hon. Minister rose on a point of order. It has been the habit of members of the Government for some time to feel that they are insulted. If he considers me to be a fool, I accept that. I will say this. When it comes to dealing with this matter, I have sufficient self-confidence

to know if I am wise. What I will say as regards this matter is that an analysis must be taken of these things. If you say that we are importing two million dollars in dairy products, you have to consider what you propose to do as regards how much grasslands you have, what is the scheme which has been put before you, and what it would be in so far as its economic content is concerned. The reason why I say that, Mr. Chairman, is because even countries with plenty of grasslands cannot be self-sufficient to the extent that they do not have to import milk products. In any scheme that aims at industrialisation, and more so a scheme in which you do not go in for industrialisation on the basis of your plant and machinery but on the basis of your land productivity, you should be in a position to see if you can get more out of it than the full resources which you are now getting and, of course, if you can get more out of it by this method, nobody would object to what you are doing. But I have made my analysis purely on what some of the experts have said. Some of the experts in Barbados on this matter have said - and my advice comes from one of the highest sources - that in so far as cultivation is concerned, in making an assessment of any economic project with land as against the production of sugar cane, you have to consider if an acre of land planted in sugar cane from the value which we get for it will not be as good as what you will get from this project. The question is: is it better to plant an acre of land in sugar cane with the value which we are getting from it than to turn it into grassland, therefore gaining more milk production for your people but losing some of your national economy, therefore lowering your national economy? It means this. If from planting sugar, you are worth \$40 million and therefore you have to spend \$2,000,000 on something you have to import, is it better to have the product worth you \$40 million and spend two million dollars on importing that product or is it better to reduce that product which you have by eight million dollars to prevent you from importing the other product? I think if you have this milk processing scheme in Barbados and by it you have all the milk flowing and you are selling it - you are not giving it away - but there is not enough money available in Barbados for the people to buy it owing to your reduced economy, it would be better if you have to find a market outside of Barbados to buy milk and keep your economy up to the highest level.

If I may give you an example of that, Mr. Chairman, the average agricultural worker or the average poor man cannot afford to eat what he produces. He would grow a big sheep or goat, or would keep fowls but he cannot afford to eat them; he has to sell the eggs which he gets and he has to turn the sheep or the goat in money to buy shoes or anything like that owing to his economic set up. Bear in mind that that man is not the only person in his home. He has to provide for his wife and children - and they are wearing clothes too; therefore it means that while he has a product which is of value to himself from an economical point of view, he cannot use it himself because of the economic content of the family; therefore he has to sell it. This is not changing your plan from A. to B. It means that if you have a new plan, you should have given thought as to how it is going to work out and as to what you have to use. You should have somebody sitting down with you giving you the necessary advice. You should have an economic unit in your Department.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip is not in here at the moment but he made a point which I do not believe he meant. He said that he was chary of outside capital development coming in to set up a milk pasteurisation plant. I will tell the hon. member that is nothing to be chary about. I believe the hon. junior member for St. John who is an economist will agree with me. When it comes to economic development, it is not like a man coming here and opening up a rum shop. When it comes to economic development, you have nothing to worry about if the capital comes from outside, no matter if even some of the profits go out of the island, for the simple reason that you are getting something out of your resources which you did not have anybody here to exploit for you. Take for instance the exploration for oil. You may have oil here but the people in Barbados do not have the capital investment to bring it to the surface. If, therefore, somebody from outside comes and bring it up, it does not matter. 5.05 p.m.

Where outside capital worries me is if it is already invested and is circulating in your own community and that outside capital mixes with the one you have and takes out some of the profits; it means that if you are taking some of the profits outside, then your sector is poor. I am not in a position to say what is the investment capital available in Barbados, but what I do say with regard to this scheme is this: the Hon. Minister made a general statement and that is why I said that this step which he has made in so far as the people of Barbados liking Barbados is concerned - you must bear in mind the background of this plantation system. If this scheme is going to be at Seawell with all the schemes which have been in operation - I would like to say that the Government owns a plantation in St. Philip known as Dodds, and for years I have been asking, if they are going to continue their own plantation system on the basis of the others, how can they get what is best for the community?

The Hon. Minister knows that it is of little use carrying out an experiment when that experiment will not prove to be successful unless you have pasture lands. If the experiment is not profitable, the Hon. Minister knows that people are not going to work on it. Some people believe that grass grows like wild bush, but grass needs cultivation and there will be results from the cultivation of grasslands. I am opposed to the idea of continuing the working of Dodds Plantation on the same basis; I have been saying that Dodds as an agricultural experiment should be run on the basis of a collective farm, so that you will begin to show that things are being run on a collective basis; and with proper education and proper knowledge, you will bring the workers into the business.

The Hon. Minister has failed to state that one of the best means of increasing the productivity of any community is to make the working-class sectors of the community feel that they are a part of the community. If they believe that they are only wage-earners and they are only getting what you feel pleased to give them in the end, their interest wanes and you will get the sort of outlook which you are getting. The Hon. Minister started off in a very complacent way in regard to this project, that it is a good thing because you can see more than what has been stated here -- the establishment of a beef industry and the rearing of a sheep farm -- I say that those are the things which I think we should do. When you are a politician in a small place you must make things work, so that you do not get the kick backs.

Those are the things which appeal to me in a private way and those are the things which I would advocate. I would like to see more people making use of their land for their stock; your whole marketing arrangement would have to be reviewed so that you can have a market for the things which you grow. There is no point in having forty acres of land and carrying on a cattle farm and not have any irrigation. You want to have irrigation, so that the grass can be grown. I should like to say that a man who can be given notice and be ejected from land cannot begin to think of any long-term planning; he may have money but he is afraid to use it, because of what people would think. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: All that has been changed.) It has not been changed at all; we have not yet begun to make the workers think along that line. A worker is fundamentally a worker at heart; (*Asides*) he is not a coward at political meetings. You will find that the average agricultural man is living in a house and he cannot help his family decently; he feels that if he does something on somebody's land, that person will feel that he is getting on too well. Why is it that you find trash houses on agricultural land? The whole idea of the worker is that he is not living on his own land and that he can be ejected at any time; therefore, he will not erect anything which is worthwhile.

I am very pleased to support this idea this afternoon, but I would like the Hon. Minister to let us know fully what he is doing. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has taken on plenty of pet animals these days; very few schemes are not his pet schemes, but I would like to ask what has become of the pet scheme of his predecessor - the pig breeding scheme? Some families change their pets; sometimes your wife likes a dog; you do not like a dog; you may like

a cat (*Laughter.*) It is therefore purely a matter of choice; but if it is only a dog which your wife likes, then you cannot keep a cat in the house. What about the pig-breeding pet scheme? How is that working?
5.15 p.m.

Now this is the hon. member's scheme, and if this fails the hon. member has plenty of other pet schemes, because we know that the St. Andrew soil erosion scheme which is a good one is one of his pets. Everybody has his pets, so I want to know if you are going to adopt new pets. Using myself in a hypothetical manner, I should like to know if I embarked on a 10 acre plot of land what type of encouragement I could look forward to. The hon. member told me just now that I did not have any money. If I knew somebody who would allow me to use five acres of his land, what sort of assistance would I get in a scheme like this provided that I had the grass already? I am in favour with this but are you going to assist the community? The agricultural workers in Barbados raise stock and that is how we get meat locally. I visit the rural areas every week, and only this week I was looking to see how agricultural workers do their work. They go to work in the morning and when they come home between 12 noon or 1 p.m., they move their cow or sheep from one place and put it at another, and in the evening when they have finished working they take it home again. It is a nice thing for a country boy to bring in his father's stock. I want to tell the hon. member that the parents who do not allow their boys to do that are those parents who feel ashamed that they did not go to secondary school and have to prevent their child from doing this work. If I were living in the country, my son would have to take out the stock and learn something about them. I was born in a family that was accustomed to doing that, so I am part of that vintage; so the hon. member would find in me excellent support in this outlook.

If the hon. member came to some of my meetings he would learn something, but he is too absorbed in listening to one type of meeting, and that is why the people in St. Peter are so edified that in spite of all the forces that come they cannot resent a good thing. I should like the hon. member in dealing with these things to give us this broad information because he is aiming at lowering the importation of meat. The hon. member knows that I am in favour and would support land production on the east coast, because the land which will go into cultivation is now fallow. What I would like the hon. member to do is to pass a Law against any owner of land who allows his land to remain fallow exceeding, say, twelve or eighteen months. I could give the hon. member legislation on that when I go to the Labour Department, because there is other revolutionary legislation which we can pass here similar to that which we passed for a man who is dismissed without cause.

However, I want the hon. member to bear in mind that this scheme is something which I feel is a good thing. What I would like to see him do in his own Department is to set up a positive industrial or agricultural development programme or unit for the precise purpose of going into this agricultural development apart from the sugar cane production. The Industrial Development Board says positively that they cannot touch it because the Act precludes them from dealing with it. The hon. member has been taking advice from the hon. junior member for St. James. You cannot take the planting experience from these old time planters and semi-planters who come into politics. We have passed that stage where we would require his knowledge for this age. What I would like the hon. member to do is to get some people around him. The hon. junior member for St. James is all right to be around you at a peasant show if you want an old fellow to tell you about old time days, but when you are dealing with modern industrial development, he would not know about that. We want to have an agricultural development programme purely on an *ad hoc* basis, so that you can have a Creamery in this island. I would not say the same thing which the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said, because I would say there is no hard feeling between us although we do not agree with all the methods which you adopt, and as far as this is concerned I should like to give you an opportunity to be proved wrong.

I do not know what land is available at Seawell because I thought the land there was taken up in these five

acre lots. I did not know there was still land available at Seawell for the experiment, but even if there is I think that experiment should be carried out at your agricultural stations. I believe there is good land at Maynards near to the station at Jerusalem, and it would be a good thing to go down there and see what can be done, because it was mooted that you would buy Maynards land. I am a politician of a different calibre, and I do not have to go around looking for little parish politics in order to get the people to put me here to represent them. I would ask the member to go down to Maynards and see if he can carry out an experiment for the benefit of the people as a whole.

I should like to tell the hon. member that he mistook me and should make an apology for rising and making those improper remarks which were totally misdirected.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I apologise.

Mr. WALCOTT: I knew he would apologise, because the remarks were not directed at him and he need not have replied. I can assure him that I am in as good a mood as the hon. member, and I can assure him that if that style is adopted there would be more friendliness between the two of us - though not necessarily between the Government and myself - on matters which the hon. member brings. I think the Hon. Minister of Education would fall into his steps. I did not have the opportunity to compliment him although it is not necessary for a member of the Opposition to compliment a member of the Government who has gone a little closer to Government, because that is a natural thing that should take place, but I support the Resolution with the reservations I have made.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
5.25 p.m.

On separate motions moved by Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

LEAVE TO POSTPONE ORDER NO. 2

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 2 and to take Order No. 3.

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

THE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION BILL, 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950. As hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons, in the first place, the Bill seeks to amend Sections two, three and four to bring the Act into line with the recent constitutional developments; that is to say, wherever the word "Governor" appears in these sections, it will be deleted and replaced by the words, "Governor-in-Executive Committee".

Hon. members will also see in the second paragraph of the Objects and Reasons that provision is made for the abandonment of the practice under the Act which entails the Corporation to submit its rates to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for approval. Inasmuch as under the Public Utilities Act, provision is made for the Public Utilities Board to fix the rates, it is felt that it is unnecessary for the rates to be submitted to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, as the more appropriate authority for the fixing of the rates is the Public Utilities Board and not the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

The other part of the Bill deals with the question of depletion allowance and the waiving of certain taxes which should be paid by the Corporation, such as income tax and Local Government tax. It is the practice that a depletion allowance should be given on this type of undertaking. It

is done in the case of natural gas and also in the case of oil. This allowance is given in order that the company may be able to carry out further exploratory work as well as drilling. In other words, it means this: if you have a reservoir of X barrels of oil or so many cubic feet of gas, the life of that is not everlasting; therefore, when it is all gone you will have to find money to carry out further exploratory work as well as drilling; therefore, it is the practice not only in the United Kingdom but also in all countries where oil is drilled to give a depletion allowance. It is true to say that the percentage varies from place to place. Perhaps I should mention at this stage that in the Bill which I have before the House dealing with the levying and collection of a tax upon the profits arising to persons engaged in petroleum winning operations, provision is made under that for the percentage of tax.

We have had long discussions over the matter with the people in the trade and it was agreed that we should fall in line if we want this exploratory and drilling work to be carried on.

The other amendments are simple and consequential in that the Act refers to the Gas Works but there are no longer any gas works. The Gas Works are now the Natural Gas Corporation because they were taken over by this Corporation, I think, in 1955; therefore, reference to the Gas Works does not now mean anything. This amendment seeks to rectify that situation.

Sir, that is all to explain as far as this Bill is concerned but I think I should at this stage take the opportunity to review some of the charges made on this Government on the last occasion when reference was made to this Corporation. You will remember the debate was started by the hon. senior member for the City some time ago when he criticised the Natural Gas Corporation for awarding a contract to a firm outside of this Island. That criticism was followed up by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and also the hon. junior member for St. John. I think he was the last member who spoke on the motion. As I said then, this Corporation is a law unto itself.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that the Hon. Minister of Trade is now introducing the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. BARROW: The Hon. Minister is wrong. When this Corporation was under discussion, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for the City made no remarks on this Bill because if he is now introducing this Bill, we could not make any remarks on this Bill.
5.35 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that reference was made to the operation of this Natural Gas Corporation; I said nothing about the Bill. What I said was that this Government --

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member has said that he never said when this Bill was discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not necessary for him to do that.

Mr. BARROW: If the hon. member has made a mistake, well, let him correct it; let the Official Reporter read out what he has taken down.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have never known such a check to be made and I can never see the necessity for it. I see absolutely no point in having any such check made.

Mr. BARROW: All right, Sir.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying, Sir, that the members whom I mentioned just now criticised the Natural Gas Corporation in the first place and said that the Corporation had gone outside of the Island and awarded a contract for \$40,000 to a firm and they were thereby putting Barbadians out of work. They went further and said that there were people in this Island who could do this work and that the Corporation went outside of the Island to get people to do

it. I have been able to get all the facts necessary in relation to this particular question and I want to say again that there was a gross misleading of this House. As I said on the last occasion, the Natural Gas Corporation operates under a Law and it has not got to take general instructions from the Governor-in-Executive Committee, as you will find in certain other Acts establishing Corporations such as the Housing Authority, the Transport Board and some of these other Corporations.

I should like to say that as long as I have anything to do with this matter, I am prepared to take the full responsibility - I am not prepared to shelter under any Act. If something is done wrongly, I am prepared to face it; but I am not satisfied, from the information I have received, that anything was done wrongly. In the first place, as I mentioned years ago, when this matter was being raised by the then Director of Petroleum and Natural Gas - he pointed out that it was absolutely necessary to get a very highly-skilled man or men to do this type of work if you do not want to have all this wastage. Therefore, when it was decided that this work was to be done, it was necessary to bring someone from outside, someone who knew something about this work. But what is the position? Unlike the misleading which has been given to this House by the members opposite, the number of people employed on this work was an average of 64,62 of whom are Barbadians. We had to employ three people from Trinidad, one of whom, the Foreman, is a Barbadian and the others are living in Barbados; and hon. members are misleading the public into thinking that ----

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has quoted me and now he is making reference to a motion which is on the Order Paper. We discussed the motion which was adjourned and therefore, I would like to know how the hon. member can speak on a motion which is not now being discussed. If you will look at the Order Paper, under the Head "Notices", you will see this:

"Mr. MOTTLEY: To move the adjournment of the House at its next meeting to discuss the Hon. Premier's Statement re the Natural Gas Corporation. This Notice was given on the 8th July, 1958. On 22nd July, 1958, Mr. Motley moved the adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss the Statement. Mr. Walcott seconded the motion and spoke. Hon. M. E. COX spoke. Mr. Barrow was speaking when the House was adjourned through the lack of a quorum."

The hon. member is now taking the opportunity to deal with a substantive motion, but the Rules of this House say that you cannot make any reference to such a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I quite agree with the hon. member. The Hon. Minister should desist from putting in his speech anything which would apply to a motion which is still unresolved. That thought came into my mind when the Hon. Minister began to speak. He is now dealing with what properly belongs to a question which still remains unresolved. I am asking the Hon. Minister to desist from taking up too much time in dealing with that matter which is still unresolved.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member who initiated this debate never carried it on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How can the hon. member say that? (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot understand why hon. members are getting out of order. I have just told the Hon. Minister to desist from anything which may appear to be a reply to a question which is still unresolved. I am taking complete care of that.

Hon. M. E. COX: With great respect, the Government must reply at some time. I will obey Your Honour's Ruling, but I should only like to say that in this particular case, it was absolutely necessary to have what are called certain Grade "A" pipe-line welders. I should like to go a little further and say that there are firms in this Island who have to bring in the same type of people to do a similar type of work. However, Sir, I must say that I am very

sorry that I did not have the opportunity of putting the Government's point of view on this occasion. I hope that the members who initiated this debate ---

Mr. SPEAKER: Not this debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: I hope that the members who initiated that debate against the Company, will carry it on and not let the matter die or get too stale.
5.45 p.m.

I would like to say that the newspaper accused this Government of being corrupt and dishonest because there was no quorum after dinner. The Opposition has made it clear to this House on many occasions that it is not their duty to form a quorum in this House. I differ from that; I could never agree with that because like myself and other members of the Government, they have gone to the electorate and appealed to them to put them in the House, and their duty to come to this House is no less than ours when the House is summoned.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member should take the opportunity to chastise the Opposition.

Hon. M. E. COX: If you will permit me, I merely want to say that is what they say and it can be proven on many occasions. Even today it was difficult to get a quorum.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. I made a quorum today, and without my presence there would have been no quorum, and I am in the Opposition.

Hon. M. E. COX: He is only one member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to go back to the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I know I will get an opportunity to reply at length to the vicious and nasty remarks made against this Government.

As I said, Sir, this Bill is simple in structure, and its Objects and Reasons seek to make necessary amendments, and therefore, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, Clauses 2, 3 and 4 of the Bill seek to amend the Act so as to give recognition to certain changes. In respect of them and against them there is no particular quarrel. Now Clause 16 however seeks to dispense with the requirements that the rates of the Corporation shall be subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Clause 16 of the Natural Gas Act, 1950 is the Clause which says:-

"When fixing the rates and scales of charges for natural gas the Corporation shall take into account the cost to the Government or the Corporation of money paid by way of compensation, purchase or otherwise, for an existing or other well or wells, the machinery, pipeline, other necessary appliances and the general expenses for carrying on the undertaking and shall submit such rates for the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Now, Sir, the charges made by the Natural Gas Corporation is a most controversial subject. There has been an increase made only recently of 300% in the charges made by this Corporation, and the result of this increase in industrial concerns affects the employment of a fair number of persons; certainly in the case of the Barbados Potteries Limited where 70 odd employees are affected, that place has temporarily had to close down because it cannot carry on these rates. The Lime Works at Apes Hill and the Caribbean Confectionery Company has also suffered as a result of the uneven distribution in the increases made by the Natural Gas Corporation. The private consumers have received infinitesimal increases, but industrial concerns have been so mulcted that they find it almost impossible, if not impossible, to carry on. It may be a part of the scheme of things with this Natural Gas Corporation to drive Barbadian Companies out of existence so that

Trinidad can supply the lime or a Swedish firm can supply the potteries which at present are catered for on the local market by the Lime Works at Apes Hill, and the Barbados Potteries Limited established in St. Andrew.

Now at least, Sir, if this power is left in the hands of the Executive Committee for its approval, they are persons whom we can get at; the electorate can deal with those who are members of this Chamber. If we transfer all our powers to a Public Utilities Board or for that matter to any other organisation which is not responsible to the people of this island, we are running a greater risk of unfair, unreasonable increases, the only purpose behind it being to drive certain people out of the market in order that other concerns which are alleged to be very magnanimous and liberal - I make no more comment on that - may take the place of the people who have pioneer industries in this island, who employ local or West Indian labour, who are financing it entirely by local capital and who have been doing a good job until conditions through this increase have made it impossible for them to carry on. A 300% increase in an industrial commodity such as natural gas for an organisation which has been adapted to work only by natural gas is the sort of thing which you can well realise will drive it out of business. I do not propose to go into any details because there are certain, shall I say, negotiations taking place and the result of them is not yet public property; as a matter of fact, they are not completed; but it is never safe, when you have as your last controlling body a body which is subject to the decision of the electorate, to transfer that power to the hands of a Board, individuals, Civil Servants, ex- or retired businessmen, industrial people, hand in glove with some of the people who may be running the same Natural Gas Corporation.

In fixing these rates and scale of charges for Natural Gas, of course what must arise is the cost of running the very Corporation itself. I would be interested to know if the hon. member who is in charge of this Bill would tell us what is the salary of the Manager of this Natural Gas Corporation. It would be worthwhile to find out because that would help us to discover why it is that the Natural Gas Corporation is complaining that it is not making the reasonable profit which we can appreciate it is entitled even by legislation to make. The Objects and Reasons let us know that the first amendments proposed are simply of a formal nature, the mere giving of recognition to certain changes which have taken place since 1950 when the Act was passed, but Section 16 which Clause 5 of this Bill proposes to amend by the insertion of certain words, is a thing which must give us very serious food for thought
5.55 p.m.

whether we should depart from a principle of having control exercised, irrespective of what one thinks of a particular Government, of its competence, of its efficiency, of its impartiality, or anything of the kind - the day of reckoning is bound to come - let us hope sooner or later - so to allow the power to remain in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee who must resolve their responsibilities to the local community and appreciate the attitude and the feeling of the local community towards this amazing, exceptional, extraordinary increase in the price of natural gas and how it affects only the industrial concerns. They found that it was necessary to raise an amount of \$36,000 in order that they can carry on; so they decided to increase their prices to two areas - Areas A and B - but Area A is residential. They decided to increase it to the industrialists who are responsible for employing people. It means that three industrial concerns in Area B will have to stand practically the whole amount of that figure which this Corporation has found it imperative to raise. That Sir, is my main comment on this Bill and I think that is the vital clause, that is the important amendment for which in my own view there is no justification and to which I cannot give my support.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, as regards this Bill I think it causes some apprehensions; nevertheless, I suppose it has got to be amended. As the hon. member who has just sat down has said, persons who use natural gas for industrial purposes are somewhat worried. I do not intend to say much on the Bill other than to vote for its passing because I remember well enough that I initiated a debate some weeks ago in this Chamber as a result of a question

which I asked the Hon. Premier and out of which a statement was made by him. I will be fair enough to him to say that he showed me the letter from which he made that statement. I said then that I thought Government should have some control over these various statutory boards which were set up. I thought I made that quite clear then. My only criticism was to the effect that I did not like what was happening and what was brought to my notice, and I am very much surprised that the Hon. Minister of Trade said that it was during a debate on this Bill that such questions were raised.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister said that that was not correct.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Has he denied what he said or has he corrected it? I do not really know. I was surprised myself to hear that he said that the subject was raised when this Bill was first discussed. As a matter of fact, I recall very well that the hon. junior member for St. John said at the time that he would not be surprised that arising out of this discussion, a Bill came down to the House to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act.

Sir, I was at pains to point out that I thought the whole trouble was due to the faultiness of the Act and the Hon. Premier will recall that. It seems to me that members of the Government, or some of them, think that those of us over here who hear things must come cap in hand asking them; "please, Sir, can we ask these questions." I want to let it be known that I am not one of those people. As soon as I find something going wrong, I will come and air it in this House. I will be quite fair in my observations.

Sir, the reason why I rose on this point is because the hon. Minister said that during the discussion, misleading statements were made by hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already ruled that I shall not entertain anything as regards a discussion which took place in this Chamber. What the hon. member is saying seems to be a matter which may be deemed to belong to the same category as that which I ruled out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I shall not make that grave error and I am sure you will permit me to say that I have not the slightest idea of going against Your Honour's ruling. What I wish to say is that when an hon. member gets up in this House and says that members of the Opposition initiated something and refused to carry on that debate and they ought to be more responsible, he knows that he has no right to say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is such a form of political expression.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That form of political expression should not be permitted at all. To say that we refused to carry on the debate at all is not kind when the hon. Minister knows that is not true. I want to say that we were prepared to end that debate that night and we are still prepared to continue that debate. If the hon. member thinks that of all people I would be afraid to continue with the debate which I initiated, that is another thought; he is fooling himself. If I intend to initiate a debate in here, it does not matter to me whom it offends: I am going to initiate it.

One thing has cropped up as a result of this debate. The Hon. Minister tried to point out that it is the duty of the Opposition to form a quorum. Well, I suppose if the Opposition is here, it will help form a quorum. The Government has fifteen members and nine can form a quorum; yet he thinks that the Opposition should come in and form a quorum. I think it is Sir Anthony Eden who said that it is the duty of the Government to carry the burden of Government and it is the duty of the Opposition to make that burden as intolerable as it can. I think that he is one man who has lived to see that what he said is correct.

The Hon. Minister referred to the fact that equally it was not their duty to stand in the House to hear the Government being criticised. The Hon. Minister ought to be fair. That night when I initiated the debate, not one of us,

and I, the least of all, criticised the Government, 6.05 p.m.

we were criticising the Board and we will continue to do so when the opportunity is given us to continue the debate.

As far as this Bill is concerned, if the hon. member wants to take some of the backbenchers to task, he can take them to task, but he will never have the opportunity of taking any of us to task for what we say on the floor of this House. The only right thing which the Hon. Minister has said is that we were voted in here as well as the Government. It is therefore our duty to make as fair and as constructive criticisms as we can and to make the burden of the Government as intolerable as we can. When you hear people like the Hon. Minister who introduced this Bill - when he was in the Opposition - talking about slanderous statements about Government officials ---

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will now revert to this Bill; I hope he will do so.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order. Do you think that the hon. member would stand second to anybody when he spoke about slanderous statements --

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given the Hon. Minister some latitude and I have given the hon. member some latitude in this matter as well.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will leave my further comments until when we go into Committee on this Bill. I really never intended to speak on this Bill, but the Hon. Minister took the opportunity of throwing things at the Opposition and that is the reason why I rose to speak on the Bill at all. Before I sit down, I should like to refer to the Order Paper which I received today. I see under the Head "Notices" the following:-

"Mr. Mottley: To move the adjournment of the House at its next meeting to discuss the Hon. Premier's Statement re the Natural Gas Corporation".

I am fully aware of my duties in here and as long as this motion is here, I have no business embarking upon it when we are discussing something else. The Notice goes on to say this:

"On the 22nd July, 1958, Mr. Mottley moved the adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss the Statement. Mr. Walcott seconded the motion and spoke. Hon. M. E. Cox spoke."

The Hon. Minister spoke. Did he not have the opportunity to say what he wanted to say? The Hon. Minister has another thought coming, if he thinks that we are refusing to carry on the debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: The opportunity will come for all of us too. Where that side is concerned, there is nothing which is said accusing me that makes any difference. One thing of which I will make sure, is that none of the nastiness that people throw at me is true. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy has referred to the new rates which have been fixed, and the hon. member went on to say that these rates were only applicable to industries. That is not strictly correct, but I do not think that the hon. member made that statement wilfully. There were until recently, two areas - area "A" and area "B". Area "A" is that through which the high pressure line passes and area "B" is the one which was taken over by the gas works soon after they were nationalised. The rates were considerably low in area "A". Area "A" was getting its natural gas below cost. That area paid something like 77 cents per thousand cubic feet, and there was an all-purpose tariff in area "A" as against area "B" which paid an all-purposes tariff in \$1.50 per thousand cubic feet and then so much per cubic foot of gas consumed. The Corporation was losing money and I am glad that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has made that point, because nobody would like the corporation to operate at a loss in order to accommodate either industry or domestic power.

The Corporation made proposals for increasing its rates and sent them to the Government. The Government

approved of those rates. It is difficult for some hon. members to speak on this question, because some of them are involved in this undertaking; however, since those rates were agreed to, representation has been made to the Government that these rates would create a hardship on industry. I went into the matter with the Chairman and with members of the Board and I pointed out that it is the Government's intention to see that Natural Gas is supplied to industry at a reasonable rate so that industries could be developed to the full, especially the pottery industry. 6.15 p.m.

I should say that while we are not connected in any way with any undertaking whether it be the Barbados Potteries or the Lime Works at Apes Hill, at the same time in view of that fact, we feel that if this Pottery Industry can be developed, it will assist us in providing permanent, reasonable houses for the masses of the island. We went into this matter, and the Board, including the Manager, and I, discussed it, and I think I can say at this stage that the Board has revised these rates and will submit them fairly soon to the Governor.

While what the hon. member said can be regarded as a criticism against the Board for increasing these rates 300%, at the same time we have to consider what are our gas reserves. My information is that our reserves are not very good at all; I have been reliably informed by the Corporation that our reserves have an approximate life of ten years, and perhaps the House should know that when this matter was discussed years ago, I think in 1955, the Ministry of Trade at the time instructed the Board to lay the emphasis upon the supply of gas to domestic consumers, and the reason for that is obvious. As I said, recently the Cabinet has altered that decision and has instructed the Board to lay the emphasis on industry.

Now there was some talk in this House that we had very good reserves, and reference was made to Wells Nos. 19 and 20. I have been able to get information from the expert who has pointed out that Well No. 20 was being fed from Well No. 19, and as a result, Well No. 20 has been closed off. I think the House should know that Well No. 1 which we purchased from the Gulf Oil Company has been a failure. We have not been able, in spite of all that has been done, to make it produce; it was put on trial and the pressure went down within a day and a half, and after experimenting with it for some time it is now considered hopeless and will have to be abandoned. So the statements made some time ago are unfounded. In order to reduce the rates to industry, it was necessary to make a small increase to domestic consumers, but I should like to assure the hon. junior member for St. Lucy that the matter was raised, and it is regrettable that it was not put to the Ministry before it had gone that far. We had figures based upon present day performances and from these figures, it did not appear at the time that any great hardship was being meted out to industries which were then using this gas.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just refer members to Rule 27, because I saw some hon. members rising to speak after the Minister had replied. It reads as follows:-

"The mover of a motion may reply after all the other members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, and after such reply no other member may speak, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Order."

Everybody had had an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is the position if the Ministers give notice of a motion and after two members have spoken, gets up and replies? Suppose he anticipates that everybody has spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER: No one can presume that the Minister anticipates that everybody has spoken, because in my opinion, everybody had an opportunity to speak. There was a long time before the Minister got up to reply, but I do not think that hon. members were attentive enough to what was going on around them, and they have been caught.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:

"Section six of the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, which Act is hereinafter referred to as the principal Act, is hereby amended as follows:-

- (a) by deleting the word "Governor" whenever it appears therein and by substituting therefor the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee";
- (b) by deleting from subsection (1) thereof the word "four" appearing therein and by substituting therefor the word "five".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like the Clerk to give me a copy of the Act, because I want to deal with Clause 2, and I cannot find the Laws of this place. 6.25 p.m.

In the meantime, since I cannot get a copy of the Act, I will remark upon the amendment (b) by deleting from sub-section (1) thereof the word "four" appearing therein and by substituting therefor the word "five". I want to take the opportunity of making this statement. I am glad to see that you are making room for another member of the Board. There is too much of the habit in Barbados that industry is a one-sided affair. It is pronounced all over the world that industry is a joint effort. When you look at these Boards in Barbados, you find the name of Thomas and somebody who is the President of some undertaking. I am saying that industry should be regarded as a matter in which both sides should be represented on these Boards. It is gone up in England that it is impossible to find any one set of people on any industrial Board unless it is a Board where they are setting up a commission of enquiry to go into some aspect of an economic question and, generally speaking, where you have something like the Natural Gas Corporation Board, where the Corporation deals with public policy and something which you employ people, you have all branches of the industry represented on that Board.

I think the Hon. Minister should come around to that idea and lay it down as a definite policy. Not only should it be the policy of this Government but it should be laid down for all time that the people who represent industrial Boards should be chosen from all sides. Sir, you will find on such committees as even the After-Care Committee that there are no members whom you can say are representatives of the workers' interest. Sir, I am not asking for anything for myself because I am not eligible for any membership on these Boards. As you know, you cannot be a member of this Chamber and be a member of these Boards.

I do not think I should worry about misleading statements as I understood were spoken about by the Hon. Minister of Trade. What I said on that occasion I stand by in so far as work being done in Barbados. I do not think anybody would suggest to the Hon. Minister or anybody that if you are carrying out a job in Barbados, you should not employ anybody who is not a Barbadian, but we are saying that if you are doing a job which a Barbadian can do, you should not employ anybody else. I should like the Hon. Minister to give that assurance. You have it that a member of the Housing Board cannot go over to the Natural Gas Corporation Board. It is a matter of public policy. I think the Hon. Minister will have to agree that when it comes to industry, it should not be regarded as a one-sided affair and the people who comprise the Boards should be representative of both sides of the industry.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sure that the hon. member who has just sat down knows that we have not been bludgeoned into something, but that it has been always the Gov-

ernment's policy to promote people of the working class type. The hon. member mentioned the Housing Board. We have the Housing Board and the Tourist Board and it is our policy to put workers as has been done, and would always be done, on these various Boards.

While it is true that on the Development Board there is not a worker as a representative in the strict sense, yet it was felt that some persons who were appointed would represent people of the lower group. I should like to assure the hon. member that that is the intention of the Government. As I have said, when we were selecting members for the Housing Board, the Barbados Workers Union did not ask for a worker to be put on that Board. My Ministry wrote the Barbados Workers' Union and asked them to submit a few names with a view to selecting one or two to be put on that Board. I wish to make that point again because it is quite easy for one to say that "If we did not force the Government into appointing somebody to work on this Board, the Government would not have done it." It is not correct to say that. Sir, I am prepared to see that at least one worker is placed on every Board that is established, especially those which come under my Ministry.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir I would like to say this. When the Hon. Minister said that the Union did not ask for it, they wrote the Union; I want to say that I am not interested in if the Union asked for it. The Barbados Workers Union is part of the community. You have set up an industry in which Labour Welfare Funds are used. Why should not a worker be put on that Board? I can name Boards and Committees - and the Hon. Minister knows that - which you have set up on which you have more people representing the industry that you have representing the workers. I want the Hon. Minister to get this clear. Do not think I asked for it on the basis of something for myself. I stand clear in this community against anybody on this question of representation. I do not dabble in petty parochial politics. I am asking for something for workers representation as such. There may be a Committee or a Board in which it may not be necessary to put a worker to represent their interests. Mine is not the parish pump policy of putting a member on a Board because he is a member of the Union. You put workers' representatives on Boards to represent a broad interest and you leave it to those people who have the choice to name the member. You leave the choice to them and they pick whom they want providing that they pick somebody of whom you would approve. You leave it to them to pick the person with the integrity and the necessary character to serve on a public Board because in the final analysis you can reject their choice. As I have said, it should be a matter of public policy just as you do in the United Kingdom.
6.40 p.m.

In the United Kingdom, you have people who represent not only the Union, but also Trades; they get that as a matter of right. It is not, therefore, a question of any cheap politics, so that there is anything that can be gained by it. I do not care two hoots about anybody when it comes to a question of principle; I will stand against my own Union when it is a matter of policy.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: I speak subject to correction, but as far as I know, the Financial Secretary is a member of this Board. I do not deal with the ability of the Financial Secretary, because that is well known to the people who can appreciate ability. I would like to know how, on this particular Board which is a statutory Corporation, can the Government justify having on this independent body, the Financial Secretary of this colony, who must advise the Board, if he is making any contribution to it at all, and at the same time he is the person to whom reference must be made in the fixing of these rates? The Financial Secretary has no right being a member of this Board at all; he cannot serve God and Mammon; he cannot represent two interests at the same time even if he were capable of doing so. It is high time that he should be taken off this Board, and if he is making any contribution to it, that would be surprising.

You cannot justify, I repeat, the membership of the Financial Secretary on this Board. The Natural Gas comes from the constituency which I have the honour to represent,

and I am amazed to hear hon. members speaking about gas and we cannot even get any to light the streets in St. Andrew. I should like to say that as a member of this Board, the Financial Secretary would be giving his financial knowledge on the one hand, and then on the other hand, he would be advising the Board as to the course it should adopt; he would also be advising the Government on the same course of action. It is therefore high time that he should be taken off this Board.

At this stage, it being now 7 o'clock p.m. Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and suspended the sitting for three-quarters of an hour.

7.00 p.m.

NATURAL GAS CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee on a Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When we were in Committee on this Bill before the suspension, Clause 2 was being considered.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, just before the suspension of the sitting, I was about to say that I was quite intrigued on being given the assurance that the Government intended to put workers as often as possible on these Statutory Boards, and also, by the interest which the hon. senior member for St. Peter was showing in the matter. As far as I am concerned, I feel that it is the duty of all responsible politicians, and I can say particularly of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is very much interested, to see that the workers themselves start to take an active and constructive interest in the working of this Board, and not just being appointed to the Board for the sake of being appointed to it. The Barbados Workers' Union should let the people in general feel that the Union itself is taking an active, positive and constructive interest in these things. I believe that the harmonious working of these Boards and the contribution which the workers would make to these Boards when they are appointed to them would be of a solid nature, if and when they are taking an interest in them as never before.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is all very well for the hon. member who has just sat down to talk about the workers taking an interest in the operations of Statutory Boards set up by the Governor-in-Executive Committee; but when this Government gives these workers no opportunity to get experience by appointing them, as a matter of active policy, as members of Statutory Boards, how can one expect the workers to take an active interest in these Boards? When we consider the composition of the Board of the Natural Gas Corporation we will find that not one single working-class man is a member of that Corporation - not one.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking under considerable strain and I would like the assistance of the experimental equipment which is being experimented with, because I would not have to strain my voice so much. Apparently the man who is in charge of the equipment seems to think that only the members of the Government are entitled to this assistance. If this is the upshot of this experiment, then we will vigorously oppose the introduction of such a system.

As I was saying, Sir, the Natural Gas Corporation came into being when the present Government was in power in 1951, and the first report was published on the 31st March, 1952. This was something which was created during the tenure of office of the present Government and it is significant that we find there the Managing Director of one of the "Big Six" firms whose monopolistic control over the economy of this Island has already been alluded to by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. We have on that Board a certain amount of nepotism. Mr. Chairman, I will not worry to develop that point any further, but we find intermarried matters like that going on between officials and members of the Board.
8.05 p.m.

There is nothing wrong about that because we have freedom of contract in Barbados in the same way as you have freedom to marry whomsoever you feel; but we do not want a family circle of vested interest running a corporation which can affect by its misfeasance, nonfeasance or malfeasance the day to day existence and subsistence of the majority of citizens in this country. There is an expression that we cannot be satisfied with being hewers of wood and drawers of water. If the Natural Gas did its job and had people on the Board who articulated the wishes and the desires of the majority of the housewives in this colony, the husbands would not have to continue for very much longer to be hewers of wood in the backyard, putting wood under the coal-pot, blowing the fires and matters of that kind. There is no point in the Minister paying lip service to the principle of participation by the working classes of the island in the running of their affairs outside of this Chamber. We have several Statutory Boards; we have Boards appointed by the Government like the Control Board, and I think some feeble attempt was made about three or four years ago to make a member of the Workers' Union a member of that Board when that good lady was on the eve of her departure to the United Kingdom.

The consumers and the housewives are not represented on this Board, and yet they control the economy of prices of every commodity coming into this island which has to be bought by the majority of housewives, consumers and taxpayers in the island. When you come to the Natural Gas Corporation, there is no point in saying that we have achieved any kind of silent revolution in Barbados when the Minister and the Government for the time being only are attired in the trappings of the office, and the real control over the economy of this island is still vested securely in the hands of what is known as the Big Six, and I challenge any hon. member to name one single Government Board in which you do not find somebody who is directly or indirectly connected with the Barbados Shipping and Trading Association, the firm who control under different names, with the exception of about three, every single store in Broad Street and every big mercantile undertaking in this country. They must subscribe to the theory advanced by the hon. member for St. Joseph who has just sat down that the average working-class man does not take any interest; he cannot, if he is never given the opportunity of inclusion to make some contribution towards.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I at this stage call your attention to the fact that the Minister said it is Government's intention to place a working man on this Natural Gas Corporation Board?

Mr. BARROW: He said it is part of Government's policy, and I am pointing out that its empty administration does not bear any resemblance to the facts of our political and economic situation in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He said that it is part of Government's policy to place a worker on the Board in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter who raised the question that the workers should be represented on this Board. I think therefore that the point about the Control Board is out of the question.

Mr. BARROW: I am merely drawing an illustration to show that if it is part of Government's policy, that policy has been honoured more in its breach than in its observance. With the possible exception of the Transport Board, there is no Statutory Body in this island which impinges upon the day to day living or the economy of the working man in the street, and that is the point which I am trying to make and establish. In other words, what we have in Barbados is this: the political phases have been effected by the Barbados Shipping and Trading and the plantocracy of this island, but they continue.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am pleading to the hon. member to speak on the composition of the Board. We are now dealing with the deletion of the word "four" and the insertion of the word "five".

Mr. BARROW: I am dealing with that, but the Section under consideration deals with a lot of other things; it deals with the deletion of the word "Governor" and the substituti-

tion of "Governor-in-Executive Committee". and then it goes on to enlarging the composition of the Board from four to five members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made the point you were making and I am asking you to deal with the composition of the Board as far as it affects the workers.

Mr. BARROW: I cannot hear you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was saying that you have made the point and should now deal with the deletion of the word "four" and the insertion of the word "five" which affects the composition of the Natural Gas Corporation. I do not see the necessity for going into the details of the Control Board now that you have drawn the comparison. I am not going to allow you to go into details as to the composition of the Control Board.

Mr. BARROW: I would challenge any member on this side or that side of the Table that in dealing not only with the Control Board but with the Barbados Trading and Shipping, who, I still say, control the economy of this island, and have only as their political mouthpieces the members of the Government side and in some quarters its considered hirelings.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I object to that. The hon. member cannot come here and call us hirelings. I object to the remark especially as you are a hireling because.....

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, how can an hon. member object when he has used the same word "hireling"? He shall have to withdraw and then ask for the hon. member to withdraw: he cannot use the same word and still object.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the member whose name has been mentioned and against whom the objection....

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Under the Rules of the House when objection is taken, the words must be taken down. Objection has been taken to the remarks made by the hon. member that Government members are hirelings of the Barbados Shipping and Trading. 8.15 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Are those remarks unparliamentary?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. BARROW: I withdraw them. I am only concerned with Your Honour's view and nobody else's. The point is that if you want any demonstration of the fact that the Government is more in the interest of the vested planters, you have it in this Natural Gas Corporation Board. I challenge you whether one single member of the working class since 1951 when this Board was appointed was ever made a member of this Board. We have on it a director of Messrs. S. P. Musson & Co., Ltd. The most influential member on that Board is one of the owners of one of the biggest enterprises in Broad Street. He is Mr. Maurice Cave and you can go through the list of membership right down the line.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. That is merely a misleading statement. Mr. Maurice Cave is not a member of the Natural Gas Corporation.

Mr. BARROW: I beg your pardon. He was, but when it was first started. The membership of that Board was Mr. Atwell, Lieut.-Col. J. Connell, the Financial Secretary, Mr. J. B. Inmiss. Nowhere would you find a representative of labour - not a carpenter, not an artisan, not a driver, not a mason or anyone belonging to the Barbados Workers Union. Take Mr. Cuthbert Blenman of St. George. He is not a supporter of mine but I would be glad to see him, or Mr. Seibert Lashley or Mr. Simpson. Those are the sort of people whom you would like to see. Do you think I feel proud now? The type of man whom I would like to see on those boards is nobody like Mr. Inmiss or Mr. Atwell or Lieut.-Col. Connell. If that is your policy when will you recognise the working class people? Where are those working-class people on these Boards? I can name all the

members of the working class belonging to that Party whom I know would not subscribe to one political theory of mine whom I would prefer to see - at least one of them - as a member of this Board than these people whom you have on it. There is a common suspicion by inadequate analytical powers that only a certain type of complexion, or a certain class of people, is capable of running the affairs of this country outside of the House of Assembly and the Executive Committee, and I am saying that the real power lies in these statutory boards. They can make or break the Treasury of this Island. I assume that it is the policy of the Government that working class people are put on Boards in extreme circumstances, when it is impossible for the Government not to put them on and so as to prevent the Government from political embarrassment. How can anyone with any sense of justice and fairplay say that the Government has a policy of putting workers on these Boards? How can the hon. junior member for St. Joseph if he has got any experience, say that the working class people are not interested?

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am sure no one in here heard me say that the working class people are not interested.

Mr. BARROW: That is not a point of order. The hon. member said that the working class should be encouraged to take more interest. He can only mean that they do not have any interest.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would allow me to explain; 'encouraged to take more interest' seems to me comparative in a way. If you say, more, it means that somebody is taking interest. My particular reference to this Board was in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I said that I was glad to know that because it means that these people will be put on the Board and at the same time, responsible members of the House and of the Barbados Workers Union will be able to encourage these people to take more interest. I am thankful for what the hon. member has said. I said more interest, not less.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, what is the use of misquoting him? There is no point to misquote him. If in Barbados, somebody should be more interested in what they are doing, how can you say that they are interested when they are not given the opportunity? For the past seven years you have not had one member of this Board being a representative of the working class; you have not even had one single middle class consumer nor even anybody from the Transport Board. It must be some sort of inferiority complex to always aspire to a collection of the people of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company, Ltd., to put them to run the country. When you put them on Boards, they are in charge of 75 percent of the country. We have to come here and vote money for them. I say again, let the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Council of his Union put up a panel of names. As a matter of principle, the number of working class representatives on these Boards should be in proportion to the working class inhabitants of this Island of Barbados. That is the only fair way it can be done. If the vested interests are to be represented, then they must be represented in proportion. Of course, Sir, there is a proportion and a proportion. You can say that something is represented and something is proportionately represented. You must have heard of this story. A restaurateur was selling rabbit pie and when there were no rabbits at all to be had and his customers wanted to know how it was that he could always have rabbit pie, he said that we have to mix up a little horse with it - one horse and four rabbits. That is the kind of proportion which the Hon. Minister probably envisages when it comes to the membership of these Boards. I repeat, what democracy is it when we have to look to the members of the Chamber of Commerce and the membership of the subsidiary bodies of the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company Limited when we want to establish a Board and we do not look in the direction of the broad masses of the people or the consuming public? If they are saying that it was always their policy to have workers represented on these Boards, I say that that policy was not observed. In the Transport Board, they put a few people because they are not possessed with the business acumen that one would expect of anybody in that

line of business, but there must be somebody amongst the 210,000 people of Barbados of the middle and working class who has some kind of ability, if they were not blinded by political prejudice, that they could find to constitute this Board. If they are going to increase it to five members, it means that it is increased by one over the present existing members of that Board. And it means that the Government now in its magnanimity is informing the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union and the general public that they intend to even up the whole process because they are going to have four horses and one rabbit.
8.25 p.m.

There is going to be an increase of one, and the Government in its magnanimity is informing the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and the general public that they intend to even up the whole process now. They are going to have four members who represent a certain section of the community, one to represent the 210,000 people in Barbados. Do you think that if the proportions had been inversely related to what they now are - four members of the working classes and one member of the commercial community - we would not have had natural gas in most of the villages in the community? I must agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and we will continue to press the Government to make the membership of these Statutory Boards and Bodies more realistically representative of the composition, social and economic, of this community in which we live.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I could allow some of those remarks to go unchallenged. I should like to reply to the second last point made by the hon. member, who has just sat down, about the Government informing the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union of the appointment of workers on the Board. No such thing was ever said or done in this House. I do not see any Secretary of any Barbados Workers' Union; all members are workers in the House and we do not see the Union in that sense. I have informed the Committee that it has always been and it is still the Government's policy to appoint workers on these various Boards. I am very glad to have a reformation from the hon. junior member for St. John, and it is really a happy reformation, because he is the one member of this House who has always been very sarcastic towards the working class people of this Island. As a matter of fact, I will say this:.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. When the hon. member says that, when he speaks about my being sarcastic towards the working-class people of this Island, I should like to ask him when have I been sarcastic towards the working classes of this Island?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I am asking the hon. member when was I sarcastic towards the workers? The hon. member is now making a statement which is unsupported by the facts.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is only recently that the hon. member referred to one of his colleagues like this: "Do you think you are talking to the people in Pie Corner?" What is associated with Pie Corner?

Mr. BARROW rose to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both hon. members are now on their feet.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member cannot come in here and talk that sort of thing and get away with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. John may proceed with his point of order.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that the hon. member should try to introduce into this Chamber

something which I understand may be *sub judice* at the moment; but I have never at any time uttered to anybody the remarks, "Do you think you are talking to somebody in Pie Corner?" I want to make that point. I myself, was born and brought up in St. Lucy and on one occasion when I was being shouted at, I said that person was not talking to somebody in Pie Corner from a geographical point of view. (*Laughter.*) How can the hon. member associate with a matter of geographical distance.....

Hon. M. E. COX: To come a little nearer home.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. We have some new Rules. Let the Clerk draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the Rule in these new Rules which states that no member can make reference to any matter which is *sub judice*. If anything is before the Court, you cannot make any reference to it in here. There is the relevant Rule; the Clerk has been showing you Rules all along; therefore, let him now show you the relevant Rule. (MEMBERS: Order.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! (A MEMBER: We will break up the House.)

Mr. WALCOTT: You hear order being called for over here; but the Minister over there is behaving badly all along.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member please take his seat? (*The hon. member took his seat.*) I was saying that I am at a loss to understand the reference which was made to something being *sub judice*. The hon. junior member for St. John has said that the hon. senior member for St. Michael had made some reference to the hon. member speaking to somebody in Pie Corner, St. Lucy. I would like to know what there is in that reference which is *sub judice*; that is what is beating me.

Mr. BARROW: I can explain what I mean by that. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is obviously under a great deal of strain. When I said that he was referring to something which was *sub judice*, he said that I had recently remarked to one of my colleagues - although he does not recognise the Trade Union, he recognises that I have legal colleagues - "Does he think he is speaking to somebody in Pie Corner, St. Lucy?" Well, the only occasion on which such a remark has been made by me is in a matter which is still *sub judice* and I meant the geographical distance between St. Philip and St. Lucy, because I was being shouted at. Full stop. (*Laughter.*)

8.35 p.m.

If you cannot understand "*sub judice*" it means under consideration by the Court.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You did not say 'your legal colleague,' and I thought you meant somebody in the House.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I happen to be born in the parish of St. Lucy; but quite apart from that I would ask you to ask the hon. member to stick to the debate, because I do not want to bandy words with him at this stage. We can do that at another place.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying that a few years ago I can remember that the hon. member had strong objections to the hon. senior member for St. Peter being a member of the Executive Committee, and he went further and told the hon. member that he could not.....

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the hon. senior member for St. Peter and ask him if there is any truth in that. How far in prevarication are we allowed to go in this Chamber? He waits until two minutes after the hon. member for St. Peter has left the Chamber and makes that statement which is completely unfounded. I will join you if you want order, but you must make him stick to the debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: It happened in this very House of Assembly and the hon. senior member for St. Peter flew at him when he made a statement in this House that he should return to school and his books. I should like to make it crystal clear that I am not prepared to sit here and al-

low this hypocritical sort of thing to get down the throats of people. What do you think we are here for? Do you think I will let him make misleading statements?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Leader of the House withdraw the words "misleading statements"?

Hon. M. E. COX: I withdraw. He should not come here and make it appear that we are not interested in the working classes when for all these years we have done so much to lift people up from where they were; he wants to convince you now that our policy is not to appoint any of these workers, because we do not think they are fit, but he, above all people.....

Mr. BARROW: Is the hon. member being Parliamentary when he says "he"?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. junior member for St. John above all people said that he would put a lighterman in This Place, ten scavengers in the Other Place, and that he would fill the place with agricultural workers.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, I would ask the member to name one single working class man whom the Government has put on the Natural Gas Corporation.

Hon. M. E. COX: Only recently, the hon. member was asking for a place for his colleague, Mr. A. E. S. Lewis; I do not know if he means that he is an agricultural worker.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. What was I asking for Mr. A. E. S. Lewis, who is a member of the Barbados Workers' Union anyhow, the President of his Division, and the only man in politics who lost his job for the working class movement?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to desist from making these statements and stick to Clause 2.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to say that the hon. member also made a statement about our putting a worker on a Board when that worker was ready to leave this island. That is not true. We put Miss Lynch on a Board years before she left this island; she was a member of the Wages Council.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I did not refer to the Wages Council.

Hon. M. E. COX: We put her on the Control Board.

Mr. BARROW: I said myself that she was put on the Control Board shortly before she left the island. The Wages Council is to destroy the Trade Union and not to assist it and you should read what Mr. Tello said about that anyhow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is making a speech.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 3 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

PRIVILEGE - GOVERNOR'S SALARY

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, am I permitted to raise a question of privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER: Of the whole House?

Mr. BARROW: Yes. Mr. Speaker, appearing on page 5 of the Advocate newspaper of today's date, Tuesday, 2nd September, is a statement purported to have been made before this House by the Premier, Dr. Gordon Cummins.

I am prepared to make it a document of the House because this is a matter which concerns the privilege of the whole House.
8.45 p.m.

This is a matter which so intimately concerns the privileges of the whole House that I am sure you will agree with me that it is a matter which cannot be left until after the recess.

I would like to make it quite clear before I start that I have made abundant enquiries as regards when this statement was alleged to have been made through my not having been in the House on Thursday, from the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk, the Reporters and the Clerical Staff and they know nothing about it.

The statement reads as follows:-

"GOVERNOR GETS HALF SALARY ON EMBARKING"

"The Premier, Dr. Gordon Cummins, made the following statement in the House of Assembly on Thursday on the subject of the Governor's Salary. Dr. Cummins said:-"

"Under the relevant Colonial Regulation, which is applied here, a Governor normally receives half salary from the date of embarkation for the Island. A Governor-designate, therefore, starts to draw halfpay when he boards the plane or ship which will bring him here, generally from the United Kingdom."

"An Acting Governor is paid half the difference between the salary attached to his substantive post (generally Chief Secretaryship) and that of the post of Governor as an acting allowance."

"The intention of the Governor's (Amendment) Act, 1958, is to bring Barbados into line with other Colonial territories and to provide for the rare case when it is desired to replace a Governor who is still on terminal leave. In the normal course, however, the appointment of a new Governor does not take effect until the expiry of the outgoing Governor's leave."

"It should perhaps be added that consequential amendments of the Letters Patent and of the Governor's Commission will be arranged in due course by the Secretary of State for the Colonies."

Now, Sir, this is on page 5 of today's issue of the "Barbados Advocate."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I never made that statement.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, this a question of privilege. I am grateful to the Hon. Premier for interrupting at this stage because, if as my information has disclosed, all of these clerical and other officers of the House have denied any knowledge of this statement made and that is corroborated by the Hon. Premier himself, certainly, a grave distortion of the proceedings of this House has taken place. I have also heard, but this is only hearsay, that an officer of the Cabinet released this statement to the Press.

Your Honour will have reason to remember that there was quite a lengthy discussion on the Bill which was called the Governor's (Amendment) Act, 1958. None of these matters which are now disclosed here in this communique was vouchsafed to the members of this House; therefore it would appear as if some official statement had been vouchsafed to the Press and to members of the public under the guise of a statement made at a session of this House.

Since, Mr. Speaker, you are the custodian of our rights, you are the final arbiter in matters of this kind. I am not to say what is the legal effect of disclosures such as this, but it certainly is a distortion of the proceedings of this House and an inadequate and misleading report of something which had never been said. I am sure the House awaits your statement on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has read from a newspaper certain statements relative to what was purported to have been said in this House by the Hon. Premier. The Hon. Premier has denied making that statement in this Chamber. The hon. member who has just sat down has referred to me as being the custodian of the rights and privileges of this Chamber but I must inform the hon. member that while that is so, I will have to put the position crystal clear to the House as it is put in May's on page 135 of the Sixteenth Edition, 1958. I am reading from near the bottom of the page.

"A member who complains of something published in a newspaper ought regularly to conclude by moving that the passage or passages complained of be read by the Clerk at the Table, but in recent years the Speaker has not insisted upon the observance of this formality. When the Member has concluded his complaint the Speaker desires him to bring the document to the Table and, when the document has been brought to the Table, directs the Clerk of the House to read the passages complained of.

When the document or the particular passages complained of have been read, it is the duty of the Member who has brought the matter under the notice of the House to follow up his complaint with a motion. Where he is not prepared to do so, the House has proceeded to the orders of the day. It would be irregular for a Member to deliver in a paper to be read at the Table without any intention of making a motion in reference thereto."

Mr. BARROW: Sir, I handed the document to the Clerk but I am prepared to have that part of it read by the Clerk. The purpose of my sitting down was to give the Clerk the opportunity to read it. After that, I am prepared to make a motion.

Hon. M. E. COX: At this stage, Sir, I just want to inform the House that inasmuch as we are prepared to adjourn for a longer period than until next Tuesday, it is necessary for a motion to be made. If we do not make the motion before 9 o'clock, we would adjourn until next Tuesday.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member rises to make his motion, I wish to say that I regard it as a very serious matter when any newspaper in this country publishes a matter purporting to give the impression, to say the least of it, that it is a statement coming from not only a member of this House but from a Minister of this Government who is a member of this House, and I consider it a grave breach of privilege.

From time to time, this House has sat under its privileges and I want to warn hon. members that when a Parliament continues to sit under its privileges, the time arrives when those can no longer be enjoyed and it takes statute law to have such privileges put back in force.
8.50 p.m.

I regard such a matter in a very, very serious light. It does not matter to me what newspaper it is in Barbados. The Rules and privileges of Parliament must be maintained and the public and the Press must know it and they must respect it. That is the position of Parliament.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move the following motion:

"That the Barbados Advocate be asked to explain the source of the information leading to the publication of the article complained of or be censured by the House for the publication of the same statement contrary to the established privileges of this House."

The reason why I say that is this: that Statement is the more dangerous, because it purports to bear an authoritative origin; it purports to be a Statement made by the Premier himself to this House. The Premier has said that he has not made any such statement and I take it that he has not made any such statement either inside or outside of the House. We are perfectly satisfied that the Premier has not made such a statement in here; if he made that statement outside, it should be one which should have been made available to the members of this House and that

is why I have framed my motion in the way that I have framed it. The motion now reads:

"That the Barbados *Advocate* be requested to explain the source of the statement complained of or be censured by Mr. SPEAKER for the publication of same."

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not know if I am in order to second that motion. (Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.) Well in doing so, I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that you have made the statement which you have made in this matter, because I was under the impression that this question of privilege in this Chamber is gradually being abused from the outside, because we, as members, seem to sit down on our rights. There is a popular belief outside that because members in this Chamber do not object, as we might do, to the reports of things taking place in here, we should be subjected to things from outside. It does not mean that at all; if anything takes place in this Chamber - we have the right to debate matters and to do things. I have noticed that people have been sailing from the East to the West by attacking even the Chair. As Your Honour has quite rightly said, it seems to me that they are going from stage to stage and it would only require Statute Law to put things right.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion, let me say this: it is only a few weeks previously when I read in the Press that the name "Town Hall" had been changed to "Law Courts". I was surprised to read that, because I was in the House on the previous day and all that had taken place was that the Bill had been introduced and it was read a first time; but the Reporter thought that the introduction of the Bill and the first reading of it meant that the Town Hall had become the Law Courts. That is another instance as to how careless things are happening, with the only Daily newspaper in the Island in the absence of senior competent and efficient Reporters.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this motion, and I am doing it because I have confidence that a responsible Editor would not have allowed such a Statement to appear in the Press, a Statement which has obviously been prepared and studied. I am supporting the idea of the censure, because I feel very confident that the true position will be explained. I was not in the House, but I wondered how the mistake could have come about. I recalled that the Hon. Premier had not mentioned anything about the Letters Patent; when the hon. junior member for St. John made mention of the Letters Patent, the Government pooh-poohed the idea and laughed. I am hoping that the true position will be explained to this House and there will be no necessity for censuring any Editor, but the public will know from what source the information came. I repeat that this Statement has been obviously prepared and sent to the *Advocate* for publication and that they published it in good faith. I will bet you that this Statement came from a very high source, but the Premier has not mentioned it. (MEMBERS: Question!)

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I am afraid that we, on this side of the House, or rather some of us, are not fully aware of this motion, or of the extent of this motion. I do not believe in following even my friends blindly. I still say that I have to see things for myself. When we follow things blindly, they say that we are "Yesmen", but when we want to enquire into anything, then they say that we are opposing it.

What I am saying, Sir, is that we have not seen the motion, and do not know the extent of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I read the motion? "That the Barbados *Advocate* be requested to explain the source of the statement complained of or be censured by Mr. Speaker for publication of same."

Hon. M. E. COX: I must thank Your Honour for reading the motion, but we did not understand it that way, and that is why I was not going to follow people blindly. I have an opinion of my own. The hon. member is not censuring the *Advocate*; what he wants to do is to find out the source from which this information came and how it did get into the paper. He does not want to censure the paper for publishing something which he says purports to be a breach of privilege, and I think. . . .

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. It is a fundamental part of the British Law not to condemn a man until he is heard in his own defence, and that is why I have worded the motion in the way I have, because that statement may have been sent from an unauthorised source as being a *bona fide* report. How could I censure the *Advocate* if they are acting *bona fide*?

Hon. M. E. COX: I listened, Sir, to the hon. senior member for the City, and from him I gleaned something. As I said, it is not a question of censuring the *Advocate* for something which is a breach of the privileges of this Hon. House; the hon. member is not interested in the publication as much as in the source from which this publication came.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I insist on hon. members that both sides of the House are entitled to their opinions, and therefore each side deserves a hearing?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am prepared to move an amendment to this motion, and it is that "a Committee of this House be appointed to consider the motion made by the hon. junior member for St. John." On the question of privileges, May's page 139 reads as follows: "The report of a Committee on a matter of privilege may be taken into consideration in pursuance either of an Order made upon a previous day"..... and so on, and I am making that motion as an amendment to the motion made by the hon. member.

Again, I would like to remind the House that if 9 o'clock comes up the House will have to adjourn until next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please write out his motion so that I can read it to the House? The hon. member may remain standing while he makes his motion.

Hon. M. E. COX: The motion reads as follows, Sir: - "That a Committee of this House be appointed to consider the question of the alleged breach....."

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that three hon. members are standing, and that is disorder.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member in the course of his speech a few minutes ago referred to what he called an alleged breach of privilege. I distinctly remember hearing Your Honour give the opinion that it was a breach of privilege, and if Mr. Speaker has said it is a breach of privilege, no other member can say it is not.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I tell this House that if we, and we must, accept the Premier's statement, it is nothing but a breach of privilege? (*Cheers from the Opposition.*)

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Page 139 of May's says nothing about a Committee being appointed; it says a breach of privilege may be referred to the Committee of Privileges, and we have no Committee of Privileges here.

Hon. M. E. COX: All that is left for me to do at this stage is to move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER: No! No! Not with a breach of privilege.

Hon. M. E. COX: Well, Sir, is it not within your power, may I ask, to set up a Committee to go into this matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will say it is still within my power to appoint such a Committee if the House so directs, but I will prefer not to set up that Committee in case of a direct motion.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the motion is as follows: "That a Committee of the House be appointed to consider the breach of privilege committed by the *Advocate* Newspaper on 2nd September and report on what action should be taken in the matter."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 9 o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Tuesday next.
9.00 p.m.