

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th November, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.00 o'clock (noon) today.

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERCUSSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

ABSENCE OF SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that His Honour the Speaker is at present engaged in a case as Senior Counsel at the Assize Court, and the case has reached a stage where his presence is necessary.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the 29th October, 1963, have been circulated, and unless there is any objection, these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*A Pause*)

There being no objection, these Minutes are taken as confirmed.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 30th April, 1963.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay:-

Statistical Service — Selected Monthly Indicators — July, 1963.

On my own behalf, I am commanded to lay:

The Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year 1961.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I beg to give notice of a Resolution that the sum of \$50,000 be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the necessary expenses of putting the sugar and molasses Factory at Haggatts, St. Andrew, in condition for operation during the forthcoming crop season;

Also Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation, and Labour Welfare) Order, 1963.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$6,806 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1963-64, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1963-64, No. 22, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I am also asking leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today as it is a matter of urgency.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am going to ask for leave to deal at today's sitting with both the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given today. The appropriate Resolutions will be circulated and there is some urgency attached to both. In the case of the Resolution re Haggatts Factory, the money is required immediately in order to start putting the factory into condition for operation for the coming crop and, therefore, hon. members will readily appreciate that it is important that work should be started at an early stage because any delay will reflect adversely on the operation of the Factory.

With regard to the other Resolution, that is in connection with the rehabilitation of polio victims and that is also a matter of urgency on medical grounds. We are, therefore, asking the support of hon. members in dealing with both of these money Resolutions at today's meeting.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS Barbados needs citizens who have had the benefit of higher education in subjects other than those catered for by the Local College of Arts & Sciences,

AND WHEREAS the income tax allowances for the parents of students studying at centres of higher education are thoroughly inadequate,

AND WHEREAS such inadequate allowances are acting as a deterrent to persons desirous of giving their children higher education;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government introduce legislation to amend the Income Tax Act to increase the allowances for the parents of students studying at centres of higher education to bring such allowances nearer to the actual cost of such education.

12.25 p.m.

Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT and E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

QUESTION

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that the tunnel at the entrance to Carrington's Village Tenantry Road, St. Thomas, needs widening in order that the water would be able to flow freely?

2. Will the Minister remedy same in an effort to bring satisfaction to the people living in the said area?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is another question standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. James who, I observe, is not now in his place.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Committee of Supply be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolutions for \$50,000 and \$6,806 of which notice was given earlier today.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

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

RESOLUTION re. SUGAR AND MOLASSES FACTORY AT HAGGATTS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$50,000 to be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the necessary expenses of putting the sugar and molasses Factory at Haggatts, St. Andrew, in condition for operation during the forthcoming crop season.

First of all, Sir, I want to apologise to hon. members for the necessity of dealing with this matter so urgently today, and I will explain to hon. members the reason for this. If the factory at Haggatts is to be reconditioned and put on an operational basis of maximum efficiency in time for the forthcoming crop season, then no time should be lost in starting the work there. Hon. members will therefore appreciate the fact that every week which goes by will militate against the possibility of the factory starting on time. That is why the Government feels compelled today to have this Resolution passed by both Houses of the Legislature so that from tomorrow morning work can be started at the factory.

From the Addendum to the Resolution, hon. members will see that the actual acquisition of this group is in

furtherance of the Government's policy of development of small farms for food production as indicated in its Development programme 1962-65 to the effect that steps should be taken to purchase the Haggatts group of estates in St. Andrew, comprising Haggatts, Brucevale, Greenland, Overhill, Bawden and River, together with the factory at Haggatts. This group of estates comprises 1,710 1/2 acres of land of which 812 1/2 acres are arable. The Addendum further explains that purchase of the group of estates is subject to the necessary funds being forthcoming from the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Fund. This source of Funds has been decided on as being appropriate to meet the cost of the purchase of this group of estates and others, and steps are being taken to have the funds made available. This involves legislative sanction being sought to Regulations extending the purposes to which the Price Stabilization Fund can be put, after agreement shall have been given by the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Reserve Board, the Barbados Sugar Producers' Association, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

In other words, Sir, the ratification of the proposal is to be sought on the part of the four bodies enumerated here, and on receipt of that ratification, the necessary legislation will be enacted in order to extend the scope of the Regulations governing the utilisation of the Price Stabilization Fund.

12. 35 p.m.

Paragraph 3 of the Addendum, Sir, sets out in further detail the Government's policy in this matter. It is pointed out that at present Government owns certain other estates, and it considers that they should all be operated on a commercial basis along the lines of the Government's agricultural policy. This policy is based on an approved production plan designed to demonstrate to small farmers the manner in which their crops can be diversified and produced on a commercial basis. In order to achieve this, Government therefore proposes to introduce legislation shortly to establish an Agricultural Development Corporation, and with the establishment of this Corporation, the Government has decided that the Sugar Industry Price Stabilisation Reserve Board should be requested to agree to make a grant of \$1 1/2 million from the Price Stabilisation Fund available to enable the Corporation, when established, to take over the running and development of all such Government-owned properties on a commercial basis. In other words, Sir, the Board is being asked to provide not only the actual money for the purchase of the Haggatts group, but to capitalise the Agricultural Development Corporation to the tune of \$1 1/2 million in order to operate on commercial lines the Haggatts group and all other estates owned by the Government, and to operate them, Sir, on lines in keeping with the Government's agricultural policy.

In paragraph 4 the Government is advised that the factory at Haggatts should be continued in operation, and that it is essential for work to be started immediately to put it into condition in order for it to operate during the coming crop season, and the Legislature is being asked by the Resolution now before it to provide the sum of \$50,000 which is required as an advance purely for mechanical improvement at Haggatts Factory. In other words, Sir, the actual capitalisation of the Agricultural Development Corporation will come in due course from the Price Stabilisation Fund, but we could not wait for ratification of the proposal by the four Organisations involved to begin to improve the mechanical conditions of the Factory at Haggatts, and therefore the only source for obtaining the \$50,000 for this purpose was the Legislature, and this Resolution seeks to get the approval of the Legislature for an advance of \$50,000 to meet the expenses of putting the factory in order.

The funds will eventually come from the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund from which a part of the funds will be reimbursed. In other words, the Treasury is called upon to advance this money which will be reimbursed when we get the funds from the Rehabilitation Fund, and I do want to emphasize that this step has been regarded as imperative solely on the basis of commencing work immediately at the factory at Haggatts. I think, Sir, that the Resolution ought to commend itself

to hon. members if they are apprised of all the facts, and if they are willing to support in principle the acquisition of this factory and the plantation group by the Government. The Government feels in principle that in the interest both of its own agricultural policy, in the interest of the economy of the country, and in the interest of the small farmers, factory workers and plantation workers in St. Andrew that this factory should not be allowed to go out of production at this stage.

Apart from the question of people employed there, Sir, and the facilities which are offered for the processing of canes produced in the area, the Government has come to the conclusion that from all points of view the retention of this factory as a working unit was economical and justified, and therefore seeks approval of the Legislature for its plans in this respect. Hon. members who have been aware of all the circumstances surrounding the closing down of the factory and hon. members who are also aware of the deep-seated desire on the part of cane producers and agricultural workers in the area to have the factory continue its operation will readily support the Government's proposals. It is quite true that in the past, as has been reported, the factory has not been a financial success, and therefore the present owners decided to discontinue its operation; but the Government has been advised that there are possibilities of putting the operation on a sound economical basis, and it is further advised that with the capitalisation involved the expenditure is justified, and that the property itself is worth the amount asked for. This is a cardinal point. Regardless of all the necessity for continuing the factory in operation, the Government feels that the money expended in this respect is justified. The value of the land and the value of the factory is well worth the amount it is being asked to pay, and if at some time in the future either the condition of the industry or the Government's agricultural policy itself warrants the cessation of the operation of the factory as a sugar factory unit, this is a matter to be considered in the future; but at the moment all things tend to point to the conclusion that the Government is well justified in embarking on this scheme.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting first of all to the lateness with which the Government has presented us with the Resolution, because I accept the explanation given by the Hon. Leader of the House. But surely, Sir, he must credit us with some sense of responsibility on this side of the Table. He has after reading the Addendum made certain explanations to us relative to this Resolution, and I agree that with the crop season being just around the corner, anyone doing business with another relative to machinery for processing cane in this island should do it quickly.
12.45 p.m.

Surely the hon. member in his entire speech has not even treated us, may I be permitted to say, with the courtesy of saying what it is proposed to give for this entire factory or plantation. You are merely asking us to vote for a Resolution of \$50,000 which says that part of the advance will be reimbursed. You cannot come in here and tell us that you are going to pay an advance on something which you are purchasing, something which is partly real estate and partly chattel but more or less real estate, because it does not merely deal with the factory. According to the Addendum it is stated that this \$50,000 is to start and put into condition the factory which contains a group of estates comprising of 1,710 1/2 acres of land of which 812 1/2 acres are arable and the Haggatts group of estates are Haggatts, Bruce Vale, Greenland, Overhill, Bawden and River. The hon. member has not told us what is the purchase price, and this House would be absolutely wrong in voting one single cent unless it knows what it is putting \$50,000 on.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will just give way on a point of order, I would just like to say that we are not paying \$50,000 on this factory.

This \$50,000 has absolutely nothing to do with the purchase price. I appreciate that this Resolution has just been put before hon. members and it may be a bit too much to ask hon. members to assimilate everything in the Addendum. This \$50,000 is only to put the machinery of the factory into condition.

When you say in paragraph 5 of the Resolution that funds will become available from the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund with which a part of the advance will be reimbursed, all it means is this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, that is not fair. The hon. member is on a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I was just explaining to the hon. member something and I only got as far as "what it means is this".

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot do that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister was just giving an explanation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot tell me that. I have been in here too long.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member made two single statements on which he wanted an explanation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Maybe, that explanation will make me change my speech. I am perfectly willing to listen to the explanation by the Hon. Minister, but what I am saying is this, I am not objecting to the lateness of this Resolution because no arrangement has been made either by the private owners or the Government for putting the machinery into order for the processing of sugar cane during the next crop; therefore, you will have to come in with something for that and do something immediately.

Sir, I go on to say that you are asking us to vote for this Resolution for \$50,000 and the Hon. Minister has given us greater thought when he says that this \$50,000 has nothing to do with the purchase price of these group of estates and factories. In other words, the Hon. Minister is telling us that the Government has not purchased yet, but that they are going to spend \$50,000 on something on which they have not yet had an agreement.

One would have thought that the Hon. Minister would have told us in the preamble what is not in the Addendum, and what a lot of us has been hearing outside, such as, the Government is going to purchase Haggatts by compulsory acquisition or that they have agreed to purchase it for so much. Sir, you have not entered into any agreement at all, but you are spending \$50,000 on a factory. If you had told us that you have entered in agreement, either in the Addendum or in your introductory speech, that may have changed my speech. Too often Ministers rely on only reading out what is in the Addendum, which is something all of us can read. You come today and ask us to vote for a Resolution for \$50,000 to buy this factory. You have not made any statement about putting the factory in order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Will the hon. member give way?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I correct myself. He said to put the factory in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I corrected myself to say that the hon. member said, "to put the factory in order". It was not to purchase the factory.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for the City makes statements and then corrects himself. I just want to explain to the hon. member that the House is being advanced this money which involves what would be a Suspense Account and it would be paid back into the Treasury. This has been done purely that work should be

started on the factory. The Clerk of the Executive Committee and the Solicitors of the owners of this factory have been negotiating on the purchase of Haggatts Factory and the group of estates, and they have agreed on all the terms of the conveyances, and as far as I know the Crown Solicitor and the Solicitor for the individuals have agreed to the proposals and that is the basis of the contract. We have been informed by authoritative people who are versed in factory work that it is absolutely essential to start from this week to put the factory in good condition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier was not in the House when this matter was introduced. It does not matter what Latin phraseology you may quote. There was not a single existing agreement between the Crown Solicitors and the Solicitors for the owners of this property that the price which you are asking will be paid. None of that was heard before.

The hon. member has said something to which I will ask him to refer to the last part in paragraph 5 of the Addendum. He said that this amount be paid into the Treasury of which a part of the advance will be reimbursed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, that is what I was trying to explain to the hon. member and he refused to listen to me. A part will be paid back from the Rehabilitation Fund, because if the sugar industry every year is entitled to a certain amount of money per ton of sugar produced, therefore, Haggatts is entitled from the Rehabilitation Fund to a certain amount of money at the end of the crop based on its sugar production, and this money is for this purpose of rehabilitating it.

12.55 p.m.

The money collected from the Rehabilitation Fund will go towards the \$50,000 and the remainder will come from the capital of the factory.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think that the way....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the House has said that the remainder of the money will come from the capital of the factory. That is one possible way in which it will be repaid, but sugar factories in Barbados regard this kind of operation as current expenditure which is recouped partly from the Rehabilitation Fund and partly from the profits of the factory. The Hon. Leader of the House has therefore only given a guarantee that if the factory does not make a profit, the money will be available from the Fund. It is not necessary that the money will come from the capital exclusively.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the position has been now clarified more so than the Addendum has made it. From the point which the hon. member has made, as far as the Resolution is concerned, we would be asked to vote this sum of \$50,000 to put the factory in a proper working order to meet this crop which is now coming. There is nothing in the Addendum which says that the Government has entered into any agreement to acquire the factory, at what price the Government is acquiring it, or what.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member is always arguing with himself. I have a Statement to make on the whole project as soon as this Resolution is concluded. As a matter of fact, I have two Statements to make in the House which Statements I cannot make in Committee. The hon. member knows that I came in the House while the House was in Committee and these Statements were in my despatch box locked up and I usually keep the keys to my despatch box.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing with myself; I am arguing commonsense.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have the Statement here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You have it, but hon. members do not know it. I excuse the hon. member for being late.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I am Chairman of the Council of Ministers meeting

in this Island and I will say that not only was I late, but the Statement was also late. My arrival coincided with the arrival of the Statement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I am still holding my own on this point. Let us admit that what the Hon. Premier says is the procedure, but he must not come to the conclusion that I am arguing with myself. I am arguing what any reasonable member would argue. You come down here with a Resolution to put this factory in order so as to meet this year's crop; you are putting this factory into shape, but we cannot say with any authority coming from any Government Minister that the Government has acquired this factory. The hon. member has actually told us that there is an agreement between the Crown Solicitor and the Solicitor for the vendors of this property, and that in itself stands good because the Government has agreed with the vendors to pay what they have asked for this property. Hon. members are entitled to know how much is being paid for this factory. I want to say this in the interest of the Government of this country; at one time it was stated that one price would be paid for this factory and in the next week \$200,000 was asked for it and in the next week they were asking for \$300,000. In the circumstances, therefore, it is appropriate that before this Resolution is passed, we should hear the Statement.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest, as a matter of fact I am going to move, that further consideration of this Resolution be postponed so that the Hon. Premier can make a Statement in this House. When the Hon. Premier makes that Statement in this House, every hon. member will know what the Government is paying for this factory, whether it be \$200,000 or \$300,000. Nobody will sit down here like an idiot and say that you should repair this factory and does not know what price is going to be paid for the factory, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. I make that motion so that we will be able to have the facts before us before we proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to make two Statements before hon. members of this House. One Statement is in relation to the Haggatts Factory and group of estates by the Government of Barbados and the other one is in relation to the additional profits accruing to the sugar industry in respect of the 1963 crop.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to make two Statements, and unless there be any objection to either Statement being made, leave will be granted the Hon. Premier to make those statements. *(After a pause)* There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Premier to make the Statements.

STATEMENT re HAGGATTS FACTORY AND GROUP OF ESTATES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the Statement which I now propose to make in relation to the Haggatts Factory and group of Estates in the parish of St. Andrew:-

In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I have the honour to inform this Honourable House that the Government has decided to take steps to purchase the Haggatts group of estates in St. Andrew, comprising Haggatts, Brucevale, Greenland, Overhill, Bawden and River, together with the factory at Haggatts. This group of estates comprises 1,710 1/2 acres of land of which 812 1/2 acres are arable.

2. This decision has been reached, bearing in mind the Government's policy of development of land of

small farms for food production as indicated in the Development Programme 1962-65.

3. Agreement has been reached with the owners of this group of estates, S. P. Musson, Son & Co. Ltd., as to the purchase price and a letter of intent has been sent to them. It is expected that the sugar and molasses factory at Haggatts will be handed over to the Government during this week, and it is hoped that the factory will be put in condition in order for it to operate in the forthcoming crop season.

4. As an interim measure, the Government is appointing Lt. Col. H. A. Dowding, M.B.E., as manager of the project. He will be responsible to the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries for the operation of the factory and estates for the time being.

5. Purchase of this group of estates, including the factory, is subject to the necessary funds being forthcoming from the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Fund, and action has already been started to have these funds made available.

1.05 p.m.

6. The price to be paid for the properties is \$75,000. The purchaser will be responsible for the balance outstanding on the soil conservation charges, which amounts to \$61,497.48, and which is repayable over a period of 10 years, and for the cultivation expenses from the 1st of July, 1963. By this purchase, the Government will also acquire the 1,435 \$5 shares now held by the Haggatts group in Molasses Terminals Limited.

7. The Government proposes that this group of estates, as well as the other Government-owned estates, should be operated on a commercial basis along the lines of the Government agricultural policy. This policy is based on an approved production plan designed to demonstrate to small farmers the manner in which their groups can be diversified and produced on a commercial basis. This is to be done by an agency to be known as the Agricultural Development Corporation which the Government proposes to establish legislation to be submitted soon to this Honourable House.

8. Government intends that the proposed Agricultural Development Corporation should be financed, at least in its early stages, by a grant from the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Fund as the development to be undertaken by the Corporation will assist the sugar industry directly and indirectly by maintaining efficiency of production of sugar cane by the purchasing of properties which would otherwise be subject to fragmentation. Fragmentation could give speculators a considerable capital gain at the expense of the overall efficiency which would be possible if the properties remained as whole units which were run commercially. The Government is taking steps to have the necessary grant made available from the Price Stabilization Fund.

STATEMENT BY THE HONOURABLE PREMIER RELATING TO THE ADDITIONAL PROFITS ACCRUING TO THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN RESPECT OF THE 1963 CROP

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have the honour to inform this Honourable House that proposals have been submitted to the Ministry of Finance jointly by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Federation of Barbados on the equitable distribution of additional profits accruing to the sugar industry during the year 1963.

2. As a result of the unexpected rise in the price received for sugars sold in the free market this year, it is anticipated that the industry will benefit by a windfall of approximately \$6.7 million.

3. Agreement has been reached between the recognised bodies representative of workers and employers

in the sugar industry as to the division of this windfall. It is proposed that there should be established a fund administered by a board comprising:

The Financial Secretary or his nominee - Chairman
One Member nominated by the Sugar Producers' Federation,
Five Members nominated by the Barbados Workers' Union, and that the sum of approximately \$1.6 million should be paid into this fund for the use and benefit of the workers in the industry, namely

- (a) Workers employed on Sugar Estates
- (b) Workers employed in or about Sugar Factories
- (c) Workers employed by Sugar Transport Ltd.
- (d) Workers employed by Sugar Terminals Ltd.
- (e) Workers employed by Molasses Terminals Ltd.

Details of the purposes for which the income and capital of this fund will be appropriated are being worked out, and the Legislature will be requested to enact the necessary legislation to give effect to this part of the agreement.

4. It is further proposed that, in accordance with a precedent recommended by the Lewis Commission in 1958 when an *ad hoc* bonus of 7% was paid to the workers out of the windfall profits of the previous year — which incidentally amounted to \$9 1/2 million — and *ad hoc* bonus of 10% should be paid to each individual worker in the industry on his total crop time earnings during the year 1963.

5. It has also been agreed that the balance of the windfall should be paid to all cane farmers and suppliers of sugar cane on the direct basis of the tonnage supplied.

6. The Government considers that this agreement is a remarkable achievement in the field of industrial relations and willingly concurs.

7. This Honourable House will therefore shortly be requested to pass the legislation necessary to give effect to these proposals.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply prior to reporting of progress, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was addressing the Chair. Will the hon. member continue?

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must say now that we have been given what I consider a comprehensive statement as to what is the position of the Haggatts Factory, the several plantations comprising the Haggatts group, what is being paid for it and who should be responsible for the soil conservation charges, and how they should be paid over a period of years. This seems to me to be Government's policy. I must, however, make my position abundantly clear that I, speaking on behalf of my Party do not agree with the purchasing of this plantation, factory or otherwise, and we are going to register our vote accordingly.

I remember well, Sir, that on another occasion in this Chamber we had to record our vote when a member of the last Government in power brought in a Resolution to the effect that the Sugar industry should be nationalised, and this seems to me — although this is not, I must confess, by design, because we are knowledgeable on this subject — that the owners of Haggatts Group had made decisions some time ago that while this group of estates would be

worked and cultivated, the sugar factory in this area would not be used any longer.

I think it is common knowledge within this Island that the owners of this group of estates are very experienced people in the handling of business, not only commercial business but agricultural business. They have quite a sound knowledge of this type of business, and I think it is common knowledge that they have made it clear to the public of Barbados that this factory has not been paying. I sympathise with the Government in that the parish of St. Andrew is predominantly an agricultural area, that is, not only are they agriculturists from the point of view of labourers, but they are small peasant owners and peasant farmers, and of the 7,000 odd people, the great majority are agriculturists. 1.15 p.m.

Due to its terrain, its hills and so on, it is difficult for the people of St. Andrew to get canes out of the parish if there was no factory in it. I am not worried about the purchasing of the plantations like Bawden, River and the other estates themselves, because I do believe the incentive of the Barbadian is that given the opportunity of working on something of his own, he gives of his best and, Mr. Chairman, that is an incentive in all of us. I have had the experience in my line of selling quite a bit of land in St. Andrew and it has been discovered that the land which is fragmented actually produces more in the hands of the agricultural worker than under the hands of certain businessmen because the people did more work for themselves than when they were working for the plantation.

Sir, it is common knowledge throughout the Island that the owners of the Haggatts group decided that as the factory was not paying they should shut it down. I am wondering whether the Government has taken every possible step they can, whether Government has interviewed all whom they should interview, and whether they have gone into every possible aspect of this venture of acquiring, not so much the land, but the factory. I will admit here and now that no Government in this country could sit by and be so insensible as to throw the parish of St. Andrew out of production. What I mean is this. The parish of St. Andrew with its vast agricultural area could not be thrown out of production because it would be a serious blow not only to direct taxation but to the very sugar industry for the simple reason that St. Andrew is not a parish, as I have heard it spoken, which can be called a good kitchen garden parish. This parish even with a late rainfall produces quite a good crop of canes. It is, in other words, a sugar producing parish.

But, Mr. Chairman, the question of acquiring Haggatts Factory after people with the experience of S. P. Musson, Son & Company, has told the general public that it is not a paying factory is something to which you should pay some attention. I believe myself, knowing capitalists and industrialists as I do, that at any time they see something which is paying them, however so small, they are not going to give it up. I am speaking squarely from the shoulder. May be, some people will say that my party represents S. P. Musson Son and Company, but let me say that I represent Barbados; therefore, I am entitled to express my view for the people of Barbados. It has been said that this factory could not pay and was not paying for some time. I, therefore, question the wisdom of the Government in acquiring it.

I am wondering whether any other means could not be brought about in order to get the people of St. Andrew to process their crops at other sugar factories. Quite a number of people will shout and shout, and I am wondering whether these have not pressurised the Government into something. I have gone into some of the facts, and I have discovered that some of the people who were shouting the most that Government should buy this factory have been sending quite a good proportion of their sugar cane to factories outside of St. Andrew and not to Haggatts Factory. Although it may be argued that a motor lorry would charge 50 cents per ton more to carry your canes either to Vaucluse or Haymans, due to the efficiency of these factories I am told on absolute authority that in the end you can have a better profit, even if it is only about 20 cents

a ton, for the simple reason that these factories paid you better than what Haggatts could pay you because Haggatts was not an efficient factory.

This is a question which must operate in the minds of hon. members. Has this Government been pressurised into doing this? I wonder if some of the same people who went into St. Andrew and said that the Government should acquire this factory are not some of the same people who have been taking their canes outside the parish of St. Andrew, and I hope that within another year or so on, these same people will not be saying what a bunch of idiots members of this Government are because they have taken up the people's money and put this imposition on them.

There must be other means of subsidising the cane farmers and agricultural workers of St. Andrew. Let us take the workers at Haggatts. The factory workers form the minority because the plantation will still be in operation. Bawdens, River, Overhill and others are plantations forming the Haggatts group. As I have said, the land will still be in operation; therefore, the actual agricultural workers will still be working.

Sir, I hope the Hon. Leader of the House who is in charge of this would state if Haggatts Factory were not bought, how many actual factory workers would suffer as a result. I hope the hon. member will give us an answer to that question in his reply.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. In my opening remarks, I said that 120 workers were effected.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I never let it appear in this House that I am aggravated to make any contradiction of what the hon. member made as a statement of fact. I have gone through this matter and I am wondering from where the Hon. Minister got his figures. I wonder where he got those figures of 120 workers from. I have been given figures; I am not talking about the agricultural workers; I am talking about the factory workers. May be, Sir, as far as the plantations are concerned, there will be a tremendous lot of people working on the plantations, but they will not be put out of work.

Sir, as far as we are concerned, it is very regrettable. While we would like to see the sugar industry carried on for the benefit of this country, we do feel that other means can be devised whereby the agriculturists — and this means the producers and such people — could be found to help them rather than by purchasing this factory. Under these circumstances, without further ado, or making any row, I am expressing the sentiments of my Party, which is that we will not be able to vote for this Resolution and will not vote for it. Had the Government come in and told us that Haggatts Factory with 810 acres of land under cultivation and with another 1,000 acres belonging to peasant proprietors would go out of operation if this factory was closed, that may be something else. If this Government had told us that this factory has produced so many tons of sugar and if this factory went out of operation, after they had gone into all of the figures that if the canes from those estates in St. Andrew were to go to Vaucluse or Haymans, it would entail such a great loss to the agriculturists and workers of that parish, we would then be able to give second thought and great consideration to the matter. 1.25 p.m.

In the circumstances, as I have said, there are still several people in St. Andrew who know things; I challenge any hon. member, even the hon. senior member for St. Andrew who is very knowledgeable of things in St. Andrew, to say that there are not peasant proprietors who send their canes out of St. Andrew rather than send them to Haggatts Factory. In those circumstances how can we, on this side of the House, vote for this Resolution? We certainly could not vote for it. There are other countries in this world where peasant proprietors, agriculturists and the like must be helped and subsidised, but to what extent? Mind you, there is no argument today to tell us that Brucevale, Bawden, Greenland, Overhill and so on would go out of cultivation as

a result of the closing down of Haggatts Factory; the argument is that Haggatts factory will cease to work because it cannot pay. I think it is knowledgeable to most of us — in fact I have heard it said by Trade Unionists that in the next ten years the number of factories will be reduced to six because it is a question of greater production and greater efficiency; therefore, it is not that these plantations will go out of production.

You have quite a number of peasants in St. Andrew; and if you argue that they will suffer as the result of Haggatts going out of production, let us know if you have done every possible thing, if you have consulted every possible authority to show where you cannot give assistance which would cost you less than what running this factory will cost, I will tell you, Sir, that it does not matter who runs this factory or how you run it, it will not pay. I am wondering whether you cannot use some mechanical means of getting peasants' canes out of St. Andrew and have taken them to Vacluse. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to say in connection with this matter. This is one of those Resolutions for which we cannot vote and, consequently, we must vote against it.

Mr. WALCOTT and Hon. E. W. BARROW rose to speak.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way, I would like to explain one or two things about which hon. members will be asking. I will be very brief in my remarks because this is only a question of the Resolution for putting the factory in a good condition and the money will be refunded to the Treasury. I have listened very carefully to the speech made by the hon. member. The difference between him and me is that he is a Capitalist and I am a Socialist. The hon. member has said everything perhaps which I have said on a platform about the people who are capitalists not giving up things if they can get anything out of them. I have made pronouncements about the feasibility of purchasing this factory. It will take a tremendous amount of co-operation on the part of the factory workers, the management and the cane producers to make this factory a sound proposition. The same capitalists which the hon. member is so proud to be associated with, have allowed the factory to run into the ground. I am not casting any aspersions against anybody; but when you have a joint stock operation, it is not like when you are running your own business. Lieutenant Colonel Dowding bought that factory at Lower Estate and he has boasted that it is one of the best run factories in the island; he will send down to St. Andrew or up to St. Philip in order to bring canes to his factory. When you have an organization which is not running a factory because it is a means of livelihood to them, they tend to be very callous and cynical about operations of this kind; when they happen to have other interests, they may consider it economic to get canes from the same area and grind them in another factory. All those are sound economic arguments for them, but not for a Socialist Government. When I say that Haggatts Factory is old iron, that is just the stage which they have left it in.

Mr. Chairman, we were asked to buy this factory and we were reluctant to buy it. The owners were projecting that they were unwilling to sell the factory alone but they were only willing to sell the group of estates with the factory thrown in as a going concern. This is no fly-by-night decision; we have set out in our Development Programme that we will organize things to encourage co-operative ownership of land without fragmentation, and give the workers of this country a bigger say in the land tenure system of purchasing estates to be run on a co-operative basis or to be run as co-operative farms. We said that we would put in roads for the people and sell the land back to them, and as to the 200 or 300 houses we would let the people who live in them have a sense of ownership by selling the houses to them. We set that out in our Development Programme and this is now an endorsement of our policy. That is the difference between socialism and rampant capitalism. The fact that over a hundred people will be thrown out of employment is immaterial as far as joint stock is concerned. Severance pay will destroy the pride which a man has in his job or in his work, although it might compensate him for loss of earnings over a period of time. There are psychological matters that the peasants have to work out and grasp; although you can convince them on paper that they can send

their canes over the hill and get a better price for them than they would get under the hill, they still regard themselves down there almost like a republic, shut in by the hills of St. Andrew and St. Joseph. They did not mind when Brucevale, Swans and Joes River closed down.

1.35 p.m.

No effort was made by any previous Government when the last factory in St. Joseph went out of production. I did not hear any talk from the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that they should buy any factory, but the worst kind of speculation went on down there. Funds were diverted from one source to another; funds were voted and illegally diverted, and the agricultural sector in St. Joseph is, if I may use an expression with impunity, a complete mess. There is no part of the Island where the land usage apparently is more completely unsatisfactory than in the parish of St. Joseph. I want to say this — and I am not being personal — that the hon. member supported that. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown actively supported factories being closed down in St. Joseph, and actually participated in the fragmentation of the land down there.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must not make these statements. How did I support the closing down of the factory in St. Joseph? The only time I had anything to do with St. Joseph is when the ex-Prime Minister abused me in Bridgetown and I went to St. Joseph to abuse him. I never sold one spot of land in St. Joseph; so how do you mean I actually supported it? If I had sold land there, I would not have been ashamed to come in here and say that, because I am a real estate broker. If I had done that, I would say so because I would have the money in the bank.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member misunderstands me when I say that. I do not think he was an agent for any of the land, but anyhow the hon. member disclaims any knowledge of Joes River. In other words, even as a matter of geography apparently he is disclaiming it; but perhaps I should not say the hon. member actively supported it, but his voice certainly was not raised in support of the people who were going to be thrown out of work when Joes River was dismantled. Maybe that is the highest I can say. What is remarkable now is that the hon. member is not concerned over the factory workers, or the fact that this is a psychological blow to the people in St. Andrew, neither is he concerned over the fact that we have had eminent authorities, people who are engineers and who are concerned in the sugar industry in Barbados and the rest of the West Indies, go down and look at the whole operation; but there is another important factor; Government was interested in the land, the people in St. Andrew were interested in the factory; but we did not think at this short notice that we could turn over the factory to the cane farmers, because they would not be able to get it opened in time for the 1964 crop season, and therefore Government wants to put it on its feet so that the cane farmer or any group of peasants could not claim that we gave them something which is useless. They are satisfied in St. Andrew that they can make a go of this factory, even if they have to sell their canes to the factory at a lower price than peasant proprietors in other parts of the Island get for their canes sent to other factories, and therefore the factory workers who would have been displaced will as soon as these proposals are formulated, be able also to take shares in the factory where they have a greater interest in what is going on. The cane farmers in St. Andrew will also be able to take shares in the factory, and the Government will have some kind of interest if the cane farmers want the Government to show their actual participation by some percentage shareholding in the factory. I am not making any positive statements now, because the period in which we had to come to the House with this Resolution was much too short for these things to be examined in an impartial atmosphere and in a sound and sensible manner, and therefore we have taken the step which we have taken to bring in Lieutenant Colonel Dowding, a former member of this House whose capability certainly no one can impeach when it comes to running a sugar factory. That is all we are concerned with at this stage. He does not belong to the same political Party as us; he belongs to the same Party as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; so they cannot say it is a political appoint-

ment, and it is also a demonstration that this Government is not concerned either with colour or with politics when it comes to the disposal of taxpayers' money. I want to make that abundantly clear. As a matter of fact, Mr. Dowding was my political opponent in St. George, and we had a lot to say about each other during the campaign; but when the campaign is over, and he is the man for the job, he is the person who will get the job. As a matter of fact, I think he is doing us a service by agreeing to take on this assignment where everybody's eyes will be upon him, and I admire his courage in doing so.

When I spoke in the parish of St. Thomas about Haggatts Factory, if you go down there you will feel yourself constrained to agree that it looks like a bunch of old iron, and Government is not interested in purchasing old iron, as I said; but representations had been made to us by people who live in one-seventh of the Island stating what they would be willing to do. We have warned them and we have shown them all the projections. We worked on this matter for eight months, long before the people in St. Andrew knew it was going to be closed down, and before they knew what was going on in the community from day to day. We have examined this in the Central Planning Committee with the economists, legal advisers, financial advisers and agricultural technicians sitting down Friday after Friday from about February at least twice a month looking at the whole agricultural sector, and particularly the agricultural sector in St. Andrew, and more in particular the Haggatts group of estates, and what was going on there. Long before any cane farmer, any peasant or any representative of that parish came to us, we wrote to Mussons and asked them what was going to happen to the Haggatts group of estates, because we are looking at the agricultural balance in the community and we are interested to see what is happening to it.

Mr. Chairman, the owners were reluctant, unwilling; they refused to sell the factory as a separate entity or to sell any one of the estates as a separate entity, and anything I may say today here about the condition of the factory, I do not mean it in a personal manner. It is that these people came to the conclusion that they could make money better somewhere else, and that is how Conservatives and Capitalists think. They do not think of the sociological impact from an act like the dismantling of a factory. The profit motives alone are the motivating factors behind Conservatives and Capitalists; but our idea behind this is not the question of nationalising or not nationalising. This Party has never said that it is in favour of nationalising the sugar industry, because firstly we would not have the money to do it, and secondly I do not think Civil Servants are the best people to run commercial undertakings. If we thought so, we would have taken the Auditor General and sent him to run Haggatts instead of Mr. Dowding. Here we had a case for public ownership, in the acquisition of Graeme Hall and the Haggatts group. When we came into power the Government and the people of Barbados did not own 50 acres of land in the whole country outside of elementary schools, but in 18 months time Government has already acquired well over 2,000 acres of land in this country, which is an investment in a country with a growing population anyhow, where land prices are never falling but are always on the upswing, sometimes in a smooth turn and sometimes by jumps, if you understand what I mean. I am sure the hon. senior member for the City will agree, as a real estate agent, that the Government is not paying too much money for land which is being sold at less than \$2,000 an arable acre. 1.45 p.m.

We are not paying too much money for it. (A VOICE: No.) As a real estate agent he is advising you that we are making a good investment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, The Hon. Premier is a good lawyer, but he cannot get away with that with me. If you sold me the land, I would give you the factory. What I am saying is that you are buying the factory and running it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If you are getting the factory for nothing, well then, it is a good buy. I just wanted to explain these matters because I can make a long sociological

speech on the modes of people who have a way of life, and feel that way of life should be preserved.

Although we have stated that the Government intends to run Haggatts on a commercial basis, it does not mean that Government intends to retain the running of it. When we get things properly organised, we hope the Cane Farmers Association will come in with Government or that they will take over the factory and run it and demonstrate to the people of this Island what they can go through with a willing spirit of co-operation.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Premier has said quite a lot of things which I would have said. He said that he is not going to make a sociological speech, but I am going to make a sociological speech and I am going to speak very long and I hope that when I have finished the hon. senior member for the City will change his mind.

Mr. Chairman, I had some notes prepared here on the socialist concept and I know what the hon. senior member for the City said about the capitalist concept. There are certain things which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said to which you can agree. If it were Haggatts Factory alone, it would be a difficult thing to purchase for Government to run. You have to look at Haggatts Factory within the context of an agricultural holding of 1,700 acres of land of which the amount of 800 acres is arable land. I am not only looking at the land which is arable because the land which is not arable can be put to use.

I heard the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown said in a *sotto voce* remark that we will cut up the land. The hon. member has been cutting up too much land, and I feel people like him should not be allowed to cut up any more land and thus make this place a landless community. I hope the Government will see to it as well as the public the benefit of this scheme is not to cut up the land so as to give people a quarter acre or a house spot of land; the benefit of acquisition of land of this size and nature is to preserve the economic viability of this Island on a basis which is consonant with a world economic pattern. There is no point of looking to a world economic pattern on sugar which is changing swiftly without concern. I can read some figures here to show the sort of economic pattern, and in my organization, we have made points and prepared a memorandum which we put forward to the Commission of Enquiry into the sugar industry of Barbados.

What political Party has done so? Not a single political Party regarded it as incumbent upon it to demonstrate its knowledge and interest in the sugar industry to state what is happening.

To give you some indication, in 1956, the value of sugar and molasses f.o.b. was \$28 million; in 1957, as a result of the Suez Canal crisis, it was \$40 million. It dropped from \$40 million in 1957, to \$31 million in 1958. In 1960, it went down to \$29 million which is a fluctuation of \$11 million. When you can get a drop of nearly 25 % on sugar in Barbados, that is something with which you should concern yourself. Sugar in Barbados and its exports represent in one year — in 1956 — 86% of your domestic exports. It never fell below 85% of your domestic exports; therefore, you can see that sugar is very vital to the Island and the preservation of sugar is very vital to the economy of Barbados. In 1957, it was 91%. When you have these startling figures before you, you cannot fool around.

I know Professor John Kenneth Gailbraith has said: "The fatal blow to conventional wisdom comes when the conventional ideas fail signally to deal with some contingency to which obsolescence has made it further inapplicable."

This whole concept has no more meaning for an emerging territory like Barbados than Noah's Ark has to a flood of today. There is no point talking about the capitalist philosophy because the capitalist philosophy throughout the world has failed to represent emerging territories. If that were so, we would have abandoned United Nations. There is no point your continuing with a philosophy which is not consonant with your needs. This harping to the capitalists and

the capitalist concept has to wait until the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown is in power. Until that time, you have to resort to the socialist concept, which is equitable distribution so that you create prosperity to even the least. Why should we support this broad scheme? This is what we of the Barbados Workers Union believe in. We submitted to the Commission of Enquiry and we were strong in our views, and any member can read it, the following statement:-

"There are basically, two reasons for substituting machinery or automatic processes for hand labour. One is a shortage of labour or particular skills, and the other is rising labour costs. It is sometimes useful too to distinguish between mechanisation, which makes higher wages, output, and employment possible, and mechanisation, which is designed to diminish labour costs."

We went further and stated:

"It follows that displacement of workers, whose wages constitute to them income rather than costs, cannot be accepted unreservedly simply because technological changes may have come to be regarded as one of the ingredients of progress."
1.55 p.m.

To me displacement is not cost to an employer; machinery is cost. Machinery is cost of displacement of the worker and his income. Moreover we pointed out that machinery has to be imported and possibly with scarce foreign reserves. This is tantamount to importing unemployment as no additional jobs are being created through the establishment or expansion of a tool making industry. When you come to look at the whole crop, I have said that sugar factories in Barbados will diminish gradually; but we do not intend to give our support to the *laissez faire* idea that you should allow private people to do what the hon. member says joint stock companies have done. Somebody will say: "This is part of my investment and I closed it down purely on financial returns." It does not mean that the sociological interest in a country is not there. I do not accept any inferior position; I feel that it is my duty to study these things and I feel that I am as capable as anybody else to discuss and argue on them. We said that we cannot abdicate our responsibility first to our members and next to the community, to ensure that the pace and scale of mechanism is so regulated that hardships and dislocation may be kept to the minimum.

That is why we say that you should have Boards and Committees. You must have legislation by order and not to permit any further closing down of any factory unless a Committee can investigate and go into the matter. You are dealing with the total social and economic dislocation which will take place within families. One hundred people in Barbados means five hundred people on the basis of the density of our population. When you go down to St. Andrew, five hundred people means 8% of the total population of the parish. That is nothing at which you can sneeze and I feel that..

At this stage, it being 2 p.m. of the clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 2 p.m. of the clock and this sitting stands suspended until 2.30 p.m. of the clock. This sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention the fact that there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move at this stage that Standing Orders, 5, 14 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting so that we can continue with Government Business.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

RESOLUTION *re* SUGAR AND MOLASSES FACTORY AT HAGGATTS

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Prior to the suspension of the sitting, the Committee was considering a Resolution for the sum of \$50,000 relative to the sugar and molasses factory at Haggatts. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was at the point of explaining that when we look at the population, one hundred workers in Barbados represent about 500 persons; that is so on account of the density of our population. The Hon. Premier, in explaining some of these things, said some of the things which I would have said and some of the things he said I made a note of. I think it is appropriate that one should state his philosophy so that you can understand where his policy stands. In Barbados I am amazed to find that people are living in the 20th century completely differently from 100 years ago, and yet you find that there is a positive encouragement for a philosophy of the feudal society. Mr. Chairman, I will give you some examples. I am not partisan in any way, but I am not on the side of opposing any one group just for the sake of opposing it, when I know that something is taking place. Some people say that you should buy a factory as a political gimmick; other people will say that you should not buy the factory because it is not going to be economical to run. I look at the matter as a proportionate farm system.

Mr. Chairman, I can go on record and show by research things which hon. members said ten or fifteen years ago, but today they are saying the complete opposite to what they have said. What is happening to this country? I can bring facts to show or to bear out what I am saying. In 1949 there were 37 factories which were producing 152,000 tons of sugar.
2.35 p.m.

Today 20 factories produce 190,000 tons of sugar, that is 17 factories less. When I hear members from the other Party accuse the Government, I would say that 17 factories were closed down in this Island, and not a single factory was bought by the last Government in preserving the *status quo* of anybody. Applewhaites is going to close down next year, and that is why I said that Applewhaites belong to the same joint stock company. I agree with the Hon. Premier that anybody who has studied the operation of a joint stock company would know that if a joint stock company is involved in agriculture, in commerce, in shipping and in many other economic ramifications, it does not matter to that joint stock company if one goes out; but at some time we all have to rise above the political. I would say to any member in Parliament that if he is not going to reach the stage of 1963 and he has not yet projected a socialist philosophy of his own, he should get out because he is not capable of leading. Leaders in this community must understand that emergent countries like ours depend on positive and bold leadership which would take on new projections

that our predecessors dared not do. There is no point in peddling with the poke-in-the-hole which cannot meet the needs, I agree completely with the Premier in bringing a Resolution like this, but we have to think of how this is to be financed. When I hear criticisms from the other side about the former statements which the Premier made, I am going to stick my neck out and say that if we are not prepared at this time to save the workers of this country, we are not Socialists and should get out. Workers have been displaced and we have left them today squatting on plantation land, living in chattel houses which have been invested by all the termites, and we have not yet seen a housing project in this Island which can reflect the growth of the sugar industry; yet we go and ask them for votes year after year, or election after election, and they are coming out in shirts and pants from an 18" x 10" house, and still squatting on plantation land. What are we to do? Are we to sit down and not let them be participants in a society that has come after the feudal days and after the days of slavery? All those who say that this is a system they want to underwrite should get out.

I would say to anybody that in emergent countries the socialist philosophy is the only redemption, because they have been possessed, over-possessed and dominated in thinking by a philosophy that was not their own. The plantation system was not meant to lift workers out of the situation other than producing cheap labour for the product they were going to export. But we are not living in an age like that; we are living in an age where we pledge to bring the workers out. In 1949 there were 37 sugar factories and today there are 20, but I did not hear anybody make any criticism and say we allowed factories to go out. Applewhaites is going out, as I said; Government is buying Haggatts; Sandy Lane has closed down as well as Gibbons, Newton and Oldbury, notwithstanding the number of displacements which have taken place within the factories themselves. Carrington, Vaucluse, Buckley, nearly every sugar factory that is at present operating has at some time or other come to the Union with a statement for displacement owing to technological changes. I agree with the Hon. Premier that displacement money and severance payment are only a palliative. We do not regard them as taking the place of a man getting a job, because if a man is displaced at the age of 35 or 40 what are you going to do for him if he does not have a job? That is why I would say to the ignorant who say that the workers must not be participants in an economy that can preserve them, but must be as dolers receiving dole, that I accept the challenge if they want to challenge me. I accept the challenge that you cannot lift the standard of this colony by having workers who are not going to participate.

Mr. Chairman, the socialist philosophy in this age is not to confiscate anybody's property, not nationalising the whole sugar industry, not expropriating any person's land, or not depriving anybody of their possessions; the socialist philosophy is to see that the concept of all sectors in this community is to participate — the private sector, the public sectors where the workers count and discipline can be imposed on all sectors to make it possible for us to rise. These communities want to live with this undisciplined, economic attitude and then look to the Government to buy land. Read the Resolutions on the Order Paper asking Government to take over land that is going to be sold out or to take over tenancies that are going to be sold. It seems that the Government is an evergreen tree that you shake; and those in the community who should know better and who should know that a community cannot rise faster or make any progress faster than by the people within the community are telling people within the sector of the community that is going to suffer that they must not be active participants. Those people should be abandoned who encourage workers in any community not to regard themselves as active participants except on the basis of being the recipients of wages. Here you have a classic example. The Government, whether by political pressure or otherwise has taken over this group, and I would say, as I said earlier, that I do not consider the factory itself as an economic proposition. A factory standing alone in the bottom of St. Andrew is not in itself an economic proposition, but 872 acres of land is; and what is important is that only last week a Resolution was passed in here taking over

Graeme Hall. Who is now to settle on Graeme Hall? Crabs? What are you taking over all these settlements for? Crabs or human beings? What part is the human being going to play? We have some small-time politicians who are not ready, because they cannot meet this age and cannot lead; they cannot give the people the leadership they require. Have you taken over these two agricultural holdings just to say you have land, or have you done it in the interest of people who did not have a penny to take them over? This same amount of land would have been available to private investors at their price, and therefore the land values would rise, and the economic position of the people would be worse.

Do you realise that if you allow a plantation to be bought privately, the cost rises? The interest on that rising cost becomes an operational charge in the industry; and the higher the capital cost rises, the higher the interest rates are, the higher the operational charges are and the lower the profit margin is, and the division of wages among the sector who must depend on wages remains lower because those are part of the charges.
2.45 p.m.

What do you find? When the Government takes over an undertaking like this, you do not freeze wages at a point, but you give wages the opportunity of rising. The higher the land costs, the more you freeze wages because the wage margin is part of the operational cost. This is something which I have to face with employers daily. The employer can add wages by negotiations. If he says he is losing money, he is going out of business, but his business arrangements are conditional by how much money he has invested. It is the cost which we have to underwrite and why should we go on calling on our workers to underwrite the cost of land. If the operational costs were not as high as they are, the wages paid out to the workers would be more.

Now, Sir, I would make this suggestion to the Hon. Premier or the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, or the Hon. Leader of the House, who has moved this Resolution. The specific plans for Haggatts have not been spelt out, but what I would like to see is a proportionate farming system introduced as was introduced in Puerto Rico. A proportionate farming system will not deprive the Government from running it on a commercial basis as is proposed. There are no shareholders, I am sorry the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not here, but his colleague can answer for him. The difference in the operation of a business like this is that after you have taken out your charges for interest, the Government can decide what your interest should be because this is not really a loan which you are making on the commercial banks, so you do not operate on a fictitious basis. If the Government's experts have advised them, they would see that this is so much money which we have invested in this Island. It is the net value; therefore we can take out so much. After you have done that, instead of banking the profit, you are dividing it among the shareholders; and even if there are no profits, you must come to the conclusion that the workers themselves would have been participating in the earnings which distribute the income among the community. That is one of the effects of proportionate farming and it has done a lot for Puerto Rico.

When you go to Haggatts and take over these estates, in order to show that you are not working on a plantation system *per se* and just working for wages and nothing more, a proportionate farming system would encourage workers to know that over and above what they earn as wages or production bonus, they have a proportionate share in the business for which the Government does not have any design by way of making profits. By a proportional farming system you would not be diminishing the fertility of the soil by cutting it into half-acre lots and saying that you are giving it to peasants. You do not have that *ignoramus* approach to this venture purely for the sake of catching a vote as was done by the last Government when they bought land and divided it up into half-acre lots; but by this approach of a proportionate farming system, you are going to enhance the economy of this Island.

There are some people in this Island who speak in terms of community, but they have not sat down for one

moment and written anything on economic theory which can be translated into saying that this has come out of this thing.

In this community, which is only an agricultural community, our national income is worth \$120 million. If you were to add some of these Resolutions which come in here, they come to \$5 million. What people want to know, what members want to know and they are asking you is if \$120 million is your total national income, how can you spend \$5 million? Where would you get that from? In addition, what you get from this venture now is a positive encouragement and I have this as an example. It has been said by some leaders of the community that by doing this, you will make the people poorer. That is why I wonder now that the Government has brought down this measure what some members of the Government Party when they vote for it would think. When you vote for this, you are voting for taking up money which the workers do not possess in order to make this community a possessed people. When you do this, the people will be contributing towards their own welfare. You have come to the House today calling on us to advance this money in order that the workers may possess something, and by so doing they are going to participate for the future in this. The Government is going to spend \$50,000, but the people are going to participate in this. In other words, you are doing this to help sugar workers, but you do not ask them to pay up one cent. By this venture, you are allowing workers to participate in their own possession.

I am not preaching capitalism, but watch every business man in this country. Whenever a businessman has a good year, he does not see how many motorcars he can buy with that profit or how many trips he can go on to see how quickly he can spend that money because he knows that by so doing, very soon the business will die. He knows that all years will not be good; so he puts down something for those years which will not always be good and in order to expand the business.

What you have as an example is this Government being forced to buy land in an agricultural community and the agricultural workers are not able to participate in it by producing a penny. But what we are doing is this; we are protecting them from unemployment. Unemployment is a danger in any community and you cannot get anything from it. It decreases the social services, and the social services can only be increased on the savings of the community. You cannot build up social services unless there are savings in the community. You cannot give the minimum necessities of life unless there is a surplus.

2.55 p.m.

I support the Government in this scheme and not on the narrow basis of the factory. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and we have evidence to show us that we have 20 factories instead of 37 factories, and in process of time factories will be closed down. In Barbados this year we produced 190,000 tons of sugar; Cuba decided not to manufacture about six years ago, but two million tons is more sugar than the whole of the West Indies put together could produce. I should say that 190,000 tons of sugar in Barbados is to Cuba like a mosquito in the rind of a rhinoceros. Some people in Barbados do not know what is going on. I visited a sugar factory in Cuba and that factory can manufacture in a week the total amount of sugar manufactured in Barbados for the whole crop season. One of the benefits in respect of sugar in Barbados is the recovery. We have a good juice content and we have been able to produce in Barbados even with the small factories which we have, a higher percentage of sugar from our canes. In Barbados we produce a higher percentage of sugar than our counterpart in British Guiana, and for every ton of canes in Barbados the supplier receives more than his counterpart in British Guiana. I give credit to whom credit should be given. Some fifty years ago one man in Barbados the late Sir Herbert Greaves, projected the idea that there should be a Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and the creation of such a Bank would save us. If that Bank had not been operating in Barbados, the sugar industry would be in the hands of Messrs. Tate and Lyle.

Mr. Chairman, do you realise what would have happened if you have 20 sugar factories operating at their present economic cost which cannot face up to others? If you had to get capital to build a factory, say, six times the size of Haggatts and you have these factories in Barbados, each time you build a factory of that size with the capital and interest cost being a part of the operational charges, then our grandchildren would be the ones who would get the price. You cannot put down a forty-thousand-ton factory costing you \$2 or \$3 million without the capital charges being worked back into the price of sugar. In Barbados we have been a homogeneous community; we have a homogeneous, economic sector and if we have a bad year we would be hit very hard from outside; but we have to be balanced by the economic theories. We have a high density of population, but yet the per capita income of the country is higher than it is in British Honduras, for instance, with four persons to the square mile. As a matter of fact, our per capita income is higher than any of the Leeward or Windward Islands. The position is that we have a local investment company and we employ more service and buy more things; our investment is a local one and that is one of the explanations for this position.

If this factory were to be sold to a Canadian firm, to what extent would it benefit the people of this community? I ask hon. members to tell me how satisfied they are with our housing and the type of living the people who have voted for them. Let me say to one of the representatives of the people of St. John that he would get the shock of his life if he were to go up to Kendal because he would not believe that people are living there. You find that people are living on a sort of lake; it is not that it has water, but these people are completely cut off. There are canes on one side of St. John and the other part is in St. George. You see in this island that a man is living on tenantry land and you can think of the amount of money which is expended on lumber annually. I am saying that a man should not be called upon to pay the same amount of money on his house which he spent in building that house at first. Let us take these Public Buildings; they have been built and you have not got to spend any money on them again. I say that hon. members of this House should be in the vanguard of seeing that people are living a better life; they must not be satisfied with the present state of things. Mr. Chairman, I regard this project as a new dimension in Barbados; it gives the Government the idea that they are taking the opportunity of being able to do something for the benefit of the people of this community.

3.05 p.m.

I support it wholeheartedly on more than one ground. I support it because it gives the workers, the private sector and the public sector an opportunity to actively participate in the economic projection and progress of this country. If a worker is working tomorrow on any of these plantations, and the Government or the Corporation can come down and say this is going to be opened up for workers to participate, why would that be? Why should the workers not have some money that they can participate in these things in their own interest? That is where I see the expansion, even if the factory cannot get profit in the same sense as some commercial undertaking, because a commercial undertaking means it cannot lose money. If it cannot make a profit in the same sense, but becomes for the time being a medium through which you can have an operation that adds to the economy of the people and not detract from them, it is a good thing. I have told the workers that that is done in the United States. Sometimes in the United States you have to enter into a factory and take it over where the business man is going out and says it does not suit his shareholders, but the Union takes it over because the workers get wages from it. When it closes, the workers get no more wages, and the preservation of their wages is part of the dividend they would be getting out of the undertaking, while the man who buys shares is not a worker in the undertaking, but his money is being worked; so you have to give him some of the money you are using, because the capital formation of any business is the liquid cash and the capital that labour forms. If labour is the capital asset and you have no shareholders to pay, their dividends would be a question of wages and they can do with

a lower profit. A businessman benefits if a worker is retained at work and is not a net loss to the community, because he distributes money and earnings which he would not otherwise be able to distribute. Businessmen who are in the consumer trade would tell you that whenever there is a shortage of money they can feel it; and whenever more money is produced in the community, they feel it also, because it is spent as people purchase more consumer goods. When you have workers being able to participate in something, it keeps employment at a high level. Thus it means that the workers have to be encouraged to understand that if this thing went out, their purchasing power would have been reduced, because in a place like Barbados where you do not have full employment, you have to guard very seriously every instance where a man loses employment.

Mr. Chairman, to look at this as a whole, I would not have encouraged the Government to buy a factory as a sugar factory, because a factory as a sugar factory is just like buying an ice cream can, where you have no ice or milk, though you can turn the empty can. A sugar factory in itself is nothing; it is only something when you have raw material, that is, the canes that produce sugar. If the Government had bought a sugar factory and then relied on somebody to send canes to it, it would be crazy. Many years ago some members of this House used to encourage Government to buy a sugar factory, but the old Conservatives who knew more about sugar factory business laughed at the idea of buying a sugar factory and not having any raw material; so they were wise and resisted the idea. Today the Government is buying more than a sugar factory. The Government is participating in the sugar industry and allowing the workers to participate also in a real and positive manner, and that is why the workers must be made to understand what this participation is, and you should be ready now by your own leadership to show the workers that they should participate, not in any bogus, political gimmick way, but by showing the workers that by participating they will be able to succeed. If we can do that, we are doing two things simultaneously; we are preserving workers at work, and we are making their future stronger.

I have suggested proportionate farming for the Government and I would like to say why. There is no point in Government taking over these plantations, Bawdens, River and so on and farming them without the active participation of workers. This should be a proportionate farm in which they should be encouraged to participate. As far as my organisation is concerned, I would like to say here and now to all the little groups that walk around and say they are forming Unions that any seven fools can form a Union, but I have never advocated from my entry into public life that workers should not participate in the economic life of this community. We are going to bring workers into it and we are going to fight that to the bitter end, because we are not going to underwrite for the workers barefootedness, living in chattel houses, living in the back of tenancies and only coming out when they hear a meeting. Those who want to fight me or my group on that have the challenge from now. Those who want to tell the workers to call for all the money can do so. I say that the workers will participate in the economy of this country from now on, and not be just mere wage earners looking for the week when they can get two or three days' work, but looking for the formation of the most important industry in the island. If some of the members in this House are not ready for that, the day will come when their successors will be ready for it, and those who want to play little politics will find that the day for that is going in emergent territories. In all emergent territories of the world, people who try to stop the hand of progress must go, and I will say to my colleagues who do not like a socialist philosophy that they are living in an emergent territory. There is room in an emergent territory for men with capital, but the capitalist philosophy cannot meet the needs of emergent territories. Private capital and private enterprise cannot alone meet it; the requirements to meet it are private enterprise, public enterprise and the participation of the workers. There has to be a tripartite association in the economic life of our country. Speaking about Barbados, you can clearly see that no private man would go and buy this land on the basis of doing what the Government proposes, because this would not be an in-

vestment where you would get people to lend you money. Where would Government get the money from if it had no savings? I was in this House in 1947 when some members advocated paying all the money out, but they should be ashamed when they see that this same money is going to be used now to help these workers. They advocated not having any Capital Rehabilitation Fund; but I would like to read the speeches of all those members then.
3.15 p.m.

Some of the members said so then — and I see some of the people who said so then — this would come under the same money which should be paid out then. Now, this is the same money which they are begging you to use; therefore, when you get these gimmicks flying around, when the evil day comes, you find a complete metamorphosis. Where would the Government look to for \$1,400,000 if you had no money? We have three funds accruing from the Sugar Industry. Some members of the House do not know the history of these funds. They were provided to stabilise the economy of the colony. The English Government decided to pay out this money because during the war the owners of factories were not able to get machinery, and they set it aside so that after the War they would be able to get this machinery. I was one of those people who felt that the Rehabilitation Fund should be examined from time to time and if the factory owners could not buy the machinery during the War, then when they were able to buy after the war, they would have to buy at a higher price.

When you rehabilitate a factory, you also rehabilitate the workers. I am not blind to that. I do not believe in a capitalist using his money unless the workers can participate in what he has used it in. The communities which make progress are the communities which work hard. The American worker is one of the hardest workers in this world. He gets up in the morning and has to catch a 7.00 o'clock train; but before he catches that train he has to do everything for himself. If you go to any American home, you will find that the only night he is out is a Saturday night because you will find him home from Monday through Friday. At this stage of our society we need creating and imposing discipline on our people because we have too much of this *laissez faire*, with some of us just running with the crowd. What is the use of making people believe that they can have a high standard of living but a low mind concept. What are you looking in? Are you looking in some reflector by which you can see the sky? I feel that these are days when someone has to be positive enough to say some of the things which should be said plainly. I have no objection in saying them.

Sir, as I have said, my philosophy is a socialist philosophy. By that I mean that I have no objection to a capitalist having his own philosophy; but in an analytical manner, his philosophy cannot meet the needs of an emergent territory. Barbados, what it is, is an emergent territory. It has a large agricultural population and a low income population. There are little savings within the employment sector; therefore, you must find it difficult when your employing sector does not have savings for capital formation. Whenever there is to be a capital formation in the name of the people, it has to come from the public sector. The private sector should be now encouraged to participate in an emergent territory for their own benefit and for the good of their own community. Therefore, their co-operation is necessary.

As the Hon. Premier mentioned, you have one of these men here — Col. Dowding. I am very pleased to know that the Government of this day can call upon a white man and there is no question of race. I am very glad that we do not carry this idea of separatism. I say this as much for my own race as the white race. I am very glad to see that you can use a person, irrespective of race. Some people feel that if a white man undertakes to do something for the benefit of the black man, he is a traitor. According to the saying, he is 'selling out the side'; therefore, you have to watch him. Similarly, if a black man undertakes to do anything for the white man. Some people say when you undertake to do anything for the white man: 'I know he was always white.' You get that type of ignorance and vulgarism

of that nature in our economic thinking. If the Government had the opportunity of using Col. Dowding as their General Manager of this venture, and they did not make use of him because of a question of colour, but looked for somebody because that man was coloured but who did not know a hoist from a scrambler and he made them lose money, I would say that they acted stupidly. That kind of civilisation is only Atlantic civilisation. If I realise that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is more knowledgeable than I am in certain ramifications of business, I would not have any doubts on his giving me advice on that line of business. I would go to him rather than going to somebody who is my friend but who only knows of selling a few biscuits and a pound of pork, I would ask the hon. junior member for Christ Church because he would know from where to start.

I have no objection to what the Government has done and I am very pleased to know that in this community we are gradually removing from our concept that the colour of a man's skin must be the criterion of determining what job he should do, but we are looking at the ability and integrity of the person. Col. Dowding was a member of this Chamber and I doubt very much, so far as his integrity is concerned, that anyone can question his attitude and ability in the business in which he is and which he is undertaking for the Government. He is a man of such strong character that even at present he is available to the Government. That goes to show that the Government has chosen someone who can advise them on the basis of giving the country an opportunity to participate in this line of business.

I would say this. Though the Resolution deals with getting this amount of money to put Haggatts Factory into good condition, we would not have been called upon to deal with that if we were not called upon to deal with the estates. Those who cannot see that this is a new projection for Barbados and to give workers the opportunity to participate in this way are blind. We can even buy some of that tenantry land and make it available to the workers. I do not expect the Government to hold that land in perpetuity as a plantation holds land. I am talking about that land which can be given up for housing. I have seen them buying 20 or 25 acres and dedicate it to the workers so that they can put up houses. That is what I stand for and what I would remain until I die. What is there to prevent us from going to Government and saying "Let us buy that land which you have there and put houses there"?

What is wrong with these new projections? Are you going to wait until somebody does something and then you will follow him? Are we so small that we cannot take the lead? This project gives the opportunity of leadership, and it gives the opportunity to stabilize life for a sector of our community which has carried the brunt of things for so long. Socrates has said that some people must be saved from themselves and I regard this project as saving some of the people from themselves. We have no Crown lands and I do not mean Crown lands in the sense of green pastures. This island which can be put to use; an area of land of 800 acres is a valuation in our income and money which can be rotated. I say: let us work this plantation on a proportionate basis and let the workers share in it. If you can carry the factory for a temporary period, then you should do so; and if you can do that, you can allow the workers to participate in it. I ask; can Haggatts be made more profitable from the point of view of expansion? I do not know; let the experts tell us. If you do not know that, let the Government see the next factory which wants to go out of production and take shares in it so that we can have a controlling voice in it. There is enough talent in Barbados which is capable of projecting the philosophy for improvement; not the philosophy of laissez faire, but the philosophy for new projects.

The Hon. Leader of the House should not use the factory as a criterion in this whole set-up; he should look at the whole project because the factory is nothing. The factory can go tomorrow. I would say that the agricultural workers have had a hard time, and anything you can do to redeem them you should do. Dodds Plantation could be worked on a proportionate farm basis; and as long as you are getting back what you are putting in, I think that that should be done. If you want to see the workers get more, then this is

what you should do. Mr. Chairman, I am not looking for votes. I am looking forward to creating an economic atmosphere for the country in which I was born, an atmosphere which will be better than when I entered it. When I leave, I want to see the workers in a better position than when I entered.

This is something which could have been done years ago when some of these factories were going out of production. You want to hold agricultural land and vest it in the people of this country. We are creating history when we do this thing today; we want to create an atmosphere which would make such an impact upon this community as the abolition of slavery made by the creation of freedom. Just as in slavery there were people who felt that there should be no freedom, so there are people whose eyes are blind to what economic freedom means and in what context you should project this economic freedom. Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in supporting this Resolution which sets out the terms and objects of what it seeks to create, and I say that this is something which should have been done years ago.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, when we have a Resolution of this sort I do not think that any Socialist could vote against it; any Socialist would always support such a Resolution. Before I go further, I should like to reply to some of the remarks which were used by the Hon. Premier. Somehow or other, the Hon. Premier says whatever he likes to say in this Chamber and then he leaves the Chamber. In that case, I feel as if I am a coward, having to reply to remarks of one who has left the Chamber and consequently, is not in his seat; but really that does not look so well. I think that the Hon. Premier should set an example to the members of this House. If he has to speak on any matter and he has to attack a particular member of this House, he should remain in his seat and hear what that particular hon. member has to say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you mean even although he has another important engagement?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, but if you were to go outside there, you would see him sitting down. That is the important engagement, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that you should sit there and try to make a lot of hanky-panky excuses. The Hon. Premier referred to me and said that Joes River factory closed down and I did not say anything about it. I do not know if the Hon. Premier were in the island at the time, but I can remember that when I heard about the closing down of Joes River factory I asked a question about it, and I was told that it was not economic to run or to buy it. I know that 80% of the peasants' canes used to be taken to Andrews Factory and Joes River Factory used to buy very little. The factories under the hill used to beg the people for their canes whereas the factories on top of the hill used to buy the canes. With the small amount of land down there, it would never pay to run the factory. (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, that was the reply which I got. The Hon. Premier took it upon himself to enquire of the peasants as to what they felt about the closing down of Joes River Factory and they said that they were glad to hear and that they were glad to see it closed down because it was of no use to them. That being the case, why would they buy a place like that? When we come to Haggatts Factory, that is on a different footing completely. Joes River was nothing at all.

3.35 p.m.

The people under the hill, in Joes River and so on, can tell you now that they got more for their canes and made more profit sending them to Andrews than they did when they sent them to Joes River; so it is entirely out of the question to say that nothing was done when Joes River went out. A few factories were closed, but I cannot remember that they had land. Mount Wilton and Malvern, as far as I can remember, were only factories, because the owners were holding on to the land.

Mr. Chairman, kindly speak to your colleague and ask him to be decent when a member is on his feet. There are Rules to govern behaviour of that sort.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member has heard you.

Mr. SMITH: I would not expect the Government to buy a factory alone then to depend on people to bring their canes, because I know the meaning of competition. If you buy a factory and everybody around it sends his canes elsewhere, you can only watch the factory. You must have a certain amount of land attached to a factory to start with, and even that cannot keep the factory running. You do not open a factory like a shop where you put in \$20.00 in goods and when the goods sell out, you bring in \$20.00 more. You have to make a turn-over in a factory, and if it does not make more than so many tons a year, you would be doing nothing. That, therefore, is my reply to the Hon. Premier when he said he did not hear me say anything about it. I did ask a question about it, but I was informed that it was uneconomical.

As far as Haggatts is concerned, I would not like the people there to suffer, nor would I like it to be said that the members of the House of Assembly are responsible for Haggatts not working next year. When the Leader of the House told us about the Resolution, it was not even circulated, and when he was piloting it through the House, I had to stop reading it to listen to him, because I could not read and listen at the same time. What he said about the Resolution, is true; but if you want to get the factory working you have to start as soon as possible. I heard the Premier say in his speech that they knew about the closing of Haggatts before the peasant farmers in St. Andrew; so they could not say it is a surprise. He also went on to say that it is no fly-by-night decision by the Government. It is however a fly-by-day decision for us to decide on it and give our approval. They had time to prove it was economical, but now at the very last moment when they feel we would not have a chance to study it, they have brought it in. This is something of great importance, and we should have more time to study it; but only because they have the numbers, they can bring anything here at any given time and it will be passed. That is not fair to the taxpayers of this country or to their representatives. The Legislature has to sign the cheque regardless of the arrangements; yet we are the last people to know about this. They have treated us like boys and disregarded our authority and power. If they could have got around this Resolution without having to bring it here, I know it would have been done without our knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, the Introducer of this Resolution failed to give us the necessary information. He spoke at length without telling us the cost or what are the agreements, but is asking us now to vote \$50,000. I should like to find out from the Hon. Introducer if this sum of \$50,000 is to replace the old iron which the Premier talked about at Welchman Hall. I am sure the Premier went there and inspected the factory and had his valuers and advisers, though the people in St. Andrew did not know it. He told the people in your constituency, Sir, that the Government is not prepared to buy old iron; so I want to know if there is all new iron at Haggatts now. At another meeting in Belleplaine, St. Andrew, to show you where the Premier did not mean to buy the factory, he made similar remarks. He will get up now and talk about a Socialist Government; but by his remarks it was not his intention to acquire the factory; otherwise he would not have talked about the factory being old iron even if he knew it was. He would have kept that to himself.

3.45 p.m.

Now that is as plain as A, B, C. You do not have to go to any college to find that out. In St. Andrew, I was told that the people were a bit on the rough side during the meeting when the Premier told them that they are not going to suffer by reaping their canes because he was going to see to it even if he had to pass legislation to make other factories grind their canes. Is that the attitude of the Government or a man willing to buy when he said all those things before hand? That is what I would like to find out. The people were told even if they had to get legislation passed to see that they did not suffer that the other factories would have to take their canes and Government would assist them with the lorries to convey their canes. But today, on the floor of the House, we are told that this Government is a Socialist

Government and projects of this sort any Socialist Government undertakes. I do not know which to believe, if today's talk or the talks at the meetings which were held in St. Andrew. I know that they do not add together; they do not mesh at all. I can say that it was not the intention of the Hon. Premier to buy that factory. What has happened? We had to go down St. Andrew and talk to the people. I promised the people there that if the Government did not buy it, I was ready to march with them to Government Headquarters. As a matter of fact, I even went so far as to get banners made. I have lost the money which I spent in providing those banners. It is gone now because it is the Government's intention to buy Haggatts now. I repeat, whoever had listened, heard and read the speeches of the Hon. Premier on Haggatts would not believe that he would have bought it, but now would think that pressure was brought to bear on him so as to cause this Resolution to be brought in here at this very late hour because what he said at those two meetings do not mesh with what is done today. The wheel would not even turn because one of the wheels has ten teeth and the other 45 teeth.

Sir, I feel that the Government has made a very wise move in acquiring the services of Col. Dowding because so far as a sugar factory is concerned, he knows his stuff. I feel that after Col. Dowding in his knowledge about a factory the very next best coloured person is my colleague on my left, the hon. junior member for St. James. Of course, I would not expect the Government to call on my colleague. The Hon. Premier said that colour has nothing to do with this. I have to believe him.

If I am not mistaken, up to last year, I know that canes used to be conveyed from all up Boscobelle and St. Andrew to Lower Estate Factory in St. Michael. I hope that the same magic stick which Col. Dowding worked on the people in those areas to get canes conveyed to Lower Estate Factory, he is going to work on people in Christ Church to bring their canes down to Haggatts Factory because it is his instrumentality that caused the people in St. Andrew to send their canes to Lower Estate.

There is such a thing as competition. Competition causes most things to happen. If Col. Dowding does not put Haggatts in order and in good shape, the same thing that Lower Estate was doing and is doing today, it would mean that some of the people in St. Andrew will still send their canes to Lower Estate for the same facilities and encouragement by way of paying them more per ton. They will bypass Haggatts. I do not doubt that 50 percent of the canes grown in St. Andrew passes Haggatts Factory yard and go up the hill.

It is true to say that Haggatts Factory has gone down. The owners knew what they were about to do and they took everything out of it, and I believe that is the reason for the Hon. Premier calling it "old iron." Since the Government has decided to buy it, they must be prepared to put it in order and must be prepared to give Col. Dowding what he wants for it and do not give him the opportunity of making excuses to say that it is not his fault because he called for a scrambler or a clarifier and you did not give him and that is responsible for its not coming up to mark. You have to give him a wide hand and let him equip it as good as Lower Estate, and I am sure you then would be able to pay the same prices for cane, and so on, and there would not be the possibility of canes bypassing Haggatts and going to Lower Estate.

Unlike most of the speakers who feel that Haggatts Factory is going to fail again, I do not have that doubt. So long as it is run on a proper basis and is equipped with modern machinery, I am saying that it is not going to fail. To put it in order is going to cost you some money, mind you, but I am sure that if the other factories are paying their owners, Haggatts would pay you. I have no doubt in my mind that it is going to pay and will not be a white elephant as most people feel. You are buying all the land attached to that factory; therefore you have a start; you have something to go back on. We have five or six thousand tons of canes as a start and you expect twenty thousand tons otherwise; but if you were buying the factory alone and relying on whosoever will to bring canes, you would not be doing any business.

I am sure that if it is run along the right lines it will pay. I have heard of some things which used to happen there; therefore I wonder to know how Haggatts managed to be there up to now as a factory at all. There were three factories in St. Andrew. Two have been abolished but they used to pay. Believe me, it would not be fair for this Government to sit by and allow the one and only one which is now remaining in St. Andrew to be abolished also to leave the people down there to be wondering where they should send their canes. I know that they would suffer in some way or the other, although many of them used to send their canes out of the parish.

3.55 p.m.

You have to remember that if Haggatts Factory has been closed down and the owners are still working the land, the other factories would have to take off that crop and that would throw more weight on those factories. They may be limiting each plantation and then limiting each peasant; in some cases, the peasant may be able to get in one or two loads of canes per week; imagine one peasant having twelve loads of canes and he may have to take about three weeks to reap those canes! That would cause a difficulty in getting labourers to work. I think that the Government is doing a very good job in taking over this concern. I sincerely hope that the price of this factory is not too high. I do not know anything about valuation; I do not know if the price of this factory is too dear or if it is too cheap; but still old iron is operating in my mind. The price sounds to be a very big one for old iron. I hope that this factory is being bought as old iron and not as new one.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that since the Government knew about this sale and the closing down of this factory about eight months ago, they could have had everything ready and everything cut and dried and they should not make any blunders now although it is very late in the afternoon. The taking down of machinery and sending it down to the Foundry and getting things going would require some hustling to be done, and in that case you may not be able to start the crop too early. Another thing, Sir, is that if all the factories are working and Haggatts does not start to work, then the peasants will cut their canes and send them elsewhere. You have to start to work in the dry season. If you do not start your crop and you allow the workers to go elsewhere, then you will not get them when you want them. As I say, the peasants will send their canes elsewhere and if they do so, then we will stand to lose. I am not saying anything against the Resolution; I would have fought tooth and nail if things were different; but I do say that it is not fair to bring the Resolution before us in this way. They have brought down this Resolution now because, the later you are with it, the better you will get through; I believe that that is why the Government brought forward the Resolution in this way.

Mr. Chairman, after hearing that for eight months they were discussing this matter and it was no fly-by-night decision, well, what else? We, who are the representatives of the people and of the taxpayers, should be told today the reason why you were not going to buy old iron in the first place and why you are going to buy that old iron now. Everybody thought that this factory was old iron, but the arguments do not coincide that they are buying old iron; the arguments do not convince us that they are buying old iron. I hope that everything will work well and instead of getting the canes in the parish, the same canvassing which used to be done from Lower Estate will be done now so that the canes will come in from St. Thomas, St. Joseph, St. James and the surrounding parishes into Haggatts Factory. If you equip the factory you will be able to compete with the others; but if you keep old iron there, you will not be able to compete with the others and you will just be throwing away money.

Mr. Chairman, I was told that Lt. Col. Dowding said that he found the factory in a much better condition than that in which he thought it was. He thought, or rather from what he was hearing, he thought that he would have found the factory in a worse condition than the condition in which he found it which is much in our favour. I have heard that

there are quite a lot of spares too; I have heard that they have new spares, but I have not been into Haggatts Factory for some years.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member has made some disstatements and I did not rise to correct him; but I want to stop him now before he goes any further. At no time did the Hon. Premier say that the people have taken out everything out of the factory. The Premier did not say that at all.

Mr. SMITH: What I said was that the Premier said that it worked out at nothing. I do not mean that they went along with a spanner and took out everything and carried it away; I do not mean it in that way. Would I be so ignorant as to say that they went to the factory with a spanner and took these things away? The way in which the Hon. Premier had put it to this House was that there was nothing in the factory now. The hon. member is always trying to polish up things for the Hon. Premier in the absence of the Premier. That seems to be the hon. member's job. The Hon. Premier will get up in this Chamber and say whatever he likes; he then clears out and when an hon. member gets up to say something, the Hon. Leader of the House gets up to interfere all the time.

4.05 p.m.

I have not said anything about him, because I have not heard him say one word about Haggatts. I do not know if he knows Haggatts. Can't he sit and listen and then reply when he is ready? He is only trying to push me off my point. He said that they worked everything out of the machinery. I do not think that could mean that they took a spanner and took away the boilers, but I have heard that there are quite a lot of spare parts down there. If that is so, we do not have to go too far. I believe when he referred to old iron he might have meant the machinery which the people had thrown outside and not the one in the factory, because I have heard that the expert who knows about a factory said he thought he would have found it in a worse condition. The onus is now on the Government, because the Premier says it would be too late to turn it over to the cane farmers to do everything, and Government is going to try it this year. Although it will be thrown in my dish and I will be asked why my Government did not do it, I would say that we have a good chance now of knowing what a factory can do. For years we were trying to see if we could get a minimum price for canes - I am speaking under correction - on the Statute Book, and if I am not mistaken, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was in favour of it, but we could do nothing because we could not get the correct figures; so the workers and peasants were liable to lose. This is quite different from goods which come from overseas, because the Controller of Supplies can get hold of the Bills of Lading and Invoices and is able to work out the prices, but you do not get a Bill of Lading or an invoice for canes, nor do you know the cost of manufacturing. You might get figures, but the ones you get you will have to drop like a red hot brick. I think my Government tried it out; but when they went into it, they found that the people would get less than what they were getting before.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot expect a person to tell you about his business out-and-out if you want to get into it; but now that we have got a factory, it might be possible that the highest price ever paid for canes in any one year might be paid at Haggatts. But do not expect to get it until you equip the factory, after which the others may open up their hands. Haggatts may be able to pay \$1.00 or \$2.00 per ton more, then you will get the other people paying \$2.50; but all the time you are competing, the farmers are going to gain, and the present Government will be responsible although in the beginning it was not their intention to buy the factory. Regardless of what one may say now, it was not their intention in the first instance, but they have seen the light, and I admire people that can see quickly and correct their errors quickly and not be stubborn. There are others who though wrong, keep on through stubbornness and cause people to suffer, but they have seen the wisdom, maybe through their advisers. You cannot expect if you are a tailor and are elected to Government and given the port-

folio of Ministry of Agriculture that you can be good at that at the beginning; you will have to go by your advisers. The Minister of Communications and Works may not have known much about road building when he was appointed to that office and he would have to take advice from the Director and other people; and Sir, if it were your chance now to become Minister of Trade, you would have to learn too unless you were in the trading line before. They have seen the wisdom through pressure and have begun to see the light on the side of the people.

Mr. Chairman, if money is being spent on Haggatts, I am sure that the person who does not send his canes from St. Michael to St. Andrew may receive very little more than what would be paid at Haggatts. There is a trick in buying canes from all over the Island, because you may meet an area where the juice is not so good. If, for instance, the juice from canes in St. Andrew is not so good, you might get a first-class juice by getting a few hundred tons from St. Joseph, St. Thomas, St. Lucy or St. George and blending them, and up goes your tonnage. There would be less tons of canes to a ton of sugar, there would be less labour, and you would be getting a better juice by mixing your canes and not grinding all from one place. I was not always a member of this House; I was an ordinary lorry driver, and there was a time when I could not get any work in St. Andrew for my lorry; but I fell on a plan and charged people in such a way for carrying their canes to Vauclose that when they sent them to Vauclose, they got \$1.50 per ton more than what was being paid in St. Andrew, and it happened that I had more canes than I could draw. 4.15 p.m.

Everybody waited on me to carry their canes there. I carried them there at the time they were contracting the sugar with the people in Bridgetown and leaving us out, and I found a way to trick them. All that Col. Dowding has to do for Haggatts is to find a way to get the canes from over the hill to the bottom. Do not think that because the factory is in St. Andrew it would not pay. It is bound to pay if you go all out to make it pay. Brucevale, one of the main factories in St. Andrew which belonged to the late Mr. Haynes, never failed. It paid out money up to the time that it went out of operation. Now that you are going to make Haggatts one of the most properly equipped factories, are you going to tell me that it would not pay? I am sure it is going to pay if it is run in the right way because it will be able to take canes from all over the parish of St. Joseph, such as Bissex Hill and Cambridge - and, as you know, Cambridge has a good sugar soil, even better than Bissex. If I were working land still, I would send mine down to Haggatts. All that Haggatts has to do is to stand up and prepare for competition because the others are not going to sit by and let canes pass by them. They are going to do everything possible to stop canes passing by them. Who will win? The peasants. And who would be the cause of it? The Government. We should try and discourage any fears in our minds that it is going to be a white elephant. Why is it that the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown is in favour of buying the land and not the factory? I do not want him to tell me nor am I going to say why. No sooner than the Government buys Haggatts Factory and equips it as it should, the cat is out of the bag. I am sure about that. As soon as they do that, the cat will be out of the bag and that fellow who has the cat tied in the bag will do everything possible not to open the bag and let out the cat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has asked the question: "Why is it that I am in favour of buying the land and not the factory?" I am wondering in what part of my speech did I say that. I was asked if I thought the Government was paying too much for Haggatts land. I gave quite an honest answer: I said "no", but I made it clear that we were not supporting the Government's policy of acquiring plantations at all because that is not our policy. I did not say that you should buy the land and not the factory. I am sure I did not say so at any time.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that is a speech now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not think the hon. member appreciates the difference between a speech and a point of order. If you take this as a speech, I am willing to sit down. Taken out of the context, it can be interpreted that I meant to say that we should buy the land and not the factory; but I made it quite clear that for the price which you were paying for it you will be actually getting the factory for nothing.

I am supposed to express the views of my Party, and it is our policy that Government should not purchase any plantation unless it is for the purpose of developing housing projects. If they were buying this for a housing project, I would say "yes", I would support that."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member went so far as to say that Haggatts never paid and that it never would pay. I wonder if he would admit that he said so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I went as far as to say that Mr. F. F. C. Gill bought that factory from the Hutsons and when they came into possession it did not pay them. When Mr. F. F. C. Gill sold Haggatts factory to Mr. J. B. King of the Economic Fire Insurance Company, it was not paying.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is making a speech, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member asked me for an answer and if he does not want to listen, he can go outside. When Musson, Son and Company bought it, it paid; but I say that as it stands now, it cannot pay.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The point is made but not clear enough to get into the head of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you know how some people mean when they say a thing does not pay. I do not know in what way the hon. senior member for the City means because he is a real estate broker, and estate brokers play in big money. One deal of theirs can be \$2,000, and if they do not make \$2,000 but only make \$500, they say that they have lost. I do not know if it is that Haggatts did not make the amount of money which the owners expected it to make.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I must object to that. The hon. member in using those remarks is casting aspersions at the owners of Haggatts when he is saying that the statement by the Haggatts Group is that they did not make the amount of money which they expected. He is actually saying that they were lying.

Sir, we have a free right to vote against it as we are agreed on a question of policy; but do not attempt on the floor of the House when Messrs. S. P. Musson Son and Company, the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Leader of the House did not say it, to say that because they did not make sufficient money it was not paying.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I said some people. I said I dare suppose it may be that the Haggatts people did not make what they expected to make. (ASIDES). 4.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking and there are other hon. members who are also speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph speaking on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: I was saying that by buying Haggatts there is the possibility of the cat getting out of the bag. The hon. member can put as much meaning to that as he likes; he will do everything that lies in his power to keep the box's mouth very tightly closed so that the cat cannot get out. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is supposed to be addressing me.

Mr. SMITH: I will finish my speech now, but I will speak what is in my mind. The old iron talk has now been changed to the new iron talk. The old iron referred to by the Hon. Premier was the one which was dumped. (ASIDES). Mr. Chairman, do you see that yard fowl? Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to you for your protection, Sir. I do not know what to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you get on with the Resolution you will be protected.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, how can you listen to me when you are hearing other voices as well?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not hearing any other voices.

Mr. SMITH: Are you sure about that, Mr. Chairman? I heard the Hon. Leader of the House say that I should sit down; the people have elected me here to represent them and now the hon. member is telling me to sit down.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member was standing in his place and he said that he does not know what to do now. Well, if he does not know what to do, then let him sit down.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if I were to be advised and I called upon the hon. member, he would advise me wrongly. However, Sir, we are committing ourselves to this Resolution; as soon as we agree to this Resolution everything will be done. Whatever happens will happen. The Government will have had the okay, and we will have agreed to the Resolution. If there is anything which we discover to be wrong later we cannot do anything about it, because we have agreed to the Resolution. I say that everything should be cut and dried. The Hon. Premier came into the House late, and while we were dealing with the Resolution he had a Statement to be laid. I am suggesting that in the same way that the Hon. Deputy Premier has been entrusted with piloting through the Resolution in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, the Hon. Deputy Premier could have laid the Statement as well. If the hon. senior member for the City had not started to raise his point, and if the hon. senior member for St. Peter did not raise his point, this Resolution would have been passed. Of course, it would not have passed me like that; but if the Statement had not been laid, the Resolution would have gone through.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The Hon. Premier has said that the Statement had not yet been prepared; even the documents which we have to lay in this House were not ready. We had a terrific pressure of work at Government Headquarters from Sunday until today, so that the relative papers came to the House late today. All the Notice Papers came in after we got here; therefore there is nothing in the hon. member saying that there was some ulterior motive which prevented the Statement from being laid.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that, and if the hon. member is implying that, he is wrong. I am saying this: let us say that they decided on the purchase of Haggatts last Thursday; I am sure that they had decided on the purchase of Haggatts before this morning, and therefore the Statement which was to be presented to this House was still late. If they had not decided on this matter of the purchase of Haggatts before today, how comes it that the name of Lt. Col. Dowding appears in the Statement? How comes it that Lt. Col. Dowding has been appointed as Manager of the project?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, without disclosing any Cabinet secret, I am saying that the Government never discussed this matter until it was discussed at a Special Meeting on Saturday. We were working on Saturday preparing for the Meteorological Conference which is now taking place at Sherbourne,

and it was impossible for the Secretaries to get out the documents before today. Lt. Col. Dowding has not yet been appointed as Manager of the project; he will be appointed. He has been nominated to the post of Manager.

Mr. SMITH: Is the hon. member saying that Lt. Col. Dowding has not yet been appointed as Manager of the project? He went down to the factory, all of this is being done and yet they have not decided to buy this factory.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is going off at a tangent. We could have asked the hon. member to go down to Haggatts too, but we know that he is a very busy man.
4.35 p.m.

We sent Lieut. Colonel Dowding, Sir Frank Hutson, an engineer, and some other experts on sugar factories in order to give us certain reports on the condition of the machinery. It did not mean that because you sent somebody there that you had appointed them to run the factory immediately.

Mr. SMITH: It was stated by the Introducer of the Resolution that it is expected to start work at Haggatts tomorrow.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Sir, I said I pressed on the Committee the imperativeness for dealing with this Resolution without delay and I said that if we could deal with it today we could start as soon as possible, even tomorrow. We wanted no delay at all, because between now and the time when the crop must start, there is very little time, and the sooner we got this through, the sooner we could start to work.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have noted here that it is no fly-by-night decision of the Government to buy Haggatts. Those were the words of the Hon. Premier in his speech. He also said that they knew about Haggatts even before the cane farmers in St. Andrew, and that it is now about eight months that they knew about it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member completely misconstrued what the Hon. Premier said in this context. At that point he was talking in the terms of the Government's agricultural policy, and he said that the Central Planning Committee had for months been discussing this question of the diversification of agriculture with reference to the St. Andrew district, and the advantages which were offered in St. Andrew for diversification of agriculture, animal rearing and what not; so he said that in formulating the agricultural policy, the special position of St. Andrew had been taken into account, and the possibility of the factory closing down had been taken into account in formulating this policy, not that we have been considering buying Haggatts for eight months. As a matter of fact, the Government files on Haggatts and its acquisition only dates from 21st August this year, which is now three months at the most.

Mr. SMITH: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to say. I am glad to see that they have bought it. I am glad to see that the Premier has bought the same thing he said he was not going to buy, and if the whole thing breaks down tomorrow, the taxpayers will know that he bought old iron, because he said it was not the intention of Government to buy old iron.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry this Resolution has taken so long, but I am glad to see it has come before the House today. This Resolution is seeking \$50,000 for conditioning the factory at Haggatts for the 1964 crop, and I can assure you that the Government has acted very wisely in co-operating with the owners of Haggatts Factory to purchase it. This Resolution has kindled warm affection for the Government because it is a very good step for the future. Much has been said concerning this Resolution, but there is not a man in this Chamber who can tell you more about a factory than I can, especially Haggatts Factory because I worked at Haggatts and Bruce Vale in my boyhood. When the people in St. Andrew heard that Haggatts Factory was going to be closed, you would have hidden

yourself if you were in my position. A woman by the name of Sarah came to me and told me that Haggatts was going to be closed and asked me to see whether I could keep the doors open. I contacted Mr. D. G. Leacock and asked him to enter negotiations with the Government. When I heard about this old iron talk, I pleaded with the Premier, but I pointed out that if he were going to buy Haggatts for Civil Servants to run, I would ask him to let it go, because Civil Servants could never run a sugar cane factory as they know nothing about it. From the time of the news of closing down, people have approached me with inquiries about the factory. When the people were informed that Government would not buy Haggatts Factory, members of the Cane Farmers Association and myself approached other factories to see whether they could reap the canes, but the factory owners and managers told us that this crop was expected to be a very big one, that their machinery was not sufficiently geared to take the capacity of canes in St. Andrew, and furthermore they would have to tell us what time to reap the canes, because we could not start in January or February as the canes in the Scotland District would be green. That information had the people in a very miserable state, and I had to find words of consolation to appease their wrath. It is at this point that the people again called upon Government, and the Premier decided to buy the factory for the Cane Farmers' Association.

When I hear the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say that it is his Party that urged the Government to buy Haggatts, I would say that is not true, because when the Labour Party came to Belleplaine and held a meeting concerning the factory, I had already assured the people that the Government had decided to purchase the factory and that it would not cease to operate. I like to give every man a square deal; so I could not sit here and hear any member say that it is through his forces that caused Government to purchase this factory. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the people in St. Andrew are the biggest peasant owners in the Island of Barbados.

4.45 p.m.

There are about six or seven estates that have been distributed among the peasants in St. Andrew. We have 52,000 tons of sugar cane, and according to the seasonal rainfall, I have predicted already that in St. Andrew we would have 70,000 tons of canes to reap. I have gone so far as to predict for the Island of Barbados according to the rainfall which we have been getting that we would get 250,000 tons of sugar if the crop is not destroyed by fire.

Sir, it is hard to shut Haggatts out of the business. It would not only be affecting Haggatts, but it would be affecting the people in other parishes because the people in St. Andrew would have to go and ask the other factories in the other parishes to reap their canes. If Haggatts were to go out of existence, it would not only affect St. Andrew, but the six other northern parishes.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that this Resolution has come to this House today in order that this factory may be put in order to reap the canes for the peasants of St. Andrew. Haggatts Factory would pay anyone to run it. Brucevale Factory paid Mr. Haynes and Haggatts Factory would have paid its owners too, but it was bad management which caused Haggatts not to pay its owners. I know the conditions under which it was worked. I know of a case when the Manager could have received canes from the people and deliberately said to them that he would be the last person to open Haggatts door to receive them. If the owners knew of the evils which the Manager was doing, they would have fired him long ago. In 1957, Mr. Haynes stopped running Brucevale Factory. That factory saved £4,500 for Mr. Haynes. Why could not Haggatts make money? The owners of it should have been down there to see. I am quite sure that with this Government operating Haggatts with careful management, it would finance itself and would be economical. I am sure that this Government would not regret having bought Haggatts.

The people of St. Andrew came to me after they heard that Government was going to buy it. I told them that I want them, when Government have taken over, to give an

honest day's work for an honest day's pay. Do you know what they told me? They said that they would give Government even some of their time. The farmers of St. Andrew work nowhere. They simply work their land. They have their children to maintain and their homes to repair. We talk about freighting canes. I remember there was a truck which took a load of canes from Haggatts to Vaucluse and then carried them to Haymans, and after the driver could not get any of those factories to take the canes he carried it to Fairfield and the Manager of that factory asked the truck driver what caused him to bring them there. He said that the other factories to which he took them would not take them. That meant that that man travelled over 40 miles with one load of canes and I am sure if Haggatts had received those canes, he would not have had to drive that mileage. Any Manager of that type would cause a factory to lose money.

Sir, we have heard of another gentleman, Col. Dowding, who is going to run it. I am sure, if it is Col. Dowding whom I know, that he would run the factory well because he knows of machinery and he has the necessary qualifications. I am certain when the people of St. Andrew get up tomorrow morning and see this Resolution in the newspapers how glad they will feel. I know their feelings. They are going to feel as if they were resurrected. I hope if there is any other factory which is about to be dismantled or abandoned, that Government would see fit to help the farmers and the people on the whole in Barbados. I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he said that any time that a factory is to be closed down the owners should make mention of it first to the Government so as to see whether Government would purchase it before it is dismantled.

Sir, I heard an hon. member saying that St. Andrew is an Island by itself. It is just like a surrounded world. The only outlet which we have is the sea. It is just like an island. If it were an Island, I would be just as a king sitting upon his throne because I know that my people sit around me. They bring their grievances to me and I do all in my power to help solve their grievances for them. It is my desire to see my people go right. I intend to work for the people as long as they put me in power. I am sure if hon. members of the House of Assembly who represent the various parishes would get up and do their duty wholeheartedly, they would never fail to get in this House as the people's representatives. It is by the work which you do for the people that you remain in here. If our works are good, we will always remain in here. I repeat, tomorrow when the people of St. Andrew hear of this Resolution having been passed by this House, they are going to look at this Government with a different eye because they will see the interest which the Government is taking in them. When you talk of "old iron", I can assure you that you will find some machinery which was working for 50 years but which with careful handling and care would exist longer. Support it, nourish it, lubricate it and give it what it needs and that old iron would last another 50 years. I think iron is one of the strongest kinds of material which comes out of the earth. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is talking of "old iron"; but if I were he, I would not worry with that. New iron would break down as well as old iron.

Sir, I can assure you that Haggatts Factory with careful management will make a success. I do not think it is possible for me to repeat all the things which I know about it because it is outside of my capacity; but I am sure that when the engineers, the factory workers, the people and all those around have heard that Government has bought Haggatts, they are going to put their shoulders to the wheel and see that it makes a success and I know that it would be a boon when this factory starts operating again. This Government knows to do good, and now they have put forward this effort and it is very good. It is one of the best efforts which I have seen in my time and I hope along with the assistance of the people that Government will not regret buying Haggatts. I will preach to my people not to let anything happen to it but assist in all ways to help make it a success.

4.55 p.m.

When you cut off that factory the people will have to go begging factories here and there. I am sure that no factory will lose in Barbados if you were to run it carefully. Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in supporting this Resolution; I support it one hundred percent.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Chairman, it might appear that I was somewhat late in rising from my seat, but as children we always learnt that we should give way until others have had their say. I am very happy to see that the Government has taken this step to secure this group of plantations in St. Andrew for the benefit of the peasants who would otherwise be the sufferers. Being happy over this matter, I have no other alternative than to support this Resolution. I very much welcome the explanation which was given by the Hon. Premier as to his reason for purchasing these plantations for the benefit of the peasants down there, and I also welcome the reasons which he has given for the purchase of the factory for the benefit of the factory workers. I know that there are factories which have been shut down for years and some of these workers have never gone into another factory to work. Whether this factory is run on an economical basis or not, it is the duty of every Government to look after the interest of the people. I feel, Sir, that this is a step in the right direction for the benefit of the people of the parish of St. Andrew. I also welcome the Hon. Premier's explanation that he has seen fit to rise above politics in appointing one who, I know, is capable and has the ability to run any factory in this island; for this post I do not think that there could be any better person than Lt. Col. Dowding.

Mr. Chairman, when the Government has to appoint members to the various Boards they should always look out for men with the necessary ability and commonsense regardless of policy or creed. It has never been a pleasure of mine to rebuke any hon. member in this Chamber, but I do hope that when such an important issue as this comes before this House, the Hon. Deputy Premier will see fit to circularise such a matter to hon. members and thereby give them a little chance to study it rather than rush it through with such indecent haste. I know that in a matter of this sort there is need for haste but, on the other hand, the interest of the people should be safeguarded. The Government should not bring such an important matter like this before us at the last moment, and I will say that they did not even bring it to us in the right way. I do not feel that they should be trying to rush through a matter of such importance as this with such indecent haste. I hope that the Hon. Deputy Premier will treat us with a little bit more courtesy in the future than that with which he has treated us today. However, Sir, I am giving my wholehearted support to this Resolution.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to say more than what has been well said by the Leader of our Party. I just want to underline the reason why we are opposing this Resolution. We think that the Government is getting this property very cheaply indeed. We are told that the land will be kept under cultivation but for reasons which have been proved to the Government, the factory is not economical to run, and it is only in a matter of time that the Government will realise that this is so. To spend good money for it to be wasted is not our policy at all; we are opposing the Resolution on the ground that an uneconomical factory is being bought and it is to be resuscitated in the face of economic facts. We have seen a reduction in the number of factories in this island from 37 in 1949 to 20 today. We understand that it is only a matter of years when more factories will go by the wayside and the number will come down to ten. Fairfield Factory in the parish of St. Lucy will go, and Applewhaites in the parish of St. Thomas is the next in line; therefore why should we try to stop something which is inevitable? If the Government had said that the shutting down of Haggatts Factory would cause some embarrassment for this crop and the next crop because the factories are not geared to take the crop, then I would say "Yes".
5.05 p.m.

The sugar industry is the backbone of the economy of this Island, and if it could be proved to us.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am very sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I am not quite clear exactly what point he is trying to convey. He said that if they were told that the factory would be run for this year and next year, he would agree that we should run it; but what I do not understand is how we are going to run it unless we had bought it. If we are going to run it this year or next year, or for three or four years, we could not run it for five days unless we bought it; so I hope he would make it clear.

Mr. GODDARD: If Government said that the shutting down of the factory this year at such short notice was such that other factories were not capable of taking the crop from St. Andrew, they would have a case in point; but I understand that all of that had been prepared and that the St. Andrew crop can be reaped by other factories more economically than it can ever be done down there. I am also told that there are many cane farmers in St. Andrew who will still send their canes over the hill and get a better price from Vacluse or wherever they may send them than they would ever get from Haggatts. I am not going over the speech of the Leader of my Party, but I only wish to point out that our objection to and voting against the Resolution is against the running of the factory because it will be on uneconomical grounds.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there are not many points on which I want to reply, because most of the ground has already been cleared by my earlier remarks; but I only want to give the Committee the information relevant to the operation of the factory and the proportion of peasants' canes processed in relation to the overall amount processed. In 1952 the factory processed 50,000 tons of cane of which 22,000 tons were peasants' canes. In 1960 it was 41,000 tons of which 14,000 tons were peasants'; in 1961 it was 50,000 tons of which 17,000 tons were peasants'; in 1962 it was 46,000 tons of which 14,000 tons were peasants' canes, and this year the total amount of canes manufactured was 49,000 tons of which 17,000 tons were peasants' canes; so the average annual tonnage of canes ground is 47,000 tons and the average proportion supplied by peasant farmers is 17,000 tons. Apart from giving that information, the only thing I want to say is this: the hon. junior member for St. Joseph had quite a lot to say about the acquisition of the factory, and then he went on to say that by acquiring this factory the Government would be in a position eventually to get some inside information with regard to the operation of sugar factories, and that Haggatts may eventually pay \$1.00 or \$2.00 more for peasants' canes than the other factories pay. I want to say that so far as this Government is concerned, we entertain no such delusions. Haggatts factory is in an area in which the terrain is very difficult, and if we wanted to take over a factory to run it to get an accurate indication of the manufacturing costs of the factory and the profits to be made from processing canes, Haggatts is the last factory for this purpose. As a matter of fact, the Workers' Union has already had to conclude a separate wage agreement with Haggatts because it was conceded by the Union that Haggatts could not pay the same wages for labour as the factories in a far better geographical location.

What does strike me as arrant nonsense was the suggestion by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that people from the outside would be tempted to send canes to Haggatts because it would soon be paying a better price. At the moment, as we understand it, the retention of Haggatts factory as an operating unit is conditioned by the fact that in the area itself it is uneconomical to send canes outside on account of the difficulty of terrain. How on earth therefore is it going to be economical for canes to come in from outside? They cannot come in by helicopter or aeroplane or something.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, the hon. member says it is uneconomical for canes to come in, therefore it is uneconomical for canes to go out.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I did not say that at all. What I did say was this: our understanding is that it is necessary to retain Haggatts as an operating unit because it is un-

economical for the peasant farmers in the Haggatts area to transport their canes outside of St. Andrew to the factories outside the parish, and the transport costs are comparatively so high as to more than offset any additional price they may get from a factory outside St. Andrew.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, there are people in St. Andrew from the Boscobelle area who send their canes to Lower Estate and get more money when the freight is taken out than if they sent them to Haggatts. The same Manager you are appointing there now paid them more.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In other words then, it is completely unnecessary to have Haggatts working, according to him. If the people in St. Andrew, including Haggatts area, can send their canes as far as Lower Estate, pay additional transport and still come out economically because they get a better price, what the devil on earth is he insisting that we should retain Haggatts? If you can send your canes outside and get a better price, send them out. Our information is, Mr. Chairman, that you have to retain this factory there because people living in Haggatts and around there cannot afford to pay the additional cost of getting their canes up the hills and outside St. Andrew's parish. Furthermore this is the biggest concentration of peasant farmers in the Island, as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew has said. There are a lot of small hire-purchase plots, and people cannot even get a lorry load of canes; so it would not pay them to hire a lorry to send these canes outside the parish; therefore you have to keep Haggatts running to accommodate them. What I am saying, Sir, is that if in these circumstances it is necessary to retain Haggatts as an operating unit because the people inside cannot economically send their canes outside, it seems to me to be really fool-hardy to be proposing that people outside of St. Andrew are going to be able to send them through the same terrain to Haggatts, because Government can eventually pay a better price.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Hon. Minister is talking what he thinks. I can tell him that people send their canes from Welchman Hall, St. Thomas to Haggatts. I have taken some there myself, so if he does not know anything, he should not talk it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All I am trying to do is to pick some kind of sense out of the nonsense he has been talking both in the House and outside the House, and I do not want to go over it again, because every little three-year old child can understand what I am saying. I repeat, Sir, that if we have to retain Haggatts as an operating unit for the benefit and advantage of the people in the area, it is merely to provide them with an opportunity for reaping their canes at home. I may tell you that the small cane farmers there supply almost one-third of the total amount of canes processed at Haggatts in any given year, and it is to accommodate them and the people in factory work, and therefore it would only go to show the vanity of human hope if you expect that Haggatts can at any time provide an indication of what is involved in the manufacture of sugar and the profits being made in the manufacture of sugar.

5.15 p.m.

If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph or his Government wanted to acquire a factory which could demonstrate on easy conditions the cost of the manufacturing of sugar and the profits made from the manufacturing of sugar, they had the chance of buying six sugar factories situated in different areas and in entirely better conditions than Haggatts Factory. They had Gibbons Factory and Montcrieffe in 1956, Halton and Newton in 1960 and Oldsbury and Sandy Lane in 1959.

Mr. SMITH: I rise on a point of order. I would like the Hon. Minister in referring to the factories which he called out to tell us also about the land, not only the factories.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sandy Lane has over 350 acres of land attached to it. But that is not the point at all. Nobody puts down a factory without offering the owners of the surrounding plantation shares in the factory. They

offer shares to the owners of the surrounding plantations in order to ensure that they get these owners to send their canes to the factory. If you go to Warrens, you will find that all the plantations around there have shares in Warrens factory. Immediately on erecting a factory, they offer shares to the owners of all the surrounding plantations because the factory is of no use without canes. In the case of Haggatts, it is having two-thirds of the crop coming from their own canes.

I only mentioned that to disperse any feelings that on the acquisition of Haggatts Factory, the Government is in a wonderful position to obtain some of the genuine statistics in the sugar industry. Haggatts would not provide this. This is a marginal operation which is situated in a difficult terrain, and it is only through force of circumstances and to ensure peasant farmers of the reaping of their crop that the Government had acquired Haggatts. It is not through any ambition of being able to obtain detailed and accurate statistics of the working of sugar factories. The time must come when a national authority or some state organisation should own a sugar factory situated in a better geographical location than Haggatts from the point of view of its being in a better cane-producing area. St. Andrew has a very heavy rainfall; therefore, the canes which are produced in St. Andrew take more to make a ton of sugar because the sucrose in them is less. Almost in every case, the acquisition of any other sugar factory would provide the opportunity of getting better information, such as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would like and which we ourselves would like; but Haggatts is not the answer to this question.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that remark coming from the Hon. Minister tells us plainly that we are doing nothing by buying Haggatts. He has thrown cold water completely on it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I have done nothing of the kind. All I have done is to throw very, very cold water on the lines which the hon. member took. The hon. member knows St. Andrew and he knows the difficulty down there; and he should not sit there and imagine that Haggatts would be able to pay \$1.00, \$2.00 or more per ton than what other sugar factories are paying to peasants for their canes.

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

AYES: Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. BOXILL, Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. YEARWOOD, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES, Mr. LOWE, Mr. COWARD, Mr. HOLDER and Mr. SMITH — 11.

NOES: Messrs. LYNCH and GODDARD — 2.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 22

POLIO REHABILITATION

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, as a result of the recent outbreak of poliomyelitis in Barbados, arrangements had been made through the University of the West Indies for Dr. J. D. G. McNeill-Smith, Consultant in orthopaedic surgery to the Government of Jamaica, to come to Barbados to give an assessment of the cases affected by this disease with a view to the organisation of a scheme for the rehabilitation of the affected ones.

As a result of Dr. McNeill-Smith's visit, four children aged 2, 3, 14 and 16 years, who are now patients at the Barbados General Hospital, appear to necessitate treatment for their rehabilitation which cannot be given in Barbados, and in these circumstances the Government was advised that negotiations should be carried out with Jamaica whereby these children could be sent there for the necessary treatment.

The result of the negotiations with Jamaica is that Jamaica would be willing to accept the children there and treat them inasmuch as Barbados could not provide what treatment was necessary for them.

5.25 p.m.

Doctor McNeil-Smith has also advised that this Government should ask the Government of Jamaica to make available to us (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, if hon. members on this side of the House.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot hear the hon. member, while other hon. members are talking as loudly as they are talking.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. McNeil-Smith has advised that the Government should be advised to make available to it a surgical technician who is at present attached to the Rehabilitation Unit in Jamaica; he would train some of our local technicians in the art of providing the necessary apparatus which these children will need for their rehabilitation. I would like to give hon. members a break-down of the expenses for which this Resolution seeks to make provision. The break down is as follows:-

Four return passages to Jamaica, \$1,482.00. It will take them about six months each in Jamaica and at the rate of \$4.80 per day for these four patients, the amount will be \$3,556.00. Treatment will cost the sum of \$768 and contingencies, \$200; making a total of \$6,006.00. Then for the Consultant, his return air passage will be \$370.50; hotel expenses for fourteen days at the rate of \$20 per day will amount to \$280.00 and subsistence allowance for fourteen days at \$10 per day will amount to \$140.00 making a total of \$800.00 approximately.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, why it is necessary to have the services of a surgical technician now. There were 79 cases of poliomyelitis reported and of those 79 cases, four persons have died. Another four cases were not polio cases at all. In one instance, a child was sent to the Hospital with a broken arm; I do not want to call the name of the doctor in the case, but I will merely say that it is a doctor from Barbados. After a careful examination of the other 71 cases the conclusion was reached that 18 of them would require mechanical aids. Eleven of those 18 cases have one limb only and the other seven have both limbs. About 25 of the children who were affected with poliomyelitis have recovered completely. I have just mentioned that so that hon. members will see that we only have 18 cases, four of whom will be going to Jamaica as soon as this Resolution is approved by this Honourable Chamber. As to the other fourteen, the Government was advised that they could be dealt with here with the assistance of the surgical technician from Jamaica; with the necessary braces, and so on, they would be able to walk again.

I may point out, Sir, that Dr. McNeil-Smith also pointed out that these children, although they are affected as a result of the outbreak of poliomyelitis, can and will still be taught to do certain jobs by means of which they could earn themselves a living. In the case of the four patients who have to be sent to Jamaica, the doctor has pointed out that arrangements can be made whereby some of them may be able to do watch repairing, and so forth. They will be taught trades to suit the parts of the limbs which they can use.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite ready and willing to answer any questions which hon. members may ask. With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not opposing this Resolution but we are the persons who are signing the cheques. We are being asked to okay this Resolution. The first part of the Addendum to this Resolution reads as follows:-

"As a result of the recent outbreak of poliomyelitis in Barbados, it has become necessary to send four children to the Jamaica Rehabilitation Unit for special treatment."

I am saying that we should know the names of these children. Suppose one of these children is from my constituency and any one of the people asked me if his child is

one of them! If this matter is not to be made private, surely we should know the names of these children. As a matter of fact, all of them can be from the parish of St. Joseph. As I was saying, Sir, if one of the parents of these children was to ask me about this matter, I would not know if the children were from my constituency or not. No attorney would agree to a thing like this; when he takes up his abstract he will want to see what he is signing for. Again, these children may be from Trinidad or from Jamaica.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this necessary Resolution and also to deplore the fact that if wise precaution had been taken, this Resolution would not have been necessary. It is true that by being harnessed in steel and leather these children will walk, but they will never run. If it had not been for this bureaucratic resistance to take precautions, these children might have been running about at their homes. I am saying that bureaucracy should never take the place or the ordinary necessities for the citizens of this country. I remember that when a question had to be asked in this very Chamber as to what was being done in relation to the outbreak of poliomyelitis in the first place in British Guiana and then in this island, the suggestion was made that there was no epidemic at all and we were more or less left out of court.
5.35 p.m.

Here now we have the sad statistics which show us that there was an epidemic of a tragic nature. These children, now broken in body and warped in mind, will be the liability of this community for the rest of their natural lives. Notice should be taken of this, Mr. Chairman, purely as a warning against any such bureaucracy in future.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to reply to the remarks of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. If the hon. junior member for Bridgetown does not know, ask him to ask a question. The type of polio which we had in Barbados was quite different from the type in British Guiana. There are three types of poliomyelitis; there is type 1, type 2 and type 3, and we found from the experiments carried out by the expert who came from World Health Organisation that there was a vast difference between the poliomyelitis in Barbados and that in British Guiana. The one in Barbados was type 1 and that in British Guiana was type 2, and on these grounds they have advised that this type of polio which we had in Barbados was something which belonged to Barbados. It was not the only time we have had polio in Barbados, as I pointed out before. Every year we are accustomed to having poliomyelitis cases in Barbados. The incidence of polio here in Barbados this year was nothing new. All happened is that there were more people affected by it than in past years, but the poliomyelitis in Barbados had absolutely nothing to do with the poliomyelitis in British Guiana, according to research and expert evidence which we have; and if the hon. junior member for Bridgetown would like me to bring it here and let him see what advice we have got, I would be willing to do so.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, is that if we had taken the precaution of using the vaccine which was used in British Guiana as a means of protection, it would mean that we would have the same number of polio cases, because we would be using the vaccine against one type of polio when it was not the vaccine of that type. It was not until recently that there was the trivalent type of vaccine which can combat any of the three types of poliomyelitis. But again I would like to emphasise that the type of polio which we had in 1963 was quite different and distinct from that in British Guiana; hence it is not a question of having it come from British Guiana to Barbados.

To answer the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I think the hon. member only wanted to hear it said "You know who spoke on this Resolution, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph?" He had absolutely nothing to say, but just got up asking for the names of the children. There are four children of the inhabitants of Barbados affected by poliomyelitis whose responsibility it is for the Government to look after. The names do not matter. I will not give the names of these children on the

floor of the House; but if the hon. member wants them from me, after the evening session he can come and have them. I do not see why the names of these children should be published. I do not know if the hon. member has a bee in his bonnet, but I should like to advise the hon. member that when he has something to say, he should say it, but do not get up and ask nonsense.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I only asked the Hon. Minister to give the names to me. I am a member of this Honourable House elected by the people, and when he gets up and says that I have absolutely nothing to say and he is not going to mention these names, that can only come from an idiot, not one who knows his job, because he is a member of this House.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member referring to the Minister as an idiot?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we are called upon to vote money and I am asking a question; but the Hon. Minister says I do not have anything to say. Would he like to get up and say what he likes and expect me to say "yes" to it? I am telling him here and now that if he starts it I can end it with him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the hon. member to couch his speech in parliamentary language.

Mr. SMITH: Why did you not tell the hon. member to couch his when he accused me of talking nothing?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph referred to the Hon. Minister as an idiot. That sounds unparliamentary.

Mr. SMITH: How did he refer to me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As talking nonsense.

Mr. SMITH: What would you say to that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is differently completely.

Mr. SMITH: I think that "idiot" is too mild a word. This is the people's business and the people's money. What would it be for him to say "John Brown"? I do not want the addresses, because you get two, three or four people with the same names. If he had said Earline Maynard, Mary Atkins or even Lloyd Smith — because I know a Lloyd Smith living in Cave Hill — I would have been satisfied. Poliomyelitis does not ask anybody a favour. The children have not brought it upon themselves, unless the Minister brought it on them; so there is nothing wrong or degrading; but he gets up here and accuses me of talking nothing. I appear to you to be more decent after now; otherwise we will get into the ropes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member referring to the Chair?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, may I through you enquire from the Hon. Minister whether it is not true that the type of vaccine which is efficacious in all three types of poliomyelitis was discovered some three or four years ago, and if it were known that there was an epidemic in the area, irrespective of its being an epidemic of type 1, 2 or 3, whether it would not have been the essence of wisdom to allow that vaccine to come into the Island so that the children would be vaccinated, bearing in mind that any wastage would be human wastage and so irrecoverable?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to point out to the hon. junior member for Bridgetown that the offers which we had for vaccine were not offers of the trivalent type of vaccine which would combat all three types of poliomyelitis.
5.45 p.m.

The trivalent type of vaccine was used in some of the other territories last year and was introduced in Barbados this year. The sort of vaccine which we were offered was

a Salk Vaccine which only dealt with one type of polio, and this was the type of vaccine which was thrown away by Trinidad and other Islands of the West Indies and which they thought was of no use to them. At the same time, they were trying to dump it on Barbados. However, we at the same time, brought in the trivalent type of vaccine which is an oral vaccine.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER the passing of two Resolutions in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND TO UNIVERSITY OF WEST INDIES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the lease of 89,069 square feet of land described in the Schedule thereto to the University of the West Indies.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to approve the lease of 89,069 square feet of land situated adjacent to the Parkinson School, the Pine, St. Michael. This land was formerly vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee and it is proposed to lease it for a period of 99 years to the University of the West Indies for the purpose of establishing an Extra Mural Centre at a peppercorn rental of 25 cents per annum. The land was formerly land of the Pine Plantation and was vested in the Housing Authority and then re-vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

At some time prior to this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the University College required an area of 42,840 square feet, but after measuring it and considering the extent of the building which was required, they further required this extra amount of land, thus making the full total of 89,069 square feet.

I beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BILL, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; Second reading of a Bill further to amend the Public Utilities Act, 1951.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very simple matter. It is just an amendment to the Public Utilities Act, 1951, in order to give effect to the proposals that the functions which are at present the responsibility of the Governor by virtue of the particular Sections of the Act be transferred to the Governor-in-Executive Committee in accordance, more or less, with our change of constitutional status.

The precise functions as set out are:

- (i) the power to appoint members and acting members of the Public Utilities Board, and to fill vacancies in the membership thereof — sections 3 and 7;
- (ii) the power to nominate persons to constitute the public utilities panel and to nominate assessors for the purposes of the said Act — section 3A;
- (iii) the giving of notice by members of the Board with respect to resignation therefrom and the power to declare the office of any member vacant on the ground that for any just cause such member is unfit to continue in office — section 5;
- (iv) the transmission of certificates relative to the failure of public utilities to comply with orders made by the Board in the event of the Board being of the opinion that no effectual means exist of compelling the said public utilities to comply with such orders — section 36.

These amendments to the Act constitute no fundamental departure in principle. As I have said, the amendments merely seek to transfer on purely constitutional grounds the power now vested in the Governor with relation to these functions. Since this is merely an exercise in constitutional status and involves no principle of any kind, there is no necessity for my making any lengthy speech.

Therefore, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that, 5.55 p.m.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the Government this matter of the public utility companies in this island and especially the Telephone Company. It is true that they are a private concern, but it is also true to say that they are operating under the Public Utilities Act and they are enjoying the benefit of the public utility services. The Telephone Company has adopted a principle that they treat people who use their services as though they are intruders. When you go to the Telephone Company's office to pay a bill, the people who work there seem to think that you are stepping on their domain and that you are only coming there to annoy them rather than facilitate them. They act as though they are doing you a great service by allowing you to have a telephone. I am sure that this public utility service does not give you the benefit like the Electric Company or the Natural Gas Corporation. If any person allows two months to pass without paying for his telephone, the service can be cut out; but it is a very hard thing for them to say that you have to pay your telephone bill by the 20th of the month in advance, and if it comes to the 21st or the 22nd of the month they cut off the service without notifying you. You just find that the service has been cut off. As a user of the telephone, I say it is true that you have signed an agreement to pay your bill by the 20th of the month; otherwise the service is cut off. You want the services of the telephone but you really do not agree with that provision. I do

not see why the Telephone Company could not notify you if you are in arrears and say: "You are in arrears and if you do not pay your bill within two or three days your service will be cut off." If you were to miss and go over three days — I know some people have had to pay as much as five dollars for a re-connection of their service. This is not robbery with a "V" but robbery with an "S"; it is not robbery with violence but robbery with subtlety.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I went to have a transfer of service made, and the Telephone Company erroneously sent me a bill for \$23.50 for changing over from one name to another. They subsequently discovered that they had sent me two bills which they should not have sent me. They eventually sent and cut off the other gentleman's telephone. I am saying, Sir, that when somebody loses one of his hands when he comes to cut out this telephone service, then some notice will be taken of these things. Another thing is that they have adopted a policy of employing people only of a certain colour; they are only employing people who are white or nearly white. The other day I spoke about the Electric Company and they made an attempt to change their policy. I want to say that there are more people who use the telephone service and who look like me than those who look otherwise. I think that you need to have a mixture there. You should not try to impress upon me that only people of that colour which I have mentioned have intelligence, and other people who look like me did not go to school or that they went to school in August or in December. All over the world we have this case of white and black; I may say that this is no racial talk. We are trying to have a harmonious running of things and it is very hard and ironical that a big concern like the Telephone Company which has been operating in this island for so many years should, in this modern age, be still practising this kind of Latin American or Roman Nose way of employing people.

Mr. Chairman, you have the Barbados Telephone Company, the Barbados Light and Power Company, you have all these public utility companies and all of these firms operating here; they make a big profit but none of them has seen fit to offer a scholarship to anybody. It is not that I would want to get any scholarship for anybody who is connected with me, but I do say that these public utility companies and all of these firms which have been operating here for so long are taking out everything from the country and they are not putting back anything in the country. The Government cannot call upon anybody to offer a scholarship locally; but if you are operating here for all of this time the least you could do would be to offer a scholarship, and doing that would not kill any of them. 6.05 p.m.

I am sure that if they had to go through some of what other countries experience with strikes every day or week, they would lose more than what they would offer in a scholarship. Coming back to the Telephone Company, I believe they give their workers a course in impoliteness. I am not saying this because they cannot represent themselves; I would go outside and say that where they can answer me and I would know how to answer them; but that Company has some of the most impolite people in the world in the office. When you go there these people look at you as though you are intruding, and you have to stand until they feel to come and attend you. I am saying this because I want the members of the Utility Board to realize that as a taxpayer, as a man who must use the utility services in Barbados and as a person who happens to be a representative of the people, I must speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, and I am asking the members of the Utility Board to be more stringent in their dealings with these utility services, especially the Telephone Company. We as representatives of the people are not going to be satisfied with this hand-me-down type of business. It is about time that people realise that God in His wisdom knew what He was doing when He made us this way. We have nothing to be ashamed of as far as our colour is concerned. It is true that some of us conduct ourselves in a most deprecable and deplorable manner, but some of the others do too, because we do not have any Al Capones here, while there are some in the United States and in other parts of the world. Anyway, we have more of the good than of the bad,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is about time that the Telephone Company stopped practising this racial policy. Whenever a short-haired girl happens to apply for a job there, it is always filled; yet when somebody moves out from there, you can see somebody else in her place. I think Barbados should employ Barbadians first, but sometimes you go there and find people who speak with a different accent from ours. With the unemployment situation in Barbados being what it is, I do not think it is very conducive to harmonious relations. A lot of people would say what I am saying today, but they are afraid. If they do not like what I am saying, although I pay my telephone bill every month, they can come and take it out, because when you say anything against the Telephone Company, they are always quick to run and cut off your telephone, because they realise it is a necessity. If they feel like doing that to me, they can do it; but I am calling on the members of the Utility Board to keep their eyes open for all utility services and especially the Telephone Company.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member can rest assured that his strictures will be drawn to the attention of the members of the Public Utilities Board in respect of this Company. Government does not and will not condone any racial discrimination on the part of any employer anywhere in this Island. I assume, Sir, that the allegations of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas are based on fact, and he has made personal investigation of the incidents whereof he has complained, and I give personally the undertaking that I will myself discuss with the Chairman of the Board the strictures he has mentioned and suggest that they be immediately investigated.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY (REHABILITATION, PRICE STABILIZATION AND LABOUR WELFARE) ORDER, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, today we introduced three Resolutions simultaneously, two of which have already been dealt with. We have dealt with the one relating to the acquisition of Haggatts, and the one with regard to the rehabilitation of the victims of poliomyelitis. The third was to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Order, 1963." I think copies have been circulated to hon. members. This is more or less formal, and I beg to move that this Resolution be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with the levies to be imposed during the ensuing year. You will see from the Addendum that as far back as 1956 the basis of agreement was settled between Government, the Sugar Producers' Association and the Union representing the workers. It was agreed then and in subsequent years until the Agreement was revised that there should be:

- (a) a "basic" levy for the credit of (i) the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Reserve Fund at the rate of \$3.20;
 - (ii) the Sugar Industry Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund at the rate of \$4.80 and
 - (iii) the Labour Welfare Fund at the rate of \$4.80.
- 6.15 p.m.

(b) an "above average crop" levy, also for the credit of the Labour Welfare Fund;

(c) a "marginal difference" levy, also for the credit of the Labour Welfare Fund;

(d) a "Provident Fund" levy, to be collected only when the necessary legislative authority was provided, at the rate of \$0.40.

In 1961, there was a revision of agreement affecting the rate of levy for the Price Stabilisation Fund as well as the rate of levy for the Provident Fund. The Price Stabilisation Fund has been reduced from the original \$3.20 to \$2.60 and the Provident Fund Levy has been increased by the sum of 60 cents, that is, from 40 cents to \$1.00.

The levy for the entire crop rate has been fixed in accordance with the agreement taking into account that an "above average crop" levy is collectible but that a "marginal difference" levy is not.

The rates of levies which are now collectible are as follows:-

For the Price Stabilization Reserve Fund	\$2.60
For the Capital Rehabilitation Reserve Fund	\$4.80
For the Labour Welfare Fund -	

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) 'basic' levy | \$4.80 |
| (ii) 'above average levy' | \$1.22 |

You now have a total of \$6.02 going to the Labour Welfare Fund.

This Honourable House has been accustomed for years from 1956 going into the background information as regards the levying of these levies. All of this is now history with which all members of this House are familiar.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Minister can furnish us with the information as to what are the present standing positions of these three funds.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: This really is a question which I did not anticipate and I would have wished that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was here because he would have been able to give it to the hon. member without a moment's hesitation. I do have some figures, but they have not been brought up to date. Therefore, there is no point in giving the hon. member these figures. I know he wants to know what the current figures are. If the hon. member has no objection, I would provide them for him by next Tuesday.

Mr. GODDARD: If the Hon. Minister will provide them by the next Tuesday, I would wait for them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand how the hon. junior member for Christ Church rose then.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That brings Government Business to an end for today.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED re MESSAGE NO.
9/1963 FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE
GOVERNOR

Mr. SPEAKER: May I take this opportunity to inform this Honourable House of Message No.9 of this year from His Excellency the Governor to His Honour the President of the Legislative Council and His Honour the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

This Message has already been circulated to hon. members and, therefore, it will not be necessary for me to read it.

In consequence of this Message which I have considered with the Hon. President of the Other Place, it has been decided that so far as this Chamber is concerned, three members of each political party with the existing parliamentary standing in this House will be invited to participate and that such members will in due course be notified of the meeting or meetings of this Inter-Party conference.

The Government Party will be represented by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the Hon. Leader of the House (Hon. W. A. Crawford); the hon. junior members for St. Lucy and St. Thomas, (Hon. J. C. Tudor and Mr. Boxill); the Official Opposition will be represented by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Mottley); as well as by the hon. junior members for Christ Church and the City of Bridgetown, (Messrs. Goddard and Lynch); the minority Party in opposition will be represented by the hon. junior members for St. George, St. Joseph and St. James, (Messrs. Miller, Smith and Holder).

That constitutes three parliamentary members from each Party in this Chamber. Although this is referred to as an inter-party conference, yet the fact that it is proposed to be held under the Chairmanship of the Hon. President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of this Chamber, is an indication that it is desired that this Conference consists of members actually in all Parliaments. In view of the fact that there are not less than three members out of the

24 members of this Chamber who are styled as "Independents", I have decided also to invite the hon. senior member for St. Peter (Mr. Walcott) who, I am advised, is the senior member in this House of the three Independents, to also join and participate in the deliberations of this Conference.
6.25 p.m.

THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As to the Order Paper for next week, the Government has deferred consideration of the Workmen's Compensation Bill which is the first Order of the Day on today's Order Paper, and the accompanying Bill which is Order No.2. We have deferred consideration of those Measures in reference to representations which were made on behalf of hon. members who claim that they have not had adequate time in which thoroughly to consider all the implications of those Measures. We sincerely hope that the intervening week before the next meeting of this House will be enough to provide hon. members with ample time to give proper consideration to these Measures because it is intended on Tuesday next to deal with both these Orders. I hope that hon. members will come prepared next Tuesday to deal with both of these Bills — the Workmen's Compensation Bill and the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 12th November, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 12th November, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.30 p.m.