

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 27th March, 1968.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.30 a.m. o' clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C.E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Leader of the House); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, L.L.B.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: I understand there are no Minutes available for confirmation. Likewise Order Papers are not yet available, but, I understand in the course of the day they will be circulated.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs to lay "The Barbados (Constitution) (Retirement of Entitled Officers) (Amendment) Regulations, 1968".

QUESTIONS

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will Government consider immediately the pressing necessity for paying out to old resigned labourers in the Sugar Industry such benefits from the Provident Fund that are due to them?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state when and how the Fund will be distributed?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting, but the Minister should state his reasons for doing this this morning. As he has fixed the meeting for so early an hour, I expect we would finish quite early. There is some reason for suspending these Orders, and he should state it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has asked the hon. member if he would give way that he might state his reason. Would the hon. member give way?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: There is a simple reason. If we meet at 10 o'clock it is better, I think, to have the luncheon suspension at 1 o'clock than at 2 o'clock. This is all.

The question that Standing orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MOTION TO USE PREVIOUS DAY'S ORDER PAPER

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as the Order Papers are not yet available, I beg to move, until they are available, that yesterday's Order Paper be the Order Paper for this Sitting.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that yesterday's Order Paper be deemed to be this day's Order Paper until the arrival of today's Order Paper.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not quite follow that, Sir. What exactly does that mean? The Hon. Leader of the House moved that yesterday's Order Paper be today's Order Paper. Your Honour has put that yesterday's Order Paper be today's Order Paper until the arrival of today's Order Paper. That is a different thing from what he moved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Through some dilatoriness the Government Printery has not yet supplied us with today's Order Paper, and we have no Order Paper to go on; so we must continue.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot say we must continue. The Hon. Leader of the House has moved, that yesterday's Order Paper be today's Order Paper, and Your Honour has put that that be today's Order Paper until today's Order Paper arrives. I do not understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: What really would have happened is that if yesterday we had suspended until today, we would have proceeded in accordance with that Order Paper. I rather got the impression – and I will be corrected if I am wrong – that the hon. member is seeking to proceed with the matter which was under discussion when the Moment of Interruption arrived yesterday. That is my impression; I may be quite wrong.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I gather the House was adjourned, and if the House was adjourned and not suspended..... (ASIDES) Who could be telling me what I am asking? Only the Speaker and the Leader of the House understand what I am asking.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is one occasion I do not disagree with the hon. senior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You said you disagreed with me, sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: This is one occasion that I do not disagree. I am so sorry the hon. member cannot hear as well as I would like.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is the thing which will get me angry, when people over there who do not understand what I am doing are telling me to sit down. They do not understand if this is a rabbit, a mouse, a red herring or a rat. (A VOICE: I understand.) Understand what? The Leader of the House understands what I am doing and I am not trying to put him in any difficulty. I am trying to regularise the procedure. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You cannot regularise anything in here.) You hear that bloody idiot, Mr. Speaker? I am not sitting down and I am not allowing it to go on this way. This cannot be done. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You cannot stop it from being done.) You are talking like an ass!

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That is your kind of language.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You caused me to talk that kind of language. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: That would only

come from a hooligan.) Are you calling somebody a hooligan? (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes!)

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. senior member for Bridgetown resume his seat?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you do not know you have been hearing his voice all the time I was standing up.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting now stands suspended for ten minutes for grave disorder.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You can suspend it for two hours, because all I am trying to do is to regularise the thing.
10.40 a.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: In the absence of today's Order Paper, if the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would give way a moment, I would ask the Hon. Leader of the House to clarify the motion which seems to have been subject to some misunderstanding.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before he clarifies it, Sir, I want to make it clear that I am not holding up the business of the House. I want to regularise and put right what I consider in my opinion – and what you consider. Sir – to be irregular. If he wants to use yesterday's Order Paper as today's Order Paper, there must be no condition attached. If at the end of the business no Order Paper arrives, then what happens? There must be no condition attached, and it must be done with the approval of the House, not Your Honour's.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was a motion which would have been put to the House. The hon. member, unless I misunderstood him, made a motion.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would withdraw that one and substitute the following:

“That yesterday's Order Paper be today's Order Paper.”

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. junior member for St. Andrew about to address me?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope the Hon. Leader of the House appreciates the stand I took in this matter, because if one of us objected it could not work.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gather that the hon. member did not hear the point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask your pardon, Sir. I rose on a point of order, and I want the Leader of the House to appreciate that there was no objection to it being done, but I wanted it to be done in the proper way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for repeating it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee of Supply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967-68 No. 67

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was adjourned, previously the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was speaking.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned, I was trying to make a point by quoting some figures to show that if we should continue at this rate we would not be able to make any repayments, or to make an effort to repay anything by 1970, because the Hon. Introducer has not made out a case to justify this loan. This Corporation was in operation for the last three or four years, and it has shown no sign of making a profit in my opinion, but now we are asked to allow it to go deeper into debt by making a loan.

I can understand if the Minister had put up a case telling us that the intention was to expand, and to give us a breakdown on the expansion so that we would know what the Corporation is about to do, even if it did not do it, in order to justify this loan. He has not done so. I would take it that we are going along in the same way throwing away money, and I would not be fair to the taxpayer or to myself, as a representative of the people, to encourage anything of this sort.

If a case had been made out to show that they had discovered what caused the losses and they had remedied that — in other words, they had 'fixed-it-right' — and were thinking of making a new start and intended to do more business in order to make money to repay the loan, even if we forgot the losses, it would have been a different matter. In other words, you are wiping off the slate and are asking us to help you wipe it off in order that you may turn over a new leaf, but the only way it could be done is to give you some new capital. That would be a case, and I would not have to say anything more on the matter other than "Aye".

We are not convinced even by the figures in this Statement. I cannot go by this Statement. I do not know how to believe that responsible licensed Auditors, who are responsible to the Inland Revenue Department, would make a Statement of this kind. We do not have a breakdown of the figures. You have borrowed money. I am not now dealing with my figures but with theirs. I see here "Loans Guaranteed by Government — Advances by Bank of Nova Scotia — \$365,000.00; Television \$785,000.00", making a total of \$1,150,000. This is money that was loaned, but where is the interest for it? This loan will have to be serviced, and the first thing you see on your Balance Sheet is your interest from the Bank. Interest is a man, Sir, who does not sleep. When you are on your sick bed dying, interest is watching you; while you are taking a spree, interest is there with you. Regardless of what is happening, Mr. Interest is there with his eyes wide open, and the time is coming for you with interest. Where is it on this sheet?

If I can pinpoint one single fault in this Statement, I can afford and I have the right to say it is no Statement. I cannot believe it. It is not a true and correct Statement. This Statement was only put together in order to try and get this loan. It was not necessary to submit a Statement like this to get a loan, because the numbers are on the other side of the House. Even if it were not a Statement at all, as long as the Government brings it here, it would pass. I would not say that the members on the other side are blind; I would not say that they are ignorant, but everything is right for them. The glasses that they are looking through are marked "right"; however they open their eyes it is right and no wrong. I cannot blame them. If they are seeking all right and no wrong, then they will be going right. In other words, they will feel to themselves that they are going right. I am laying the blame on the entire Government. If the members on the other side comprise the Government, then I have to blame them. Do you know why? The Government has an expert at the top. He knows figures backward. If he is flying in an aeroplane and he sees figures flying about, he will know them.

Sir, I feel now that this was purposely done. You can take it for granted, Sir, that I may be the most backward in here, but with more sense. If I can see that something is wrong, then you cannot say that the Prime Minister of this country has not seen it. 11.05 a.m.

You cannot say that. You cannot say that the Hon. Leader of the House has not seen it. I would not say that, because they have had the opportunity to see this Statement in draft form, as the Hon. Leader of the House informed us yesterday that it took time to get to the Cabinet and it took time to leave the Cabinet. That means that the Cabinet is not prepared to let it go until they make sure that it is O.K. Therefore, in their opinion, it is O.K. and they are thinking, in my opinion, that we above here do not know figures. This could never be true and correct,

except the loan was interest free. If the Minister can tell me now that this loan is interest free, I will say, well, all right; but if he cannot tell me that, if he cannot prove that, this is wrong, and we should not go by it at all. In my opinion, if the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution can see it in this light - he is no fool either. He knows figures and he would tell you that if he had to do with this, do you know what would happen? If the present members of the Opposition were in power with this, and the other members on the lower side were in the Opposition, I seem to hear the hon. Introducer painting and the hon. junior member for Christ Church - all of them would be parading in a matter of this sort. I think that all other members are new members, but I can swear that the hon. junior member for Christ Church would take not less than about ten to twelve hours on this matter, knowing him as I do; but if one can read things here on the inside of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, I know what is written there as far as this is concerned. That is why I am happy, I am one of the most happy men in the world, that I am in the Opposition, and most hon. members would tell you that and you will find it out if the people should find favour with you to return you here and you should be in the Opposition. It makes dumb people talk.

Now, Sir, in this case, I cannot vote for anything like this. I would be dishonest to myself and to the electorate of St. Joseph, in other words, the electorate of the whole Island, because it is not properly made out. Something has been left out and I am pin-pointing that the interest has been left out. So long as the interest has been left out, most things have been left out. There is an old man who lives near me. When they trouble him, he says: "Hard ears, you would not hear; hard ears, you are going to feel." This Government is bound to feel because we have been warning them every time we get a chance on the floor of this House, to be careful as to how they are going about their business. Why do they so much like to rub up with the importees? And the Prime Minister has given them very nearly the same power as the electorate of this country has given to him. Why does this Government so much like to rub up with strangers and not their own? I can call them, but I am not calling them because I will have a chance very soon from now to deal with another Ministry; but strangers can come in here and do as they like. They can swipe the taxpayers, pull up their sticks and out they go and we have to pay for it. It is not a case of their being able in 1970 to pay back one cent; we have to pay for this. As I said yesterday, they may not be in existence. This particular company, this Thomson group - I do not know if it is a group, a man or what, but he wants to monopolise everything. I understand that they wanted to monopolise the Press of this country and the Press all over the world, and they have their reasons for these monopolies. Why would they not put up the money if they know that this was a paying concern, and they know that there is money in it? Do not let any person fool you; no industrialist who knows that his industry is going to make money, is going to encourage the Government to put money in it. The only way in which he would encourage the Government to put money in this industry is to make

sure that the Government cannot call upon him to pull up his sticks when he does not want to do that. As soon as you see them wanting to share in the profits and not in the losses, something is bound to go wrong. Every idiot should know that.

We do not know what is being paid out to these Thomsons. In other words, as far as I can see, and I hope the Minister will stop me quickly if I am wrong, I should be able to see how much money they have got apart from the Government, and how much interest is being paid to them for their money, or if money is being paid to them by way of dividends or anything of that sort. I think I noticed what the Government has put up. I will look for it so as to make sure. I see here that the loans are guaranteed by the Government, but I have not seen if these people have money in this business. It should be here to let me know how much money they have in it, and if they are getting any interest, if any dividends have been declared to them or if they are going down the hill with the Government financially. All of that should be here in this Report and let us see what the true picture is. I am not saying that we should do away with it; I would not say that we should do away with it because I am told that Rediffusion was quite willing to run this thing, and it has not been denied by the Hon. Introducer. Rediffusion is here already; all that the Government would have to do is to stand by and see that Rediffusion does not take them for a ride. All that the Government should be interested in is the entertainment for the people; and if TV is going all good and well, as well as C.B.C., it would be for Rediffusion to see that everything is carried out well and good and that they do not commit themselves to unnecessary burden and weight. This is what they should do.

11.15 a.m.

Rediffusion is already in the Island and is doing a good job. In my opinion they are making money. I am not an engineer, but, Sir, I feel that Rediffusion's overhead expenses should be more than C.B.C.'s. I do not know. I say that because C.B.C. have put up their equipment and you are getting it over the air. You do not even know what is bringing it into your home. When it comes to Rediffusion, you can see the poles and wires which they have installed all over the Island and these cost money. Even if the equipment of C.B.C. costs a little more than that of Rediffusion, in the long run C.B.C. should make more than Rediffusion because C.B.C. does not have to go to that expense by way of replacing poles, wires and things of that sort.

I feel that Rediffusion is making money and C.B.C. should be making money rather than throwing it away. Something is definitely wrong; but we cannot sit here and every time that they throw it away, we vote more money or allow them to borrow it because if we are not even giving them the money and we are giving the green lights for them to get money, the banks will never lend to the Corporation unless this

Hon. Chamber gives the green light. If I back a note to a bank for my friend and he fails to pay, I will have to pay it. I am saying this authoritatively because I have been burnt and I dare suppose most hon. members of this Chamber have been burnt along these lines - the only ones who would not be burnt would be the ones who could tell a good lie.

If we give them the green light, we should have to pay it for them if they do not pay it. How are they going to pay it back? I hate, Mr. Chairman, to repeat myself, but the Minister has failed to convince me how they can do so. I know that I am speaking now to the chairs because the Minister who is responsible for this Department is not in this House. I am saying that it is a disgrace and an insult. It is murder being created on the taxpayers of this country when the Minister concerned is out of this House and we have to vote money for his Department and he is not present to answer any one question.

I feel that we should not vote for anything under this Ministry in protest because we do not really and truly know who is responsible for it. It is a disgrace and the people of this country should never forgive the Prime Minister for doing a thing of this sort. He is calling on us to vote the money for a Department and the Minister is not responsible for his vote. He does not have to say a thing.

I do not know the man called Mr. Sandiford. If he appears here now, I do not know him nor do I care to know him either. He can say: "Well, Smith can get inside there and talk as he likes. Any one of the members of the Opposition can talk and say anything, I do not care anything about them. I do not have to see whether they are vexed or pleased." But if we can get him inside this House and crowd him with questions and drop the lashes on him, we would be able to bring him to his senses. Do not care how powerful he may be, he could not be more powerful than the Prime Minister and we succeeded in getting him to his senses and we would get Mr. Sandiford to his senses too.

Mr. Chairman, I know that you are going to stop me now, but when you stop me I would have come out with it so quickly that I would be finished. I was told that they called on him to run for St. James and he bluntly refused.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is speaking about a member of the other Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us remember Rule 26(9). I would like you to observe it.

Mr. SMITH: You can talk about 26(9). I do not know anything about members of the other Chamber. I do not care; I just do not care; 26(9) or 26(10) cannot make him pay any kind of respect or anything at all. I just do not care; he is not a member of this Chamber as far as I am concerned. I am talking about the Minister who should be inside this Chamber.

You rake anything and put up there and put him over me. You pick anything from the wayside and carry him up there and tell him that he can get up there and talk whatever he likes. I have to face the tape; I have to go and beg for votes. He too should have to face the electors, but he has got a say now to fleece them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would interrupt the hon. member again. Rule 26(9) says that the conduct of Her Majesty, members of the Royal Family, the Governor General of the West Indies, the Governor, members of either Houses of the Legislature, Judges, or the performance of judicial functions by other persons shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion.

Therefore, I ask the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to defer. Let the hon. senior member for St. Joseph continue.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I say that if the hon. member is criticising the appointment of a Senator as a Minister of Government, this might be a legitimate criticism though I have doubts of its being a pertinent one; the Constitution allows it. However, it seems to me, that in some of his remarks, the hon. member gave the impression that he personally dislikes the Minister and I am sure that this is not the case because he says that he does not know him. It would be, perhaps, as well if he does not pursue that strain, and in any case the impression is that he is personally motivated against the Minister; but, so far as I know, the Minister has never offended him.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have said that I do not know the gentleman. I hate no one. Every living human being in this world and in Barbados is my friend. I dare suppose if I meet up the gentleman tomorrow that I would speak to him, and if he is a man who would "fire" one, I would "fire one" with him. 11.25 a.m.

I am criticising the gentleman through no fault of his, because if he were honest he would not have accepted the Ministry.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, to say that because he accepted the Ministry he is dishonest is a personal attack on him, and I am sure the hon. member does not mean this, because the hon. member is not, as he says, motivated either by personal knowledge or personal dislike of the Hon. Senator. You criticise the fact that there are not enough Ministers in the House of Assembly although the Constitution allows this. This is legitimate though not pertinent, because the Constitution permits it; but when you go outside and speak as if the hon. member had some personal dislike against the hon. Senator, and to make it appear as if the Hon. Senator was dishonest in accepting the Ministry - I do not think that is what he intends, and he must see this surely.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, when I said that if he were honest he would not have accepted it, I mean that he

can come in here and sit in the Gallery like anybody else, but he cannot sit in one of these chairs; and knowing that, and knowing that he cannot reply to me if I am attacking him or asking him a question, in fairness to the electorate of this country he should not have accepted it. Imagine you are a Minister of the Crown and you cannot come into this House and take a seat! You have to stay outside and listen to all that is going on. I will say now that the Leader of the House had no right to bring anything here for another Minister. If he were a whole man he would not do it either, because it is not fair to him. Now start me up; I am ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has moved to a personal attack on me, and I have defended him. The hon. member must realise that I am a member of the Government, a member of Cabinet and Leader of the House; so you cannot say I have no right bringing in something which is Government policy to which I subscribe.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is bringing business here for a Minister from the Other Place, and all I will have to do is to throw the lashes on him. I was holding off all the time, but he can stand up for them. That is why we will get nowhere with decisions and actions of this kind by the present Government. Do you know, Sir, that this is the worst session I have ever seen or had the honour to sit in since there was a House of Assembly? The behaviour, actions and everything are worse since we have become independent. When we were not independent we were gentlemen and acquitted ourselves like gentlemen, but now we have become independent we are handling ourselves - like what? Think of the behaviour we have just had about five minutes ago; think of what is happening in this particular session since we have become independent and who is responsible for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will appeal to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: I am getting on with the Resolution. This is a money Resolution. Do not think I am advising you, but when you are going to rule on me, you have to be careful because under a Money Resolution the scope is very wide. You may be asking for trouble to pin a member down on a Money Resolution. You can pin a member down on a Bill, but not on a Resolution that is asking this House to give the green light to spend money.

Here we have a Balance Sheet that is not true. How am I to know that the Minister who is in charge, not the Leader of the House, did not tell these people to do as they like, and that he did not care anything about us? How am I to know it was passed on to him and he refused to have anything to do with it and asked that it be carried to the House as it is? How am I to know if the present Minister knows about this Balance Sheet either? How am I to know if he sat in on it and pointed out the things we are pinpointing now, drew it to the attention of the Government and they denied them? That is why I say the Hon. Minister should be in here. I do not know him and I would

hate the gentleman to think I am against him or hate him or anything, because it is not in me to hate anybody. If I hated anybody I would not even look at the Prime Minister because there is nobody who has told more lies on me than the Prime Minister. There is nobody who tried to insult me more than the Prime Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member should withdraw those words.

Mr. SMITH: What words?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That the Hon. Prime Minister told lies on him.

Mr. SMITH: Do you mean when I can prove it? Bring the Official Gazette and I will prove it to you. If I can prove a thing, must I withdraw? I said there is nobody who has told more lies on me than the Prime Minister. There is no man who insulted me deeper than he did, and you want me to withdraw it!

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Standing Order No. 26 (7) states that no member shall impute improper motives to another member, and at least I am of the opinion that when the hon. member says that the Hon. Prime Minister lied on him he has been imputing improper motives, and I am asking the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, now I will withdraw it, but anybody who has sense and intelligence will look at you as you should be looked upon.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to withdraw the words that the Hon. Prime Minister has lied on him.

Mr. SMITH: And when I withdraw it now, it means he did not lie on me! I would be a hypocrite. You are asking me to tell lies on myself. Well, I withdraw it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is the third time I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. SMITH: It could be 100,000 million times. I am not afraid of you. Go ahead! If you want me to withdraw it, I withdraw it. I will do any damn thing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We must have order in this Assembly. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has just said that this was the worst session with regard to behaviour, and I would never have expected him to be indulging in this type of language and behaviour.

Mr. SMITH: What caused me to do it?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to get on with the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Do you know what caused me to do it? When I credit a man with sense and find him to be a fool.

11.35 a.m.

I credit a man with sense and find him to be an idiot. (Asides.)

Mr. Chairman, why do you not call on the hon. junior member for St. Andrew now to behave? You would not hear him now; you are afraid of him; birds of a feather flock together. (Asides.) I was making a point. Mr. Chairman, you have to sit there and listen to us. It may be that the medicine we are administering is a bit bitter, but you will have to take it. The time will come when I have to come to your rescue, and I will come to it as a man. When a man tells lies on you, he is not telling the truth. That man said he went home to my house, and saw a pig tied to my dining room table, but he never visited me yet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again appealing to the hon. member to continue with the Resolution before the House.

Mr. SMITH: I am saying that man said he went home to my house, and saw a pig tied to my dining room table. That man never yet went to my home. You can make me withdraw that now; I did not call any name, but you know who I mean. That man told more lies on me than they have jackasses in Egypt. You can make me withdraw that; I am not calling any name. Now when we come to a Balance Sheet like this, we have to ignore it completely. Do you know what has come to my memory now, Sir? I am thinking of the time when that man said so when I was defending you. I now remember that it was in connection with the members of the Fire Service at Cross Roads feeding pigs. I was defending you, because you raised the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see any Fire Service in this motion.

Mr. SMITH: There was none up there either. (Laughter.) Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Leader of the House laughed so sweetly he made me laugh, too. Sir, let me suggest certain things. I am no longer criticising anything. Let us take our duties very seriously. I think that you should cause an investigation into this Department, and see what is really wrong with it before we give out this money. What I say in here today is not a criticism; it is just hard-headed commonsense. I am trying to point out to the Government where something is wrong.

I do not think the Hon. Leader of the House would be angry with any member on this side if he said something sensible. I understand if a member was talking foolishness - even the man who was talking would look foolish. It is a fact that some time ago when the hon. senior member for St. Lucy and the Hon. Prime Minister were in the Opposition, they kept me in that Chair from twelve o'clock one day until seven o'clock the next morning trying to put up their point to stop my Government - I am not saying the last Government - from spending money in the wrong direction. They felt that it was wrong, and they were trying to convince the present Leader of the Opposition that he was wrong. You are well aware that these leaders can be very stubborn and

they put up a fight. I was not vexed with them; they felt that something was wrong, and they wanted to draw it to the attention of the House and the electorate of the country that is was wrong.

I now feel that this matter is wrong, but I am not going to criticise it without offering a solution. Some people can only criticise and do nothing else, but I would try to offer a solution. There should be a thorough investigation into this Department. You can hear a lot of things at the sea, and that is why I go there so often. I understand that the workers at the Corporation do not get much money. I thought the staff was being overpaid. I thought the Barbadian staff was getting a good pay. I understand that the staff is not well paid. I understand that only two or three people are well paid. Let us have a thorough investigation into this matter; let us see what can be done; let us find out what Rediffusion will do for us, if we have to turn over a new leaf. If Thomson or Malcolm cannot carry on in such a manner as to make the business pay and Rediffusion can carry it on and relieve us of this burden, then we should investigate the matter and see what could be done. Do not do things to please a certain person or persons.

This is the taxpayers' money that they are spending. I read some time ago an article written - I would not call him an idiot, but I would prefer to call him a snob - by somebody to the effect that if you were not a lawyer you should not be paid for your duties in the House of Assembly. He felt that the honour given to me and you, Mr. Chairman, should be sufficient, but if a lawyer was deprived of his seat he should be given a pension. You must have read it, too. That is how all of them look at us. We did not go to any College, and so we are idiots and that is why I am prepared to stand up to any of them. They are a pack of snobs.

Let us go into it thoroughly and see what can be done. I heard that this money is not to be used as working capital, and that every cent has been spent already. If it is a fact, then the enquiry would bring that to light. If it is a fact, we will have to pay with our eyes closed; but do not let us go into the same trap again. We will still need working capital. If it is a fact that the money is to pay debts, you will still want money to carry on. You will need money to pay the staff and so on. If you are doing a business and you are doing credit, you do not get in all of the money at one time. You must have money so that you can pay your bills and your staff until money comes in. You cannot run a business waiting on your debtors to pay your bills, because that is very uncertain. You must have an overdraft at the bank, or money put aside so that you will be able to pay your staff until money comes in.

11.45 a.m.

The Hon. Introducer would not know this either, because he is only entrusted with those things there, just as they could have called me and pushed them into my hands too. He may not know it, but let them see that there is an investigation, and enquiry set up with economic experts to go into this matter and see about it; but you do not want so many experts because

I can see that you are paying out more money for labour, and expenses, than you are getting in receipts. That is putting it in a nutshell, but the question is to find out why this is so. If they are not doing as many sales, and the broadcasting and the other things are not doing as much as to stand up to the expenditure, they will have to do some cutting. They will have to bring it down to suit the sales, and if by doing that you have to go below, well then, you must pull up your sticks. That is my little enquiry, but the big enquiry may say something else. They may be able to say: "Look, you are doing something here which is costing you ten dollars to do it, but the income from it is only a penny." I believe that something is wrong. I am not accusing anybody of dishonesty, although that could work sometimes, but there is something wrong.

For all of these years and in every year you are losing more and more and it is too much; therefore let us have an enquiry, let them go into the matter and report back to us and ask us for more money and we will give it, but quite differently. You will have to tell me that you have found out that to hold on with Thomson you can never get through, that Thomson was carrying away or working wrongly and we have decided with Rediffusion to run it on our own, and I believe that we will have a better chance if we were running it on our own. Just send out one or two people to learn something as to how the thing is to be worked, you get a good, decent engineer and why could we not run it? But at this rate we are running it. The Government is running it because you have to run to the Government for money whenever you want it; therefore we are running it. However, we do not have the whole say. I daresay that too much politics might have crept into it. Business and politics do not agree. It may be that too much politics found itself in between, and if too much politics have found itself between there, this is what will happen. I am not saying that it happened with the last Minister or that it would happen with the present Minister; but if these people are running things along their own lines and they are doing something which they feel is right, and the Minister or Permanent Secretary can come along and wants to tell you what to do, you are asking for trouble. Do you know what is going to happen? That individual will say: If they are going to run it, let them go and run it"; and they are not going to be any more interested in it. As soon as you allow too much politics to creep into business, that can be the trouble. I daresay that what we have said on the floor of this House could have caused it, but we did not have to talk so much against C.B.C. before. What I am saying here now, and what other members may have to say, is that politics may creep into it and cause the thing to be wrong. That can happen. There are some people who may say: "Little foolish Lloyd Smith can get up there and talk his foolishness, but he is not going to talk it with me." You will get something like that even in the ordinary Department, because in some of them when you go there, the people look at you as if you have leprosy. I do not know if you have ever noticed it, but, Sir, that is nothing to do with this.

You will have to put your house in order and we are quite willing to come to your assistance. We must

have C.B.C. running; it is there already and I will say that it has come to stay, and it should stay. I would not be so ignorant as to say that you should scrap it. You may want a new management. It wants something to be done with it; it may want a little more pep into it. When we come to TV, they will not be able to do much expansion because, in my opinion, whoever is able to get TV has got it already. That is how I feel. It is the people who are not able to get TV who would only be trying to get one here and one there, but I feel that every one who is able to purchase TV has got it already, so that the licence from TV cannot be much now. There are some people who would more get TB before they get TV (Laughter.). They are too poor to get it. The TV. sellers may bring down the purchasing power, or whatever you care to call it, but it may be brought down to reach certain people's pockets. That is what is happening. They are telling you that there is no down payment and right away you start to pay \$15 or \$20 a month. Your friend has TV, your friend's children can enjoy themselves, you would like to enjoy yours and you will go and pay this \$20. For the first three or four months you will try to pay, but in the fifth or sixth month you cannot do anything and they will take it back from you. Except this particular Corporation is quite willing to help those who have not got any TV yet and try to get one in every home - that would be a matter of extension. Take, for instance, the private radios; I have a little one which works by electricity, but it is loud as anything. I do not remember how it got there; I believe that my son brought it in. However, I do not think that it could cost more than \$15. If they were to get some of these small ones, if they were to get to work and get some of these in every home which has electric current - let every such home get one of these small radios and you would be expanding it.

11.55 a.m.

Let every home that has current get one of these small radios. You will be increasing the number of licences and everything of the sort, and let the same Corporation import them and sell them. You will be doing something; but just to sit here as you are sitting and giving us false accounts only trying to get money out of our hands is dishonest and somebody should be locked up if it is so. Rather than doing that, try to expand if you can; but at this rate which you are spending, you are going to throw this amount of money away. As I have said just now, I hear that it is only to pay for debts - some of it has been thrown away already.

We cannot get here and say that we are not going to pay it. We have to pay it because we are responsible for this thing down there; so I would not get up and say that I am not paying one cent - just like the B.M.C. That is why I am appealing to the members of the Government. It is the Government that is responsible for all of this money going down the drain.

Another Bill is coming up which may be controversial. I know the Minister who is in charge of that plays that he is a hot number. He is present today. He would not be like the other who is somewhere

else now; he would not be in the Senate. He is present today to take the blows. But this particular Minister who is responsible for this matter before us can do as he likes, and I will have to tell the people of this country how we are being treated.

Now, the hon. senior member for the City who has just sat down went to England at the time when the Constitution of Barbados was discussed and, Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell you that had I gone there, do you think that I would have agreed to this being out in the Constitution? I believe this matter was put into the Constitution after they came back here or when they went out of the room. This was poked into the Constitution. Do you think that I would have agreed that a Minister could be appointed, or should be appointed from the Senate? Do you think your humble servant would have agreed to that? I would never have agreed to that. I would have shouted for all the murder in the world. I would have shouted so loudly that you would have stayed down here and heard me.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. I think the hon. member would recall - and the hon. senior member for Christ Church as well as the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would remind him - that even before we were independent we had full internal self-government under the 1964 Constitution. In fact, in the pre-independence Constitution it made provision for Ministers to be chosen from this House or both Houses. That is quite in order.

The hon. member would better remember this too. I think that the Hon. Mr. Morris was Minister without Portfolio some years ago. This is common practice in British Commonwealth Constitutions; there is nothing extraordinary about it and was certainly no secret of ours put in after the Conference; it was part of the conference proposals and there are two hon. members over there who knew about it and who raised no objection in any way towards it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, suppose it was inside there before I was born, I am saying that it is wrong. It is not because it is there that it is right. I say that I would never have agreed to it if I had seen it. I would not, because it is a serious thing; but if I were the Prime Minister, although it is in the Constitution, I would not do it.

Well, he scraped the bottom of the barrel and he has nothing more down inside there to bring inside here; if, Sir, among his colleagues, he cannot pick out one, why move the Hon. Leader of the House? If he is going to tell me - and I believe that he is honest enough to tell me - "Really, Boy-child, I could not do any better; if I had anything more I would not have done it," I would have said to him: "Well, you could have let the same fellow remain." That is what I would have done.

I do not doubt that he has scraped the bottom of the barrel. He should have let the same fellow remain even if he was bad. A bad boy is better than no boy at

all. That is how I would have taken it; but when it comes here, we really would be taking advantage of the present Leader of the House when it comes to educational affairs because he does not know all that is going on in that Ministry. He may have known all that was going on during his time, but not now.

Well, Sir, I would not go on any further; I think I have made mention of my solution. Firstly, set up an enquiry to go into the matter thoroughly before you go any further. Secondly, if it is possible for you to be able to make more money by letting go Thomson - I do not know how many years' contract you have signed with him - by pelting him through the window, pelt him away at once. Thirdly, if you can bring in Rediffusion through the door, do so, or if there is any other company that will take over C.B.C. and run it, let it do so, or if you feel that you can manage it on your own behalf with your own people, only having a qualified engineer at the top, do so.

But surely, do not carry on in this way. Do not come back to us asking us for any more money except it is to put it on its feet definitely. Do not come back before you make an enquiry, and let us know early the results of the enquiry. If you feel it would be better to change the personnel of the directorate of the Board or whatever you call it, or that you should get rid of them and get fresh ones, do so. Do not keep any of them just for a keepsake or may be only because they can ask for a vote for the D.L.P.

If you feel that the Chairman is O.K. - I do not know who he is - although the Chairman is not to be blamed in some cases because the other fellows can gang up against him and out-vote him, well, keep him. If you think the personnel of the Board is not what it should be, get rid of them. Do everything to get C.B.C. back on its feet and make it a paying concern.

Last but not least, it is time to let us have the uses of it. Do you know that we do not get the uses of that station at all? It is time that the debates of this House - even if not all, some of it - should be broadcast every Thursday or Friday night and let the electorate and those people who really and truly cannot come in here or who cannot read or are blind, hear.

You promised it to us in your manifesto of 1961. Do not come back here for any more money until you allow the people to hear us in this Chamber, and not for a particular individual to be able to come over the air at any and at all times. I have heard the hon. senior member for Christ Church say that one Mr. Sandiford said that he did not bring over the remarks of the B.L.P. He had no right doing that even if the people of C.B.C. were going to do it. Do you know that it is only certain functions that the people of TV will bring over while others you cannot see? Do you know that if anything were to happen to your humble servant, they would not bring over anything about me?

12.05 p.m.

Do you know that if your humble servant were anywhere they would not focus the camera on me? They must feel I am too ugly and would break the lens. Take, for instance, the debate on the last budget. Only the Prime Minister's speech and the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas were broadcast and nobody else's. Who are the two of them? Do you mean I am not a representative too? This is the people's business and the people's money, and still you can get some people saying "no" all the time, and when they are in trouble they come to us to say "yes". It is not fair. I am looking forward to hear about or see an enquiry into this Corporation, because something is wrong that needs fixing right. Do not come back to us for any more money until you have put your house in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when the suspension was taken for dinner last night, I was speaking on this Resolution. I said then that I considered that even the most ardent, devout Conservative would have to acknowledge the fact that there were certain essential services that would have to be run by the State, and I mentioned those such as water, Post Office and transport. None of us would agree that it is essential to have run or backed up by the State with the money of the taxpayers a service such as radio and television, much as television is used by quite a number of people. If we could not get private enterprise to run it, then I would heartily agree. What I am saying now I said on the occasion when this came up. On one occasion, Sir - you were not here then - I hammered out the argument for Pan American Airways to be allowed to land in this country, and I was branded on all sides as holding a brief for Pan American Airways, and my political opponents even went on to say I was paid. That never deterred me from putting over my point of view, and I was backed up by some members of the present Government because I felt I was right, and I have lived to see Pan American Airways operating here and bringing in a tremendous lot to this country.

As far as C.B.C. is concerned, it is my considered opinion and the opinion of all thinking people that wherever you can get a company, a firm or an individual to run a business of this sort where you can collect trade and income tax, it is better to do that than to unnecessarily tax the nation to run it. It might be argued by Government members or by those who are in favour of it that we are not taxing the taxpayers, but I want to say that this is the same, Mr. Chairman, as if you came to me and wanted \$10,000 borrowed and I signed a note for you. I could only sign the note for you because I was worth something, and if you did not pay, I would have to repay the loan. What has happened with C.B.C. in the first case is that we backed them with money and they have shown a loss. It is true it is entertainment for people, but I am satisfied that Rediffusion who operates such a business in England and in other countries would be in a position to run this, and they had offered to run it without asking for one cent. The Government would have been in a position to say they must have a certain amount of time and they must have a Director on the Board or something of the sort.

I do not even go so far as to agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I say: "Cut this off once and for all and offer it to Rediffusion to run" There are sick minds on the other side who would walk about and say that I have a brief for Rediffusion. All I know of the business. They will tell you that I have a brief for Bryden or Leacock, but they do not tell you that they are the very people who are subscribing to the national income of this country by their investments in this country; and it is my opinion that they could run it. I am not going to vote for this \$2 million for the following reasons. I am no auditor or accountant, but if you cannot bite and you have a dog that can bite, you must use him. I think the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said so. I had this Report put into the hands of competent and experienced people. I know it is being said that the hon. senior member for Christ Church should not have said what he did, but what he did say was that if what the Leader of the House said was so, then his opinion is that it is incompetence by these people.

Now I am going to ask a few more questions which I want taken down word for word. There is not only one chartered accountant in Barbados. There are several, and thank God today for the first time we have chartered accountants looking like me too. When you get a certificate as a doctor, it does not matter if you look like me, the Leader of the House or the Deputy Clerk. I have always been accused of having to go to Jack Dear or Dick Leacock to get my information. I am pleased about that because both are Cambridge graduates and both are experienced men and can advise me on a lot of things I might want to know that I would go to the Leader of the House to find out because he had the opportunity of getting an education which I did not have the opportunity to get; so I have never taken umbrage when somebody tells me I had to do that.

Now, Sir, dealing with the two Reports and the statement of Accounts, I want these questions answered. What is a Managing Agent? This is something that must be answered. What is the agreement whereby Thomson acts as agent and what are the conditions thereof?

12.15 p.m.

I will spare the Hon. Leader of the House the pains of writing, because I can give him a copy. No doubt he will have to reply to them, and I can spare him the pains of writing because there are many questions.

What percentage of all TV programming consists of foreign film, local film, live broadcast?

How many hours per week for each of the above? (Asides.)

Did you say that Jack Dear wrote these? I would be proud. Do you know where Jack Dear went to?

What percentage of Radio programming consists of canned features, public service programming, music, local features, news, religion, children?

You will recall that you sent us a Report and a Statement and we want to know everything because we have to find the money.

How many hours of the above?

Has CBC been assigned a clear channel station? If not, why not, since 10,000 watts is considered high in accordance with the Federal Communications Commission of the USA?

Everybody knows what happens sometimes at night when we are trying to pick up CBC.

Why are the resources of the country wasted having two broadcasts for cricket? (Asides.)

I hear a pig grunting, but I do not know where it is, Sir.

Have any overtures been made by Rediffusion to have a single broadcast?

Is it more profitable to have an Outside Broadcast Unit than a Video tape machine which would allow programmes to be repeated at will and cut costs of original broadcasts? (I have copies of these for the Advocate; so the man cannot say he did not hear.) Do you hear me, Vanderpool? Whether you publish them or not).

If "Brathwaites of Black Rock" was successful, why was it abandoned? That was a good programme, Mr. Minister, and I have to compliment you for it.

What was the value of fixed assets in 1964, and what caused increases in 1965? This is an important question, Mr. Chairman.

What is the period for writing off formation and pre-trading expenses? The Minister will have to answer all of these questions. This is nothing to rush through, because \$2 million is involved. \$2 million is money in any country in the world - even in the Republic of China.

What is the rate of interest for advances from the Bank of Nova Scotia, and why didn't the auditors put this information on the Statement?

I am going to digress here a minute. You might be a Chartered Accountant; you might be an Auditor or anything; but I submit that not one of us in here is a Chartered Accountant. I feel that things should be made plain and simple so that the ordinary man can understand them. We represent the people. Some of us might not consider ourselves among the ordinary, common people. I consider myself one of them. I cannot understand, and that is why I have asked the questions.

Mr. Chairman, if you were carrying on a business, and somebody told you that he had to borrow money from the bank and had to pay interest on it, would you accept that unless you were told what rate of interest he was paying? Do you not think we are entitled to know

as well as the people who are buying corn meal, sugar, flour, braces, panties and so on? They are the people who are paying taxes.

What is the rate of interest for advances from the Bank of Nova Scotia and why didn't the auditors put this information on the Statement?

This matter of telling us about the standard commercial rate, or 1/2 % below the prime commercial rate - no one has yet told us, since the Government amended the interest rate for Banks, what the Government has fixed interest rate at for Banks. There are four Banks operating in Bridgetown: The Canadian Bank of Commerce; the Bank of Nova Scotia; the Royal Bank of Canada, and Barclays Bank. We know that the Usury Act was amended from 6%, which is the oldest tax in the country, and we know that you could not charge more than 6%. We know that that was amended and we could be charged 8%.

Since that the Government gave us reasons for amending the rate, but we do not know if the Banks are allowed to charge 10%, 12% or 20%. What we do know is that the Solicitors cannot charge people borrowing money around town more than 8%; so when you tell us that it is 1/2% or 1/4% below the prime interest rate we do not know what it is. We must be told what it is. If you do not feel that we should be told, then the Government can go ahead and borrow \$2 million. I would advise the Opposition to walk out without voting on it. Let the Government borrow the \$2 million and do what they like with it. Let them borrow the \$2 million on Statements which are not worthy to be considered by honest men. Why did not the Auditors give this information in the statement?

This question is peculiar, because the Hon. Leader of the House will believe that I have an insight in this matter.

When are the loans and advances due? Are they due already or not?

What is the cash flow of the Corporation? The Hon. Minister will quite understand what I mean.

Does income for 1964 represent total income after deduction of Agents' Commission?
12.25 p.m.

Let me repeat that because it is not in the Statement and these have been perused by very able men. Does income for 1964 represent total income or income after the deduction of Agents' Commission? This is something which we must be told. After all, you are asking us to commit the inhabitants of Barbados to a loan of \$2 million, not \$2,000, and that is a lot of money. Is Sales Department wages paid by Agents of C.B.C? This is something which we are entitled to know. This is not just saying "Yes" or "No", because the answers to these questions have got to be taken down and the public must know. If by C. B. C., why? What are the individual expenditures on radio programming? We are not just dealing with an Auditor's Statement; we are dealing with something which we

packed up money for and gave to you. Some people feel that you should give the Directors whom the Government put on the Board one Statement, and come in to the House of Assembly where there are a bunch of nincompoops and say: "We do not care anything about you all; you are just elected there," and give us another Statement; and this, I submit, is what has happened.

I am not accusing the Minister for knowing this; they can give the Directors of C. B. C. one Report and the Ministry another to be brought to the House. What are we? A bunch of what? But we are the representatives of the people. What are the detailed expenditures for each department - wages, salaries, royalties, fees etc., for each year? I hope that the Minister will not tell me that these questions must be answered or that they must be put down to be asked; these questions are being asked, arising out of the Report which is in here now. I am dealing with these questions in the Report and the Statement now. These are not questions which I want you to come here and answer next week, next month or next year, but before we can vote to lend these people this \$2 million, because the Report before us is not a comprehensive Report; it is not a Report covering everything. I happened to be in the Opposition with the Hon. Leader of the House and the Prime Minister and we would have talked on this, when the Barbados Labour Party was in power, for about a week. Do you think that they could get away with murder with this? Do you think that they could come in here and ask us to lend them this \$2 million like this? I have always been in the Opposition; I love it. I am asking this of the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister knows that he should tell him this; he knows that they should send this to him. Are you telling me that this is sent to the Board Members and not to the Minister? All of this the Minister should have there in a file, and if it is there in the file, it should be put in the Report and put in the Statement. What are the individual depreciation expenses for each year? It is a peculiar thing that the Minister tells us that C.B.C. would be a money spinner in another few years, and he tells us what they would get in the first year and in the second year up to 1970 and then it would start to make money; but you will notice that the Minister did not tell us what are the individual depreciation expenses for each year. All these years you told us what money they are going to make, but you know that it will depreciate. It is machinery and I do not know of any machinery which does not depreciate. Surely, the Minister would have that information from the Directors. Have they sent any Director in here today? Because these Directors are know-all people. Are they not in here today? What are the interest costs and how are they appropriated to each department for each year? That is a simple thing in doing business and, surely, the Hon. Minister will be able to tell us that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we come to an important matter. If I am told that this is not rank, stark dishonesty, I do not know anything that is dishonest. What fee is paid to Thomson for Consultant services? Do you think that a Report could honestly be brought before this House, they knowing that Thomson is paid a fee, whether it is a dollar bill, a thousand dollars,

two thousand dollars or five thousand dollars, and we have not got the right to know? What are we? The Prime Minister, the Hon. Leader of the House, the Minister of Social Services and the present Leader of the Opposition could not get through this. You come in here and tell us all of this and you refuse to tell us what you are paying Thomson? If you can tell us that you have lost \$400,000 this year and \$100,000 that year, then tell us what Thomson got. That is all I am asking. Why does this Report omit to have that in it? Are they afraid to put in that? And are you telling me that this is an honest, straightforward, upright, true and correct Statement? I would like to discuss this matter with a mind like that of the father of the Hon. Leader of this House. He would tell you straight: "You have to tell me how much is paid to Thomson." I am not kicking against how much is paid, but tell us how much was paid. We are not saying that it is too much or it is too little, but tell us what is paid; give us a chance to know. After all, we, on this side of the House were not brought in here on wheel-barrows; we got elected here too. This is a democratic Assembly. The Government must rule and they must run the Government according to democratic procedures, but at the same time, you must let the Opposition know: and when the Opposition knows' then we will be able to explain to the people. If I went outside now and said that we were paying Thomson \$100,000 a year or \$200,000 a year, would you blame me for that? Do you mean to say that you would have the trouble of going out and denying it when a big Report has been brought in here, a lot of Statement signed by an Auditor, a Chartered Accountant and you refuse to put that in?

12.35 p.m.

When the Report come in here, with a complete Statement signed by an Auditor and by a Chartered Accountant, you refused to put it in. And then they had the brass and the temerity to walk about saying that they can put one thing before the Directors and do not give a damn about the House of Assembly; they can put what the hell they like before the House of Assembly. This thing is getting out of hand.

All that you have to do is to come in here with a proper, true, correct and upright Statement. I am not accusing the Minister for falsification or anything of the sort; but what they have to do is to give you a proper, true, correct and upright Statement, fearing nothing, and we would come in here and perhaps just only quarrel. Of course, I would still hold the same view that private enterprise should run it, but we could not say anything; we could not ask all of these questions.

What fee is paid to Thomson for Consultant services? Is not Thompson the Consultant? You cannot deny that he is the Consultant. What fee have you paid to him? I offer this seat now to the Hon. Leader of the House or to everyone of the Ministers to take up that Statement or Report and show us over here what he is paid. I go further. I not only would offer them this seat, but I would offer them cash if any one of them can honestly tell me what Thomson is paid. If they can tell me, then they are withholding information

from the House. What is he paid? He is the Consultant and we know he is the Consultant. After all, you can handpick everybody on a Board; you can even handpick Ministers.

There are those of us who have been in public life for a long time, and this is a small country where you can mash somebody's foot in St. Lucy and somebody in St. Philip would cry "Aye". (A VOICE: Do not touch St. Philip.) My friend says not to touch St. Philip. Well, somebody in St. John. There are other people who would know. You know what is going on down there is wrong!

Now, Thomson is the Consultant and you are paying him a lot of money as Consultant. Rather, we find the money, Thomson finds no money. I have been all along telling you to let Rediffusion run it. You are going to say that Mottley has a brief for Leacock and one for Bryden. Well, I have a brief for them. What is that to do with them? What I am saying is that you should let private enterprise run it. We do not have to take up the taxpayers' money to do this sort of thing when you are losing money - \$400,000.

A sum of \$400,000 would move the houses of so many people out of Nurse Land that you will think it is funny. If Thomson is the Consultant, then why did he allow such a situation to develop at C. B. C? You have brought in Thomson because Thomson is this know-all about radio and television and all that sort of thing. If he is the Consultant, then you can tell me what is the fee that he is paid, and if he is the Consultant, why has he allowed this situation to develop at C. B. C? You have a Consultant Engineer at Haggatts Factory, and I am sure the Minister of Agriculture has brought in a Report telling us what is the condition of Haggatts Factory. There are consultants at Bulkeley Factory and at Searles Factory and they go into these things. This is a position which I do not like at C. B. C. If Thomson is the Consultant at C. B. C., why has he allowed this situation to deteriorate to such and extent?

This is a question which must be answered. What are the fixed costs of operation? This, Sir, is important. I believe the Minister would have the answer to this question there.

Now, Sir, does the Auditor report the whole Statement of Accounts, - since in his Statement, he only refers to the Balance Sheet? You know, you only have to pass First Standard to know that one and one make two, and four and four make eight. I have to do with business, and we have to make returns to the Income Tax Commissioner. Does the Auditor report the whole Statement of Accounts - since in his statement he refers only to the Balance Sheet?

This is a very simple thing. He has not made any reference to it. Maybe, I am too ignorant to understand. It is because I do not understand that I am asking. It is because James Johnson does not understand that I am asking. I am asking so that the Government would get this information out for the benefit of John Citizen.

These are questions which I have asked and which I would like answered and, in my opinion, if they are answered we would be able to get on much further with this Resolution. I repeat, the last question is "Does the Auditor report the whole Statement of Accounts, since in his Statement he refers only to a Balance Sheet?" What we are criticising is the fact that somebody has the brass to withhold something.

Who is the internal auditor? Who is the man employed there? Something is prepared and you put it before the Board, but that something they are boasting is not to be brought before the House. Is that right? We are not blaming the Minister because quite frankly I know that he does not know anything about it, but he represents the Government and collectively they have to carry the blame.

They must tell us what the true picture is before we can vote for this \$2,100,000, Mr. Chairman. Do you realise that this is for a loan of \$2,100,000? If you went to the bank tomorrow, whether you carry papers or not, and you are doing business, they would like to see your Balance Sheet. I wonder if a private individual went to the Nova Scotia Bank and carried this type of Balance Sheet to them if they would lend money, to the person on it. Do you believe that they would lend money on this? You could not even get through the door of Barclay's Bank with this. Maybe, there are some things I know, and it is better that I withhold that for the time being.

Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that the Government is not too late to control it. Take all the time that you want on it, get all the publicity; but do not take up the taxpayers' money to do this nonsense which you are getting on with and paying Thomson. What is Thomson doing? Tell me what Thomson is doing for the money which you are paying him. I see though, according to the Auditor's report, you are not paying him anything. But you say that he is the Consultant and you know that you are paying him money. We know that he is paid a tremendous lot of money. What for?

Mr. Chairman, I think I have made my contribution to this Resolution, and it is my considered opinion that unless the Ministers can give us the answers to the questions which I have posed which must arise out of the Resolution, I will not be able to vote for it.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, if the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia is a member of the Democratic Labour Party, one has still got to enquire further what could have prompted the Management to come to any sort of decision to make a loan of \$2.1 million to a Corporation that has been functioning such as the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.
12.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, from the very Report which has been handed to the House, there is nothing which shows us how many meetings the Board has held; and when we bear in mind that members of the Board receive \$15 for a meeting, it must give us some cause for concern due to the fact that the affairs of the Corporation as

presented to us now are in such a state that we have to wonder whether we have a Board comprised of members who have an interest in the Corporation, and if the Bank of Nova Scotia decides to make this loan, whether we have a Board so constituted as to show any intention or any capabilities whatever of reaching in ten years' time the target so brightly painted by the Leader of the House yesterday.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the very first place we must say that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation does not exist in truth and in fact. I say that because if one were to attempt at this stage to carry out any sort of investigation into the functions of this body from its inception, there is nowhere to be found the initial correspondence, chiefly what we call the Letter of Intent from the Thomson group to the Government, which was signed by the Government. After the Government signed this Letter of Intent, the Corporation was set up. At the Board's first meeting the Board ought to have signed such a Letter of Intent to Thomson, but it was never done. As a matter of fact, some members of the Board never heard of this Letter of Intent until this Resolution was brought before this Honourable House. They knew absolutely nothing about it. I intend to draw the Leader of the House to his feet two dozen and two times before I sit today. I want the Leader of the House to get up and deny whether it is true that the Thomson people have been making demands for money according to the terms of their Letter of Intent, a copy of which should have been in the files of C. B. C., but in this case the Ministry of Education - but which has mysteriously disappeared from the Files of the Ministry. The strange thing about it is that only matters pertaining to C.B.C., have disappeared from these particular files. In the face of things like this, Mr. Chairman, are you to expect us on this side of the House to support these high-handed doings?

Mr. Chairman, the Caribbean Broadcastion Corporation was set up in 1963. Let us for argument's sake just look at one or two minor points. At the end of the first working year a loss was shown. At the end of the second working year a bigger loss was shown. Now I want the Leader of the House to tell us after receiving the Report of the Auditors dated 1st June, 1967 and their earlier Report of 21st July, 1966, what was the cause for the delay in Government realising the chaotic situation with C. B. C. finances, and what kept them from coming to the House and reporting the matter even in the manner they have attempted to report at this stage. The fact is that the former Minister of Education has been negotiating with the Thomson group for a take-over by them, but did not find the favour of certain of his Cabinet Ministers. You have heard, Sir, that the Thomson group would make money out of the operations of C. B. C. They have been making money without the take-over. C.B.C. has been operating during the past few months in this manner. When a few dollars come into the till, they could not set out to pay their bills, but only those people who pressed them and called upon them day after day for payment would be given something to keep them off for some time.

12.55 p.m.

This is the way that C. B. C. has been operating for months; but, Mr. Chairman, you will find that there are lots of reasons why C. B. C. finds itself in the present position.

Now to the members of the Board. We might hear that they are not in here to defend themselves, but they have a Minister to defend them. All I have to say as regards any of them is in respect to their duties as members of the Board of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. But before I give them the "run-through", so to speak, I must remark on this particular point. There are people occupying high offices in Government who are abysmally ignorant of what we know as human relations in industry. As a result of their ignorance, they advise the Government accordingly ignorantly. That is why you will hear, Mr. Chairman, that if two Police Officers are not speaking to each other, it is only the Commissioner's business. That is why you will hear that foolish type of talk.

I am saying that at Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation a similar situation obtains, because the present Minister of Education, who is responsible for Caribbean Broadcasting, has absolutely - and he has shown it - no use for certain members of the Board, and he means to get rid of them, or two members of the Board.

I see there is a Deputy Chairman, Mr. Clifton White, and there is Mr. Ellison Carmichael. The present Minister of Education has no use for them at all - none whatsoever. The Leader of the House can get up and deny it when he is ready. You also have on the Board a Mr. John Fletcher. Let the Leader of the House tell us now when last Mr. John Fletcher attended a meeting of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. Whenever he attended he made it clear that he was not getting himself involved in the nasty affair of Caribbean Broadcasting. That is the situation, Mr. Chairman. In other words, these are the very people who are managing this organisation.

I am presenting this picture to you, Mr. Chairman. I want to let the public understand that, even when \$2,100,000 is given to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, as a result of the type of human relationship in the industry it will not pay. It will not pay even if it were given \$2.1 million from all the Banks in all the Towns in all the world. These are members on the Board who go there just to get \$15 a meeting; some of the others have no interest at all in what is going on. What do you find? I must say that the present Minister of Education intends liquidating the present Board, or getting rid of certain members of the present Board, but he is not getting rid of those members because he wants to see C. B. C. making money or, at least, paying its way; he is not concerned with that at all; he wants to see there people who will do his bidding.

The plan right now, Mr. Chairman, is to cause nothing but confusion among the members of the Board, because Mr. Robert Best, who is the present Editor of the Advocate, has been promised the

management of Caribbean Broadcasting, and the present Acting Manager has also been promised the job. But what do you find? Mr. Robert Best is a known friend of the present Minister of Education who is in charge of Caribbean Broadcasting. So what must happen, Mr. Chairman? On the Board there are members who are not prepared to entertain any suggestion of Mr. Best taking over Caribbean Broadcasting when this money is voted. They feel that Mr. Best functions very well as a journalist, but he does not have the necessary "know-how" to bring Caribbean Broadcasting out of its present chaotic condition. I do not think that they have anything against Mr. Best personally; so you will find the old system of pulling down the coop to get rid of the pigeons is being employed now. The Minister has the intention of liquidating the Board and putting members there who will acquiesce and have his nominee, Mr. Best, appointed to the management of Caribbean Broadcasting.

Now let us ask ourselves this simple question: Is this the action of a Minister who really and truly intends to save, at least, the Leader of this House the embarrassment to which he has been subjected throughout the debate on this Resolution? It is just not fair. It is not fair to the taxpayers of this country, because however you look at it - it has been said on the floor of this House already that the taxpayers of this country will have to find the \$2.1 million. We are saying here now that the present set up in the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation as regards the projection by the Leader of the House yesterday - we know how he projects, and we know exactly how much importance to attach to them. We attach no importance whatsoever from this side of the House to those projections. We know that he is not serious. He told us about it being a money-spinner. Yes, it has been spinning money down the drain and into Thomson's pockets.

Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered that the Thomson people supply programme material and get paid for it; they have a large interest in the Advertising Agency abroad; they do not pay the local staff anything to speak of; they are drawing consultant fees; they get a percentage of the gross revenue. In other words, whether C.B.C., through its operations, wins, loses or draws the game, Thomson must get his money. That is the situation. Why should they come here today and paint a rosy picture? Believe me, Mr. Chairman, it is rank dishonesty on the part of the Government. I will tell you further, Sir. The members of the Government know that they approached one of the Commercial Banks at Bridgetown, and the Manager was polite enough to tell them that it was not a reasonable proposition in which his Bank could be engaged. (An hon. member: "Which Bank?") The Royal Bank of Canada's Manager told them so. I want the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia to understand the view that the Royal Bank of Canada held of this proposition. 1.05 p.m.

Why have I mentioned the Royal? Nowhere in this Report do they tell you whether or not they owe

the Royal Bank of Canada money. But what do you find? In their Report on the financial picture - this was signed by Mr. K. D. Hunte the Chairman, and it goes on:-

"The sale of air time produced an overall increase of 20% on the 1965 figures. Expenditure was held at the 1965 level," and the next two words "being some \$20,000 less in fact than in 1965."

Mr. Chairman, when they used the term "being some \$20,000 less in fact", this is a report which is being made to the Board, the Directors, so to speak, and are we to understand that the Chairman of the Board does not even trust his other members of the Board to know what is the exact amount? He says "being some \$20,000 less in fact." Suppose it was not in fact! He goes on further "an increase of about \$25,000 in wages". In other words, it tells us that there was an agreement with the Barbados Workers' Union and it resulted in their having to pay additional wages. Why is it that the Corporation has got to approach this business in such a way as to tell us that the amount was an increase of about so much and so much? Do you mean to say that they do not keep books or that they do not know what the wages increase cost? This is a Report which the Chairman is signing to be circulated to his other members of the Board; do you mean to say that he cannot even trust the other members of the Board to let them know what is happening with the Corporation? That is what it amounts to; but they go on further and they now come down to a reduction of approximately \$220,000. Why can't the Chairman of the Board tell the other members exactly what reductions you have made and where your increases are? But, Sir, there is a reason behind all of this.

The Hon. Leader of the House was the Minister of Education. I am not prepared to say that because he was the Minister of Education that he was bound to know everything. It is not necessarily so because we have even seen him jump to his feet - I prefer to say that he jumped to his foot, because he stands on one foot whenever he rises. However, Sir, we have seen him jump up to say that he had no knowledge of things which the most elementary Minister or a Long Grade Clerk in the Ministry would know. The Minister has no knowledge of it, but he might have had knowledge as to when the Thomson group made two bold attempts to take over the C.B.C. He may know that or he may not know it; but whether he knows it or not, it is a fact, and we are prepared to establish it on the floor of this House, that particular negotiations have been dragging on. "The C.B.C. has been running to ruin in the mean time: so we cannot wait; but we will not let the Opposition know what has been going on behind the scenes. We will not even let the Bank of Nova Scotia know." I wish to God that the Bank of Nova Scotia could have some one of its officers to sit in this House at this time and throughout the debate to report to them factually our views. They might not need any protection from us, but we feel that we are doing the Bank of Nova Scotia a service and we feel that if we do an establishment like the Bank of Nova Scotia

such a service, we are doing it to the entire banking community. We are trying to protect them in this exercise.

I want just to make one point. We have been presented with something called a Balance Sheet, but anyone who has had the pleasure of seeing two or even three of the Statements of Accounts presented to the Board from time to time - two or three, no more - just to see what these Statements said, to receive the Balance Sheets and attempt in the remotest manner to make comparisons, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that if you had it within you, the picture presented would be enough to make even the Leader of the House commit a breach of the peace. This whole thing is nothing but rank dishonesty from beginning to end. Nothing at all whatsoever is clear as even - well, I will tell you this: the Manager of the Royal Bank of Canada says that it was not reasonable, and he must know. Remember, Sir, that the Manager of the Royal Bank of Canada apparently had only received a delegation from the Board - a well chosen one, one that could wield the most influence.

1.15 p.m.

He heard after he examined all that they had to say; but he came to the conclusion that it was not really reasonable.

Now, on the whole, the members of the Board of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation have been fooled in this exercise. I must charge the Chairman of the Board with the matter because the ex-representative, Mr. Keith Hunte, can be no fool neither morning or night, and when he appends his signature to a Report such as this, one would feel that Mr. Hunte has fixed his signature to something that can bear examination even merely on the face of it.

But no, Sir, nothing of the kind. You will find that while we have in this Statement of Accounts for 1966 figures showing us that \$277,177.56 were administrative expenses, I am to say here and now that members of the Board were shown and received figures bearing out that the administrative expenses for the same period amounted to \$300,000. So you will understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the House as the former Minister of Education has got to accept the blame fairly and squarely for the financial position in which C.B.C. now finds itself. He cannot get away from it however much he feigns ignorance of a lot of things happening yesterday, hoping to gain the sympathy of the Opposition. Yesterday, he showed himself as a child dealing with the most dangerous weapon. That is what he pretended yesterday.

But, Mr. Chairman, that does not mean much to us. We have to bear in mind that even when we look at our Capital Expenditure vote for the period which we have just passed here that the sum of \$2,100,000 is much more than any single item of Capital Expenditure anywhere in those Estimates. That is what you have to bear in mind. As the hon.

senior member for the City said, \$2,100,000 is money any part of the world.

We have got to make it clear and let it be understood that we know that if the Leader of the House and the members of the Government can just come and present a little eyewash and have the House agree to lending this \$2,100,000 to Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, it simply means that in the not distant future we will find ourselves having to look for more. Let us ask ourselves if the taxpayers can afford all of this.

Mr. Chairman, even at this stage, \$2,100,000 can build lots of houses to house many people whose names are on the list of the Housing Authority. There are also many officers of the Government who are waiting to be loaned money to get a little house for themselves and their families, but what do we find ourselves doing in borrowing this \$2,100,000 from the Bank of Nova Scotia? Look at the thousands of little children who cannot be properly housed in schools in this Island! There is no room in the inn. We are not borrowing this money to build schools. There are no places in the schools for children, but what are we doing? We are borrowing this money to finance the biased operations, the onesided operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

I will tell you something, Mr. Chairman. There springs to my memory an instance. It arose out of a case when the Editor of the "Daily News" had published an article - I think it touched on something about the number of persons who were likely to be going to the United States after Independence. I think that was the subject matter - and immediately after that publication, the fools of the Press of this country, a spineless people, were summoned to the Ministerial Buildings at Bay Street.

I was one of the fools. I turned up out of sheer curiosity. I wanted to know what it was all about. It was summoned by the Government Information Officer. The Prime Minister had something to say. I went up and I remember asking a most senior member of the Press at the time and the Editor of the "Daily News" what we had been summoned there for that morning. After it was explained to me, a junior in the field of journalism, I suggested to the Editor of the "Daily News" and this very senior newspaper man that when we entered that room that morning and the Prime Minister set out in any way to attack Mr. Cozier, the Editor of the "Daily News" for what he has written or what had appeared in that newspaper, we should decide to make a dramatic walk-out and we would be making bigger headline news than all the Prime Minister might have to say.

I was told "Boy, wait your chance' you will have to learn."

The Press Conference was televised, sir. After the Prime Minister set out to castigate Mr. Cozier, I beckoned to him and to Mr. Joe Broome who was present. We held a conference inside the Conference Room. I suggested to them that that was the hour

when we should walk out on the Prime Minister. They did not agree with me. They preferred to let him have his say and then let Mr. Cozier reply. I said then, "well, if that is your decision, I will abide."

Mr. Chairman, you can take it from me. That morning I remembered the Prime Minister carried on and on so that I said then to myself "Is this what these experienced journalists are allowing the Press to be subjected to?" But we listened on and at the end of the Prime Minister's harangue, Mr. Cozier set out to reply.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to advise the hon. junior member for St. Peter that what he is debating, in my opinion, is irrelevant to the subject matter under discussion and I would prefer him to continue to deal with the Resolution under discussion.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to what you have to say, convention requires that all hon. members in this House and particularly those addressing the Chair must take notice of you. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, after listening to you I do not want to tell you that you want noticing. I am accusing C.B.C. of biased advertising and reporting by producing one side of a picture. That is what I am doing; so do not let anybody mislead you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I want to tell the hon. junior member for St. Peter is that people going to the United States and a conference at the Prime Minister's office has absolutely nothing to do with the debate under discussion.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with you; but in view of the fact that C.B.C. whom we are now being asked to vote \$2.1 million for, reported one side of the story and did not make mention that Mr. Cozier was present at the conference that morning, how could I be out of context? This is C.B.C. reporting and not any nonsense from Gall Hill. I am showing to this House where C.B.C. went out of its way to do injustice to the Press, and if you were standing in my place, you would be attempting, if you had the fire within you, if you had the where-withal, to try to put the case even more forcibly than I have attempted to do.

The situation is one where we find that even the Reports as presented do not show this House whether the radio operations or the television operations lost the money, although the law requires that this be done, but we know that the television operations carried Barbados to hell. Let the Leader of the House get up and deny these things, because you know, Mr. Chairman, there was a time when he was forbidden to go to C.B.C.; so he might not know all that went on. The Minister has not jumped up to deny it.

The amount being asked for is \$2.1 million. We have got to bear in mind that nobody has anything against the Bank of Nova Scotia, but why is it

that some other Banks in Bridgetown are not given some of this business? A Corporation like C.B.C. should try to raise this money amongst as many Banks as reasonably possible. It should try to make friends with as many people as possible. I feel the Manager of the Bank will soon be transferred, anyhow. We know, Mr. Chairman, that being in association with the Thomson group has caused all this anxiety, because whether or not the company made money, Thomson had to get money for doing nothing. You have hard working people who are going all out day to sell Air Time and do whatever they can to build up the finances of the Corporation, and then you find the Thomson group doing absolutely nothing but taking the calf out of the cow's belly; so you must understand what effect it must have.

Apart from that, I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Joseph mention that right now C.B.C. is losing the services of some very able technicians. Rediffusion and elsewhere have offered them a better pay, and you must understand that these people have been told time and time again that the Corporation is losing money, though they know that the Thomson people are getting money; so you cannot pay Thomson and pay your local staff too. I want the Bank of Nova Scotia to understand that in a very short time they may find that C.B.C. is employing a lot of nincompoops who know nothing and destroy the equipment, and despite all the projections for paying back the loan in ten years, before that time a lot of people who are associated with it now will have to take boat and go somewhere else, because the operations of this Corporation are not such as can stand the light of day at any stage. The Leader of the House ought to know that time and again members of staff have been told that they have got to make sacrifices to bring the Corporation through. What kind of sacrifices are you asking these people to make under such conditions?

1.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, you will see that they start to show a film for one or two nights, and the third night it disappears from the screen. Film Companies have been demanding their money. I will tell you something now. Caribbean Broadcasting has the name of Barbados similar to how the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake has the name of Barbados abroad. The Film Companies know that Caribbean Broadcasting does not pay. The time may come, Sir, when one night when you switch on your television you may merely see the picture of the Leader of the House, and they will switch off just like when we had the opening of the University College Wing. A few weeks ago on the screen was the Prime Minister delivering his Presidential Address, and flashed on the screen was Doctor Who! We may soon find ourselves with Doctor Who, Doctor No, and so on.

If the Leader of the House had come here and given us the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, he would have completely disarmed the Opposition, but what has he done? With regard to

the radio end of C.B.C., what can the Minister tell us, or what does the Report tell us? What are the Minister's projection as regards Schools broadcasting in this 10-year period, or even for the present? This Report does not tell us anything whatsoever about those things. I must tell you that the whole matter is a huge joke as regards Schools broadcasting, because at those schools to which programmes are beamed the halls are unsuitable for receiving such programmes. The children are herded together in a hall, or in such close proximity to the rest of the school that there is nothing but confusion, Sir, when Schools broadcasts are being relayed.

Sir, the argument might be advanced that in some of the City schools here and there you might find a suitable hall and so on. What we want to say is that it is not so well chosen as to lend itself to the ears of those pupils to whom the programmes are addressed, and the hall does not serve the purpose at all. You will see that we have to be very, very careful even if we attempt in any respect to entertain what the Minister has said on this whole matter. We have to be ultra cautious in accepting even the little that he has attempted to proffer.

With regard to production on television, there can be no doubt that local shows and local productions are vastly superior and far more cultural than some of the things that are flashed on the screen night after night. I believe that a little expenditure will be involved in producing some of these things locally, and where ready cash is not available you will have to resort to crediting, whether from overseas or elsewhere. The situation is that we do not know in truth and in fact what is going to be the next position of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. I would look here just for a moment at the accounts for the year ending January to December, 1966.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will indicate how much more time he would like - if he is likely to finish, say, in the next quarter of an hour.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the Leader of the House. He says: "If I were going to finish in another quarter of an hour, he would agree for me to carry on and finish." I told him that I am going on longer than a quarter of an hour and he says: "Go on then." Let us take a break now. Do I move that we take a break now?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I meant that we could take the suspension when the hon. member has finished his speech.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are in Committee; I can stop at this stage and come back again, which I intend to do. Is the Minister and Leader of the House suggesting that because I may feel inclined to eat now it is going to shorten my speech? This is a convenient time to take the break.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

1.48 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On re-assembling.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, a look at the Balance Sheet for the year ending December, 1966, has a very remarkable omission in respect of the Corporation's operations for that year. If you look at the year 1965, there was an amount of \$35,405 pre-payments and deposits. For the year 1966, the accounts show no pre-payments and deposits. Mr. Chairman, I know that this is not a true picture of the state of affairs of the Corporation. I am sure that for the year ending December 1966, that there were pre-payments, but the accounts do not show such an entry, and, Mr. Chairman, it might be these small things or rather, these things which might appear to be small, which make us feel pretty indignant over the state of affairs of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation as presented to us by the Hon. Leader of the House. For instance, the Hon. Leader of the House wants us to believe that by the end of December, 1967, there is going to be an expected trading deficit of \$336,000. I am pleading with the Hon. Leader of the House to re-examine his figures and see if he has not slipped into error somewhere, because that figure should never have read \$336,000. It is, in truth and in fact, \$563,000. I am just asking the Hon. Leader of the House if he would look at his figures again. It is not a case in this respect particularly that he tries to mislead us, but I feel that in this particular case he has slipped into error somewhere along the road. I would like to ask him if he would tell us what the true position is as regards the trading deficit up to the year

December, 1967. We are told that for the year ending December, 1968, there is a projected deficit of \$184,000 and that for the year ending December 1969, that amount will be only \$81,000.

In any business which a person is carrying on, you must take stock at some time or other. You have got to take stock in order to see what you have in your bond house, and among your personnel as well. You have got to see if production is at its highest rate, and if not, why not? There are no two ways about it. It cannot be denied that it took the Caribbean Broadcasting a period of time before the finances could be depleted as we find they are today. It is not a case where there is any evidence of any person stealing a large sum of money from the C.B.C. or anything of the kind at any one time. We are not suggesting anything of the kind; so what have we got to do? We have got to learn from the Minister what plans he has got on foot. Are you going to dismiss your present staff? I do not think so, unless they deserve it. If you are not going to take a drastic remedy to apply to a drastic ill, the remedy which the ill demands, how are you going to tell us that by December, 1969, your trading deficit will have been reduced to a mere \$81,000? We are being asked to vote this \$2,100,000 and we are told that this amount of money is to re-finance the Corporation, so to speak, and to give it working capital; but there is something which does not smell so well in this matter. Just last week there was withdrawn from before this House a Resolution for \$50,000 to finance the Corporation to the end of the present financial year. I am wondering if that referred to the end of the financial year or the financial year of the Government or the financial year of the Corporation. There are lots of reasons when we see the Hon. Leader of the House get up and ask for leave to withdraw the Resolution. It is not a mere withdrawal; there is something a back of it and those are things at the bottom of which we want to get. For instance, if that \$50,000 had been wanted to finance the working of the Corporation to the end of, say, this present month, the Resolution has been withdrawn.

Is the Bank of Nova Scotia financing you with that \$50,000 to carry on your operations for the period for which you had asked for the money to carry you through in this Resolution which you have withdrawn? If the Bank is advancing that money, on what authority is the Bank advancing the money? Is that \$50,000 to be a part of this \$2,100,000 which you are now asking for? Those are the things on which we would like to have some sort of explanation before we can really and truly entertain the Minister with his Resolution for this sum of money.

2.30 p.m.

We cannot deny that at the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation there is definitely too much Ministerial interference; for instance, I have got to admire the former Minister of Education. You will be surprised to know that he spent considerable hours, even going into the wee hours of the morning, at the studios of C.B.C. when they were at Black Rock. Evidently, he had his reasons. I am not now saying

that he was like a watchman watching property. Nothing of the kind, but he was there at that time.

However, you never heard that there was this sort of Ministerial interference that you have come to know of since this Ministry has changed. Therefore, you have got to find in the first place that the members of the Board are people who have an interest in seeing that the Corporation lives up to expectation not only in the production on the screen, but that its financial affairs are in an orderly manner and carried out according to the requirements of the law so that if at any time it should be found necessary to approach this House to help save a situation or to do anything to help the Corporation, hon. members would have before them a true state of affairs and an honest picture of the dealings of the Corporation; and in hearing an explanation from the appropriate Minister, they would cheerfully support the request because they would have been satisfied that this Corporation is fulfilling a need in the community - that it is doing something and uplifting our people, whatever it might be. But that is not the case as it is today.

In this case today, we are led to believe that all sorts of things except what are really pertinent to the Corporation's need for \$2,100,000, are pertinent. Mr. Chairman, we would like to know from the Minister how much money the Corporation needs now to liquidate its outstanding indebtedness. After we have been told that, we ought to be told how much money it requires as working capital for a particular period - let us say to the end of the Corporation's present financial year.

Let us then be told, Mr. Chairman, if you find that you have been carrying too heavy a load in a particular respect, as we say, paying out money to the Thomson organisation for doing absolutely nothing. This is a thing which we want to be told us. How do you propose to curtail expenditure in that particular respect? It is not good enough.

The Corporation is in debt. A decision must be taken here today because of the desire of Government members to relieve the Corporation somewhat. But in truth and in fact you know that after you have voted this money, you are not relieving the Corporation; you are relieving the Corporation at the present moment of its indebtedness, that is, you are giving it enough in hand to satisfy taxes. It is not enough. We want to hear something more of this particular matter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have said on this particular matter - at least enough at this particular point; but there are one or two things which must bring the Minister to his feet and we want to hear his reply, for instance, there are short term loans in respect of the year ending December, 1966, to the sum of \$321,306.84. We want the Leader of the House to tell us from what sources did those loans come. Let us say that you know how much money you owe the Royal Bank of Canada now! Is it not that there is an agreement with the Nova Scotia Bank that it is willing

to advance this money to pay off the Royal Bank of Canada and they are going to hold the bag? Whatever is the agreement that you are entering into, we want to be told something about it because we would like to be told at this stage so that if anything worse should befall the Corporation at a future date, we cannot say that we were not told.

That is what we have to consider at this stage. It is not good enough, because the Government has its weight of numbers, to be standing up and saying that regardless of what the Opposition says, we have our numbers and we are going to vote for it. That is just not good enough. We are asking the Minister to put everything which he knows about the Corporation before us.

Sir, I have a number of points which I can raise in Committee at a later stage, but I am just prepared not to burden the Minister at this hour with all, as we want to hear him. We want to need him and hear what he has to say on this particular matter because the Minister has had experience in commerce, and I am sure that no business in Bridgetown is going to have a trading loss of \$676,505.85 and just decide to turn to a Bank and borrow more money, throw it into the till and carry on the business as they were carrying it on before without a guarantee of some sort of restriction.

We have got to be very careful. The taxpayers have got to pay the cost of all of this, and it is only fair to us that we be told, if you find that your total loss is as much as \$676,505.85, that you tell us what you need, let us say, as working capital and what you propose doing about reducing your administrative expenses to a minimum.

2.40 p.m.

We know that quite a number of people have come here from overseas sent down by the Thomson group. We have all heard about Mr. Dennis Vance and others, but C. B. C. had to pay them; so that is why we have got to be very careful and guard against bringing people here in the future to perform duties which can better be performed by our local people.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit down without touching on the note of human relations at the Corporation, and I can only appeal to the Minister to seek out and ferret out wherever it is who is so conducting himself as to make life unbearable for the staff at C. B. C., for as you know, Sir, the last General Manager we had there was a very efficient Civil Servant, but when he found he could stand it no longer and made written application to be relieved of his duties at a specific time, he got the curt reply that he could go immediately. That is the way a senior Civil Servant has been treated. He could not stand conditions any longer. These are things that are happening. It is not decent enough by any standard, and if you are going to treat your Civil Servants who might be seconded for duty at C. B. C. in that manner, what do you think is going to be the treatment meted out to lesser mortals at C.B.C.? I will await the reply of the Minister at this stage.

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, there are a few matters which I would like him to deal with in his reply, and I have crystallised them in the form of questions. I have a copy of them so that the Minister can have it. We have had the opportunity of studying the debates which took place in October, 1963 when the Bill was introduced by the then Minister of Communications and Works, the hon. junior member for St. Michael, and he said then "The Consortium consists of Television International Enterprises Ltd., Thomson Television (International) Ltd., and the National Broadcasting Corporation of America. This agency is proceeding with the technical aspects of the establishment of a radio station on the basis of a Letter of Intent and Instruction which has been read in the House."

Arising out of that, Sir, we on this side would like to know whether it is not a fact that N. B. C. has withdrawn from the original Consortium, and if it is so, was there any new agreement in respect to (a) the fees to be received by the other members of the Consortium and (b) with respect to the services to be performed by the other members of the Consortium? We would like to know whether the Consortium pays for any member of the staff of C. B. C. resident in Barbados and working daily at C. B. C. Again, Sir, the Hon. Minister at that time said "In reward for the services outlined above, the Consortium would receive a commission of 15 percent per annum for the years 1, 2 and 3, ten percent per annum for the years 4, 5 and 6, and five percent per annum for the years 7, 8, 9 and 10 upon the revenue derived from the sale of radio air time and other revenues which could be regarded as wholly commercial after deduction of all discounts and commissions. The Consortium would bear the cost and expenses related to the Project Manager's functions, including travelling expenses, and in addition the expenses of any and all Consortium members required for consultation on behalf of the proposed radio service in Barbados and overseas. With the advent of television, the Consortium as consultants would advise on the problems of staff integration and on the reorganisation of the radio service. The fee for these additional services would be re-negotiated with the Government through the designated authority at that time."

Arising out of that, we want to know whether it is not a fact that the original agreement as disclosed by the Minister of Communications in the House only dealt with the sharing of revenue derived from the sale of radio time advertising and other commercial revenues after deducting trading discount, and had nothing to do with revenue derived from the sale of advertising time on television. Now that television has come, has there been any new agreement with respect to the Consortium on the sharing of revenue derived from the sale of advertising time on television and other commercial revenues attributable to television? We want to know if there is such an agreement, when it was made and if it was ever disclosed to this House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it was inevitable, I suppose, that a debate on so very important an

issue should detain the House for some time, and I think quite rightly that this is nothing to be regretted, that it is all right and proper that Government Departments, Ministries or other agencies of Government ought from time to time to come under the most searching public scrutiny.

2.50 p.m.

I myself last week warmly welcomed the idea, and I must confess that that aspect of it never occurred to me before, that the House should have an opportunity in Committee of Supply to cast the most searching scrutiny on the affairs of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and not, as was originally thought, to have a general debate on policy on the Abstract Resolution which was before the House and which is still before the House.

In the course of this debate, although the hon. members opposite - and particularly the hon. junior member for St. Peter - may poke fun at me when I say that a lot of the things which have been said in this Committee yesterday and today, I quite truthfully have not heard before - and I repeat and I will say which they are - it is nonetheless true that I had not heard some of them before. It is obvious that the hon. members opposite have channels of communication open to them which are denied members of the Government. This seems to be a fact; but I would wish that even when we debate matters and bring facts to bear on the discussion, we should do so a bit more openly as representatives of the people.

I said in here last week, and I repeat it again: Any member of the General Assembly ought to take opportunity as frequently as is convenient to him to visit all Government Departments, Ministries and Agencies as is their right. I use to say this when I was in the Opposition. I remember one day when I said it in this House, Mr. Cox took me up on it and said that that could not be so because merely being a member of the House of Assembly gave you no right to go to the Ministerial Buildings and ask the Financial Secretary any question. We had a ding-dong argument, and I believe at the time Sir Grantley Adams intervened in the debate. I am speaking under correction, but I believe either Sir Grantley Adams or Dr. Cummings intervened in the debate and upheld my view. It is a point of view which I held when I was in the Opposition, and I repeat it here now I am in the Government. It is not a privilege; it is the right of members of this General Assembly to enter upon and to visit, whether he has given notice or not, any Government Ministry, Department or Agency - and this would include Statutory Corporations during their working hours - and engage the people so employed in pertinent discussion of the way in which the affairs of the Agency, Ministry, or whatever it is, are being run.

Hon. members opposite may think me impertinent, if I were to urge this on them, and it would be impertinent because, as I say, it is not a privilege, but it is their right. I could certainly be forgiven for expressing the personal point of view that they would exercise this right more frequently and they would get, I believe, the same kind of results as they get

more secretly with less bitterness and less political emotional involvement. I would certainly be in favour of this, and I do not think - my colleagues can speak for themselves - any of us would think it strange or wrong if this were a practice which hon. members adopted. I urge this upon them. I think it would help public affairs tremendously in this Island if this were done, and if, in consequence of doing this, they could come in this House and say: "I did not wait to hear this by somebody telling it to me secretly; I went for myself; I questioned the people involved, and I was told this. Why is this so, and what have you to say about it?"

I say this as a preliminary, because if I tell you that some of the charges made about the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and its workings I have not heard and do not know, I am really telling the truth because it could easily be that the Minister, or the Government itself collectively, might sometimes be the last to hear of matters going on in the Government Departments. The Opposition, on the other hand, could easily be the first to hear, because it is the business of members of the Opposition to hear, and, if what they hear is significant enough, to exploit the situation arising out of the difficulty.

Now, in outlining this matter, I want to answer all hon. members' queries. Some of them, of course, will require further research which I cannot have at my disposal at the moment, but I think that most of them I can answer. When I was outlining the Government's point of view yesterday and also the financial difficulties of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, I pointed out that it was my view and the view of others inside the Cabinet and more intimately connected with the day-to-day working of the Corporation that, apart from any other consideration, what was wrong with the Corporation was that it suffered from the beginning from the lack of working capital.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas did take me up on this point and said that whether or not you had equity capital at your disposal ought not to effect materially the efficiency or, perhaps, even the propriety of the undertaking. This is a matter of opinion. But it did seem to me yesterday - and it still seems to me to be significant and to be worth attention - that if you set up any business enterprise of whatever nature, and it has to run its day-to-day expenses out of loan capital so as to buy its equipment, pay wages, buy even significant things like a postage stamp, a time must come, unless its revenue position is so fantastically good, when it must feel the shortage of working capital. I am still convinced of this, and I am still convinced that while you may be able to point a finger here and there at wrongs which should be put right - defects in policy, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter said, and possible defects in harmonious relations - while you may be able to point out with accuracy that there is something wrong in the whole arrangement which appears to provide for such out-draining of revenue to Managing Agents - I can admit and concede all of this - yet at the same time at the bottom of the situation is the lack of day-to-day working capital; and until this is rectified, the Corpora-

tion, even if it were to put in train all of the improvements suggested by hon. members opposite, would sooner or later run into the same kind of difficulty.

In short, what is proposed, when you strip it of all the argument or discussion which has come around this matter, is to enable the Corporation to pay off its outstanding debts which, as far as I can see, total \$1 1/2 million, and then leave with it some \$1/2 million which it may use as working capital on call whenever it has need of it. This is the position, as I understand it, and it has been explained to the Cabinet.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the Hon. Leader of the House. I am going to say right now that I think he is replying in a very suitable and adequate way at the moment, but I should be glad if he would expand a little bit on what was explained in the Cabinet in respect of the repayment. If the argument is that loan capital is crippling the Corporation because of the necessity for paying interest, is not interest going to be paid between now and 1970 on this?

3 p.m.

The argument against loan capital and in favour of equity capital is that if you do not pay interest on equity capital, if you cannot pay dividends, you cannot pay dividends, but at least you do not have to pay interest on it. The shareholders are losing the interest. If this is just loan capital, it is not going to improve the position of the C. B. C. What exactly is going to be done? I have not heard a word said about what rate of interest is going to be paid on this \$2,100,000. What is the present prime commercial rate? The Addendum to the Resolution really does not tell us in so many words whether interest is going to be paid between now and 1970 or not.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's point is well taken, and before I go further I should, perhaps, link that point with the criticism which has been made by the hon. junior member for St. Peter. The hon. member made some strictures against the Bank of Nova Scotia which are very serious, and if I interpret him correctly, his point of view was that other commercial banks or at least those of them who knew of the situation of the C. B. C., fought shy of entering this proposition because they did not think, or in the case of one of them, it was not thought to be reasonable. He did give us a hint of this last week and I got on my feet at the time to say that I do not think that this was the situation so far as the Bank of Nova Scotia was concerned, but I could not give a denial then because I was relying on my memory, although, in some corner of my mind, there was a hazy recollection of how the Bank of Nova Scotia came to be involved in this particular exercise. Of course, the Bank of Nova Scotia are the C. B. C.'s bankers anyhow, but I am speaking in respect of this particular exercise. I asked for the Ministry's files and I found that on the 27th July, 1967, while I was still the Minister of Education, the Permanent Secretary minuted to me the report of a meeting which was held on the day before, that is on the 26th July, 1967, and that meeting was held at the Financial Secretary's office

at the request of the General Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia. Those present at the meeting were the Financial Secretary, the General Manager of C. B. C., the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Accountant and the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry. Now it appears that that meeting had been arranged at the request of the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia because he had seen - when I say that he had seen, I mean that it was submitted to him, not that he had seen it clandestinely - that C. B. C. had submitted to him in the capacity of their Bankers, the financial projection and the analysis which were made of the position of C. B. C. and the projections for the future. The Bank Manager stated at the meeting that he had requested this meeting in order to consider the position of C. B. C. with special reference to outstanding loans of which I am speaking all that time - about \$1 million was overdue - and another 1/4 million would fall due by the end of the year. He said that he had studied the analysis which confirmed his conclusion independently reached that there was every indication that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation will be a profitable concern if it could be afforded a moratorium from the payment of debts until 1971. He made a tentative proposition that the Bank of Nova Scotia should make a loan of \$2 million to the Government which would be repayable at the rate of \$250,000 a year beginning at the end of 1971. He further stated that this could be passed to C. B. C. on terms agreed on between the Government and the Corporation. He continued that such an arrangement would have to be approved by the Head Office, but the Manager thought that it would go through so long as the transaction was between the Bank and the Government. That is the note of the meeting.

Mr. Chairman, it was my recollection, although I could not remember clearly last week, that in so far as this particular exercise was concerned, that the question or the point of borrowing was made on the initiative of the Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia himself, who said that he had studied the analysis of C. B. C.'s financial position and that he had reached the independent conclusion that it would be a viable proposition so long as it could clear itself of its indebtedness, and to that extent he was prepared, tentatively, that is, informally, until he had consulted his Head Office, to recommend a loan of \$2 million to the Government which would be repayable at the rate of \$1/4 million a year beginning at the end of 1971. Only, that he would have to consult his Head Office and they, of course, have since been consulted and they have since agreed. That is how it all started. I like to be fair to everybody concerned. It is possible that other banks may have been consulted, but I do not know this to be a fact. The hon. member asked about the Royal Bank of Canada, I think. Well, I can refer to the files and get proof of this; we do owe them something like \$72,000, I think it is. There is a short-term loan outstanding for them. I would like to say, as I was saying, that it is possible that other banks may have been approached informally. There is no record on the files of this, but I myself would doubt very much whether the relationship between the Bank of Nova Scotia and the other banks could be so bad or so brittle that the other Banks would try to make it appear that the Bank

of Nova Scotia was being left to hold the baby because they made this proposition to us.
3.10 p.m.

I say this now. I would believe myself that on the face of that if a similar proposition had been made to any other bank, I see no reason why it could not be accepted or entertained because it was made by the Manager of Nova Scotia, according to my belief, on his own initiative after he had reached an independent conclusion as to the true state of affairs of C.B.C.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister can tell us if prior to the request of the Financial Secretary, the Manager of Nova Scotia had not been interviewed by somebody from C.B.C. on this matter.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, I do not know if somebody had been interviewing him. I can say that he had seen, and had submitted to him, an analysis of C.B.C.'s financial position, and it was in consequence of what he had seen and studied that he had asked for the meeting. Therefore obviously, somebody must have been talking with him even if it were no more than giving him a financial report or whatever it was. Somebody must have been talking with him; but anyhow, the fact is that having studied the analysis, having seen the financial report, presumably for the preceding year, he reached that independent conclusion and made an offer.

I would like to say in passing that there would be no reason whatsoever for other commercial banks to be in any way upset about this because the Government, so far as I am aware, does business with all of them. I think Barclays acts for Housing. I cannot remember all in detail, but I know that all of them work for Government agencies and while some of them may feel that the business is not as evenly spread out as it may be, I know that all of them get some of it, and certainly I can speak with greater knowledge here.

The Royal Bank of Canada does the business of the Transport Board. I have been recently seeing the reports coming to the Cabinet from the National Insurance Board and I see it to be their policy to put on deposit accounts equal amounts of its business as it is accumulated on all four banks, so that so far as National Insurance is concerned, all four of them are doing an equal amount of business; so that I think, what one bank may lose on the swing, it may gain on the round-about, and there is no reason whatever for ill-feeling between any of them so far as this is concerned.

I add one rider to this: I would be very astonished indeed if the Bank of Nova Scotia with the wealth of experience which it must command in its entire system got into something which turned out to be different from what the Manager himself thought. I would be very astonished indeed and I do not think this is likely to be the case.

Coming back to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, these are the terms so far as I can see upon

which the loan is negotiated: a moratorium until 1971: but I have no evidence before me that interest would not be paid between now and then. I would imagine that this will be so, in which case the question which the hon. member asked will be very well taken that charges will still have to be made even although the period of repayment is spread out.

The Corporation will have to examine this aspect most carefully and see to it in their examination of it that they are not landed in the same sort of difficulty. As I have said just now, the difference between this loan and previous loans is just this. The Corporation owes, I would say, \$1.6 million to clear off its accumulated indebtedness. It is proposed to borrow \$2.1 million. It seems to me that a quite sensible arrangement has been arrived at to allow the Corporation to have \$1/2 million of working capital at its disposal which it may call in, and it would be silly to take it up and pay interest on it if it is not using it.

It seems to me that it would have this fair amount of working capital at its disposal to use on call if it should need it, and this would be, in my opinion, a different sort of proposition and an easier situation to the present position which obtains.

Hon. members do not need me to rehash the whole position. They are familiar with it. We came in and got guarantees for loans to be raised for money to be advanced for equipment to be bought, and certain necessary expenditure to be gone into to set up radio and television. Radio and television are now a consolidated exercise, and it is different for me to say whether without television, radio would be able to pay or not; I do not know. The Corporation and its advisers will know this. An hon. member suggested - I think it is the hon. junior member for St. Peter - that it was television more than radio, if I understand him correctly, which was eating up the money.

Be that as it may, let me turn to some other matters which were raised in the course of this debate. We had some suggestions made by hon. members which - and I am not saying this to flatter them because I know this genuinely to be so - in my view, are worthy of consideration. I would not say 'worthy of acceptance' because you must have consideration before you have acceptance.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter said earlier this morning - I do not want to misquote him - that the former Minister, referring of course to me, was negotiating with the Thomson group for a take-over bid, but this did not find favour with some of his Cabinet colleagues. That is not so. Up to the time I left the Ministry, I had been having periodical discussions with the Board of C.B.C. and with the Thomson group about the position of C.B.C.

It is true, certainly, that I had discussions with the Thomson group, but the hon. member said that I was negotiating with them for a take-over bid. That is what I am denying. I am not denying that I had

discussions with them because I had discussions with them. I have heard their proposals but I have not entertained them. That is all. So you must get the record straight.

Mr. HINDS: Am I to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is not denying that the Thomson group made a bid to take over to him? They made the suggestion to him, but he did not make it to them.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would not deny that; there is nothing in that to deny. It is a fact. Do you know why they wanted it? They want it because they themselves believe that even with its present operational structure other than financial that they can take it and make it a multi-million dollar enterprise. They believe this and their wanting to take it over was not gratuitously to ease the Government or the Corporation out of what in the sympathy of their hearts they believed was an intolerable situation for us. 3.20 p.m.

They saw that, even as it is, with what capital they would be prepared to put into it, - and it would be just this amount - they could make it into what we all would like it to be; but I could not recommend that course to the Cabinet, not because I distrusted Thomson - their proposal was a legitimate proposal; they did not come under-handed - but because I genuinely feel that if you can tell me that something I am running badly can make money if you take it over from me, it is my duty to see whether I cannot revamp my ideas, do better than I am doing now, bring in new people, if needs be, to reorganise for me with my acquiescence and my understanding of what they are doing, and do for myself with my own enterprise what you say you would take from me and do. And it was on those grounds that I did not recommend to the Cabinet that we should consider the Thomson offer to take over the station, because I genuinely felt then - this was only a year or so ago - as I do not know that with proper procedures - I do not mean that the procedures in force now are in any way improper - but with more streamlining of managerial and other procedures, and without the financial incubus that now exists on the Corporation, it could make money.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, will the Minister say how much Thomson offered?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I cannot say this because we never got far enough to talk firm business, but I can definitely say that we recognised that \$2 million E.C. would be what they would themselves inject into it if they had it. That is as much as I can say, but they never said they would give us \$3 million or \$4 million or \$5 million or \$1 1/2 million as the case may be, because we never got that far with them. That is the position as far as that is concerned.

Let me deal now with another point. This might be a digression and I do not want to digress. Hon. members, particularly the hon. junior member for St. Peter who appears to be well informed, much

better than I am, on the inner workings of C.B.C. says that the Minister does not have confidence in this or that member of the Board. I do not know that this is so because the Minister has never said this to me; and so far as I know the Minister, and I have been able to assess his work as a colleague, I have found him to be a very straightforward and conscientious person and Minister of Government, and I have never seen anything of him which would give me the impression that he would be motivated by petty spite or by pique or anything like this.

I must also make a comment on some remarks made or hints dropped about the former General Manager.

Mr. A. N. Forde was my Permanent Secretary for about three years. I have found him to be a conscientious and very distinguished and able Civil Servant. I do not know why he requested to come back into the General Service. It would be improper for me to ask Mr. Forde why, and it would not occur to me to ask anybody else. (Mr. Hinds: We asked him.) But I would like to say this: I have reason to believe that the officer in question will not regret the request he made, because his services are so competent and so distinguished. I am saying this genuinely because he has served me as a Permanent Secretary, and he served me well, and that is not intended to be a reflection on the other two who has each of them been good and excellent in their own way; but I think I had a longer time with him of the three I have had, and I can say for him that I am confident that his services to this Government will continue in a quite high and exalted sphere, and therefore I say that I personally would not trouble about his leaving C.B.C. It may turn out to be for his best. I am one of those people, Mr. Chairman, if I may speak personally, who never think anything a disaster. This will certainly turn out not to be a misfortune for him, and as soon as the Public Service Commission is ready to make the change - or whatever it is - or the adjustment, this will be done, and everybody, I think, will be happy, and the officer will come in for deserved congratulations from all and sundry. I need say no more; so you need not think that a disaster has taken place.

It was also said among other things that there is a proposal that Mr. X, calling him by name, is to be the new General Manager of C.B.C. This again I do not know to be a fact. I heard it for the first time in here and I am neither in a position to deny nor to affirm it. I merely say that I do not know this to be a fact, but I am a little doubtful about its authenticity - not that the hon. junior member for St. Peter may not have heard this. I have no doubt the hon. member heard it, but I doubt whether this would be so, quite frankly, and I would not say anything more about it because since I have not heard it and it has not been drawn to my attention officially, I ought not to make any comment on it except to say I am not aware of it.

One last point in this section of my reply. I do not think it is true that anybody who works at C.B.C. is

in any way inhibited or brow-beated or terrorised. It was said on the opposite side today and yesterday that with respect to the protest march which the Barbados Labour Party organised and held, instructions were given to C.B.C. authorities not to televise it. Again I must say that I do not know this to be a fact.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, will the Minister make enquiries then of his successor, and ask if Senator Sandiford himself did not telephone and use the words "so-called march" in connection with the incident. And if he wants another example of which he may know of interference, is it not a fact that in London during the C.B.C. coverage of the Independence celebrations, the News Editor was criticised for putting me on the air, after the Prime Minister had spoken to say that Independence Day would be 30th November, and I then went on the air and said there would be elections before? I suggest to the Minister that the News Editor was criticised in London for saying that. Those are two examples of interference which perhaps he would like to comment on.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would investigate both of these. Again the second one was without my knowledge, and I really mean this. I am hearing that as well for the first time.
3.30 p.m.

I will investigate that. I have a point of view on these matters which I hope, and so far as I know, is shared by my colleagues, but if it is not shared by them it is still my point of view, and it is too bad for them. I would not myself be a party to any manoeuvre which would make it appear to the Opposition, the general public, or to anybody, that I am afraid of free expression of opinion. I firmly believe that if you have an argument and you advance an argument, it is my duty to demolish it, if I can. If I cannot demolish it, that is too bad for me. I would not be a party to anybody saying: "You cannot do that" and "You cannot do this."

I have had, while I was at C.B.C. myself, to make one decision. It was a difficult decision at the time and for which I could not be so accused, but I made that decision on the ground that when a Minister - I cannot remember the circumstances, but I remember the occasion - goes on the air, he is making a Ministerial Statement, and if he wishes to do a Party political broadcast, he must say that it is a Party political broadcast, and the Rules of the Party political broadcast, if they exist, would have to apply. I ruled that a Ministerial Statement does not necessarily call for an Opposition reply. That was all. I remember that occasion when I felt that way, and I still feel so. I honestly doubt whether my colleague would do this thing that he is accused of. I doubt whether he would ring up and say: "Do not do this or that." Anyhow, I will investigate that for my own satisfaction. This purely internal point was a digression germane to the issue, but not as significant as the other section of my reply.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church addressed some questions to me - four of them - which I shall now try my best to answer. The first is: Does the Thomson organisation pay for any of the staff resident in Barbados and working at C. B. C., and, if so, how many? The answer to that, so far as I am aware, is "No". I do not think, unless this has happened recently, that there is any staff working at C.B.C. whose wages and salaries are not a charge on the revenue of C.B.C. I think that everybody who works there is paid out of the revenues of the Corporation, and that nobody works there whom Thomson pays.

It did happen, however, that in 1966 when Thomson was asked by the Corporation to do a review of the Corporation's finances, Thomson did send down one of its senior accountants, a Mr. Drew, I think his name was. (An hon. member: "Mr. Drew.") I thank the hon. member. Mr. Drew was sent down to work with the Corporation for three weeks or a month to go through this whole financial exercise, and in that instance the Thomson organisation by whom he was employed met the cost of his being here. I cannot readily recall any other person. Mr. Vance, of course, was the substantive General Manager, and his salary was paid in the ordinary way by the Corporation. Mr. Cordean came here in 1963 or 1964 for six months before the television was set up, and there was a Mr. Williams, who, I believe, was an engineer, who came here for four or five weeks before the Television Station was opened. All of their expenses, so far as I recall and know, were a charge on C.B.C.'s revenues.

The next question is: Has N.B.C. withdrawn from the original Consortium? If that is so, was there any agreement with respect to the fees to be received by the other members of the Consortium and with respect to the services to be performed by other members of the Consortium? Now the Consortium with which the Government of Barbados negotiated for the establishment of the Radio Service dissolved, or was dissolved, within six months of the establishment of the Radio Service. It appears that the National Broadcasting Company and the Thomson Enterprises had some internal differences of opinion among themselves - it was nothing to do with the Barbados operation, but with other operations - and decided that they should break their partnership.

Now, I am speaking purely as a layman here, and I must not be taken to be dogmatically laying down the law on any matter pertaining to this. Before the Consortium had broken up we had, of course, entered into an agreement with them for the establishment of radio, and a Letter of Intent was despatched and signed on behalf of the Barbados Government and acknowledged by them, and the agreement entered into for the establishment of radio. Six months after radio was established, the Consortium broke up. The Government and the Corporation had then to decide, having to embark on television, who was to be the Advisory, or Consultant or Managing agents for the Television Service. The legal and juridical question

also arises - this would be of interest to the hon. senior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas - it cannot be debated here, but I think it will arise as to whether when a Consortium with whom you signed an agreement breaks up whether your agreement would be in force. I am not pronouncing on it, but this would be a legal question entirely out of the scope of my own interest here this afternoon.

If the hon. members already know - at least, from what they have said they appear to know very well - the outline of the agreement with Thomson's the phasing out of the Managing Agents fees from 15, 10, 7, 5 vanishing into nothing at the end of the tenth year.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to say something here which will appear very strange for a Minister of the Government to say. I think that anybody in this Island would be properly justified in criticising the Government for having entered upon what looks like a draining operation on the revenues of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. You could say "Why have you been so foolish as to enter into the kind of arrangement which gives your Managing Agents what we might call the cream of your revenue, and in respect of which, if you do not have to make that disposition of your revenue, you might not be in such a bad situation today?" This is a legitimate query, but I will tell you this. We quite frankly entered into this, because at the time when we were setting up radio the Government did not feel - I do not like really to put such an important point in a negative way - in other words, the Government felt that there was genuinely some experience to be gained by having that Consortium as Consultant Agents. We felt so and we went into it with our eyes open.

We did say: "This is the kind of agreement, and although we do not like it, we are prepared to enter into it, because what we think we will get from this arrangement will more than outweigh the amounts we have to pay out in the first few years."

3.40 p.m.

That is why we genuinely thought at the time that if Thomson were going to get 15% of the gross revenue, they would train all our staff for nothing - and when I say Thomson, I mean the Consortium - and they will put quantities of expertise at our disposal, and we will get in exchange for whatever it is we are paying, not only the actual people who are working at C.B.C., but people even outside the employment of C.B.C., trained in skills which they did not then have and which nobody in this Island could provide. We thought that it was a *quid pro quo*. We were not selling out the interest of the people of Barbados. Nobody who knows the Prime Minister, despite what you may think of him as a political opponent, would believe that he would sit idly by and allow an arrangement to be negotiated in which Barbados was giving and not receiving. Apart from his robust commonsense, his temperament would not allow him to be a party to an agreement which, on the face of it, had nothing in it for Barbados. But we

did think at the time that it was worthwhile employing a Consortium to advise and consult with, because a Consortium, in our view, if made up of radio and television organizations, would be able to put at our disposal expertise which we do not have.

I must confess to the Committee quite frankly that we have been disappointed in this, and if you wish to take it out on us because we were so silly as to enter into that kind of agreement in which we gave all and got very little in return, I think you would be entitled to take it out on us for that, because it has not turned out as we have anticipated. On the other hand, you should also know this, that from 1966, although he might have been doing it before, but I recall from 1966 or, let us say, from the end of 1965, the Prime Minister had been continually and repeatedly saying this agreement will have to be re-negotiated because no self-respecting Government or community could remain, or could be expected to remain, satisfied with an arrangement which drains money out and which, in turn, is not matched by services commensurate with the money. That has been the Prime Minister's view, it is our view and, in fairness to Thomson, when this was drawn to their attention, they have said that they were prepared to re-negotiate the whole business and come to some reasonable arrangement. I hope that the people who are responsible for making the new agreement when it is made will interpret it to be reasonably in our view and not in theirs necessarily alone. We are prepared to come to some reasonable arrangement which not only scales down considerably the management and consultant fees, but will also take care of the other end or the other aspect of the thing which I think ought to have been done, that is, to take our own people and train them at their expense.

Now, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas made the point - I cannot deny it because it is true - that the courses which members of the Corporation's Staff have gone up to attend - Mr. Rudder, I cannot remember all of them, but those courses have either been given to them by the Commonwealth or various agencies, the Colonial Office, A.D.M., Science, Technology, this, that and the other. I believe, however, that in relation to Mr. Forde, the General Manager, just before he took up his post with the Company, Thomson still made it possible for him to have a managerial production course. I think that that may be an exception - but as far as the others are concerned, other agencies made those courses and visits available to them. I want to be emphatic on this. I do not want members of the Committee to feel that we have not been speaking sharply and telling the Managing agents of our dissatisfaction; they know of it; but I still think that it would be an advantage for us to retain the connection and see to it that we get value for our money, and best of all, to see that the money which we pay them represents the money paid only for services rendered. That is the position. It is perfectly reasonably possible to retain the Managing agents and Consultants because you do need them, I think, to some extent, and to say to them; "For any single service you render us we are prepared to give

you a flat rate on everything we earn particularly with some of the air time we sell or rather, some of our sales revenue as has been got through our own exertions and not by yours and other agents may have to be paid as well." Therefore, hon. members opposite are on perfectly good grounds with us and we are at one in this. If you tell us to good ahead, hurry and re-negotiate this whole agreement with them, we are ready to do it and we have started on it. We are prepared to drive the hardest possible bargain consistent with the efficiency of the operation and we are not prepared to let the old system continue; but I do not want hon. members to feel that we did this because we wished to harm the country or because we were a set of nincompoops. We did it because, at the time, we genuinely thought that there were some expertise, some skills to be acquired which these people could give and that since we cannot reckon skills in terms of dollars, if you have two or three or four programme producers, half a dozen engineers and two or three good TV make up artists, if you have a whole range of people trained, their work in the radio and television services for years to come, would bring in much more than the outlay of Managing agencies.

3.50 p.m.

This has not materialised and I quite frankly tell the House that this has been a disappointment and I think we can be charged - if a charge is going to be brought - for not having enough foresight to see that it would turn out this way; but it is not going to turn out this way again because we are negotiating for these things.

Now, in case hon. members think that I am dodging the particular issue and clouding important points under a mass of verbiage, I want to say that this is not so. I wish to come to the point whether there was an agreement with the Consortium - or any part of it for television. There is not. If by agreement you mean a written document signed by two parties to a contract, the answer is "no", but there is an understanding which is regarded not only in discussions but in the files, that after the Consortium broke up there was the definite understanding that we ask the other half - the Thomson part - to see us through with the establishment of television. There is that understanding. It would be unimportant for me to make any comment on the legal and judicial conclusions of this.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not want him to give us any pronouncement on the legal situation; I want to know what is the factual situation. Does the Consortium get any proportion of their revenue derived from the advertising revenue from television?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, they do. That is why I say that we are dissatisfied with this and we are negotiating over the whole situation. Therefore, you can see that I am not hiding anything from the hon. members.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder if the Minister would be disposed to ask the Thomson group to give him free services for, say, one year.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Hon. members can take this assurance. As far as this whole thing is concerned everybody, from the Prime Minister to the people involved in the day-to-day operations of C.B.C., is at one in getting the best possible terms for this thing and in cutting down and cloaking off this drain of revenue. Everybody feels this way about it.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: If the Minister will give way. Can we be assured by the Minister that no further money will be paid to Thomson at all until a new agreement is negotiated? Just as in the case you make retroactive increases to workers and you make retroactive contracts, cannot you state that nothing be paid to Thomson until new agreements are negotiated?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, I will promise the hon. member this. I will talk over his suggestion, but I cannot say that because it seems to me that there will be legal implications. I do not know. But I shall certainly pass this on to the appropriate quarters. It can well be - I do not know if it is so - that the Corporation could have reached independently a judgment - when I say a judgment I mean a thinking on this matter - and could have decided that. This can be the case.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister say if the solicitors on behalf of the Thomson group were writing to the Corporation?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I believe that this is so. But after all, let us be frank. It would be wrong for the Committee to get the impression - I certainly did not intend that they should - that although we have very important points to be ironed out, the Thomson people are sharking us or that they are unwilling to reason or negotiate with us. They are willing to negotiate and I have every confidence that we are going to get the best possible deal when this whole matter is being negotiated with them.

I am convinced of this but, as a matter of fact, they have recently said this. This is not a secret. Before I go further, the hon. member in an interjection asked me whether the Thomson solicitors had written and I said that this could be so. I am advised that no solicitors have written the Corporation on behalf of the Consortium.

On the last occasion when the Prime Minister spoke with a representative of Thomson, the first and perhaps the only point which the Prime Minister put - and he put it bluntly and directly - was, "What services are you prepared to render us for any money at all that we may agree to give you?" The reply of the gentleman was, "It was not a question of what services; it is that you have not been getting our services because we did not think that we were needed." I do not think that the Prime Minister fell for that but the reply was, "We always have more

services than you think you are getting but you never asked us and we do not think that we were wanted, but now you have let us know that you want us to help train people and by expertise and things at your disposal, we are prepared to do this."

Well, the Government of Barbados is not going to refuse assistance or help from anybody, but we certainly are not going to take that assistance at the old terms. That is why I say that the whole Committee is at one in this matter. I would like to pause here now and see if hon. members would remind me of anything which I forgot because I really cannot remember everything that has been asked me.

Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are so many things shown to light this afternoon that it seems to me bad taste for me to raise some of the questions which had been raised with some heat yesterday. Hon. members on this side are seriously concerned with the form of the Accounts. We really are because the Act proposes the accounting and proposes a Secretary to the Board. Perhaps we are not paying enough attention to the Act and its requirements when these Accounts are submitted to us.

I imagine that there are good accounting explanations as to why there are variations in the figures for 1965 in the Second and Third Annual Reports. But there can be no doubt at all that the Accounts as laid in the House do not conform to Section 18 of the Act which requires that they show the different operations of the different branches of C.B.C., and also, Mr. Chairman, nobody shows Profit and Loss Accounts in which \$100,000 or some such figures is paid to Thomson without revealing that in the Accounts. If you did not know that, there is no way of finding it out from the things in that Report.
4.00 p.m.

If you do not know that, there is no way of finding out from the Third Annual Report. I am informed that these figures for income in the Third Annual Report are net of what Thomson has got already, and that, Mr. Chairman, is not proper accounting procedure. These Accounts could not possibly stand up under the Companies Act, and the hon. member must understand we were not just being fractious; this is something that looks to us like fraud, because it looks to us like an attempt to hide from us.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. St. JOHN: On a point of order, before the hon. member replies, we do not see any charge of interest as against the revenue for the year, and one cannot in our submission derive a true picture of the operational loss if at least the Bank charges are not charged.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: All of this is so well taken by me that I want to disclose something now which I could not even on pain of death disclose last night. When the hon. member made this point about the change in figures in the Third Annual Report, he did have me genuinely upset, and he would never know how upset

I was. I was on the point of halting the Committee's proceedings then and having a Cabinet meeting this morning, and before I summoned the Assistant Financial Secretary in the first instance, I withdrew from the Chamber and went behind the Speaker's Chair, and I transferred from the Second Annual Report the gross figures to the comparative column of the Third Annual Report to find that by transferring the gross figures, I got out the same result, and then it occurred to me that the change in the figures had been made deliberately, - I say "deliberately", but I do not mean feloniously or anything like that - in accordance with some accounting procedure which I personally could not understand. I went into it further and I drew hon. members' strictures to the proper authorities. The point is well taken and there is an undertaking which I firmly give now that the Accounts will be submitted - I will not say in their proper form because I cannot admit that they have been submitted in an improper form - but will be submitted in ample form in accordance with what the law requires. I cannot give any further undertaking than that, but the hon. member's point was well taken and did have me worried, but I have discovered that there has been nothing improper, that it was just a variation in accounting procedure which, shall I say, accounted for this. I am not making a pun. I understand it now, the hon. member himself understands it and we will do it more fully in the next one.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am almost tempted to rise and ask the Minister if there is any criticism which we made which he thinks is unjustified, because he has agreed with every single criticism that certainly I have made.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, there are some. All the criticisms which were criticisms of persons and which in my view did tend to denigrate them. I think if we could separate all that, as I have tried to do in my attitude to this, we would have had a most perfect debate, and it would be the most instructive debate I have ever participated in in my thirteen years in this House. I have really enjoyed it apart from that, and I would wish hon. members opposite in future to continue to make the most searching scrutiny but to leave out personalities, because the people are not here, and what is the use of worrying with them, anyhow?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is going to have these more ample Accounts submitted, I think he appreciated that the Opposition must have come into the House feeling that Thomson is a part of the reason why C.B.C. is losing money, and when you see Accounts in which Thomson payments have been excluded, it must make us highly suspicious.

Now Mr. Chairman, we do not want these more ample Accounts for the sake of coming in here to make more criticism. We just want them because this is \$2 million. This is genuinely the biggest piece of the capital vote for last year, and we really want to see whether it is true the radio service is making money and the television losing it; we want to see the interest rates; we want to see what Thomson gets every

year. If the Government knows that Thomson pulled the wool over their eyes, why didn't they want the Opposition to see how far down the wool was pulled? All this should be in the Accounts.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, we do not mind you knowing or thinking that wool had been pulled over our eyes. We certainly worried about your saying that it was steel wool.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would not know too much about steel wool in this case, but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, even though as I say all has been sweetness and light, the Opposition cannot say that, because the Government admits to having made a mistake, and that because Government knows it did wrong because the Government did not have the expertise, we agree with what has happened at C. B. C. At some future stage when the new agreement comes to be negotiated, I dare say we will vote for that; but we must as a mark of our disapproval for all the years when something that should never have come about was going on, continue to oppose this Resolution. I appreciate the Leader of the House's tact, his honesty and the very capable way in which he has made his reply. I appreciate the fact that he evidently has got the hon. members on his side under control today and the things that they were shouting us down for yesterday, they are sitting down and reading their magazines quietly today instead of shouting us down again. We appreciate all that, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the Minister understands there is no rancour in our vote; but if they had asked anybody with real broadcasting expertise in 1962 they would not have paid Thomson for anything.

There is just one further point about training facilities. Do not expect much in the way of them from Thomson. Mr. Chairman, excuse my being personal, but when in 1962/1963 I heard something about Thomson and training facilities, I knew that Thomson has no training facilities worth the name by the broadcasting standards of Great Britain. Nobody would go to Thomson to learn anything about broadcasting. I am not saying that the people who work there are inefficient, but the people who work there have been trained in films at the B. B. C. or perhaps in Rediffusion or by the I. T. A's own training school in Wembley. Nobody would set out to join the Thomson organisation to learn about television or radio.

Mr. HINDS: Just one small point, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister has answered most of the points, but I did ask about the letter of Intent between Thomson and the Government, and I think the hon. senior member for Bridgetown did table some questions, and I am sure the Minister would be willing to let us hear the replies to them.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: As regards the questions asked by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, I am not trying to get out of anything. I have the replies here and they are numerous. Would you like me to instruct the Clerk to have them duplicated and handed around? You would not therefore press me to answer them now, would you?

Mr. HINDS: What about the letter of Intent?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think I did say that we have on our files copies of the Letter of Intent which was drawn up and signed between us and the Consortium at the beginning of radio. If you are referring to radio, the answer is "yes", but not for television.

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

AYES: Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON
Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE;
Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SARGEANT; Mr. WEEKES and
Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS - 9.

NOES: Mr. HINDS; Mr. J. M. G. ADAMS; Mr. SMITH and Mr. St. JOHN - 4.
4.10 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1967 - 68 No. 67

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the loan by the Government to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of the sum of \$2,100,000 to be borrowed from the Bank of Nova Scotia for revising the financial structure of the Corporation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, what, of course, we did in Committee of Supply was the appropriation. We now have to provide the legislative guarantee for

the money. I really would have nothing new to say in introducing this and, therefore, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. LOWE; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. SARGEANT and Mr. WEEKES - 9

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas voted "No" when the voices were taken, and I heard him vote "Aye" when the division was taken.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I was reading a magazine.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I call on you and the Clerk to certify what voice was taken. All of us heard the word "No" coming from down there. He has just said that he was reading a magazine, and did not know what was happening.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I cannot detect the voice of one hon. member for St. Thomas from another. (LAUGHTER).

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Are you inviting me to vote "Ayes"? I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that although I am not saying I said "No" when the voices were taken, I heard the voices of the hon. senior and the hon. junior members for St. Thomas. I heard both members for St. Thomas say "No".

Mr. SPEAKER: It would have been remarkable if those hon. members voted in unison.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Except on a matter of pensions, perhaps.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have sought the information of the Deputy Clerk of the Table, and he cannot help me as to where the sound of the voices of "No" came from. Therefore the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.....

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. Can you remind me of what the Resolution is?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask Mr. Clerk to remind any hon. member who has not yet voted of what has been taking place in the House today.

Mr. DEPUTY CLERK: It has been moved and seconded that a Resolution to approve the loan by Government to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation of the sum of \$2,100,000 to be borrowed from the Bank of Nova Scotia for revising the financial structure of the Corporation do now pass. A division was called for and hon. members voted as follows:-

AYES: Hon. J.C. TUDOR, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. C.E. TALMA, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Hon. N.W. BOXILL, Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. SARGEANT, Mr. WEEKES, - 9.

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. St. JOHN - 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that 9 hon. members have voted in the affirmative, and 3 hon. members have voted in the negative. I now declare the "Ayes" have it, and accordingly I declare this Resolution duly to have been passed.
4.20 p.m.

DAIRY INDUSTRY (REGULATION AND CONTROL) BILL, 1968.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance:- To move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the regulation and control of the production and distribution of milk and milk products in the Island, to establish a Milk Advisory Board and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Minister starts, I am appealing to him and to the Government, that this is a very controversial Bill and it is going to take us until morning. It would therefore be a first-class idea if the Minister would postpone it until another time. Most hon. members have to be out to night, and it would be a good idea if the Minister would consider postponing it and allowing us to get out. Prisoners sometimes get a chance to go out. (LAUGHTER)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am surprised to hear from an experienced hon. member of this House that he has to go out when there are parliamentary duties to be attended to.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, while I would like to accommodate hon. members, especially my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I would like to state that there are certain proposals in this Bill which it would be necessary to have implemented within the next few weeks for the protection of all concerned in the Dairy Industry. That is why we are hoping to deal with this Bill today. As a matter of fact, I do not think that the Bill in itself is controversial. There may be certain controversial things with respect to the Milk Plant which I am prepared to deal with today. The Bill provides for our getting clean milk, that people should be licensed sellers of milk, licensed farmers and so on. I cannot see how this Bill in itself could be controversial; what is controversial is the running of the Milk Plant. This Bill is for the purpose of seeing to it that good and clean milk is provided in the country. (Mr. SMITH: This Bill will make it clean now?) The hon. senior member for St. Joseph knows that I always give him as much co-operation as possible, but this is one reason on which I am asking him to sympathise with the position and to reciprocate. As I always give him one hundred per

cent co-operation, I would like him to give me one hundred per cent co-operation in this matter now.

Mr. SPEAKER: To give you the co-operation which you allege you give him.

Mr. SMITH: I will give him by talking until morning.

Hon. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member so desires, I cannot stop him. He has freedom of speech in here.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. Can the Minister tell us if there is anything controversial in the Bill that it has to come into operation from tomorrow?

Mr. SPEAKER: That certainly is not a point of order. It is so far from it that it is almost far from the truth. (Laughter).

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, sometime in 1965, there was an agreement signed between Messrs Northern Dairies Limited of the United Kingdom, the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board and the Government of Barbados with regard to the establishment and operation of a Dairy Plant in this Island. There were certain relevant terms of the agreement which are for consideration here now, and the terms were as follows: that the Company should be licensed as an approved processor of milk and dairy products and to limit the award of such a licence solely to the Company for a period of at least ten years, and that the premises should be registered. I refer now to the premises of all persons who are dealing in milk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Notwithstanding that it has not been drawn to my attention, there does not appear to be a quorum present, and unless it is drawn to my attention, that a quorum is present this sitting will be adjourned.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the Bell be rung inasmuch as there is no quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for helping the Chair. Let the Bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung,

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that there is now a quorum. Let the hon. Minister proceed with moving the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill.....

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I see that you are as anxious as the Hon. Minister on the other side to have

this legislation passed, but we, on this side, cannot allow it to be passed like that because, as we said on the last occasion when we had a debate on the Milk Industry in this Island, we were as anxious as the Government to do everything in our power to establish an industry such as the milk industry in Barbados; but we were dissatisfied with the manner of operation of the Milk Plant, and, in particular, with the powers that the Government had to control the operators of the concession which was granted to them. By this Bill, the Minister seeks to arm himself with conditional powers and, in particular, the most material aspect of the Bill is Part 5 because the other parts of the Bill seem to me to cover the ground which has already been covered by the Dairies Act which is an existing piece of legislation.

Sir, we, on this side, are still not satisfied that all the problems and all the defects both in the distribution and the manufacturing of milk in Barbados have been remedied. As far as we know, there is still a tremendous amount of fear among the milk producers who were encouraged by the Government to embark on relatively large sums of capital expenditure in buying a new type of cow, a supposedly high milk-producing animal, on the understanding that all the milk produced by them would be bought by the Pine Hill Dairy.

4.30 p.m.

There is still fear in their minds that as soon as the tourist season has ended - it ends on the 15th April - the Pine Hill Dairy will revert to the system of quotas. I think an assurance at this stage from the Hon. Minister that in the event of this Bill being passed that regulations and orders will be made.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member would give way?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has given way.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member will remember that I said when there was objection to doing this Bill at this stage that there was a certain amount of urgency about it. The hon. member will know that there is provision in the Bill which gives the Minister the authority to compel the dairy plant to take whatever milk is produced in the country and offered for sale to the dairy plant provided that it is of a satisfactory quality.

This is the main reason that I want to do the Bill today because I am aware that the tourist season will soon be over and that the milk used by the tourists will be in surplus at the plant, but at the same time we are now encouraging the growth of the dairy industry. Let me say here categorically that there will be no more quotas; the milk plant will have to take the milk. That is why I asked to have the Bill done today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of elucidation made. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. St. JOHN: You see that if the Hon. Minister was not trying to snap the Opposition just now, he would have made his normal second reading speech and, may be, we would not have talked at all. But he was trying to snap us. The Opposition is very grateful for the assurance given by the Minister because that would alleviate some of the fears which have been expressed by these people who have indulged in this expansion as a result of the persuasion and encouragement of the Government.

The second point is that it has been my experience here in the Law Courts.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it that the member is going to meet here in the Law Courts?

Mr. St. JOHN: My experience here in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Ah! Yes! I did not hear those two words.

Mr. St. JOHN: I do not know what has happened today. Perhaps sitting in Committee for such a long time must have caused it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not appear as if there is a quorum. (A PAUSE) There is now. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir. I would like to know what new machinery and additional staff the Department of Science and Agriculture -

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would like to be in a position to reply to the point made by the hon. member. I did not hear the last point made by the hon. member and I ask him to repeat his last point.

Mr. St. JOHN: I will repeat it, Sir. One of the problems we have been hearing is that the Government Chemist and the Department of Science and Agriculture have been clamouring for a long time that they do not have sufficient staff as well as adequate apparatus and machinery together with proper regulations and standards for testing milk. No doubt, the Minister will have the power to make regulations but that Department claims to be understaffed and ill-equipped.

I would like to know from the Hon. Minister if he has any plans, and how far forward these plans are for providing this necessary machinery so that the Bill and regulations made thereunder may be properly enforced. This is an important aspect of this matter because it is useless assuming the Minister has the power and the laws and regulations, and not having the machinery to enforce these provisions.

This, Sir, is the second point. We notice too, even up to now, that the Pine Hill Dairy is still saying that it is unable to sell to 250,000 people thirteen thousand pounds of milk per day, which is the local production. Up to now, there has been no price reduction to the consumer, and they have not affectively answered the charges made by the Opposition on the last occa-

sion when we had a debate on this matter that one of the reasons why they have been unable to sell the milk is because the price was beyond the reach of the general body of consumers in Barbados.

They still continue with the uneconomic method of selling milk in cartoons that they themselves claim cost six cents per cartoon. Perhaps, the Hon. Minister would be able to tell us what further discussion he has had and what efforts have been made to help reduce the cost because when one realises that they sell this milk in quarts, that is three cents a pint for the cartoon alone, and these cartoons are thrown away immediately after they are used. We understand that they have pursued the policy of putting the larger proportion of the locally produced milk in the sterilised form and selling it in the sterilised form. Perhaps, we can get a progress report on that.

Lastly, on this point of the price of milk, as we understand it now, the Pine Hill Dairy has been guaranteed a monopoly on the importation of evaporated milk in Barbados. The distributors - both whole - salers and retailers - claim that notwithstanding the fact that the Pine Hill Dairy has been granted a monopoly, the price to the wholesaler has been greater than previously when there was no monopoly granted to any individual commission agent in Barbados. And what is more, the facilities which used to be granted by way of credit by the commission agents is now being removed by the Pine Hill Dairy and it is now making more per case of milk than any wholesaler merchant ever made before, and the retailer now is making less per case.

We quite realise that largely due to the fault of the Pine Hill Dairy itself, its first operations resulted in a deficit to the extent of some \$180,000, but what we do not feel is correct and justified is that the Hon. Minister should allow the Pine Hill Dairy to force Government into a position where Government must condone the Pine Hill Dairy charging an exorbitant price so as to recoup its losses in one year. They should spread the recoupment of these losses over some period of time, remembering how important milk is as a part of the diet of the community as a whole and remembering too that with the condition of our economic structure here, the small shopkeeper bears in the out-of-crop season a large proportion of the burden of credit to the consumers at a period of time when they need the credit most. Now, this has been a sore point for a long period of time and I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us what are the plans that the Government has with respect to it.

4.40 p.m.

The hon. senior member for Bridgetown charged on the last occasion we had a debate that the Pine Hill Dairy was making \$3 on a case of 14 oz. tins.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Pine Hill Dairy has never made \$3 on a case.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has risen on what or why?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said on a point of order. The Pine Hill Dairy has never made \$3 per case on any milk imported to this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now what is the point of order that the speaker has asked me to determine?

Mr. St. JOHN: I have no objection, Sir. I gave way.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not concerned with the hon. member. I am concerned with the Chair.

Mr. St. JOHN: I gave way, Sir. I allowed the hon. member to interrupt me. I extended that courtesy. I have seen Your Honour endorse that pattern of conduct on many occasions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even when Homer nodded, he never did it twice.

Mr. St. JOHN: The position is that it may not have been a point of order, but I gave way. If it is not \$3, tell us how much it is per case, and tell us further if it is not more per case than previously was made by any commission merchant in Bridgetown. Remember, too, the volume of the turnover that they have in evaporated milk now, because they have a monopoly of importation which is equal to the total amount that nine or ten commission agents in the past used to import, and they used to give credit. You used to be able to draw it from the wharf, you did not have to go up to the Pine Hill Dairy, and the wholesalers did not have to pay cash for it. You are saving on these costs, and still you are making more per case.

Those, Sir, are the three basic points. We obviously are in agreement with this, because it is clear that unless the Government is armed with these powers, the concessionaires with whom they have negotiated, that is Northern Dairies and New Zealand Milk Marketing Board, intend to hold the consumer in this country up to ransom, intend to extract as much profit as they can out of the milk-consuming public, intend to pay the dairy producers of milk in Barbados as little as possible, and they regard this country as a basis for experimentation in their new fangled methods of making condensed milk and evaporated milk. All three of these things, I think, are clear. Now the Government has found that they do not have enough legislative power to deal with them adequately, we on this side criticised the operation, and we obviously would have to support any measure now that is designed to give the Government adequate power to deal with them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if I should say anything that my colleague has said, it is because I was either outside or I was not listening. I thought the Minister in charge of this Bill would have enlightened us on it, but all he did was to let this House know that this Bill is going to give us clean milk which makes me feel that we were getting dirty milk all the time.

Now, Sir, the object of this Bill is to provide for the regulation and control of the production and dis-

tribution of milk and milk products in the Island with a view to promoting and expanding the local dairy and livestock industry and the provision thereby of an adequate supply of milk and milk products of the best quality at reasonable prices.

The object of the installation of the milk plant was to promote and expand the local dairy and livestock industry, but what is worrying me is that if this is the object of the company, why has the plant got to import evaporated milk into this Island? If they were importing this evaporated milk for the purpose of blending it with the other milk to give you a better quality, I would agree with them. But they are importing milk and robbing the merchants of their commission. They import the milk and either take it to the Pine Hill Dairy or the merchants have to draw it from the Port, and I understand that a person would have to buy 160 cases c. o. d. in order to get a berry.

Before the establishment of a milk plant, the agents used to import it and distribute it to the merchants who had 90 days grace to pay for it. It was possible that a merchant with a fast turnover could sell every case of that milk and have the money in the Bank, or he might have been able to spend some of it before the time was due to pay for it. Either because the Government or the Minister is encouraging it, these boys have taken it upon themselves to take it completely out of the hands of the merchants, import it and compel you to pay cash for it. No business, Mr. Speaker, can afford to buy goods cash and credit it out at the same time, because it is bound to go underneath. Most of the supplies are credited. You go into a merchant in Roebuck Street with \$200 or \$300, pay for the goods you had the week before and take out goods for the following week without a penny. 4.50 p.m.

When you compel the merchant to buy it and credit it at the same time, you are creating a hardship on both sides: the consumer and the retailer. It is those people in the country where I belong who are bound to meet it very hard. These people in the country have to do the same thing with the small shopkeepers. They pay for last week's supplies, and they take away this week's supplies without paying any money for them.

Here it is now, this particular item or commodity - because the Government has the big stick in the corner, it is allowing these people to do as they like. This morning someone telephoned to me and said that they had increased the price of the milk by 96¢ per carton. That is what I was told this morning on the telephone. They were told by the boys up there that they had the "okay" from the Ministry.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to assure the hon. member that the Ministry responsible for the control price of milk is the Ministry of Trade and not the Ministry of Agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order concisely made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should like to point out that the Ministry of

Agriculture did not give the Milk Plant any "okay" to increase the price of milk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order equally concisely made. I congratulate both hon. Ministers.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, this will tell you now that the Milk Plant is the Government, and those two are the Milk Plant. If they do not know anything about it, and the merchants have to pay more for the milk, then who is the boss? Who is the Government?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Milk is controlled and it is on the Scheduled List, and, unless the Schedule has been changed with the Order directed, the Price Control Officers have a right to bring up the Milk Plant, or any other person who increases the price of milk, unless the price of milk has gone up, been agreed to and published in the Schedule. No increase prices have been published in the Schedule by my Ministry, and the Milk Plant, or any person, selling milk over the price stated in the Schedule is liable to prosecution. If it is the last thing I would do, it is to prosecute the Milk Plant, or anybody else, who sells milk above the Scheduled price.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order made.

Mr. SMITH: If the Minister is trying to make his side clear, I cannot blame him, Sir. A particular merchant did not tell me this; so I will not call the name of the firm. I was also told that a particular merchant sent in the bill that he paid for the milk to the Controller of Supplies. The Minister can investigate that matter and find out the position. I will tell him the merchant's name privately. The merchant did not tell me this, but I was told so. Speaking under correction, he wanted 800 cases, but he was told that he could only get 700 cases on the C. O. D. basis.

Sir, what is worrying me and will continue to worry me is what the Milk Processing Plant is really processing. If we are still buying the imported milk with a hardship attached to it - before we could get in on grace-payment, but today we have to pay for it cash or leave it. What is the purpose of the Milk Plant? What is it doing for this country? What is it importing all of this milk to do, Sir? There was a time when the Plant was processing something like a rock stone in a tin. That is what I can say. The tin was marked "Sun Gold", but when it was opened, instead of a junk of gold, it was something looking like a rock with many colours, not even white. If we are to continue processing something like that up there, then ask these people to stop it.

I can remember some time ago, Sir, as you know, that we used to subsidise pig feed in order to help to rear more pigs. The present Government stopped that. When I enquired about the reasons for stopping it, I was told by the Minister in charge that they wanted to encourage the rearing of more cows; rather than to rear pigs, we are going to rear cows and do all of this processing work at the Pine; so instead of subsidising the feed for pigs, they were going to help the people to rear more cows. Is it that the cow's milk they are

getting up there is not sufficient and it is necessary to import more milk to mix with it, or what? I do not know.

I was not in here, but I do not know whether the Minister merely read the Objects and Reasons of the Bill. I merely stepped out, and he is trying to pull a fast one on me. He missed me, and he sat down quickly in the hope of having it put to the vote. That is what he wanted.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is accusing me of trying to put this matter to the vote. The duty of a Minister is to come into the House and explain to the Opposition what the position is. When I was introducing the Bill, the Opposition walked out. I did not have anybody to explain anything to. I came here fully equipped to explain to hon. members the full position at the Milk Plant; I anticipated the questions which would have been asked, and I am quite capable of answering any and every question asked by any hon. member on the other side of the House. There was nobody to speak to, and there was no other alternative than to allow the matter to go to the vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making a speech. The hon. member must bear in mind that there was someone to speak to, because there was a Chair to address.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: But the Chair was not seeking information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that will tell you how he ignores the Chair. He calls the Chair nobody. I am saying this.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH: Sit down. What point of elucidation are you talking about? You only want to cause more trouble now. Sit down. What are you going to elucidate? Why do you not go up to the Pine and elucidate?

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot even suspend for grave disorder, because there is not a Clerk present at the table. I am absolutely impotent.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was not speaking to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I quite understand how the hon. Minister feels, and he does not think that he so flatters the Chair. The Chair is understanding, and does not need unnecessary clarification.
5 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, you must not allow the Hon. Minister to be getting up on this point of elucidation and this point of order; he only wants to keep you back in the Chair. He said that there was nobody in the chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, he cannot keep back anybody.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, let me prove to you the type of Minister whom I have to deal with now. When I came in here, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking. How on earth could the Minister say that no person was in here? If no person was in here from the Opposition, would he not have had the question put? I am accustomed to telling him - I cannot say what because it would be out of order, but he is so much accustomed to telling these little ones that he cannot tell a big one yet, because he cannot tell one yet that when anyone hears it he will think it is the truth. The Minister cannot get up there yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the name of a local newspaper.

Mr. SMITH: None of the Opposition was in his place and yet when I came in here, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking! The Minister had his opportunity then and I know how quick you would have been to say: "I think the 'Ayes' have it." He can say that I do not know as much about it as he likes, but I was born before him and I have more brain than he has when it comes to business. I may not have it when it comes to teaching lies, but when it comes to business I have it on him. (Mr. HINDS: Racehorses). Well, I would not say that because he does not feed them. (Laughter). When we come to a Bill of this sort, the Minister is now asking for the authority to control the production and there was a time gone by when my wife was so afraid of these tins of milk that she said: "Not another one in here, don't bring it." You would be surprised to know, Mr. Speaker, that I went home one night..... (Mr. SPEAKER: I am not surprised that the hon. member went home one night.) Well, on this particular night I smelt something. I said: "Gracious me, what is that?" She said: "That is the milk you brought in here." She had opened a tin. Now the Minister is telling me that he is bringing in a Bill to control something in relation to which it is only that God is merciful to us, otherwise a good few of us would have gone down and the undertakers would have got a few berries. You know as well as the world what was coming from up there in a tin, and they were fleecing the people with the price, making people pay more for it. I am not having any more confidence in some of these Ministers when they come in here and tell us all sorts of things in order to get something passed, when, in truth and in fact, they themselves do not know about it. Some of them do not know what is going on. I can tell you that, as to some of them, I know more of their Ministries than they know about them. The Chair in their office is soft and cool and they can swing around in it and so on, and they are not getting up and going out and putting their ears to the ground and listening.

I understand that the people up there are disgusted. This thing cannot pay and they are going to pull up their sticks. The Government believes in putting their money with foreigners. I do not know who they are up there, but they come in here with a few cents and the Government then throws the taxpayers' money with theirs and then when you least think of it, they

come in here with a Resolution asking us to do this, that and the other. When these people see that it is not going to pay, they are not going too far financially in it. The Government believes in arranging with people who are working for a commission, people who are working in the profits, and they would not even ask these people this question: - "If you lose, how much are you prepared to stand?" They are telling the Government how much they must share in; they are telling the Government how much they must get; but if it is losing, the Government is not asking them how much are they prepared to lose. I suppose that if the Government were to ask them, they would tell them and we would not get too far. You are trying to put these little "nay nay" industries in this place and then we have to pay through our noses for that. What is the good of putting up an industry and you are getting the produce 50% dearer than if you have to import it, and you may be employing only two or three people? It is much better to let that industry go by itself, and if it was going to employ 20 or 25 people, you could subsidize those persons. You would not be losing anything; if you had to call them up and pay them until they get work, you would not be losing one cent; but you are going to throw away thousands of dollars and you are telling me that you are relieving unemployment. You are relieving unemployment, but at the same time you are burdening employment. As to these people, whether they work or not, they have to eat and drink and they have to find money to spend. When they have to pay more money for food, you are not helping them. Let us face facts. I am quite willing to do everything that is right, but the Minister knows to himself that this is a hot rod, and setting up a Board of Management or anything of the sort is not going to cure it. It will only cure it when this processing plant puts its house in order to do the necessary processing without having to do this big importation. This place up there sank or was sinking money. Last year I may tell you that it made a little money, but what did it make the money from? - Not from the processing of the milk, not from buying people's milk and processing it; it made the money from the importation of the same milk and the profits they have made have to be subsidized now, or they have to pay for the other side that is throwing them away. 5.10 p.m.

Now, Sir, if the processing side is throwing it away through some fault of whom, I do not know, but the importation side is making money and what it is making is to pay for what it is throwing away, well, stop the side that is throwing it away. If the processing side of it cannot measure up and has not proved profitable while the importation side is showing a profit, stop the processing side and go back to the old time religion - go back to importing the milk, go back to letting the merchants get it and everything concerning that. Control it. Let the consumers get it more cheaply and let the processing side stay up there because that side is not making any money.

If I expected that you still would have had to import so much milk in the country to keep the Milk Plant going, I would have been shouting for murder up to now. I never expected it would have been like that because when you told me that you were

going to improve the livestock industry and you were going to do this and bring in machinery to make this and that, it went down in me that every plantation would have so many heads of cattle, every householder would have a cow and you would be getting the milk from these people. In other words, I felt that you would have been able to get as much milk as you required.

I do not know anything about it; I am not a Minister. Neither one of these people came and talked and negotiated with me. If they did, I would have asked them some questions, but they must have negotiated with the Government; they must have talked with the Minister. I believe that they must have informed the Minister that we should get as much livestock milk as would carry on the milk processing plant for it to be a paying concern and it would stop us from importing this particular milk.

I really thought that it would stop the importation of milk, but I believe that you are importing more now than when you did not have the Milk Plant. Some thing is wrong. I understand that sometimes you have a glut of milk up there. Why I did not ask the person what was responsible for the glut was because I thought it might have been a glut of bad milk - not good milk. I thought that was the milk which they could not dispose of - the bad one. I did not know that they had so much cow's milk up there - fresh milk - that they could not get rid of it at certain times of the year. I did not know that the tourists drink so much milk when they come here - more so than any other time - that the Directors of the Milk Plant have to import this "Sun-Glow" or "Glow-Sun", whatever you care to call it.

I was told that the tins were being imported. Well, if they import the tins and they are tinning the milk from the processing plant, that is all well and good, but they are importing the milk too. I cannot see why, and I hope the Minister will be able to get up here and try to convince me and this Honourable House why they have to import so much milk, whether it is that they are not getting sufficient cow's milk or whether it is that they are not encouraging the livestock industry.

I do not think that they are encouraging it because I do not see so many cows around by me. I want to know if the Government is lending people money to buy cows and to rear them or anything of the sort. As I have said, thank God that we did not lose a few. That same place up there, I am told, caused one of the Directors to leave because things were so bad. That is what I heard. It may cause more. I hope it will cause the Minister to go because he must get up and tell us the truth about everything up there. Let him reply to us as a man would reply.

I will say it now because he himself has heard it. I understand the reply we were given just now by the Hon. Leader of the House about C.B.C. I will bet you that the Minister is not going to get up and admit certain things about the Milk Plant up there. He is not

going to admit certain things because he is encouraging them. I am saying that it cannot pay. The people cannot pay more dividends because they are losing money. This Government will have to do something by way of pumping more money into it. If they do not pump more money into it, it will fall through just the same way as C. B. C.

After this Bill is passed, then this particular Board that they are setting up is going to tell you that their advances are so much and that they want a little bit of working capital. That will be the first report that will come to the Government, and the Government then will be coming down here with a Resolution asking us for some money to pump into the Milk Plant up there because if it is losing money, it must have working capital. It must work. You are importing milk and you are making money from the imported milk.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If the hon. member would just give way, Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I want just to observe that the Pine Hill Dairy is not a Government department so that the Government has got to put money into it. It is a limited liability company just like any other limited liability company in this country, in which company the Government owns a quarter of the shares. Government does not control the Pine Hill Dairy. I want the hon. member to know this. It is not a Government department; it is not like C.B.C.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, that is not a point.

Mr. SPEAKER: I advise you that it is a point.

Mr. SMITH: Well then, Sir, if it is not a Government department, what is the Bill doing here before us; if it is not a Government Department, why did the Government allow so much rotten milk to be made by that place up there? If it were mine, they would have had it thrown through the eddies already.

What the Hon. Minister is telling me is that it is not a Government Department, but the Government has money in it. Why then did the Government put money into it? Sir, when you peruse this Bill, you will see in it the power which this Government is putting into the Minister's hand, yet it is not a Government Department. What is it?

Well, I think you better say good-bye - good bye black bird - to the little money which you have put into it. Do not put any more into it, and leave the company to see for themselves. Close your eyes to the little few pence that you have up there, and do not come in here for any more money for it. Do not come in here asking us to vote any more money for it, and let the people up there get on as they can. I believe too much politics is going into it since you told me so now. As soon as too much politics goes into it, business do not work, and I believe that some person is trying to go to far with the people up there.

Leave them to themselves and they will get out of their troubles. You are telling me that you only have in it a little nay-nay amount and it is not a Government Department.
5.20 p.m.

Do you know we had some children who almost died the other day? There are some children who cannot resist things. Their resistance is very weak; so be careful in dealing with that place up there. I am telling you that the Directors are very dissatisfied; they are not making any money, and people are going to pull out. Now you say it is not a Government Department, and I know who is going to lose. All is not well up there financially, but you are coming with a Bill to control it.

The other day a man told me he is sorry he has put his money in cows, that he expected he would have got through very well by sending all his milk to the plant, but now he is indebt and cannot raise the interest to pay on the loan he made from the Bank to buy the cows. He thinks that in order to make the Plant pay, you will have to make up your mind to increase the price of milk; but do not let me hear you have increases it. Now it has gone up 96 cents per case. These people will have to try and safeguard themselves, because you cannot expect a man to invest his money and then throw it away. The only person who can do that and succeed is the Government, but no hard-headed businessman is going to continue to throw away his money. The Minister, only has a small part in it, but he is playing a big part in it. We would have done a better job if we had gone on in the way we had been going. People who kept one or two cows to supply their home with milk thought a better job would have been done by sending the milk to the Plant, because it is really cheaper to buy milk than to keep a cow, so they were glad to get rid of their cows and were prepared to support the Pine Hill Dairy. The Dairy has failed to support the people, because there is too much imported milk coming to this country when you have a milk-processing plant. If they are importing milk, they should only import as much as they are going to use up there. If they cannot supply the required amount, they should allow the merchants a quota to help themselves by getting it direct. Do you think if I were a Minister I would allow any company to import foreign milk and sell it to the people of this country? If that is to be done, let us put it back into the hands of the merchants who will be paying trade tax and income tax.

I believe the Pine Hill Dairy may be getting a little tax holiday, and if they are, they are robbing the Government because the Government loses that income from trade tax. If they are going to be milk importers, call them milk importers, but not "Pine Hill Dairy." The Hon. member is a schoolmaster, and I would like him to define "dairy" for me when he gets up. My commonsense tells me that an importer cannot be a dairy. You know, when you have a big lot of education, you look down on other people but you cannot look down on me this time. It should be the Pine Hill Importing Agents for Milk, but not

Pine Hill Dairy. Why did you allow them to do this? And then the hardest part is that the milk must be bought for cash. For instance, I know of a low Budget supermarket; could you expect the proprietor to find money for 160 cases of milk at one time? This would give you the impresssion that the Pine Hill Dairy does not want small people, because when they specify that a person must buy 160 cases of milk cash, they are looking at the big shots and not the little fellows; they are trying to squeeze out the little fellows as far as milk is concerned. He can get less than 160 cases, but he will have to pay the same thing for it as if he were buying it from any merchant who buys 160 cases.

The Government has 25 per cent of the shares in this Plant and must therefore have a Director on the Board, and he sits down around the table and encourages these people to fleece the small people, and if the Minister knows about it, he is encouraging it also. It should not be 160 cases.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, there are five Directors of the Milk Plant, and the Government has one vote of the five. Because of the small amount of money which the Government has in the Plant, the Chief Agricultural Officer who is the Government's representative on the directorate cannot sway the decision. It is his vote against four others.

Mr. SMITH: I thank the Hon. Minister for that. He cannot sway the decision, but he can report to his Cabinet or to his Minister what is happening and the Minister has that power to ask them to leave the Plant and close it. Do not come to me with that foolish hanky-panky excuse.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I am now asking the House to give the Government the authority under the issuing of a milk processor's licence. This Bill provided that the Pine Hill Dairy and any other milk processor must have a licence which can be withdrawn if they are not operating in accordance with the wishes of the people of the country. We do not have any power now and this is what I am asking for. I am quite willing to answer the hon. member on the other questions.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I said that this Bill has come at a very late hour. This Government has put their money in a concern, and has waited until the horse is out of the stable to close the door. Do you not think that before you invested one cent or before they started you should have had done this Bill to control them?
5.30 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. It is unfortunate that the hon. member was not in his place when I began to introduce the Bill, and it is unfortunate that the Opposition did walk out and left us without a quorum so that I could have explained things quite fully. I commenced by saying that in 1965 we started work on this matter and a Committee was appointed. The Committee was appointed in 1965

and it had to report. It was my intention to read out the complete recommendations of the Committee, but there was nobody here other than the Speaker and the members on this side of the House. There was nobody in the Opposition to listen to me. There was nobody in the Opposition to hear me read out the Report of the Committee appointed to make recommendations to the Government. After the recommendations were submitted to the Government, legislation had to be drafted in order to implement the recommendations. What kept the recommendations so long was due to the fact that there were many, and we had to go through them with a fine-tooth comb. I wanted to point out this to hon. members when they walked out of the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Mr. SMITH: That must be a gallon this time; that is not a pint.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say "pint", I said "point."

Mr. SMITH: I am putting it my way, Sir. I told the Minister already that I was born before him, and he cannot pull a fast one on me. He say that he is trying under this Bill to get power to take away or give a licence. This will give him the power to do that, but I want to know this and I hope he will answer me. You did not have to give a licence before, and you could not take away one if they were abusing the position. How did they manage to import milk into this country? How did they manage to import milk into this country without a licence? It must be remembered that you did not have any power or authority to do anything. They are now importing milk and doing as they like with it. You cannot import anything into this country without an import licence. Who gave the licence? "Fix-It-Right," or the Government? You now see the need for this; you now see that you cannot control the people; tell me about that now. I will sit and allow you to answer me now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid if the hon. member sits, he will sacrifice his right to continue his very interesting address. The hon. member has a right to reply, and I am sure he knows when is the time to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. SMITH: He is seeking to pull a fast one on me. I am telling this honourable Chamber that he cannot pull a fast one on me. He is seeking now to give a licence to sell a half gill, to buy a gallon from a milkman and to sell it, but he is not concerned with the selling of a million cases of milk and making a lot of money. Here it is that one merchant can order 800 cases of milk, but he is told that he can only get 700 cases. The little fellow will have to buy 160 cases at a time. What about this licence now? The Milk Plant is importing milk into this country without a licence. I will call up the Controller tomorrow morning, and he will have to let me know how it is done. I will remind the Minister that I was a member of the Control Board; I have

been alive too long; I am an old soldier, so you cannot fool me.

I am saying this for the last time. The Government has to be blamed for this situation. When the Government is putting money into anything, whether it is a cent or a penny - Why should the Government put any money into it? Business people come into this country to set up an industry. They did not ask the Government for any money, but the Government asked them to take money. The Government could control things in the Agreement and so on, and it would not have to put one cent. It could make certain Regulations that they would have to agree to from the start before one stick was put down. Let the people come and spend their money. When they spend their money they will put an interest in the business, and they are going to make money. Do not think an industrialist will walk about in a foolish manner. When he tells you that he is going to set up an industry, the only thing he may be in doubt of is the population; that we only consist of 250,000 and so on, that that is not sufficient, and that they will try to see if they could export some of the products to the other smaller territories.

Of course, some industrialists will not come near Barbados to open an industry. They cannot, because our population is too small. Even the rum industry, and I drink a lot of it, has to stop making rum a certain period of the year. We cannot consume all of the commodities produced in this Island in such a manner as would enable all of them to make a profit. It would be necessary to rely on export trade, in order to do good business. When an industrialist comes here, he or she may be like a turkey with the wings falling down. He cannot get in anywhere else, and he will try to get into Barbados. No big industrialist would set up an industry here unless he went into the other territories to find out.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member still addressing the Chair?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, and listening to the Clerk at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I express my regret that the Clerk should have interrupted the hon. member in the course of his address. I hope that will never recur in this House.

Mr. SMITH: I hope so, Sir. I am adhering to the Clerk now, Sir. I will close. Some of these Ministers think that when I get up here and give my views that I am against them, or that I hate them, and do not want to associate with them. That has caused some of them to disassociate themselves from me when I go into the Lunch Room, but I do not mind that. I must state my views. This is the most important part, and the Minister must see to it from now that if the Pine Hill Dairy is going to continue to import milk into this country to re-distribute to the merchants, then they must put their house in order to give a 60-day or 90-day grace payment. They must compel a buyer to buy 25 cases and upward.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. My understanding is that the Ministry did take up this question of 160 cases. I understand that you can get as low as 5 cases now.

Mr. SMITH: I am glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker. But how, C. O. D., or grace-payment?

Mr. SPEAKER: Just let the hon. member pose his question. The Hon. Minister is so careful, I know, in noting every point of his reply that he will give the information at the appropriate time.
5.40 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: See to it then that when they can get five cases, let it be sixty days or ninety days. No. 3, do not carry it all the way up to the Pine and then the merchants will have to send up there for it. Let them draw it(Asides). Mr. Speaker, what is that noise there? There is some noise down there.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did hear some of it, but I know that my friend, His Honour the Deputy Speaker, is doing his best to keep everything under control.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, there is some noise down there and you must try and stop it for me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for St. Joseph now proceed.

Mr. SMITH: As I was saying, Sir, you should not allow them to draw the milk up to the Pine and then the people have to send up there for it and pay them for the freight. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is not listening to me now; he is listening to somebody else. I am coming home now: so just listen to me. Let the hon. member who has just gone there to attract you - you ask him to wait. I am on the floor. If they are going to draw the milk up to the Pine, let that be at their expense; do not carry it up there and charge the merchants for it. The merchants are accustomed to drawing their goods from the Port; therefore, let it remain down there and they will do the necessary ordering and everything else and post it to the wholesalers. Let them have an agent just as the merchant has his agent. Let the Pine Hill Dairy help unemployment by putting a clerk to go around to the merchants as soon as the ship is coming in or take the orders from the merchants - and as soon as it arrives, they will post them the order to go and draw it out. That is what I would like to see and hear. Do not allow them to be fleecing people up there, although they had no right with it all. They should be only importing theirs. Mr. Minister, listen to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, no. The Chair is listening. The Minister may hear if he cares.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I know that you are listening, but the Minister was not listening.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is his misfortune if he does not hear.

Mr. SMITH: Let it be in this way. I am not in favour of their dealing with it at all. Let them im-

port theirs and let them do as they like with it up there, and let the merchants continue to import it through the Comptroller or the agents or somebody else, and let us get ahead. As to this milk question, the way in which the boys have it up there, it is making money, but who has to pay for it? The consumer. I am in the consumer's corner; I am not in the corner of the Pine Hill Dairy. See to it and do not let me get any more of these reports.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we have heard very little from the Minister on this Bill up to the moment, but there are just one or two points which I want to raise and see what the Minister has to say in connection therewith. There is no doubt that whatever the Government seem to be associated with, one can find much to say against it. We know, for instance, that what happens at this Pine Hill Dairy is that from the launching of the project there was not that amount of sincerity which one would expect from the authorities. This scheme was launched by bringing in second-hand machinery and passing it off as something new. That is definite. They brought in old boilers and they almost brought death to 244,999 people. That excludes me, Sir, because I do not drink milk. What we have got to concern ourselves with is this. There are quite a number of small men who bought two or three cows in the hope that they would have been able to supply milk to the Pine Hill Dairy, and we know that no provision is being made for them any longer. They are too small and the Government has shown its intention, wherever possible, to get rid of the small man in whatever undertaking he might be.

This Bill is laying considerable emphasis on health standards and considers in some detail the question of processing or producing milk for human consumption. Now, this is something which has got to be given very, very careful consideration because we are not sure that even by the lessons which they ought to have learnt in the past of their past operation - we are not abundantly clear that they have really taken in those lessons. We have learnt from the Minister of Trade that his Ministry is concerned with the price-fixing of milk, the price at which milk should be sold, and I also heard him say or express his intention to prosecute or see that some sort of legal action is taken against the Pine Hill Dairy or any other concern which is overcharging.
5.50 p.m.

Now there is no denying the fact that the provision merchants have been charged during the past two days 96 cents per case over what they have been charged formerly. As a matter of fact, they had been paying \$12.96 per case, but from yesterday or day before, they have been called upon to pay \$13.52. It is costing the wholesalers one cent per tin more.

I want to know from the Minister of Trade if they really and truly mean to take action. If it is found out that the Pine Hill Dairy has been overcharging the provision merchants 96 cents per case on six-ounce tins of evaporated milk, I really would like to see and hear in truth and fact that definite action is taken,

and not action like what the people have been told in Independence Square about B.W.I.A. and this lot of summonses.

We want action this time if it is true that these people have been overcharging the trade. We can easily say that the provision merchants need not buy at that price. It is all right to say so, but the Pine Hill Dairy people are bringing it in for the provision merchants. This is a very serious business. They have the promise from the Minister that there is going to be an increase in the retail price to the consumer; consequently they have jumped the gun and have decided to over-charge the provision merchants.

The provision merchants have got to buy because they make very little profit - which is about 58 cents or something like that - when they sell a whole case of these six-ounce tins of milk. That is nothing to the trade, but nevertheless they have got to try and keep this milk on the shelves because if they do not have this milk on the shelves, you will understand that the consumers will have to drift and go all about down the street where they can get potatoes, where they can get flour, where they can get corn meal or whatever else they want. Every provision merchant would lose his trade today if he does not have milk on his shelves. It would run riot if these business places do not have milk, and all the customers will go down the streets where they can get milk from other places. Therefore, the provision merchants have got to try and keep a little of everything on their shelves so as to, what we call, "catch his customers"

This is a dangerous situation in which we are placed. But now, if the provision merchants are over-charged one cent per tin of six-ounce milk, what is the position? Is he expected to buy it at 96 cents per case more than what the Schedule says or what he was paying for it in the past, and sell it at the same price at which he was selling it before? How could you expect the same people to give him business?

What we would want to see at this stage is not that the Price Control Inspectors, or the Police for that matter, run up Roebuck Street, Tudor Street and along Eagle Hall and hound down some of the shopkeepers who have bought some of this milk during the last few days and have it on their shelves and perhaps are charging an extra cent or something for it; we do not want to see you hound them down now.

The source of the complaint is at the Pine Hill Dairy. They are the people who are overcharging. Haul them before the Courts with a forthwith summons, and I am sure that every shopkeeper, every provision merchant, wherever he is, would boldly take his purchases back to the original owner. Get it straight! Let the Pine Hill Dairy people refund every cent to everyone of those provision merchants that it has over-charged during the past few days.

I am asking the Minister to let us see that the Government take definite action against these law breakers. We have heard it trotted out about here that this body breaks the law. Mr. Speaker, I believe

that they are taking pattern for what is happening from the Mother Parliament in Great Britain because you hear Mr. Harold Wilson say that if Mr. Ian Smith does this, it would be an act of this or an act of that and every sort of thing. We want to see definite action being taken. Stop all this racketeering that is going on about the place.

Now, Sir, there is one other point that worries me very much about this Milk Plant. I can assure the Minister of Trade that I am not going to be very long on my feet, but there are practices that are being engaged in at the Pine Hill Dairy that can upset the whole plant. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that they are employing people up there as guards, as they call them. They are employing them as guards because they are paying them watchmen's pay. They are paying them the very small pay of a watchman, but what do you find? You employ a man as a guard and then give him clerical work to do. Then you are going to dismiss them; but these very poor people cannot look for some of these lawyers to carry their complaints to.

You employ a man as a guard and you are going to dismiss him for not doing clerical work properly and give him a letter to that effect. You regard this man as a guard, but you give him clerical work to do. You send him away, but he got the same pay the day he left after working there many months as when he was taken on. In other words, you have not promoted him in any respect. You employ him as a guard and when you dismiss him, you dismiss him as a clerk at a guard's pay.

All of these things are not right at all. I may tell you, Sir, all of these industries almost without exception that are being established here - the principal parties in them intend to do absolutely nothing else but to suck the blood of the poor people of this Island. They are milking the blood out of the poor people. What more can you find than that to which I have referred, Mr. Speaker? You hire a man as a guard or a watchman, but you put him then to do clerical work.

These people do not intend to hire clerks to do the work inside the place. They want to run it as cheaply as they possibly can, and at the same time get everything they possibly can. I understand the Minister to say a while ago in this House that it is not \$3.00 per case that they were making by importing this milk into this Island. I want the Minister to tell us on the floor of this House, if the Pine Hill Dairy people were not making \$3.00 profit on each case of milk imported into the Island, how much money they were making.

6.00 p.m.

As the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said, if these people are making so much money by importing milk, I do not know what kind of business they could be carrying, because here is a case where we set up a manufacturing industry, and their chief money earner is importation. They are also sucking the poor people of this country, because when the commission agents in Bridgetown were allowed to import

milk, they sold it to the provision merchants, and the provision dealers in turn sold to the shopkeepers, and when it reached the shopkeepers it was far cheaper than it is today though you have set up an industry to manufacture it. You have allowed the industry the monopoly to import, make \$3 on each case landed at the Port, and the milk is reaching the consumer at a price at which people just cannot afford to buy it.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that there is a dire need for a thorough investigation into the operations of the Pine Hill Dairy. We are taking too much for granted when a Minister comes and tells us that something is right. The Minister of Agriculture told us some time ago when we were discussing matters connected with the Pine Hill Dairy and the bad milk which was being processed there that there were eight or nine things that were found to be wrong that gave cause to this milk which almost killed the whole population, and he gave us to understand that seven out of the eight or eight out of the nine things had been detected and corrected. Up to today, Mr. Speaker, I understand that they have spent over \$40,000 carrying out research to find out what caused this and what caused that and why the milk would not last more than a few days. I do not want it to be said on the floor of this House by the Minister or anybody else that if they have spent \$40,000 in research, that is \$40,000 that should have been passed on to the milk consumers in this country. That is \$40,000 which they have milked out of the consuming public, and I will say it is a sure case of ill-gotten gains. They have had to spend it just as they got it. I want to hear from the Minister that something has definitely been done and that the situation at the Pine Hill Dairy is going to be vastly different from what it has been in the past. We want to know that the consuming public is going to get better and cheaper milk.

I understand that the Pine Hill Dairy people are complaining that the containers in which they supply certain qualities of milk are responsible for the high cost; but remember, Sir, that milk at 22 1/2 cents per pint is a terrible thing in this Island. During the past few days the price of the 6 oz. evaporated milk has gone up, as well as the price of the large condensed milk. What is the Government going to do? Are they going to allow the Pine Hill Dairy to turn everybody's mind in this Island from drinking milk? The people cannot afford to buy it and we are appealing to the Government to do something. Oh Lord, protect the consuming public! Don't let the Pine Hill Dairy fleece them any longer! We want a reduction in the price of milk to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, many little children in the schools come from the country districts, and their parents cannot afford to give them the amount of milk that is so necessary. That is why these children in the end cannot pass these examinations. They are not properly fed; they are under-nourished. Milk is a staple diet, and if the children in this Island could each be given one pint of milk per day, we would have the happiest, rosiest, loveliest looking children any part of the world. The Minister has referred to the number of pounds of milk, but let me tell him, Sir, that if during the tourist season the hotels had been buying up this

milk, we are willing to have the Government subsidise it at this stage for these few weeks if we are certain that every child in every school in the Island is going to each get one pint of milk per day. In addition, there are some poor mothers in the rural districts, in the City and elsewhere in the Island, and we are willing to have their children bathe in the milk rather than have it thrown away this time. We have had a situation where the plantations could not dispose of the milk from the cows they kept and were feeding it to the pigs. In the parish of St. Thomas that has been happening. Is it fair, Mr. Speaker, that people can have milk to feed to their pigs, and the poor people in St. Peter and in St. Lucy which you represent can only get a drink of milk one day per week, and that is on Sunday? Why should the price be as it is today? Let us hear by tomorrow, if humanly possible, that something is done to protect the consuming public.

If the Pine Hill Dairy finds that it cannot operate without making a loss, let them get out of the business, because there are other people who are interested in setting up dairies here who will come in, and bring their know-how and clean, proper equipment. I am sure that the Minister will not be able to defend the charge that the price of milk has gone up considerably since the establishment of the Dairy, though we were told when it was set up that the price would be cheaper to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I will not keep back the Minister any longer. I know that he is anxious to get the Bill through, and we do not want in any respect to hold him up. There is, however, one small point on the matter of price-fixing. Yesterday when I learnt what was taking place between the Pine Hill Dairy and the provision merchants in Bridgetown, I got in touch with the Controller of Supplies and got the assurance from him that there was no question of an increase in the price of milk. The Pine Hill Dairy has shown that they have absolutely no consideration for the people of Barbados. If they had, they would never have produced the stinking milk they produced in the past. They would have had shame, some measure of pride and some regard for standards. They have nothing of the kind. They are just money-grabbers and they do not care how they get it or where they get it, and I warn the Minister about supporting people like the Pine Hill Dairy operators.

6.10 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I would like to explain to him - I do not want to cross the path of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who is responsible for the Pine Hill Dairy, and who will wind up, actually, the debate. I would like to reply to the hon. junior member for St. Peter with regard to some questions asked. One of the first problems at the Milk Plant after we installed it was that the cost of fresh milk in Barbados is more expensive than in any part of the world. It would be impossible to carry on, if large quantities of fresh milk are not used in either the making of evaporated milk, or in the production of condensed milk. Most of the other milks are used for processing bottled milk and milk for quart cans.

As was mentioned just now, the cost of the containers is rather high; the cost of production of milk, due to feed and the cost of concentrates - as Barbados is not a large grazing country, high concentrates have to be used at high prices, and that has kept the price of milk at an extraordinary high rate, far higher than any other part of the world.

When the Milk Plant started production, one of the things that was overlooked was the necessity to have small tins of evaporated milk. We discovered that no provision had been made for producing small tins of evaporated milk, which was the main type of milk poor people used. The small tins of milk had to be produced. It meant that the diversification of the Agricultural Programme in Barbados had to go ahead. We had to produce our own feed for cattle, etc., for the Pine Hill Dairy. In other words, to sell milk, or to reduce the price of milk, it would be impossible as an incentive to the producer. That would have stagnated the whole thing.

We had to import into the country small tins of evaporated milk. We imported the 6 - ounce tins of evaporated milk, because more people in the country and in shops used it. During the devaluation the maximum price was \$2.60 per case, and I agreed with it. This was a very high margin of profit allowed to any businessman. \$2.60 per case was a high margin of profit. This high margin was allowed as a consideration for the subsidisation of fresh milk that was produced at a very high price.

I think provision has been made since the Minister of Agriculture has applied to the Pine Hill Dairy for some of this milk to be used in schools for nourishment of children rather than giving it to pigs and so on. I consider it a waste to give pigs something that could be used by children. After producing for a considerable period, as you know, we had this problem of bad milk into the country. The Pine Hill Dairy carried out experiments, and we gave them licences in the meantime to import milk whilst they checked to see what was the cause of the trouble. Therefore we went on importing the small and 14 ounce tins of milk which we were not producing in the Island, as the milk made locally was not standing up for any period. The margin of profit made on the imported milk in tins compensated for the losses that we were experiencing in producing fresh milk in the Island. More fresh milk was produced than they could have disposed of in the tins and the milk sold in the bottles.

Sir, the source of this milk came from the Carnation people. Due to the devaluation the price of this milk has increased considerably. With the local production of condensed milk, which they have been producing quite well and quite efficiently from the beginning, the cost of tins, freight, and commodities used in the manufacture of milk has also gone up. The price of milk since devaluation has not been increased. The Pine Hill Dairy has submitted a proposal to Government asking for an increase in the price of milk. This increased is being looked into

at the present time, but no decision has been made up to now.

Only this morning, I would like to assure the hon. junior member for St. Peter, a merchant in Bridgetown - I will not call his name - at ten o'clock this morning presented me with a bill where he had bought at the wholesale price far in excess of what was stated in the Schedule. The Schedule sets out the wholesale price and the retail price. Just as the hon. member has said, in most of these instances in these small shops the poor shopkeeper has paid a high price for it, and he is forced to sell it at a high price because to sell one commodity it is necessary to have other commodities, and he has no alternative. The Price Control Officers find their way into these small shops where people pay high prices for it, and I agree that these are the people who usually pay the penalty and get the fines.

Mr. French produced to me this morning a bill showing that he had bought milk from the Pine Hill Dairy wholesale at a higher price than the scheduled price. The Controller of Supplies was in my office, and I told him: "Do not take any hesitation; it is my instruction as the Minister of Trade, and I accept any consequences from anybody with regard to what happens in this; take legal action against them immediately." If they hold the milk and do not produce it, we have equally as well. The example should be set from the source of something that the Government has an interest in. That is how I feel about setting the pattern.

Sir, I can assure you that I have given instructions this morning to the Price Controller to take the necessary proceedings just as he would with a small shopkeeper with a tin of corned beef. He must treat the Pine Hill Dairy in the same manner. I make no apologies to anybody for it, because this is the source and the means whereby you have to cut down this high price, and this is setting the pattern to the small man. The small man buys the milk at a high price, and very often he has no alternative. Too often, it is not that the small man wants to profiteer, but it is a means of selling another commodity. A man would go somewhere else to buy milk and other commodities. I would like to assure the hon. member that I am very active on this, and I am prepared to make an example of anybody. I have no regard for anybody; I have no interest in stores. I am interested in the people of this country and the law. The Law has not been changed giving the Pine Hill Dairy any right to increase prices, and I am prepared to take action against them as Minister of Trade.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Hon. Minister for the assurance and the prompt action he has taken in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. junior member for St. Peter caught me not nodding, but otherwise occupied. He was not entitled to speak again. It is no point of order to return thanks.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there were several points made by hon. members on the other side not necessarily on the Bill, but in respect of the operations and functions of the Milk Plant. I would like to start off by answering the last speaker first, and go back to the first-in that nanner. The hon. junior member for St. Peter mentioned the fact that second-hand machinery was used in the Milk Plant, and I say "Yes". We were under the impression that the machinery was new machinery. I have no covering up to make for anybody.

They have used a second-hand boiler and this is one of the reasons that they were producing bad milk. The position is that they came to this country with a project which was said to have \$1 million. They discovered in the end that \$1 million could not produce the sort of plant and equipment that was necessary. Instead of buying a new boiler, they bought a second-hand boiler. The boiler was even too small, and this is one of the main reasons why bad milk was produced.

6.20 p.m.

The Minister of Trade has pointed out that the Milk Plant was given permission to bring in milk. He has explained that the cause of the demand for the six-ounce tins of evaporated milk, because of the consumers' request, it was considered expedient to import this type of milk. He has also pointed out that some time in May or June last year, permission was granted to the Milk Plant and this is in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph - to import fourteen -ounce tins of evaporated milk. The hon. member wanted to know why that was done and the answer is this; the Milk Plant, because of a faulty boiler *inter alia* was producing bad evaporated milk. It was considered necessary therefore to stop the manufacture of evaporated milk but at the same time, the Milk Plant, after having made representations to the Government, agreed to get milk - I think it was to come from Holland with the labels showing the manufacture in this particular territory, and the Pine Hill Dairy carried the label "Pine Tree", "Sun Gold" or what have you. This was an arrangement between the Pine Hill Dairy and the manufacturing firm abroad in order to meet the demands of Barbados carrying the same label, but pointing out that the milk was made out of the country for the Pine Hill Dairy. That was done merely to keep the trade mark on the market.

It was pointed out at the time that the Ministry of Trade gave the Pine Hill Dairy the authority to import the milk, and it was also pointed out that they hoped to have their milk back on the market in two months' time. This was some time in May or June last year, but this was not to be. They got in experts and spent over \$40,000 on research work which they did, and we saw their point when they said that they could not get the milk back on the market after two months, because what they did was to make certain batches of milk and keep them, and in every week they would go through the milk in order to see what the last quality of the milk was. They wanted to be in a position that when they went back to the man-

ufactures of evaporated milk, they would have done without these faults. They had milk for about six months or more; they had some stored for six months and they have found that the formula which they have now is all right. There is one piece of equipment which they are still awaiting, but the experts have pointed out that the man whom they have now can still make the milk and, as a matter of fact, he has still made some without this equipment, but they prefer to get this other piece of equipment. The boiler was retubed last year and because of that they are now in a position to produce the milk. It is my understanding that last week they began producing evaporated milk again. It is not yet on the market because they want to be able to test it after a matter of days; however, they have begun manufacturing evaporated milk, and the local evaporated milk will soon be on the market. I just wanted to explain to the hon. senior member for St. Joseph that the reason they were giving is that they wanted to keep the trade mark in the eyes of the public, and this was supposed to have been a temporary measure.

The hon. member also asked about the price of fresh milk - and about the price of milk generally in Barbados. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has pointed out that the price of milk in Barbados is too high. I should like to remind that hon. member that similar sweetened condensed milk and similar evaporated milk, not of the same quality, has been manufactured in the past; but sweetened condensed milk is being produced in Trinidad and sold at 33 cents a tin, whereas in Barbados, it is sold at 30 cents. In Jamaica, it is sold at 34 cents a tin and, in Barbados evaporated milk is sold at 31 cents. (Mr. HINDS: What about wages in Trinidad?) All right, evaporated milk is manufactured in Trinidad and in Jamaica and is sold at the price I have mentioned. Now, I want to be brutally frank. We are encouraging in this country a system of agricultural diversification; we are now building up the dairy industry which we did not have in the past. I mean by that that we did not have the quality animals in this country in the past, the quality animals which we are having today. There was not that much interest in dairying in this country, and, as a matter of fact, the quality of the milk which the average consumer in this country was using was questionable. There is no question about that. Every now and then you found that this person or that person was charged with placing adulterated milk on the market. There is no question of milk adulteration at the Pine Hill Dairy.

I will tell you this: the average person who keeps a cow or two and is selling milk in a three-gills bottle or a pint-and-a-half bottle to his customers on mornings, milks his cow in a bucket with seams - and I have seen even recently, since the Pine Hill Dairy began operation, a certain person who owns cows and whose milk was not accepted by the Pine Hill Dairy because they were not satisfied that the standard demanded was maintained by this person came to me himself with milk and asked me to send that milk to the Pine Hill Dairy along with my milk

on my behalf. When I looked at the container in which the milk was, it was a bucket that seemed not to have been scrubbed for ten years. It seemed as if water was scarce, and dirt was all around it. Dirt was in the seams of the bucket-and this is milk that was sold to people in this country to drink.

But that is not the standard that is demanded of the milk sent to the Milk Plant. What I am saying is that the Milk Plant demands a certain standard, and that is not the standard which is demanded of the Milk Plant. In the past not all the milk produced in this country and sold to the average consumer was bacteria-free or dirt-free or had the minimum of dirt, and it was not strained. You saw all sorts of dust in it, and that was the sort of thing that you got, plus the question of adulteration.

You may have a Jersey cow giving you six pounds of milk, and you are selling twelve because the question of solids and fats in the milk of a Jersey cow is more than the solids and fats in the milk of a Holstein cow; therefore the milk of a Jersey cow can carry more water.

People know that that is what is happening in this country today, but it cannot happen with milk from the Milk Plant because every batch of milk produced as such to the Pine Hill Dairy is tested: and if you do not have certain standards - let us say, suppose your milk had not been up to the required standard because bacteria was troubling the milk; suppose there was any evidence of dirt in the milk, if there was blood, if there were flies or any sort of foreign body found in that milk; it is reported back to you and in order to maintain a high quality from the dairy farmers, at any time there is a warning from the Dairy Plant, you lose for every warning one-eighth of a cent per pound of milk on the whole month's production.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church knows this too. For every warning that you get from the Pine Hill Dairy the particular farmer loses money; so he must keep his milk at a high standard if he is to receive an economical price for his milk. That is why I can make bold to say that the average consumer in this country, where fresh milk is concerned, is getting a higher quality, and the milk farmers do not worry to put water in it because the Pine Hill Dairy makes its test so as to know when water is in it. Whenever water is found in it, that milk is turned down. You therefore cannot adulterate your milk.

On the question of containers raised by the hon. member - the plastic containers which the Dairy Plant is using - I have already told them that this is nonsense. We have been accustomed to using bottles in this country. A bottle can be used for two years so long as it is properly sterilised. Perhaps it can be used longer than this unless it is broken. Every time a housewife in this country buys a quart of milk, she is throwing away six cents. If it were bottled, you would have to bring in some automatic machine or something of the sort to clean the bottles, but it would be

in the interest of the consumer because the consumer would not be throwing away six cents every time she used a quart of milk.

I have already raised the question with the Milk Plant and they said that they do not favour bottles, but they were bringing in a plastic container which would cost less. I still feel that the bottle in the long run is cheaper and that the consumer should be getting cheaper cold milk.

Hon. members would remember that every vote for Nutrition in the Estimates has been increased by a few thousand dollars, and this has been done for use of fresh milk in schools in the out-of-tourist season. As from next term in some of the schools, some of the milk from the Dairy Plant will be passed on to some of the children who are not in receipt of school meals. It is to be appreciated, however, that the cost of producing a pint of milk from milk powder is only in the region of four and a half cents to five cents a pound whereas it costs four times as much to feed a school child on pure fresh milk.

We have to grow; we have to do it in stages; we cannot just double or treble the vote on Nutrition under the Schools' programme. At the same time, we have to cut our suit to suit the cloth.

It was also suggested that the Government is trying to get rid of the small man. This is ridiculous. The position is that the Government is trying to help the small man because the Government has made it possible for the small man to get loans, in the first place, to purchase cows, and this Bill takes care of the small man because the fellow with one or two cows does not necessarily have to get a licence.

Therefore, this Bill takes care of the small man whom the Government is accused of trying to cripple. The Government has made it possible for the small man to have a loan from the Government to purchase the same quality cow as the big dairy producer. We allow them to advance one-quarter of the cost of the imported Holstein from Canada, and we give them two years to pay for the cow. By then the cow would have had two calves and it is known that in the lactation period the cow would be in a position to produce enough milk to pay for itself.

On the other hand, we do not ask the small man to pay any further deposit for the first four months because we feel that we should only ask him to pay after the cow is producing. How is it that we are not doing anything to help the small man?
6.40 p.m.

We have also gone further. We have made provision by the Farming Incentive Board to help the small man with an acreage of land from 25 acres to half an acre; yet we are accused of doing nothing for the small man. In the development of the livestock industry a grant of 30 per cent of the cost of whatever it cost to fence, to plant grass, to set up irrigation equipment is made and he is given a loan of another 30 per cent.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of elucidation, did the Minister say that provision is made for the man with less than half an acre?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: From 25 acres down to less than half an acre these facilities are granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: On a point of elucidating, the hon. member rises to such a point to elucidate some matter raised by the member himself in the course of his speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: This was not done before, but at the time when the hon. junior member for St. Michael was in the Ministry, and through the Farming Incentive Scheme you can see that we did not even go out of the ambit of the fellow who has more than 25 acres of land. This was a scheme for small farmers; so it is not fair to say we are not helping the small man. We are helping him to improve his herd. Now that I have pointed this out, I think the hon. junior member for St. Peter would be satisfied that the Government is making an effort to the limit of its resources to assist the small man.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Joseph raised some interesting points which I will deal with briefly. He asked about cash payments, and the answer to that is that the Government does not have any control over telling the Milk Plant whether it should sell milk cash or on terms. This is a matter of internal administration. If they feel to do it, it is a matter for the Directors and internal routine.

The hon. member asked why we should put up industries. I should just like the hon. senior member for St. Joseph to know that if we close down the Dairy, 600 people are going out of work, and thousands of dollars invested in the animals would be lost. Mr. Speaker, there are 117 people employed at the Dairy Plant itself, and there are approximately 500 people employed on the 40-odd dairy farms and plantations producing grasses

Mr. St. JOHN: If the hon. member would give way on a point of elucidation

Mr. SPEAKER: A matter raised by the hon. member in his speech?

Mr. St. JOHN: Will the hon. member agree that it is slightly exaggerated to say that 600 people would be out of work, because a number of dairies were in existence before and instead of selling milk to the plant they sold directly to the consumer.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. and learned member has not elucidated any matter raised by that hon. member during the course of that hon. member's speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that any industry which is employing 600 odd people must be encouraged in a country. You cannot kill an industry. This is in reply to the hon. senior

member for St. Joseph who said that we should have gone back to the old state since the Pine Hill Dairy is not living up to expectations. We have to think of the people employed. If you ask why put up industries and say it costs more, I would say it is better to bring an industry which is employing a reasonable number of people even at the expense of paying more for the commodity. Take for instance, milk. We have been importing in this country in milk products something like \$4 million a year. This results in an adverse effect on the balance of payments of this country, and we are exporting capital. When we have the Milk Plant operating here, we are keeping capital in the country and enhancing the economy of the country rather than reducing it by exporting capital. So it is better to keep capital in the country even though it costs a little more to do so rather than subsidise labour in another country, because whenever we import we are subsidising labour in another country, and we have 20,000 people unemployed in Barbados.

Why do you think we are encouraging diversification? We are importing into this country \$34 million a year in foodstuffs, \$11 million of which are in vegetables and vegetable commodities. We are satisfied in the Ministry of Agriculture that by diversification we can reduce this amount considerably, and when it is reduced the \$11 million will circulate in the country. If we grow more vegetables in this country, the incidence of labour is increased. There are people who would get three days' work in the out-of-crop season who when vegetables and food crop are planted get six or seven days' work.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen anything in this relative to diversification or three days' work. We are dealing with setting up a Board to control milk.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, encouragement of the dairy industry in this country is the main effort of the Government in an agricultural diversification programme, and this is what Government exerts the greatest amount of energy on. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I was just pointing out to the hon. member that it is better to produce your foodstuffs locally. The encouragement of the dairy industry will result in our importing in this country less beef. We are encouraging the establishment of a pasturage to keep steer; therefore the high incident of meat which is imported would be reduced, and instead of sending money to Argentina or New Zealand or Australia, it will remain here and find work for some of the 20,000 unemployed people in this country. The hon. member can therefore see the benefits of encouraging industry and establishing a dairy industry in Barbados.

I have already answered the hon. member on the question of loans made by the Government. On the question of why the Government took shares, the Government took shares not necessarily because it wanted to do so, but the people told the Government that they were willing to come in, and they wanted

Government to show its interest and be in a position to know what is going on with first hand information on the operation of the Plant. They asked the Government to take a quarter of the shares, see that the people of the country take a quarter and they would take half the shares, so that the confidence of the people would be ensured.

Now I want to take up the hon. member on a point and it is this: despite all the difficulties which the Plant had to face in its first two years of operation, despite the fact that it had an operational loss of \$181,000 in the first nine months, in the second year of operation - which is 1967, January to December - they made a net profit of \$76,000, but they had to meet the losses of the year before of \$181,000; so the Balance Sheet will show an overall loss of something like \$105,000. The position is that on the operations of the Milk Plant last year they did make a profit; so we cannot say they are going down the line.
6.50 p.m.

(An Hon. Member: It made profit from selling imported milk.) The Milk Plant only had authority to import milk during the latter part of last year.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, a point of information, or a point of request or whatever it is.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of information.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I want him to answer a question which I asked him. What he has just said is only an illustration of what we have been saying. The exorbitance of the profit they were getting on the sale of the milk allowed them to make \$76,000 in a short space of time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has made another speech purporting to be a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for Christ Church raised the question of the Chemistry Department. As far as I am aware, we do not have any shortage of apparatus in the Chemistry Department in the Ministry of Agriculture. The position is that you have to decide whether you are going to listen to people who are mentally equipped to answer you in certain questions or not.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker; I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Clause 2, it is stated:

"milk" means fresh, clean, unadulterated lacteal secretion from the complete milking of healthy cows."

Now, when it is adulterated up there by mixing the powdered milk, evaporated milk and everything together, are you still going to call it clean milk from cows? The Minister admits that they are importing milk; he admits that they cannot get this thing fixed right, and yet he is telling us that:

"milk" means fresh, clean, unadulterated lacteal milk from the complete milking of healthy cows."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the definition of "milk product". What he is saying about evaporated milk and so on is taken care of under milk products. You will see it in the interpretation clause. Milk in this clause refers to fresh milk, but what he is dealing with is the question of milk products, which definition is set out further down.

Mr. SMITH: I am dealing now with milk. You just told me that the Government is lending money to buy cows and to encourage people to get fresh milk. You also told me that you cannot compel the people up there to certain things regarding the price of milk. In other words, I feel that the importation of evaporated milk should be stopped. Let us expand the dairy industry by bringing in cows. In other words, do not give them a licence to import evaporated milk. Give the merchants the licence, if needs be. Do not allow them to import evaporated milk, but allow them to do everything with the fresh milk. If it is necessary to import evaporated milk, you should take it in through the other source. If you allow them to import evaporated milk and carry it up there, we would not be sure that we are getting fresh, clean milk from cows. As long as they are allowed to import milk and make so many thousands of dollars, they are going to lose interest in the processing and the expansion of the milk industry. The cheapest way out and the quickest way to make money they will take, and we will be robbed of our clean, fresh cow's milk.

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

Clauses 3, 4 and 5 were called and passed.

7 p.m

Clause 6 was called and passed.

Clause 7 was called. It reads as follows:—

“There shall be paid for the issue or renewal of a dairy keeper’s licence such fees as may be prescribed.”

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I see that this is the provision which deals with the licence. Clauses 5 and 6 deal with the refusal of the authority to grant a licence. I do not see any provision for appealing in this Clause. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What is in the Schedule?) There should be a provision for appealing. I see that provision later on in respect of other things, but I do not see anything here about appealing in respect of the licensing of dairy keepers.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the position is that the Authority for granting the licence is the Chief Agricultural Officer. If he refuses to grant a licence to a person, that person has the right to appeal to the Minister.

Mr. St. JOHN: All right.

The question that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 8 was called. It reads as follows:

“A dairy keeper’s licence may be cancelled by the appropriate authority if -

- (a) the licensee fails to observe any of the conditions subject to which the licence is granted;
- (b) the licensee disposes of or ceases to keep milch animals;
- (c) the licensee requests the appropriate authority in writing to cancel the licence;
- (d) the licensee dies.”

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, speaking of a dairy keeper’s licence, this Clause says that it may be cancelled by the appropriate authority if the licensee fails to observe any of the conditions subject to which the licence is granted. What I am concerned about is this; if this is going to be the situation with the dairy keeper’s licence, what is going to be the situation with regard to the Milk Plant monopoly?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the reply to that question is this; the Milk Plant comes in

that part of Part 3 of this Bill which deals with the milk processors. The Milk Plant has to get the same licence, and it has to adhere to the same conditions, under the rules governing the granting of this licence. If they do not adhere to these rules, then the licence is taken from them. It should be noted that the term “milk processor” is not necessarily limited to the Milk Plant or to any person who is processing milk.

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has made an interesting point. As I understand his definition, the term “milk processor” is so wide that it includes not only people who are dealing with milk but with those who are dealing with ice cream and that sort of thing. What I want to be sure of is that your existing ice cream producers are still going to continue to get their licences. The former senior member for St. George used to do some milk processing and now he is not allowed to do milk processing, in the sense of importing pasteurised or evaporated milk, from imported milk powder because of the decision to grant the concession to the Pine Hill Dairy. We want a policy statement on this, because sometimes he has difficulty getting a licence to import milk for the purpose of doing his ice cream business, and there are a lot of other people who are dealing in ice cream too.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, provided that the applicant satisfies the conditions as set out by the Regulations which are to be printed relative to this Bill, he is entitled to be given a licence. It does not matter whether he is the senior member for St. George or whether he is a member of the Democratic Labour Party or of whatever Party. The position is that if he satisfies the conditions, then he qualifies for a licence. The same person, of which the hon. member has just spoken, some time ago met with difficulty in getting milk powder, and I quite well remember that the Hon. Minister of Trade and I saw to it that he got his milk powder. Therefore, it is not a question of personality; it is a question of principle and of adhering to the Rules and Regulations in respect of this Bill; as long as those conditions are satisfied, anybody is entitled to a licence.

Mr. St. JOHN: It is not a generalised licence. You mean that you will continue the policy of saying that you will only grant a milk processing licence to the Pine Hill Dairy for the purpose of importing milk from abroad and re-constituting it; but you will grant other people licences for other milk products like ice cream and cheese or whatever they want to make. That is what I want to know - or whether you are saying that you will not grant a monopoly for making re-constituted milk, to be sold just as you would buy cows’ milk and ice cream and anything like that, only to the Pine Hill Dairy.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, as I have already explained, all these things are covered in the Regulations. For example, there may be a case of let us say we had in Barbados an industry for the manufacture of lumber. This industry is expected to be given a certain amount of protection. It is a

question of giving pioneer status to people to process corn meal or flour in this country, and it depends on the needs of the country and the number of factories to be allowed. If there is a market for more than one or two or three factories, all of these things are taken into consideration. It depends upon the demand for the product.

Mr. St. JOHN: Therefore, I am correct in saying that a milk seller's licence will be issued, some for some particular products and some for other milk products. For instance, the Pine Hill Dairy could have a milk products processor's licence in respect of milk products, but you can restrict Bico or Buddies only to the manufacture of ice cream and ice cream products. (A MEMBER: That is so.)

The question that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 9 to 11 were called and passed.

Part III was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Part III stand part of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is just one point here relative to Clause 13 (a) which refers to the standard of the premises and equipment being used or proposed to be used by the applicant. Are we to understand that the Board is going to appoint the type of inspectors with the type of knowledge necessary, that you would not put people to inconvenience? For instance, is somebody going to reject your machinery because it is not from the firm he represents and that type of thing? That is what we would like to know.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if a person is denied a licence through the appropriate authority, which is the Chief Agricultural Officer, because of his not having certain equipment, he has the right of appeal to the Minister; and if the Minister is satisfied that there is a hardship brought upon the man because he has an enamel bucket in which he was milking and which is seamless, and the Milk Plant or the Chief Agricultural Officer felt or told him that he should have a galvanised bucket which is seamless, as long as the Minister is satisfied that a man is producing wholesome milk, he will get his licence.

Mr. HINDS: Does, this mean that we will have additional staff in the Ministry of Agriculture to cope with this aspect of the work?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that is "Yes". The Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Health.

The question that Part III stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

7.10 p.m.

Part IV was called and passed.

Part V was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to move that Part V stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. St. JOHN: I asked the Minister on the second reading about the profit that the Pine Hill Dairy makes per case. I said that it was \$3.00. The Hon. Minister said that it was not \$3.00. What is it?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Hon. Minister of Trade gave the figures. He said it was \$2.56.

Mr. St. JOHN: Now, as regards your Milk Advisory Board, as I understand it, I hope it will reflect the point of view of the producer, the distributor, the wholesaler and in particular, the small retailer in the country areas who does not make anything out of it and has to give credit.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will promise the hon. member that when the appointment of this Board is made, I will take all these things into consideration and select people of all sectors that have to do with milk, whether it is selling milk or otherwise. All these sectors will be represented on the Board.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I see here at 33 (2): "The Minister shall appoint as Chairman of the Board a person who has no pecuniary or other interest in the production or selling of milk or milk products."

Now, I understand what that means, but what I would like to know is what about the Minister himself who might have some interest?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: That Minister is not going to be the Chairman of the Board.

The question that Part V stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Part VI was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want it to go on record that I thank the Opposition for their co-operation in assisting us in getting through with this Bill.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for the day.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House stands adjourned until Tuesday, 30th April, 1968, at 2.30 in the evening.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Yes, Sir, Your Honour promised to give a ruling as to the absence from the Order Paper of a Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I never give a ruling between 9 p.m. and 10 a.m. I have a certain amount of hours for sleep. The matter will have my consideration.

Before I adjourn the House, assuming the motion will be passed, I would like to say that the question of Standing Orders of this House is giving me considerable thought during this session, and between now and whatever date this House resumes, it has occurred to me that if certain hon. members would be willing to associate themselves with me - hon. members from both sides of the Chamber - we might consider the revision of Standing Orders.

I would be grateful if the Committee would associate itself with me in respect of that subject matter. I would ask certain hon. members if they would be associated with me. These hon. members are:-

My colleague, the Deputy Speaker, (Mr. Sargeant);

The Chairman of Committees, (Mr. Yearwood);

The Hon. Leader of the House, (Hon. J. C. Tudor);

The Hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. St. John);

The hon. junior member for the City, (Mr. Lynch);

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph, (Mr. Smith);

The Hon. and Learned member for St. Thomas, (Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams).

7.20 p.m.

I also invite to serve the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for St. George.

If those hon. members will associate themselves with me in Committee to continue the revision of the Standing Orders of this Chamber, I would be most grateful. We would be occupying ourselves to good advantage before the resumption of this session.

In anticipation, I thank those hon. members who, I am sure, are prepared to work during the short recess which is provided.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 30th April, 1968, at 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.25 p.m.

HIS HONOR

STANDARD 427 001 155
JAN 17 1975

IN
T
2
1

25 446 34.4 444

150

INVESTIGATION OF THE
RECORDS OF THE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

NOV 1960

NOV 1960

the dated
standing for
the record have

of the State
Recommendations for
Areas in the Island

33