

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 - 76

Tuesday, 14th October, 1975.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 o'clock p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN (Deputy Speaker), Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (Econ.) LL.D., (Prime Minister); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister Without Portfolio); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LLB.; Hon F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting for Tuesday, 7th October, 1975, are before you for confirmation, and unless there are any corrections or alterations, those Minutes will be confirmed.

There being none, the Minutes are duly confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have received the Accounts and Statement for the month of May, 1975 from the Accountant General.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Forgery Act, Cap. 133.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to incorporate the Girl Guides Association of Barbados.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Sugar Workers (Provident Fund) Act.

REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to inform you that I propose to deal with the Report of the Select Committee on the Succession Bill at today's sitting.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Forgery Act, Cap. 133, be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to incorporate the Girl Guides Association of Barbados, be now read a first time.

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

The Question was put and resolved the affirmative without division.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Sugar Workers (Provident Fund) Act, be now read a first time.

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED TO MR. A. DaC. EDWARDS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for leave of absence for four weeks with effect from today for the hon. Member for St. Andrew.

I have before me a certificate based on the advice of his medical advisor that he should be given four weeks further rest with effect from today.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting. That is in view of the fact that we have the Succession Bill to deal with and other weighty matters. If there are any items that the Opposition wants to deal with, we will stay on and have them considered.

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

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

THE SUGAR EXPORT LEVY BILL, 1975

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the end of World War II mainly on account of the agitation made by the Sugar Producers in the Commonwealth Caribbean,

and particularly as a result of a scheme started right here in Barbados, there was considerable agitation that there should be a guaranteed market for sugar supplied by the Commonwealth countries to the United Kingdom, particularly since Commonwealth countries had during World War II, without questioning and without bargaining, without recourse to economic factors, supplied the entire output of our sugar crop to Britain during that time of stress and conflict.

With the possible exception of Australia, the whole of the Commonwealth sugar producing countries can be regarded as developing countries and primary producers; and it is notorious that whereas we have been paying higher prices recently for industrial goods, the prices paid to us by Metropolitan countries for primary products have frequently been below the cost of production.

It was for this reason that the Ministry of Food and Agriculture as it then was in the United Kingdom — the British Government having overall responsibility — that the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement was entered into between the Ministry of Food and Agriculture in England and the Commonwealth Producers Associations, not Governments, to do what they expressed in the Agreement as the intention to ensure reasonable supplies to the United Kingdom at prices which would be reasonably remunerative to producers in the Commonwealth, bearing all the costs of production into consideration.
12.20 p.m.

I think the main feature which one must not ever forget about the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement as it then was is that it was an agreement not between Governments, but an agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Producers Associations or Organisations in the Commonwealth such as the West Indies Sugar Association. Trade Unions and the Governments in the area were not even invited to the talks, but as a result of the arrangements which were made model legislation was sent down to all of the sugar producing countries under the guise of the Sugar Industry Price Stabilisation, Rehabilitation and Labour Welfare enactments which, as far as I remember, were passed in this Parliament in 1947.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that in the first instance the sugar agreement was not a Governmental agreement in so far as the Caribbean exporting countries were concerned; it was not an inter-governmental commodity

arrangement; it was an arrangement between sugar producers, and what I find remarkable is that the Governments of the time did not agitate to become parties to an agreement which so vitally affected the level of economic activity in the respective countries. Under the Act of 1947 a levy was imposed on the sugar industry of \$13.20 per ton which was apportioned by legislation between the three funds, the Price Stabilisation Fund, the Rehabilitation Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund; and the Labour Welfare Fund as far as I remember got the short end of the stick — \$2.40 per ton of sugar exported, \$4.80 for the Rehabilitation Fund and \$4.80 for the Price Stabilisation Fund. So you had the prospect of the sugar producers in Barbados getting \$4.80 per ton for the rehabilitation of their factories, for such things that were allowed at the same time that depreciation accounts for. They were supposed to use this money for keeping their machinery and factories up to standard, and I remember when I came to this Chamber we had on our side, as I then was, backbenchers particularly who urged the Government to extend this to horses and carts, so that by some device people who had lorries and horses and carts got a play, but only a small play; it was not any big play; it was a little berry as one former member for St. Joseph used to say. These things are bagatelles; I do not mean in St. Thomas; I mean trivial amounts were allocated to the peasants and the small growers, and the bulk of the money went to the factories.

The price of sugar at that time was very low. It was less than \$100 as far as I know; something like £17 per ton. But this was the big agreement that the Ministry of Food had negotiated with the sugar producing interests when wages were in my humble opinion practically below subsistence level. So to understand the economics of the sugar industry you must understand that whereas a manufacturer of any other commodity starts off with his cost of production and if he has a vigilant trade union he has to start off with his wage structure, then the other inputs like electricity, gas, fuel, raw materials, and then by good accounting procedure he calculates for amortisation, and in building up his price he calculates for a reasonable margin of profit and then his particular commodity is available to the general public for sale, we had this big arrangement whereby you started off with the price and worked backwards to what the cane grower and agricultural worker used to get, because the unions and Governments were not part of the negotiations.

Let us say that the price was \$100 per ton. This is not free market competition; this was something which was in the best interest of the consumers in the United Kingdom because they got their sugar at good prices. They fixed the price and then the factory got about 26.7% which was, say, \$27, and then there was an amount of, say, \$73 available to pay the cane growers at an average rate of recovery of 8.6 tons of cane per ton of sugar. That is what we get today. Then you had to pay transportation to the factories, and then out of what they got for their canes the cane growers had to pay labour. So there was a limiting factor on wage negotiations because they started off with a fixed price on the sugar industry. In no other industry that I know about do you have an arrangement where you start with the answer and work back to the sum. But this was in the interest of two groups, the consumers in the United Kingdom and the sugar factories in the Caribbean, not particularly the cane growers.

In Barbados they were in the fortunate position that the sugar factories were owned by the large plantations; so what they lost on the swings they made on the roundabouts in the mill. To me this was a completely unsatisfactory arrangement. That prevailed from 1947 with the price of sugar edging up, and you can take it that when the Sugar Producers Associations went up to the United Kingdom to negotiate, they were concerned with their margins, and some of those sugar associations had representatives on them who were directors of the refining interests in the United Kingdom as they still have today, particularly Tate and Lyle, which is the big monolithic refining interest in the United Kingdom with about three or four different refineries scattered from Tilbury to Greenwich throughout the United Kingdom. So here you had a situation where the sugar producers were concerned about their margin of profits in the factory, but they also had an identity of interest with the sugar refiners in the United Kingdom, the refiners being Tate and Lyle, and with Tate and Lyle owning many factories in Trinidad and Tobago, in Antigua — Antigua Sugar Syndicates — in St. Kitts—Nevis—Anguilla, and in Jamaica, leaving only Barbados and Guyana out of their tentacles.

In Guyana they had Bookers-McConnell and Sandbach Parker, again two large English firms who were not so closely tied up with Tate and Lyle interests in the United Kingdom, but again who were concerned about their

factory prices rather than what the cane farmer or cane grower secured.

12.30 p.m.

In Trinidad the same story, Britchin Castle, Caroni and Golden Grove, the estates owned by Tate and Lyle, and Tate and Lyle owning the refineries in the United Kingdom. In 1945, or 1950, when the Labour Party in England had espoused the taking over of the refining processes in the United Kingdom, Tate and Lyle spent between £20 million and £50 million in advertising, taking up three and four pages in the national dailies, criticising the avowed policy of the British Labour Party to nationalise refining interests in the United Kingdom. The agricultural worker in the Caribbean had no say, the Trade Unions had no say, and the Governments took no say — and I say that advisedly — because in 1962 shortly after this Government assumed office I made very strong representations that both the Trade Unions and the Governments in the area should be involved in any negotiations relating to so vital a sector of our economies. I made these presentations to Mr. Maudling, to Mr. Duncan Sandys and eventually my representations bore fruit. I was backed up by the Trade Union Congress of the Caribbean, particularly, I should like to give credit to the Jamaican Cane Farmers Association and Mr. Gurrani, I think it was from the Trinidad and Tobago Cane Farmers, but very strong representation was made, and as a result I think from 1963 or 1964 the Government of Barbados was represented along with other Governments in the discussions on sugar prices, and I do not really understand why the sugar manufacturers in the region were so narrow-minded and so short-sighted as wanting to exclude the Governments from these negotiations, because it has been clearly demonstrated that since the Governments in the region and the Trade Unions have taken part in the negotiations we have been able to carry a lot more weight and to secure better prices in the sugar industry for the sugar which is exported.

In 1962 I attended the first Heads of Government Conference in London at either Lancaster or Marlborough House — it does not matter, it was in London — and Mr. MacMillan as far as I remember was the Prime Minister, and it was the first time that the whole issue of Britain's entry into the European Economic Community was being raised with the members of the Commonwealth. It was the first time that Britain began to make overtures because the Treaty of Rome had been in existence for only about four years, but in the remarkably short

space of time the European Economic Community had made tremendous strides as a community, and Mr. Heath who subsequently became the Prime Minister of Britain on at least two occasions was the person who was responsible for the negotiations between Great Britain and the Inner Six as it was then described. The most of the time at the Conference in 1962 was spent discussing the effect of Britain's entry on Commonwealth trade.

I represented a strong lobby for the Commonwealth Caribbean in so far as sugar was concerned, and the furthest that we got in trying to secure some understanding of what the future of Caribbean exports would be was that a Committee was appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. Duncan Sandys, and I happened to be in discussion about the Associated States with the Secretary of State and was a bit late attending the Committee meeting. I was about five to seven minutes late and when I arrived there I found that the meeting was over, and Mr. Duncan Sandys had come into the room and said that sugar is not a tropical product and as far as the Commonwealth is concerned they were only discussing tropical products, and that was the end of the meeting. This brought me up shortly in my tracks. I am aware that sugar is not a tropical product, as a matter of fact, people tend to think of sugar in terms of sugar cane, but the largest producer of sugar in the world today is the Soviet Union, over nine million tons a year. The total amount of sugar that is produced on the average in years of good rainfall is between 85 million and 89 million tons per annum, and over 72 million tons of that in a good year is not anything that can be traded free across the board, because 72 million tons was subject to special countries or within countries themselves in the way of price supports for beet sugar farmers and so on.

The whole question of sugar and the EEC has not been an easy question, because particularly where France and the United Kingdom are concerned, the best sugar producers have votes and the cane farmers have no votes. It is as simple as that. We have had to fight every inch of the way, a fight which I respectfully submit would have been abandoned a long time ago by the Sugar Associations because they did not have either the political will or the economic clout to bring home to the importers of sugar the importance of proper prices for the exports which we sent to those countries. We started off on a basis that we were in competition with the European beet

producers, and when there was a reasonably good crop of beet in Europe, then the proportion of beet sugar and raw cane sugar processed by the refineries varied and tended to depress the price of cane sugar entering in the United Kingdom, if not in actual terms certainly when the yearly or biennial, as they became, negotiations came up the ability to press on for higher prices and therefore better wages was inhibited by the level of beet sugar production in the United Kingdom. Levies are nothing new being introduced here today. The difference between the levy which is contained in this Bill and the other levy that we have had from 1947 is that one was superimposed by the United Kingdom Government and this one has sprung from this land itself in the light of the economic requirements of the nation in which we live.

Exports of sugar, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have had their ups and downs. We have had in Barbados some very good years during the past 20 years and we have had some terrible years during the past five to seven years. The lowest post war production we ever had was in 1948 when I think our sugar production declined to something like 78,000 tons, but up to the sixties, certainly up to the middle sixties, we have been producing an average of at least 150,000 tons, so much so that we were able to secure the largest percentile quota vis-a-vis average production under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement in that Barbados had a quota at the negotiated price of something around 134,000 tons.
12.40 p.m.

Then we had access to the Canadian Market at World price plus Canadian preference, so that we could easily, in any one year with 167,000 tons, taking the local market into consideration, the Canadian potential and the guaranteed quota at a fixed price under the CSA, do with a sugar crop of 167,000 tons. If the World Market price was better than the CSA price, as happened, I believe, in 1967 — or (Mr. ADAMS: 1964.) — the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says 1964 when we produced something like 202,000 tons. There was a good World Market price. It was the 1963 crop, but there was no point in our producing a lot of sugar in a year when Cuba was producing a lot of sugar and other countries were dumping sugar on the World Market. I think 167,000 tons is a good production for Barbados, and I also think that our agricultural policy ought to aim at something between 165,000 and 167,000 tons. We would then be able to satisfy local

demands, satisfy our CARICOM countries, and also our guarantees under the European Economic Community.

I think in 1957 we had very good prices. In 1958 this is phenomenal. The crop harvesting of sugar cane was late in starting. A Commission was set up under the Chairmanship of now Sir Allen Lewis, Chancellor of the University of the West Indies, as he now is, to inquire into the impasse which had arisen between the Sugar Industry and the Barbados Workers Union. I do not want to go into the details on that, but what I want to mention is that the Sugar Producers in Barbados operated in such a conspiratorial manner that when even Sir Allen Lewis asked them for the accounts to try to ascertain what kind of excess profits they had made in that year as a result of the 1957 bumper crop and good prices, they were reluctant and unwilling to give them. As a matter of fact, at first they refused to do so. I do not know what kind of conspiracy this is, because it is a question of arithmetic. In so far as the profits were concerned, the gross receipts were easily calculated. They refused to disclose it because it was \$9.5 million over and above their normal profits which the Sugar Producers of Barbados had made in that year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I disclose that by simple calculation, by reference to London and by, as they say in the Law Courts, prosecuting from information received — from information received from inside the lion's den itself, from their Chief Statistician who I considered as a friend of Barbados and a friend of the people. It was only then this \$9.5 million was disclosed — Sir Allen Lewis can tell you the story because I gave him the figures. The General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union can tell you about it. They came to some understanding as to the distribution of the profits made that year.

I only want to say that none of the members sitting on the other side is responsible for what happened then, but let me put it in a mild, mutual kind of way. The workers received no support from the Government of the day. As a matter of fact, one Minister went to the then Officer presiding over the Island, and told him that he should lock up Barrow, Crawford, and Tudor, just for trying to make the Sugar Producers — (*Asides.*) — I am not calling any names because the gentleman will never enter this House again. Let the dead bury the dead. I suppose I am going to be criticised if some of the Ministers cannot read the burial service. I

do not want to drag up the past; I am giving you the history of how we arrived at this position.

First, I am saying the Sugar Industry Price Stabilization Rehabilitation and Labour Welfare Act was not designed by the Barbados Government. It was imperial legislation sent down as a result of the 1947 negotiations with the CSA to all the producing countries — a protection written into the negotiations so that there should be some money available for unspecified welfare purposes. Some of the money was used to build schools. My recollection is that Combermere School Hall was completed with \$58,700 out of the Labour Welfare money because they had overspent the vote. It is a laudable purpose. I went to Combermere School, and it has a very nice hall, but I am only recounting history to show what was done with the money. We had in the 1947 legislation \$13.20 a ton until last year.

Now the demands and requirements of this community increase from day to day, and it was only last year that I was able to increase the levy from \$13.20 a ton to \$40.00 a ton. That is under the Act. When we wanted to vary the formula before, we had to get permission from the Secretary of State for the Colonies before Independence, but the overall figure of \$13.20 remained. We increased the amount given to the Labour Welfare Fund, which was always grossly inadequate for the requirements of the Barbados Housing Authority, but we increased the proportions allocated to the three separate Funds so that the Labour Welfare Fund, eventually, got the lion's share of the levy. The Price Stabilization Fund was designed, they say, to ensure proper payments to the factories and so on when the price of sugar fell, and in cases of drought and so on.

We have never had to have recourse to the Stabilization Fund, and if we had been in a position where we would have to go to the Fund to maintain a level of payments to cane growers and to agricultural workers, the Fund would have been grossly inadequate in any event. From time to time, with consultation with the Sugar Producers Federation and the Barbados Workers Union, the Stabilization Fund has been used for National projects. Some has been used, I believe, for the Provident Fund, the original \$3 million, and for various other projects, from time to time, after consultation and with the approval of Parliament.

12.50 p.m.

This formed the Stabilisation Fund which is the only Fund which was not handed back to the Sugar Producers because they had the Rehabilitation Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund. That Fund was accumulated and it has been used from time to time for various projects. I do not have here a list of the things for which it has been used, but any hon. member is entitled to see what it has been used for.

So that is how the levies were provided, not by Imperial Act, but a model Act was sent down. It was increased only last year \$40 a ton so that the Tripartite Committee which is a Committee of Government Officials, Trade Unionists and Sugar Producers was able to make a larger allocation to National Housing which is the main thrust of labour welfare in this island last year than it had made before and which is still inadequate.

At the beginning of the crop last year, in the dying days of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement — because it came to an end in December — the Prime Ministers of Guyana and Jamaica got together with me and said that it was time that we, as Prime Ministers, took a more active part in these negotiations.

The price of sugar — I cannot remember whether F.O.B. or C.I.F. — the price in the U.K. last year, as recently as last year was £61 per ton, that is 20 cents short of \$293 if my calculations are correct. That is for a ton of sugar. Never in my lifetime has any cane grower been paid more than \$26 per ton. Never. It used to be \$11 way back in the 1950s. Then it edged up to \$18 and it stabilised at \$18 a ton for a long time. Then it went up to \$23. Even in the years when they were getting bumper crops and good prices, the cane growers seldom received more than an average — I would like to say an average of \$25 per ton because you Mr. Deputy Speaker, living in an agricultural community, would appreciate that some factories pay a dollar or so more than other factories as will be the case this year; but I will come to that.

I cannot do anything about that because it is traditional in the industry and is based on recovery from factories and that kind of thing, and there is no formula that I have been able to devise whereby you can pay low producers more money than high producers, and it is just impossible.

I have had discussions about it. You can pay on the basis of factory recovery, but you

cannot say that a man living in Charnocks, Christ Church should get \$100 a ton and the man living in the Bulkeley valley should get \$50 a ton. I want you to understand that because we are going to get all kinds of magical formulas on the floor of this House, from all the experts about what should be done and what should not be done and how you should do this, do that or do the other.

But, Sir, the point that I am making at this stage is that the average price paid per ton for sugar cane was something like \$25 a ton. There was a time when you could consider the average yield in Barbados to be 30 tons per acre so that a cane farmer could look forward to a return per acre of about \$700 or \$750. Four or five years ago that was not an impossible return, considering the level of wages at that time, before inflation and so on. With a good average rainfall you could get \$720 a ton leaving out what you might owe to the bank on interest payments. Your average cost of production would vary between \$300 and \$400 per acre so that you could look forward to making \$3,000 or \$4,000 if you had 10 acres; but I do not consider this enough for a man to raise his family on in Barbados. No person in Barbados having 10 acres of land with three or four children could afford to look after 10 acres and do nothing else. He would have to go out and work in Public Works, in Bridgetown, drive a lorry or horse cart and drop some marl in the road or something. There is no such thing as a pure cane farmer who owns ten acres in Barbados. This is a myth.

This is why in our scheme in St. Lucy we are putting people on farms of a minimum of 40 acres. The Minister of Agriculture tells me that it is 20 acres. They seem to be cutting us down to size because originally the concept was 40 acres. I suppose that if you give them a 20 acre farm you could settle more people. That is 40 families and 20 acres — 40 twenty acre lots. I stand corrected; but what I am saying is that you cannot live on a 10 acre lot. Anybody who tells me that he has a family and is satisfied to work 10 acres of land, I would like to see how he does it, because in Barbados it cannot be done.

It could be done, perhaps, with high capitalisation and market gardening as Mr. Sam Marshall did with 11 acres at Eckstein Village, but with very intensive capital inputs; but not a cane farmer. It is just impossible, and I think that everybody in this House will appreciate that.

So, Sir, you had a situation where last year the fixed negotiated price was £61 a ton. Costs were going up all the time, and early in the year when our team was in London negotiating with the Minister who was responsible at the time, he made an offer of an increase of £11 a ton just \$52.80. That meeting did not last very long because I sent a cable saying that if that was the price do not expect any cane sugar from Barbados. I was backed up by Mr. Burnham and Mr. Manley. The meeting adjourned, and next day they put the price up to £83 a ton and that was the price which was paid under the agreement last year; and I think that on the World Market they managed to get a little more. Certainly, we sold some sugar to the US at a better price than £83 a ton. We sold at over £100 a ton; but that was only last year. That was only 18 months ago.

In the interim, then the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement came to an end. Britain was negotiating to enter the European Community with all the implications of beet farming and that kind of thing; and the world price of sugar — not cane sugar, sugar — began to rise at a phenomenal rate. In 1975, as a result of a meeting which Mr. Manley, Mr. Burnham and I had in Jamaica on a Sunday morning we decided there and then that we would take control over the marketing of sugar.

Now, we did not have to do this under any law; but I must say that right from the outset I had the co-operation of the sugar producers in Barbados, particularly of the then Director, Mr. E. R. L. Ward. I did not have much difficulty in persuading the sugar producers that the interests of Barbados were not co-terminus, co-equal or co-incident with the interest of the West Indies Sugar Association because the West Indies Sugar Association was dominated by representatives of Tate & Lyle who were doing a certain amount of square dancing with the producers in the U.K. and speaking out of one side of their mouths in Brussels and out of the other sides of their mouths at Lancaster House during the sugar negotiations.

1.00 p.m.

I said that in no way would the level of economic activity in Barbados be dictated by negotiations made by the representatives of Tate and Lyle, the refiners in the United Kingdom, and so we began to direct the quantities and prices and destinations of the sugar crop of 1975. I want to make this clear; I want to get it on the record. Not a single pound of sugar

has left Barbados in 1975 the sales of which were not directed by me in my office after consultation with the Ministry of Trade, Mr. Dean from Plantations Ltd. and Mr. Erskine Ward. For every single pound of sugar that left this Island this year, the prices that we secured for that sugar and the destinations to which that sugar went were all decisions made in my office and by me in the last analysis, and I take full responsibility for it.

As a result of our marketing strategy, Mr. Manley, Mr. Burnham and myself, we managed to secure an average price for our sugar of over \$1,200 per ton; from \$293 in January 1974 to \$1,200. There are certain fortuitous circumstances. Good prices yes, but the marketing strategy had to be designed in such a way that you sold the right quantities at the right time; and on one occasion I sold forward, that is, futures in sugar for delivery six months later, at very close to \$3,000 per ton. The only reason why we did not sell the total sugar crop at \$3,000 per ton was because we had negotiations going on in Brussels to secure for the industry in the Caribbean a long term agreement which would stabilise — that is put a platform underneath your price structure — the industry over a long period of time at guaranteed prices. It would have been possible for us to gamble and say let us sell the whole 95,000 tons at \$3,000 per ton and take a chance next year, but that would not have been sound policy on our part, and we did not want to do anything — I would not like to use the term "to sabotage", it is such a vulgar expression when bandied about — which would weaken the position of our negotiating team. What we did do was that we said we could only guarantee under the arrangements which were being made to replace the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement which expired in 1974 on 31st December, to reduce our commitment from 134,000 tons to 50,000 tons which would give us a stable quantity at guaranteed price, but there would be a margin for us depending on the size of the crop to play with when we could either sell a little more if they required it or we could get better prices in the free market.

At the same time the U.S. Sugar Act went into abeyance in 1974. Under the U.S. Sugar Act the Caribbean was given a quota of at first 240,000 tons. This was cut down last year to 120,000 tons, but Barbados managed to secure entry for about 20,000 tons into the U.S. market last year which brought the average price of our sugar up beyond the

Commonwealth negotiated price, so that the sugar factories were able as a result of our strategy last year to pay to the cane growers something like \$40 per ton for cane. I personally went. I was the only overseas representative who spoke with Congressman Poag, Chairman of the Congress Agricultural Committee which were responsible for looking after the passage of the Sugar Act through Congress, and his warning to me was that when a new Sugar Act comes in they will look after the people who have been looking after them, and his message was clear.

It was felt that through a misguided policy the Caribbean exporting countries had rushed in previous years to supply sugar on the world market to other countries and neglected the U.S. quota, so that the U.S. quota was really never filled. In 1971, and 1972 we did not come up to our quota, and that is why were cut down to 120,000 tons, because the people who were then responsible for the marketing strategy, that is the West Indies Sugar Association, went grabbing for world market prices in other places and left out the U.S. market, because the U.S. market is also at a guaranteed price and a reasonably good price, but for the past two years we have certainly entered not less than 20,000 tons of sugar in the U.S. market.

Now the U.S. Sugar Act is in abeyance. I cannot predict whether it is going to come back into operation again. That is a matter for the United States Congress, but whenever it does come into operation we will have in addition to the 50,000 tons which under our agreement with the EEC Barbados is now committed to supply to them 20,000 tons to 25,000 tons minimum, because in the years of their need I took Congressman Poag's advice as Chairman of the Congress Agricultural Committee and looked after their requirements just to keep a foot in the door. So this had been part of our marketing strategy.

In so far as the local production is concerned, we consume in Barbados about 14,000 tons of sugar a year. We are also committed to supply the Associated States with about 75% of their requirements, and therefore we cannot ask them in the Associated States to pay the world market prices of \$1,200 per ton for sugar; so we have agreed to supply the Associated States as we did this year with sugar at a price which covers our cost of production, which is around £150 or \$720 a ton roughly. Since we are a

sugar producing country here in Barbados and we are fighting inflation, we decided, that is, between the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Finance, that there would be no increase locally in the price of sugar.

1.10 p.m.

The price which the Barbadian consumer is paying for sugar is based on last year's negotiated price. Now there is something that the average person does not know, the Barbadian consumer pays the same sugar levy of \$40 a ton, as does the consumer in the Associated States, that the people in the United Kingdom have to pay. The Associated States pressed us for selling them sugar free of levy and we said there is no way we can do that when the average Barbadian has to pay. The average price of sugar in Barbados is around 26c a pound, and in the other Caribbean countries except Guyana where it is 11c because it is subsidised it is something like 80c a pound. We do not have any control over that, we cannot tell them at what price to sell their sugar but we certainly have the duty, if we are fighting inflation because charity begins at home, but the producers said they have lost because they had to sell their sugar at last year's price. That is a lot of false arithmetic. They could not sell it that way because we would not allow them to sell it that way. When they are getting these phenomenal prices the thing has to be averaged out and the Barbadian consumer has to start controlling prices on the things which he produces. There is a loss in Barbados because with the average cost of production not more than \$150, somewhere between \$141 and \$150, and it is very difficult to pin it down, but I am positive it is not more than \$150 and I think it is more than \$141, because when you try to get information from the factories and so on the same words mean different things to them than they mean to you and me. Let me put it that way. You find this in all accounting procedures. There are as many accounting procedures as there are accountants in Barbados, but the cost of production in Barbados varies between \$141 and \$720 a ton, so if you say the average return is \$1,200 there is a margin on each ton of sugar of approximately \$500, let us say, based on this year's cost of production.

There have been in Guyana and Jamaica for the past two years sugar levies. The Government of Guyana has a formula whereby this year alone — of course they have a larger production than we have — they will make over \$270 million out of their sugar levy. I am not quite sure what the Government of Jamaica is

going to make but I want to say this, that neither in Jamaica nor in Guyana or even after the recent 100% award in Trinidad is the level of wages secured by the Trade Unions better than it is in Barbados. I have not computed the Trinidad award on paper, let me have some slight reservation about that, but the level of wages in agriculture in Barbados for the past 15 years has been higher than in any other part of the Caribbean. I say that without any fear of contradiction whatsoever. I have behind here at least one representative of the Trade Union in Barbados and they collaborate very, very closely with their counterparts in the other Commonwealth Caribbean countries.

The cane farmers in Guyana this year received \$29 (Guy.) a ton for their canes, that is at least 20% lower in terms of Barbados dollars. The agricultural workers when they went on strike in Guyana earlier this year during the crop went on strike because they were asking for a 30% raise on their wages and the Government was only prepared to offer them 15% and the negotiator in his report which I have here came out with an award of something like 20% increase in wages. At the Transport Board here in Barbados that is a joke, some of the people got 75% increases in wages. The University people are asking for 40% on basic salary and 24% on housing allowance. In Guyana a 20% is supposed to be inflationary and their wages are still below what ours were two years ago in Barbados and they are marketing the sugar in the same markets that we are marketing in, and in many cases having a much larger crop than we have they were able to sell to China, Algeria, Tunisia and some young democracy behind the Iron Curtain. They were able to sell or exchange sugar at very good prices and they have not disclosed to the public up to now what their average price has been for the over 360,00 tons that they have exported so far. They have two crops a year in Guyana. They do not need irrigation and sometimes rainfall can be an embarrassment to them because the fields get waterlogged, so they do not have the problems that we have. They have two crops a year, they market their sugar all over the world, and the formula that they use in Guyana went up to 80%. I am looking for the formula here, but I do not want to delay the House. Their formula went up to 80% over and above a certain price.

I have the Trinidad formula and in this same document I have the Guyana one, but in the Trinidad Act this is what the levy is.

Where the price does not exceed \$480 per ton, no levy

Where the price exceeds \$480 but not \$576 per ton, 15% of the excess over \$480

Where the price exceeds \$576, but not \$720 per ton, 30% of the excess over \$576

Where the price exceeds \$720, but not \$960 per ton, FAS 50% of the excess over \$720

Where the price exceeds \$960, but not \$1,200, 70% of the excess over \$960

Where the price exceeds \$1,200 per ton FAS, 80% of the excess.

That is the Trinidad levy. In addition to that an excess process tax is levied on the sugar companies. The tax will apply when the charter profits, that is, profits before tax, exceed \$15 million in the case of Caroni Limited and \$2 million in the case of Orange Grove. The tax will be at a rate of 25% and will be applied to the excess profits defined in the weigh-in, so that the factories in Trinidad and Tobago in addition to their normal company tax rate which in Barbados is 40%, I think it is higher in Trinidad, it is probably 50%, will pay an additional 25% excess profits tax.

1.20 p.m.

They would pay an additional 25% excess profits tax in addition to paying the levy into the Fund. I also have here the wages paid in Trinidad and Tobago. I have the Agreement between the Sugar Producers Federation of Jamaica and the BITU and the NWU in Jamaica as to their wage levels for this year. I also have the award dated 21st June, 1975, which I mentioned earlier in my speech — the award which was made by a Mr. Victor Crane, as arbitrator in the sugar industry in Guyana, to verify that the wage level is below what it is in Barbados. The award which he made was that the wage increases and increments for 1974 and 1975 will apply to all categories of NPCA workers as follows:

1974, 20% on the rates paid at the 31st December, 1973.

1975, 10% on the wages paid as at 31st December, 1974.

The cost of these increases will be in the vicinity of \$16 million. That is a country with a sugar production of about five times the size of the sugar production of Barbados.

The hon. Member for St. Lucy can tell you that, as a result of the collective bargaining conducted by his Union with the Sugar Producers Association in Barbados, or the Sugar Producers Federation or whatever they choose to call themselves, the net effect of these negotiations amounted to about 74% increase. Not a 20% and a 10%, but 40% and a 30%. It is 74% as compared with the wages paid in January last year in the sugar industry in Barbados. In addition to that, even after I finish with these sugar levies, they are going to participate further in a 40% additional a month increment which I hope, if we do not prolong this debate too much, they will get within the next two weeks. The cane farmers will get a minimum average of \$10.00 a ton more for their cane varying from \$69.13 to \$73.20. Nobody should get less than \$69.00. If they get less than \$69.00, they can come to me and I will see that they get paid. They have received \$60.00 already. Some will receive \$13.00 more, and some will receive \$9.00 more. That is an undertaking that I give.

From March this year I have watched the market; I have done my calculations, and you will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I thought it is only fair for everybody to know before I went away in May that I intended to put on this levy so that the Sugar Producers would not go and do what we call in Barbados 'lick out the money' and then say they did not have any money to pay into the Fund, or no money to pay the cane farmers, or no money to pay the workers. I held back my hand. I telephoned the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union and told him: I hope that you are going to conclude your negotiations because I do not want to announce anything about levies before your negotiations are completed. Whatever you and the Sugar Producers arrange is all right with me, but I cannot delay after the 31st day of May.

I also want to state categorically that at no time did the Barbados Workers Union had any idea of how the Funds were going to be allocated, neither did they make any request. They were locked in battle with the Sugar Producers Federation, and they arrived at their conclusions completely unfettered by any decisions which were impending, as far as I was

concerned. Neither they nor the Sugar Producers Federation had any knowledge of the quantum of the levy which I intended to impose, although I had said that this is an economic situation which calls for the same measures as had been introduced by my two colleagues in Jamaica and Guyana with whom I have always worked closely in consort. I have been doing it for 35 years.

There is nothing new to me to have a common approach to an economic problem. Some of our problems are greater than others and they must, necessarily, be variations in the timing and the methods used in order to bring about the better economic conditions that we seek for our nations as a whole. When we are discussing Sugar Levies, we know what the other people get on with. I do not want to start a quarrel, but whenever there is money mentioned in Barbados you can hear certain people beating a drum agitating people. I call it distressed politics. They try to make people believe that there is somebody holding back, or carrying away something that they should have. This is endemic in the political life of this country, and they trade on the fact that one of their prophets, or high priest, said that Barbadians have a short memory. They trade on that and they go about agitating people.

I want to tell them this. I make on economic and social grounds, no apology for introducing sugar levies in Barbados. They are not new to Barbados, and when the economic situation demands and the prices which we get for export justify the imposition of further levies, or heavier levies, I will impose them for the overall betterment of the community over which we have control. The alternative to an imposition of a sugar levy is to allow the planters to do what they like with the money, and what they choose to dispense to the under privileged will be down Broad Street within three days. The people will take home gas ranges, television sets, all imports from abroad, therefore, increasing our balance of payments difficulties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have to see our strategy. When I say our, I mean the Prime Minister of Jamaica, the Prime Minister of Guyana, the Minister of Finance, when they had one, of Trinidad and Tobago. I mean Mr. George Chambers, not the triumvirate that they have now. But his strategy introduced on the 1st of January, this year is imposing levies up to 80% in Trinidad. We all have the same objects in view. We cannot allow one narrow section of this community, because they are in a privileged

position of owning land, to dictate the level of economic activity in the country. We could not allow them to sit on Mount Olympus and dispense largess in a way which they feel would be best suited to their objectives, which are neither social nor economic, as far as I can see.

The alternative to having sugar levies in this country is to let them do what they like and then tax all the other people in the country to make up for the projected deficits which, even after my Budget Speech made earlier this year, was of the magnitude of \$15 million.

1.30 p.m.

The objective of the Bill — I do not go through a Bill and say that Clause 1 says this and Clause 2 says that. I know about this. I helped draft it; and you can read and I presume that all the other hon. members, even those on the other side, have been exposed to a certain amount of formal education in Barbados. So I do not burden you with the Clauses of the Bill. I am telling you about the philosophy behind the Sugar Levy and not the mere clauses of the Bill or the quantum of the levy which is imposed.

It is very simple — to cover your budget deficit which the House has already approved. This was approved in the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. This is a deficit of \$15 million. For the past six years the Sugar Industry has not made any contribution by way of tax to the revenue of this island. You and me and even the Transport Board drivers have been carrying this country by pay as you earn contributions, and the moguls of the Sugar Industry have not made a single penny contribution except by way of taxes on their salaries and by way of company profits.

Why? Because from 1967, 1968 year of assessment, 1967 year of income, they have established that they have lost money because of the prices being paid under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. They have claimed that those prices were not remunerative to the producers of sugar and they lost money.

They claimed that, and I believe them. The Commissioner of Island Revenue believes them. Well, if he believes them I have to believe them because he sees their returns and I do not see them. I do not have any access to their individual returns. In 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974, Mico Garment workers, Juman's Factory workers, taxi drivers and members of Parliament — we have all been carrying the Sugar Industry. They have not contributed one penny, and they

have been using our roads, big, heavy trucks breaking up the roads all the way down to the Deep Water Harbour day after day and night after night and not one penny contribution made to the Ministry of Communications and Works to keep these roads in order from 1968 year of assessment.

I am saying that because the Income Tax Act which was written by them says that if one factory made \$1 million last year and it lost \$3 million in the previous five years it is allowed to write off the profits made in this year and even next year against all the losses sustained in the previous years; but I am not allowed to do that. They are allowed to break up our roads with the big, heavy lorry. They use our water that we are paying for. They have been doing that from the 1968 year of assessment, writing off the taxes so that we have reached a situation now. (ASIDE: How about the tourists?) We can get at the sugar producers, but we cannot get at the tourists; therefore Peter will have to pay for Paul.

They have been breaking up our roads for the past six years. What I am saying may sound amusing and comical, but it is true. They tell Mr. Campbell to go and read Section 2 of the Income Tax Act, but do not forget that I lost \$3 million so you still have to wait for another five years and then carry that forward dropping a year. You understand the strategy? You drop a year at a time. So in this year 1975 you are going to drop the 1970 year of assessment. If you lost in 1971, 1972, 1973 and 1974 you are still not paying any taxes. So in 1985 these people may still not be making a contribution to the economy that you and I have to make. I got more than 3,000. This time my computer tells me 3,987. You can write that down. I was only four votes out last time. This time I may be three out. I am sorry Mr. Deputy Speaker. That was not intended for you.

The whole point is that you look at it from two angles. You are hearing shouts about the poor agricultural workers. I am nothing to do with the wage levels of the agricultural workers, Sir. That is for the union. What I am trying to establish is that the union got a 74 per cent increase for the agricultural workers plus a 40 per cent out of any excess which there may be. I have the amount here that they will get after this Bill is passed, whereas in Guyana they got 20 per cent on 1973 and 10 per cent on 1974 and that was negotiated in June this year; and our wages were way above the Guyana wage levels, and they have a bigger sugar export than we have.

Well, if you look at it from the point of view of the sugar factories, they do not have a

case. If you look at it from the point of view of the workers, their case has been made for them already. So anybody who is quarrelling now will have to quarrel with our comrade from the northern parish and with our comrade from St. Michael West and not with me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now whom does that leave out? You have the factories on one side and you have the workers on the other. In the middle now we hear about the poor cane growers. When they talk about the poor cane growers, as I said before, some of these poor cane growers are cane cutters getting the 74 per cent increase. I think that it is now 18 per cent of the cane production in Barbados that comes from people with less than 10 acres of land, none of them living off the land exclusively; and they get it one way or they get it the other way. They get it either as general workers or as sugar workers.

That leaves the cane growers to cover their cost of production. The cost of production in Barbados of cane per acre now, with the rise in the price of fertilisers and so on — on figures supplied to me by the Sugar Producers Association — I do not like to speak from memory on this but I think the cost of production is \$672. Mr. Deputy Speaker I would like to correct those figures. That \$672 relates to another matter.

1.40 p.m.

The \$672 relates to another matter which I have here, but let us take \$600. Even a man who has produced only 10 tons of canes per acre at \$60 per ton would already have made a profit. Later on I will check on the figure, but the Minister of Agriculture assures me it is \$560, not \$672. The \$672 relates to another calculation I have. An amount of \$60 has been paid out by the sugar factories as a first payment. Some people have produced 12 tons in the dry rainfall areas. At 12 tons an acre they still make a profit, but it is not a big profit. It is only \$120 an acre and if a man has ten acres, that is only \$1,200 for a whole year's work at \$100 a month; so obviously where the factories are getting 26.5% of the net receipts on sugar and molasses for factory expenses, we have to watch this very carefully. 26.5% of the total net revenue received by the sugar industry is going to the factories and they have been amalgamating the factories. There are about ten or eleven at the most, and during the coming year — I have somebody coming down from one of the international agencies — I intend to look very carefully at these accounting procedures, because I am not satisfied with the

rehabilitation money, with depreciation on the straight line basis and everything else that they are allowed, and that the 26.5% to the factories is justified; but I am not in a position to interfere with it directly this year. They say that in Jamaica the factories get 38.45%. That is Jamaica, but this is Barbados, and do not forget that the Jamaican factories belong to Tate and Lyle; so they would have some super accountants to juggle around with their figures to make it look big, but we are living in Barbados and I do not think the 26.5% is justified. When you take out 26%, that is about \$25 million for the factories alone, and the rest is left for the sugar levies and the agricultural workers and the cane growers. That in a nutshell is the whole situation.

Now in this Act the sugar levies will continue. The \$40 under the Act of 1947, that is, the Price Stabilisation, Rehabilitation and Labour Welfare Act, have got to be deducted before we compute the amount that will be paid on the levy. There are certain deductions that have to be made.

I am sorry about the delay, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I was looking for the Bill. From the levy the \$40 per ton will be deducted and certain other expenses such as insurance and transportation of the sugar from the factories to the bulk installation at the Harbour. All these things will be deducted before the levy is imposed; for instance, a Harbour levy of \$8, selling expenses of 5% of the f.o.b. price, and a non-taxable allowance of 10% of the f.o.b. price. This is the formula which will be utilised. We will deduct the \$40 for the three funds before the levy is imposed; terminal charge of \$5, a Harbour levy of \$8 which they have to pay; selling expenses of 5% of the f.o.b. price, and in addition to all that, before the levies are imposed there will be a non-taxable allowance of 10% of the f.o.b. price.

Now the total amount of sugar produced in Barbados this year was 96,889 tons; that would include fancy molasses, and the total revenue accruing to the industry was \$77,527,875, and this is how the revenue was earned: 14,100 tons of sugar were sold locally; 1,210 tons went to the Caricom countries; 9,500 tons were sold to the United States at \$2,680 a ton; another 4,750 tons were sold at \$1,205 per ton to the U.S.; 600 tons to New Zealand at \$1,196 a ton; 9,763 tons on the free market at \$1,450; 30,000 tons to the United Kingdom under the agreement at \$1,196, and the final 20,000 tons to the United Kingdom at \$1,050. The difference there of course is devaluation of the pound against the Barbados dollar, because the price is still £261 per ton, and then the final sale to the United States was at \$914 for 6,966 tons.

Now if you start at the top and come down to the bottom, the allowances which I have made on those sales before the levy is imposed is as follows: \$40 on the local; \$89.90 on the Caricom; \$455 on the first sale to the United States; \$233.75 on the second sale to the United States; \$232.40 on the first sale to New Zealand; \$270.50 on the sale to the free market; United Kingdom \$232.40 and \$210.50 respectively, and on the last sale to the United States \$190.10 per ton. I have given the quantities, I have given the prices, and I have given the deductions. The total receipts amount to \$94,194,322.

1.50 p.m.

The first sale that any levy is imposed on is the first sale to the U.S. 15%, the second sale to the U.S. 30%, the sale to New Zealand 30%, sale to the free market 30%, the sale to the United Kingdom 30%, sale to the United Kingdom, second amount, 30%, and the final sale to the U.S. 10%. If the cost of production was at \$600 a ton, the lowest price that was received was \$914 a ton. All of this talk that I heard businessmen and sugar producers with, well, suppose the price was £251 immediately they would lose, but there were no sales at any marginable prices. It will be made in the Order, Sir, but as far as I remember the levy provides for 10% between £160 a ton and £199 a ton, 30% between £200 and £350 and over £351, 50%.

The point which I am making is this, that even at the time when some of the sugar producers were saying this levy was not going to work, because suppose they sold at £251, no sugar was sold on the margin. The sugar sales were made well inside those blocs so there was no question of £1 per ton causing anybody to lose \$1 million or anything like that. I just want to dispel that fallacy once and for all. At the time when the amounts were calculated by me of 10%, 30% and 50% there was no sugar sold anywhere on the margin so there is no question that if you move up \$3 that you are now in a 15% bracket, if you understand what I mean, and this was the propaganda they were spreading amongst the agricultural workers. I know all about it, you live in the sugar belt and you would know too, and I could always verify by asking you but I already know. Any innovation that you make in Barbados you can always find distress politics. You only have to look outside through your window and you will find somebody willing to ring a bell, blang, blang, blang to say that the world is coming to an end and Doomsday has arrived because you introduce something that they are not accustomed to, even when it is for the overall

good of the people who are keeping all the noise, so I am not worried about that. As I said before, if the occasion arises again I will try to get back more of the taxes that the sugar producers — I would not say they have not paid — claim they are not in a position to pay and let them pay part of the cost of running the whole economy in which all of us benefit. That is all I have to say on that.

If the hon. members would like some more information on the levies in the other countries, I have those levies here. If they do not want the information it is a matter for them, but the levies even in St. Kitts-Nevis and Anguilla are of a magnitude which does not compare with what we have done here in Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that I have given a history of levies in Barbados. I have tried to give as much statistical information as I can do in a short space of time, and just turning to the Act itself, certain amendments have been circulated and are now embodied in the Act as amended which I will deal with when the Bill goes to Committee. The Act makes provision for the Minister of Finance to appoint a committee to advise on the disposition of any levies which are imposed. On that committee will be a representative of the Ministry of Finance, a representative of the Ministry of Trade, and I intend to select representatives from the employers and workers organisations, but as I said in my statement made earlier in the year, in May, this year it is intended to allocate the levies in the concluding months of the year as to \$8 million for housing which is badly needed in the island and which we have not been able to get from the Labour Welfare Fund, as to \$4 million to sugar producers at a rate of interest which I consider reasonable, and as to \$2 million for mortgages for the Barbados Workers' Union's scheme.

I want to say a word on that in conclusion. At meeting after meeting of the National Insurance Board, the Board has urged that more National Insurance funds should be channelled into mortgage financing. We have done some mortgage financing with the Public Officers' Housing Loans and we have tried to persuade the commercial banks where we have fixed deposits to do some mortgage financing as well. Some people say the people in the Union are not the people who work with the money. I want to dispel this idea that this money belongs to anybody different from the

Government of Barbados, the Government being the people of Barbados. They have been urging on us to use funds from the National Insurance Fund to lend the Barbados Workers' Union for mortgages. The majority of the workers in the Barbados Workers' Union are agricultural workers. The largest section in the Barbados Workers' Union is the agricultural section, the factory workers and agricultural workers.

Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took his seat.
2.00 p.m.

All of those things are included in the arrangement for the \$2 million, and they still have access to the \$8 million. How can you say that the agricultural workers are being left out and the people in Bridgetown will get the money? Do the people who work in Bridgetown go to St. Philip to live? Only one of the Deputy Clerks of the House does that. Who else in his right senses, with all due respect, would do that? It will be the agricultural workers who will be getting improved standards, and not only do they have access now to their special fund, as members of the Union, but they have access to the national houses as well. They also have access to all the other funds. They are getting it going and coming. They are just like the Port workers who have their own Provident Fund going down there, and they still have access to the National Insurance Fund.

You will find all kinds of agitation being drummed up because money is in the air. The people on the other side always feel it is a good way to agitate people, to get them disturbed, and upset them by telling them there is money they should have got and have not got. All I can tell them is to come and get it. My Committee comprised of members of the Public Service, the Ministry of Finance particularly, the Workers Union and the Employers Federation, specifically the Barbados Sugar Producers, will be there to see the channelling of these funds into productive sectors of the economy after, of course, the Government have deducted, for general revenue for the benefit of the whole Island, what we think the whole Island justly deserves, after having carried the sugar industry on our backs for such a long time. I want to make that point. I have been carrying the sugar industry; the Marshal has been carrying the sugar industry; the Clerk of the House has been carrying the sugar industry. We have been carrying them on our shoulders, and they are talking about their money. It is not their money; it is our money.

We have been carrying the shopkeepers, too. All they have been doing is carrying us to court.

Anyhow, this is the situation, so you have to look at the total economic situation of the country. I could go on to discuss the inflationary effects of releasing money and so on, but it is not necessary for me to labour that point. We are living in an era when inflation is rampant, and we cannot allow money to be dissipated in the economy on imports which would further affect our balance of payments. We are going to see that any future excess profits that accrue to any industry in Barbados will be shared not only by the workers in that particular industry, but the whole community which has to pay taxes will have the burden on them eased as well.

As I have said, the alternative to a levy is \$15 million more in taxation on everybody, or an excess profits tax on the sugar industry alone which would go into general revenue. This is the line taken by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, but it is a line which I have not elected to take. The amendments, as I have said before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will be dealt with in Committee. The time being just after two o'clock, I take great pleasure in moving that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. ADAMS rose --

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that the Sitting be suspended for one hour -- until a quarter past three.

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

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
2.05 p.m.

On resumption --

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed. When this sitting was suspended the second reading of the Bill was moved. Any members who desire to contribute to the debate may do so.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are few occasions in social, or parliamentary life, or

indeed life of any sort, that illustrate the twists and turns of human nature more than those occasions when you hear a reformed drunkard extolling the virtues of teetotalism, or a proselyte at the gate extolling the sanctity of the new God. Listening to the Prime Minister today, it was hardly possible for me to believe that this was the man who made a speech 10 years ago, the very year that he said he was meeting Mr. MacMillan and others and Mr. Sandys, or close to the year, stating that he did not wish to see another cane blade in Barbados. This was the man who, today, said that Barbados' sugar industry ought to aim for a total of 167,000 tons of sugar.

He did not leave the history of the sugar industry to the Minister of Agriculture, perhaps, wisely, but he outlined the history of the sugar industry since the war, perhaps, for the benefit of the House of Assembly, perhaps for a wider audience some of whom may have been voters, perhaps for his own benefit, but it is an exercise which we on this side would wish that he had undertaken before. If he knew all that much about sugar and was prepared to put the case for sugar, for that is what was done today so completely and in such depth, and as far as I can judge with only a few lapses into what I would not like to call a customary inaccuracy. If he was in such a position as to do all of that today, why was he not in such a position in 1964?

Now, the debate has been conducted without Party rancour, or without personal rancour, and that fact is much appreciated on this side. But there are one or two minor errors of emphasis, from our point of view, and perhaps minor inaccuracies which ought, for the record, to be put quite straight. We do not believe it is accurate to say that the Government first took part in the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement negotiations in the year 1963 or 1964. I am tolerably certain that well prior to that date Sir Grantley Adams accompanied, at least, Sir Archibald Cuke and others to such negotiations in London. The Prime Minister's errors, if an error, is one which I know is widely held because I went out of my way some years ago, perhaps 10 years ago also, in conversation with the then Secretary, Mr. Norris, I think, of the British West Indies Sugar Association to chide the Association for never permitting the Government to take part in negotiations on the price of sugar. Mr. Norris, on that occasion, assured me that I was wrong and cited certain earlier occasions which went back, indeed, before 1958, although that seems a little unlikely to me. Since he spoke of Sir Grantley Adams in particular, he must have been speaking of a time prior to 1958. The point is

worth checking. It may be that the Union never had any share until 1964. I have always believed it to be true and always much resented it, as I think the Prime Minister resented it, but I have been told from other sources that this is not entirely accurate.

Well, I would also like to take issue with the emphasis of the Prime Minister's speech when he dealt with the fixed price for sugar. It was made to sound something unique, but at that stage fixed-price-commodity Agreements were by no means unique. Sugar was itself as widely traded throughout the world at fixed prices. Other commodities, even including extractive commodities, copper in Zambia and in Chile and so on, were sold by one arm of the great Anglo-American Copper Combine to another arm of the great Anglo-American Copper Combine at fixed prices. Even oil surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is an example of a commodity that has always been traded at a fixed price. The Oil Companies fixed the price of oil from time to time. They fixed the price of oil in the 1930's at \$2.00 with small variations depending on transport cost; the price went up, and there is still a fixed price for oil.

3.20 p.m.

So it is by no means unusual for commodities exported in bulk to be traded in the world at fixed prices. The advantage to the producers in theory is that they have a guaranteed market with certain production and the advantage to the consumers is that they have a fixed price. I believe that even at this stage the Government is still trying to fix prices although they are fixed on a sliding scale and not a flat rate as was done originally with the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement price; and we on this side, what we say about the Sugar Industry — because we are putting forward some ideas today — I do not think that we would like to be associated with any general attack on the idea of getting a guaranteed market and a guaranteed price for our products. I think, that taken to extremes, the Prime Minister's arguments might well be construed to mean that. Indeed, the whole business of the marketing strategy — I have spoken on that in here before. If Mr. Erskine Ward chooses to give the Prime Minister credit for the marketing strategy in sugar, that is up to him. I do not myself believe that there is anything that the Prime Minister could teach Mr. Ward about the sale of sugar or how to make a dollar.

I see it in a different light. I see it in the light that Mr. Erskine Ward, wise and farseeing a man as he is, expected that with the increase in

sugar prices would come a very substantial increase in taxation. Mr. Erskine Ward, Mr. Armstrong, the Robinsons and the others have gone out of their way to flatter the Prime Minister in the hope that the sugar producers would be released from the full lash of taxation. Whether they succeeded it is for them to judge. I will not pass judgement on it because I hold no brief for the Sugar Producers Association. None whatever. Whether they are satisfied that having abased themselves they have received their due reward in that exercise is entirely in their hands.

The Prime Minister has dissociated himself from the wages which the sugar workers receive on the one hand, and on the other hand is going to dissociate himself from the wages which the sugar workers should receive and the rewards which they should receive as the fruits of their labours; and we expect that the representative of the Barbados Workers Union is going to accept the force of our arguments on this particular matter.

It may be that in Guyana because the sugar workers are Indians, Mr. Burnham is not interested in paying them a living wage. It may well be that in Jamaica, perhaps also for political reasons, the sugar workers are unable to hold the clout with the PNP Government that they might have held with the Bustamante Government; but that is no excuse for the sugar workers of Barbados being in any way short changed when there is a possibility of real prosperity coming to them.

But to continue with the history, Sir. I do not want to take us all around the world and back again in two hours. We should be glad that Jules Verne is not alive. He took us around the world in 80 days and the Prime Minister takes us around in 80 minutes; but there are one or two points that must be touched on.

There is the question of the difference between the sugar levies. Now, I said that this debate was certainly one without party rancour; and the Prime Minister was a member of our party in the days when as fair a deal as was possible at the time was being worked out for the sugar workers. It must be remembered that popular Government came to this country from the rural districts in Barbados. It came to this country through the initiative of the sugar workers and those who organised them and from the support which the sugar workers embodied in their union and the Barbados Labour Party when it was engaged in a fight against the plantocrats.

I think, Sir, that the Prime Minister is selling himself short when he indicates that the

progressive social measures carried out by a Government of which he was part — he was not in the House in 1947, but he was in the House in 1951. He was in the House with the Holidays With Pay Act. He was in the House when the money that had been accumulated was being directed to be spent, and he is selling himself short when he devalues the part that popular government played in bringing about the Labour Welfare Fund for example. I select that because I agree with him that the Rehabilitation Fund was only another one in a long series of measures which have been brought to this House because it is based on the whole quota by which Barbadian planters were able to get together with the British Government in order to keep the Sugar Industry viable in terms of capital injection in this country.

But, Sir, I think that the whole cause of both political parties — the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party — is ill served by suggesting that the social reforms of the party from 1947–1952 that did so much for the sugar workers of this country were in any way dictated by the Colonial Office. The Colonial Office or the Southern Division of the Privy Council, whatever it was 200 years ago, did indeed impose a sugar levy to allow the Government of Barbados to be carried on with the 4 per cent tax on exports. I do not regard the 1947–52 period as being a period in which it was the British Government that was taking any kind of initiative. Nor do I regard the present levies, as the Prime Minister seems to regard them as an exercise of the popular will native to Barbados.

The present levies are taxation pure and simple. They are no more or no less than that. Whether they are necessary, whether they are too much or not enough are all questions about which we can argue; but I have yet to hear any Minister of Finance say you should be glad that we put on this levy because it is a native Government putting it on. Taxes are taxes whoever imposes them.

I know that the Prime Minister would have made minced meat in his days in the Opposition and perhaps would make even finer meat of any Minister in his future days in the Opposition — of any Minister who got up and said you voted for this Government and if this Government taxes you, you should be glad. Nobody has to be glad because of these levies. These levies take money out of the pockets of the sugar workers just as much as out of the pockets of the sugar producers.

Now, I said at the start of my speech that it is nice to hear a reformed drunkard preaching the virtues of lemonade. Well, it is nice to hear the Prime Minister preaching the virtues of sugar and preaching that we should aim for 167,000 tons. I think that that figure is misconceived because it is based on the whole quota.

I would be very glad to see our sugar production over 150,000 tons or a minimum production of 150,000 tons constantly aimed at. I will not quarrel with the figure, but how can we aim at this figure when the Government of Barbados has taken steps both negative and positive over the last few years to discourage the production of sugar in this country? The first step that I will advert to is the same negative “no cane blades” speech. Nobody could approach sugar production with confidence after that speech in the face of the hostility of the head of the Government; and that still remains true to some extent.

There are a certain number of sugar planters — in case the Prime Minister does not know — going about saying that they have received assurances from the Minister that low loans will be made available at interest rates sufficiently favourable to allow them to modernise and make injections of capital to countervail the bad effects of the sugar levy. These are sugar planters who I know are close to the Prime Minister and there are seeking to persuade other planters to accept and give general support to the Prime Minister. These are planters in St. George and St. Philip, and one is indeed in both St. George and St. Philip and in Christ Church as well because his house stands on the borders of the three parishes.

The Prime Minister will know who I mean. They are telling other planters do not mind the levy. The Prime Minister is going to help us really. Plantations Limited has been told by certain people they will share in other aspects of prosperity so that what they may lose in sugar growing estates they may find that they will gain in the importation of various types of agriculture machinery, although I cannot think what that will be.

I do not know if the Prime Minister knows all of this. I just throw it out. I do not believe that he would want to know that there are sugar planters going about the country soliciting support for him and saying how he is really their friend. He does not need me to tell him the names, whether privately or publicly. He knows

the parties concerned, the knighted gentleman and his son and the other people whom I have mentioned. He very well knows who they are. There are good canvassers which he has in that quarter as well. Thank goodness that they are not canvassing for the Barbados Labour Party.
3.30 p.m.

The reason why they are not canvassing for the Barbados Labour Party is that from the time we realised a couple of years ago and last year indeed that we were being misled and sought to be used as tools where the Sugar Producers' Association was concerned, we have utterly, I at least have refused to receive any more messages or put cases in particular ways and so on. The day that I received a message from an official of the Sugar Producers' Association not to attack the Prime Minister in the House because that would make him very hard on the Sugar Producers, I began to be suspicious, and it came from somebody relatively high up in our party, but fortunately one whose judgment enables him to see through these things. Let the Prime Minister be the beneficiary of all their fine words. I never wish an editorial in the Sugar Producers' Gazette to praise me. They do not send me the Gazette anymore so I do not know what is in the editorials. I do not wish any front page editorial to congratulate Tom Adams from a sugar producer as to any aspect, a speech, a policy or anything he has put forward. Let the Prime Minister have it all. He will put the case for sugar; we will put the case for the sugar workers. Let him deal with the producers. If he has any contacts to make, let him make his contacts with those. He told us in here how he rejected contacts with the Barbados Workers' Union on the question of wages. He is proud to tell you how he and the sugar producers sat down to put money in the sugar producers' pockets by a marketing strategy for sugar, and in the same speech he tells you that he has nothing to do with the wages for the workers, that he leaves them to his colleague from the north and the hon. member for St. Michael West. He will help the sugar producers to negotiate what price they will get for their product, but he will not help the workers to negotiate what wage they will get for their labour.

Now, Sir, it is this aspect of negotiations to which I would now like to refer. The Barbados Labour Party had long felt that the dominant position played by the producers of sugar in the marketing of sugar was one which is not tolerable in a society whose two leading political movements organise themselves as social democratic movements. The Prime Minister implicitly agrees with this; he must, since he has

spoken in a critical way of the fact that the Sugar Producers negotiated Commonwealth sugar agreement prices by themselves without assistance for the Governments in days gone by, and it will be a part of our policy that sugar should not be marketed by informal meetings in the Prime Minister's office between representatives of the Sugar Producers' Association and the Prime Minister looking at forward prices, reading the sugar brokers' gazettes and getting the advice from whoever it is he may get it, from the lawyers in Washington, I forget their names, but they have released a good deal of information as to how to go about flattering Governments and flattering Congressmen and working things for their clients in the West Indies in respect of sales. We do not believe that is the way to do it.

Just as in many African countries some of the first steps taken on the road to African socialism was to insist on commodity marketing boards, such as the Cocoa Marketing Board in Ghana, and I believe there are peanut marketing boards in Nigeria and so on, we should insist that major commodities that have an important part to play in the lives of people must be marketed by the Government. I would go so far, although I do not believe that this is entirely the position of the workers' representatives, as to say that it is the Government that should give a guaranteed price based upon a reasonable return on investment capital and working costs, and not the inflated returns which I believe are based on what it would cost to build a sugar factory today, to the suppliers of sugar. The Government should buy the sugar from the factories and sell it where it can. A Board on which the workers' representatives would have a place, the sugar producers' representatives would have a place and the Government would have a dominant voice should be the agency by which sugar is marketed in this country. As I say, it should not be a question of Mr. Ward, Mr. Dean and the Prime Minister sitting down, decent and worthy gentlemen though all three may have proved themselves to be in this recent exercise, and deciding from a cloister how to handle these things. The Government should not have to be worrying about levies. The Government should be buying, it should be approving the wages, approving the returns and securing the industry from time to time against the catastrophic falls in prices which will occur from the shortfalls in crops, and in return for that receiving the windfalls such as last year and the windfall of 1963. That is the way I see it and that is the way the Barbados Labour Party sees the entire question of sugar levies.

It goes without saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that under such a system there would be no need for this Act because Government would be doing the exporting, would be receiving all after seeing that the just demands of labour and the owners are met, and I am not precluding the building-in of Union agreements, and certainly I am not precluding the building-in of agreements that the Government must be prepared to pay out special bonuses in years of exceptional sugar prices. These are details which have to be worked out. If such a bold and imaginative policy had been introduced, there would be no need for this debate today, because the Government would not have to be accounting to anybody for what share of the \$25½ million it will be getting from the United States. It would be in Government's pocket and its distribution would already have been assured, subject to any particular bonus agreements. But you know, Barbadians have short memories; exactly what the Prime Minister said. I do not know which prophet from on high he was referring to, but Barbadians really have short memories.

We sat down in here today and I suppose most of us have remembered the no cane blade speech. The sugar producers have sat down and everybody has just gone on, in the face of these amazing twists and turns of Government policy and Government's attitude towards sugar. Even in the middle of putting the case for sugar, the Prime Minister could not forbear from attacks, not very meaningful or important attacks, upon the sugar industry's losses over the last ten years. What is the true position? He attacks the sugar industry for not paying taxes since 1968, but in general you can say that the tourist business in Barbados does not pay taxes at all because the tourist industry in this country is protected by income tax holidays.

3.40 p.m.

Tourism is supposed to have overtaken sugar as the great contributor to our economy. Last year's employment in sugar hardly declined and nobody was put on short time. We still had to bring in workers. Last year employment in tourism substantially declined and many tourist workers were put on short time. Those tourist workers and the tourist industry still consume the services which are provided by the Government of Barbados. You will see new roads being built in tourist developments. When a hotel is going to be built new water mains are put in, the road is widened, all types of facilities are provided for a hotel, no facilities are provided for the plantation tenants, no facilities are provided to make up the roads in plantation tenancies, but go down to Holetown

today. People in these heavy rains in Dukes Tenantry, St. Thomas — they are out of Farmers Tenantry now — but in parts even of Shop Hill have to plough through the mud, but down Holetown you will see beautiful pavements being built for the tourists at Sunset Crest, road widened, money spending for the tourists at Sunset Crest. Is that not a consuming of our resources without any tax benefit accruing to the Government? The tourists come here and spend money and they pay indirect taxes but the sugar workers are always here spending money and paying indirect taxes. They are always here bearing the brunt of the cost of living with fewer resources than the tourists who come to Barbados, and I think it is an insult to the sugar workers, not to the sugar producers, to speak ill of the sugar lorries using up the roads. It is an insult to the sugar workers who do not have roads to walk on to get out of plantation tenancies instead of making snide remarks about using the roads.

The people who drive the trucks, are they not sugar workers? Are they not governed by the Union agreement for sugar workers? Do not the plantation managers pay income tax? Does not Mr. Lisle Ward pay more income tax than anybody in this country, as I have sometimes heard said? Does not Mr. Pile pay income tax? Do not Sir Stanley Robinson and Mr. Jeffrey Armstrong pay income tax? I believe that they would go to prison if they did not, personally, although apparently in this country in these days fifteen-, twenty- and eighty thousand dollars income tax is going by the board, according to the latest registrations debts which the Inland Revenue Commissioner has made.

To suggest that the sugar industry is contributing nothing in the way of taxation to support the general services of this island is to suggest something very mischievous indeed, because it inflames people and it does not allow them to get an understanding of what is really involved. Plantation managers are salaried employees, perhaps whose salaries have not gone up commensurate with the salaries of people in Bridgetown or the Civil Service — again not that I hold any brief for them — but many a man is working as a plantation overseer, he is not recognisable as a person of a class who has ever oppressed anybody. They associate with the workers, they identify themselves with the workers. When the dance halls, St. Thomas Social Centre or the casino at Greens or the Sealy Hall Casino, are having dances you see the plantation overseers in there drinking a grog with the plantation workers, male and female, just as you see the politicians. In fact, you may

see them more than you see the politicians, and they are not high salaried employees, and they are all paying taxes. The plantation supervisors are paying taxes, everybody is paying taxes. There is nobody that I know in the sugar industry who has an income in the Bahamas or an income in Bermuda guaranteed to him while he pretends to work down here for \$800 as to my knowledge happens in the hotel industry. People come down here on derisory salaries of \$800, \$1,000 and \$1,200 a month, and that is the salary which is declared to the Inland Revenue Commissioner but they really are working for money in Bermuda and the Bahamas, receiving money from companies in those tax free havens, no doubt in these days now also the Cayman Islands.

The greatest employer in this country is the sugar industry, the greatest number of taxpayers that any one industry employs in this country is the sugar industry. Go and ask the people who got production bonus in July whether they do not pay tax. Ask them how they feel to know that the Prime Minister says that the sugar industry needs taxation, that it is wearing out the roads of this country and not paying any taxes for them. If the companies that own sugar estates in this island are somehow managing to evade the payment of tax, that is a matter for the Minister of Finance and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. The balance sheets that I see from time to time all declare a dividend. Maybe I only see from a distance, maybe I only see the fortunate ones, but I did not go into this, I do not particularly care about it, I am not interested in that. What I believe is this, that many sugar estates have gone out of their way not to show a loss but to make a loss that they have paid salaries to their owners and let the company show a loss so that in the fullness of time when an application is made to the Town Planner for permission to cut up the plantations on the grounds that they are unremunerative to keep in sugar they have accountants' figures to support them. I believe that. I know of one plantation where that was done and I see the houses rising in a nice middle class development in what I believe is a fine sugar growing area in the two southern parishes of this island. I believe that that has been done. I also believe that it may well be so that salaries of Attorneys — Mr. Armstrong can tell the Prime Minister about this — may well have been rising again so as to hold down the profits of the company. I believe so, I do not know, I believe that is a trend that may be coming on now with the corporation tax but I do not know, I really have no information on these aspects of it but it is

simply not fair to say that the sugar industry of this island does not pay tax when every last sugar worker is paying his little income tax, his National Insurance, buying food with heavy indirect taxation, right up to plantation managers and indeed the owners.

When you say this and you realise that in fact the tourist industry is not taxed, you can appreciate what a very dangerous statement it is. The Prime Minister said he is nothing to do with the agricultural workers wage levels. I have a note taken here, but we care about these wage levels and when we in the Barbados Labour Party mounted a campaign earlier this year we mounted that campaign not in defence of the sugar factories, they can defend themselves, they have the ear of the Prime Minister. We mounted that campaign in the interest of the agricultural worker, a man who remains no matter how much higher his wages are than those of the Indians in the Corentyne and Berbice, he remains the most depressed wage earner in social terms in our economy.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a cane cutter should have a guaranteed wage of \$1,000 a month during the crop season. I will give a figure, it is not a fancied figure. Some of them get it I believe when you add the production bonus to what they get during the year itself. If there is a shortage of cane cutters, if cane cutting is a profession which is despised, let cane cutters get some money in their pockets, and when you say "oh, he is a cane cutter", the man can hold up his hand and shake the Grantleys and say "yes, this is what I get for it." That is what is needed in this country. When coal miners in Britain could not be recruited — because coal mining is a dirty dangerous business, despised by people — when they could not be recruited the minimum wages in the coal industry have gone up to the point where I believe the present minimum coal miner's wage negotiated over the terms of the last election in Britain, is it not £94 a week now?

3.50 p.m.

Sir, I want to deal with these estates. (*Asides.*) The Prime Minister has sat down and said that is why Britain is where it is now. We are talking about coal. It is nice to be able to make a jive, but when you make a jive without knowledge it can react on you. That wage of £94 a week is being paid to coal miners, but if there is one thing on which the economists were absolutely united it was that, because the British had rehabilitated their coal mining industry and were still generating 60% of their electricity by

coal, the full impact of the increase in oil prices did not fall so hard on Britain. That is one of the few crosses that Britain did not have to carry in recent years. It had to bear the cross of oil to a lesser extent than the other economies of Western Europe because the coal production was at a level which allowed electricity to be generated at reasonable prices.

The coal miners had to get that type of wage because the profession was one that nobody wanted to do. When nobody wants to do a certain profession, payment of cash is what brings it out. I believe that an altogether new approach to the sugar industry is required. I will tell the Prime Minister something about what he has said in the past about the sugar industry. I remember he made a very impassioned speech. He is not an impassioned orator. He is a narrator, a story teller, a lecturer, but he made a very impassioned speech once about he does not want to see the mothers of Barbados in sugar fields with loads on their heads — he said words to that effect — acting as beasts of burthen. That is an important phrase, and we on this side are with him, but you must make it possible to get rid of the mothers of Barbados from acting as beasts of burthen in the sugar cane fields by making it possible for the sugar industry to modernise and for wage levels to be paid. You must modernise to increase productivity, because the increase of productivity comes from the employers to my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You have to make people work harder. Nobody works harder than those same mothers in Barbados, but you must allow the plantations to mechanise the industry and pay the reduced number of sugar workers a proper wage. That is what will stop it. The mothers would not be lifting loads of cane about the fields, if it were not economic for them so to do. If you insist on minimum wages which make it uneconomic for them, then the plantations will buy the cane-loaders and pay those who drive them proper wages in the fullness of time.

Now, despite the Prime Minister's putting of the case of sugar so admirably, there are one or two further aspects of it that I want to go into. The first thing deals with the local credibility gap. I am never one that likes to use these clichés, or these modern phrases, that look so attractive. I always try to avoid speaking of multi-national corporations, but there are some phrases that so particularly describe a man, or describe the aura that surrounds him, that they have to be used, and the credibility gap is one of them.

Now, I had some serious doubts when Barbados revalued its currency, for there were two steps in the exercise of translating our base

currency from sterling to the dollar. The first is the decision to make the change, and the second is the point on the scale at which you choose your new rate in exchange. I had some serious doubts when I realised that the Prime Minister, effectively, was going to revalue our currency. As far as I know, a step taken since the war only by Germany, Japan and Switzerland. I cannot see Barbados having an economy with the massive strength of those of Germany and Switzerland, not to speak of that of Japan. Therefore, I was a little hesitant when I saw that a 10% to 12% had been created. I thought immediately of the effect on our exports to CARICOM. That is still at a disadvantage — a serious disadvantage — because we have raised the price of our goods within CARICOM by 12%. To my mind, the Prime Minister was assuming what some of us had been suggesting that the manufacturing sector really has no serious promise in the development of the Barbados economy.

I also looked at the question of tourism. If it is possible to come to Barbados for \$30.00 a day and the hotel receives \$66.00 for your \$30.00, when you revalue and \$30.00 equals \$60.00, then the hotels would have to increase their prices. It is an invisible export and, perhaps, an invisible disadvantage, but it is a disadvantage. Most of all I looked at the position of sugar. I said that we are getting good prices for sugar at the moment. The effective fall in sterling is meaning a great increase in revenue to Barbados from our sugar exports because the value of our currency is falling. The amount of money we receive in our hands is rising, and Barbados' particular governmental trouble in 1974 and 1975 has been a shortage of Government revenue. The Government is attempting to hold down expenditure, but the revenue side is very damaging. You want money in the hands of the Government and money in the hands of the people to deal with inflation.

I said to myself that if this revaluation is going to mean a loss to the sugar industry of money, then it is something that has to be very seriously attacked. The Prime Minister reassured us in his speech of the 30th May, 1975, the confidential chat, that sugar exports would not be affected because sugar prices had been fixed in terms of European Common Market units of account rather than in pounds sterling. Resting upon that assurance, which I assumed to be true, I relaxed and said: Well, our greatest thing this year is sugar; we are getting high prices; our exports are not affected. But today the Prime Minister reveals that, at least, 20,000 tons were affected. You may say that they may not have been affected very much. I think it is 29,000 tons. I am not sure of the last sale at \$914.00 a

ton. You may say that they have not been affected very much. It is \$150.00 a ton less than the previous amount was sold at, but that is \$2½ million. That is a loss to the sugar industry as well as the loss which the levy has brought about. That is \$800,000.00 less in the workers' pockets as a result of the revaluation.

4 p.m.

That is something to bear in mind. Seamen of Barbados who are paid in sterling are losing money. The \$10 million that comes through the Post Office in remittances from people in England has been reduced to \$8 million and the sugar receipts have also been reduced by \$2 million, and it is against this background that a levy of this size was thought appropriate by the Minister of Finance to pass on the Sugar Industry.

Sir, I will tell you one of our proposals, one of the attitudes we would have taken. I do not see why at all it was necessary for any of the sugar levy to fall on any proportion of the workers' share of the increased sugar price. It would have meant some reduction in Government revenue. Undoubtedly it would also have meant that income tax will have to come out of it. But the workers should have been allowed to get their 40 per cent before any question of a levy was gone into. The workers should have got their 40 per cent of the excess and levy only on the sugar producers' share. That is something which we on this side feel extremely strong about.

If it is the sugar producers who have by their skilful accounting deprived the revenue of taxation since 1968, let their accountants get them out of this kind of mess. Let somebody get them out of this kind of mess; but nobody could suggest that the sugar workers themselves have been guilty of tax evasion or tax avoidance or tax fraud or anything else. The workers should have got their share out of the levy on the receipts in the hands of the sugar producers. That is the fault in the whole Bill as far as we are concerned.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken generally about the shape of the Sugar Industry rather than about the Bill in particular. It is obvious if there is no Central Marketing Board, and that the levy has to come from a separate authority that at some stage a Bill such as this would have to be passed. The Bill as we see it is a mere mechanistic exercise.

If the proposals I was just suggesting could have come about, presumably they would call for a different type of Bill altogether; but it is not the duty of the Opposition as I see it to tell the

Government how to do its business and to produce an alternative means of taxation in a tax measure; but just as the Prime Minister has not dealt with Clauses 1 to 7, nor indeed will I pursue Clauses 1 to 7, neither here nor in Committee. That can be left to the agricultural statisticians, the Minister of Finance and his shadow.

Sir, it is on the broad issues of principle that we want to make it clear that we oppose the Government on the question of the sugar levy. We believe first of all, and I repeat, that the levy itself could have been rendered unnecessary by a complete re-organisation of the scheme of marketing sugar in this country. The Government should be buying the sugar from the sugar producers and selling it; and we believe particularly that the levy in all its severity — for I have heard nothing which ameliorates the full severity of the figures quoted by the Prime Minister in his Confidential Chat — we believe that the levy in all of its severity should have fallen only on the producers and not on the reasonable expectations of the earnings of the sugar workers.

I do not know why there is this dwelling and dwelling on the 10 acre man. I do not believe that there are many 10 acre men in Barbados. The Prime Minister would surely have all the figures there. I believe that the 2, 3, and 4 acre men are the people who are interested to know whether \$60, \$70, \$80 or \$120 a ton is what they will get for their sugar. I do not know why this business of the 10 acre man seems so to obsess the Prime Minister.

All of us know that 10 acres of sugar cane land is not enough in these days to carry a family in any type of existence different from that of a cane cutter. We all know that I am worried about that. I am worried about those employed for wages in the sugar estates.

Other members on this side are going to deal with the whole question of the withdrawal of land from sugar; the fact that the sugar crop should be much greater, but that Government policy has allowed plantations to be cut up. Other hon. members, I am sure, will deal with that in full; but before I sit down I have to say that it is never popular in politics to tell the people who rejected you "I told you so"; but it has to be said because our party went into the last election as the party promoting a strong and viable agriculture in this country.

We went into the election against the background of the "no cane blade" speech and

the "be suburban" speech. We went into the election carrying on our backs the imaginary baskets and hoes so eloquently described by speakers of the Democratic Labour Party campaign in St. Patricks during the month of September, 1971. We went into the election with all of that on our backs.

The Government did not only oppose us on the platforms, but it actually took steps in 1971 of further hostility towards agriculture in this country; and it is only in the last two years that the chickens have come home to roost. The waters of the Red Sea have rolled back across the open sands. It is only in the last two years that the Barbados Government has given any attention to the boom in agriculture; and that Government over there had the country of Barbados helpless in the face of its economic enemies at a time when Barbados should have mobilised its economic strength to deal with what faced it.

Sugar has more than wiped out the adverse conditions we had to face in respect of our increased oil prices. The Prime Minister speaks of subsidies in other countries being the result of the immensities of those countries' populations. Countries that have a sugar production five times ours have a population eight or nine times ours. Man for man Barbados has always produced much more sugar per population than Guyana, Jamaica or Trinidad.

Therefore, Sir, if we had maintained our Sugar Industry in the thin years we would have been in a position in the good years that come every seven, eight or 10 years — you can absolutely rely on it that the Russian sugar crop, the Cuban sugar crop and the European beet crop generally is going to fail ever so often. That can be relied on as night follows day; and in fact if you look at the long term climatological predictions, beet must go down because Europe is getting colder in winter, and it is getting colder during the germination period of the beet in the ground.
4.10 p.m.

Therefore if you had destructive frosts every ten years before, you are likely to get them every eight years now. All these are things far seeing people can look at; but this Government was so prejudiced and blind and so eager for cheap electoral advantage that it spoke of baskets and hoes, of cane blades and beasts of burden and destroyed the confidence of the people of this Island in agricultural development, and it is a confidence that will take years to build up again. The present Minister of Agriculture would be the last to say that he possesses the necessary charisma,

knowledge, ability to communicate or anything else that could reasonably be expected to give the people of this country confidence in agriculture again. No speech from the Prime Minister seeking to avoid the shallows and the rapids which he has created for himself in the past in dealing with the sugar industry of this Island is going to build it back up either.

When I sat down here and heard that as soon as it is money you hear people going mad behind the money and saying this and that, what did the Prime Minister do in 1958 with the \$9 million windfall then but go all over the country and inflame the sugar workers, hold meetings outside Government House and pushed hon. members and straight forward and liberal minded men to the extent where they advised the Governor he should be locked up? What did he do at that time? He did exactly the same in respect of the \$9 million that the Barbados Labour Party did with the windfall and we are doing now. It may be that history will say he was right then, but he cannot be right then and we wrong in the windfall and wrong now; he cannot be right because he is he and we wrong because we are we; exactly the same agitation, indeed more agitation because you had severe cane burnings in 1958 before the crop which were not present in 1964 and certainly not in 1975. He cannot assume that it was right for him to say it then and wrong for us to say it now. That would not wash, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Prime Minister, I believe batted for 80 minutes. No hon. member on this side is going to bat for that long, but I can guarantee that we all will make more runs when the point comes to the point. Thank you very much.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Prime Minister in his address today sought to claim that there are going to be many experts on the floor of this House who will try to tell him how the money should be allocated particularly in these years when inflation is so rampant in the Caribbean, but what I would like the Prime Minister to understand is that he seems to be falling into the same category of men who believe that because something is done in Trinidad and Guyana that it should be done in this country as well. I would hope that he would take a second look at that philosophy and decide that it is not everything that is done abroad that can be superimposed upon the Barbadian society and work as effectively as it works elsewhere. He himself has made this very statement in relation to the Union and the Civil Servants only two weeks ago when he said that

the Trade Union was an imported institution which was imposed upon the people of the Caribbean without modification.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to correct the hon. Member. It was the President of the Caribbean Development Bank that said that. I made other remarks about the Trade Union which I will not repeat at this stage.

Mr. BOLDEN: I accept the Prime Minister's statement, but this is the same situation which we are talking about whereby something which is done abroad is sought to be imposed upon Barbadians in a Barbadian context. I have always been opposed to this method of dealing with the situation in this country. I have been fortunate enough to hear the last Minister of Communications and Works, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, say the same thing, that we in Barbados seem to believe that people who act in one way or another in another country could be taken to be experts in what should happen in this country. Now the Prime Minister was very careful to give the figures about the levies which have been imposed in Trinidad and Guyana, but he knows fully well, and he has said today, that the cost of labour in Barbados far exceeds that in most of the other Caribbean territories.

The Prime Minister in my humble opinion has taken over the role of negotiating wages whenever the Trade Union has been unable to negotiate the wages, with the result that we have got a guaranteed five day week, and the Prime Minister had to adopt this system in order to break what was a potentially strangling strike in the sugar industry. We have also got the Severance Pay Act which is also another method of guaranteeing many people, including sugar workers, regular employment in industry. Bearing these two factors in mind the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture must declare in no uncertain terms whether or not they believe there is room in this country for the small agricultural producer whether in sugar marketing, market gardening or any other field, because I have seen clearly that there is a trend in Barbados today in which the magnates are advising the Government with the effect that in the long run the small agricultural producer and the small businessman in this country will be totally wiped out and only the magnates will remain, taking us back to the period of the Thirties. That is my belief.

I say this because the method of applying the levy today as the Prime Minister has said is

going to create hardship in respect of the small sugar farmer. The Prime Minister said he does not believe in any ten acre sugar farm, but the Prime Minister must also remember that that same small sugar farmer has been the backbone of the sugar industry in this country. I very well remember the years 1948 and 1949 when I first went into sugar. The large sugar factories in this country like Bulkeley, Lower Estate and Carrington used to struggle to get the small farmer's canes in first. There was assistance which was given to him; he was given assistance to purchase fertiliser, he was given assistance in the cutting of his canes and in hauling, and he was paid in advance for his canes, and he also relied on the bonus which was given after the crop. It is pitiful that in this year of high inflation, immediately after the crop, the sugar worker in this country has been walking up and down the country going to every Member of Parliament — and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have had this — borrowing money because he cannot get through.

The Prime Minister I believe should know that the small farmers, whether you call them peasant farmers or small plantation farmers, cannot survive after the long five year drought we have had in relation to the large magnates in sugar. They have got a bigger cash flow. I lay the blame squarely at the door of the Ministry of Agriculture in this respect. The small farmer is deprived of the facilities which are offered to the large land holders in this country. This is where the fallacy exists in the Ministry of Agriculture, because they do not know the Acts under which they are operating in agriculture in this country. The small farmer who has less than 25 acres has no facilities for borrowing working capital on his holding. The large holder of land has all the facilities at his disposal, and in spite of all the bad debts year after year, that is where he survives, and in the year of prosperity he is able to recoup the losses he has made before; but the small farmer goes out and out until he is down never to recover. This is the philosophy which the Ministry of Agriculture has not looked at. It is the Minister of Agriculture who has not been doing his part in relation to small farmers, because he should be telling the Prime Minister that this method of levy is one which will work hardship on the small farmers in this country.

I am not a financial expert, neither am I an economic expert, but it is plain commonsense to see that the big plantations are those that will benefit. I can tell you something. There is one of them walking about saying that despite what the Prime Minister is

saying he is going to pay for another plantation out of the money he is going to get back at this time, and he is sure to buy it from one of the small ones who will fold up. The Prime Minister knows him fully well. That is exactly what is happening in this particular issue.

4.20 p.m.

That is exactly what is happening in this particular issue. The Prime Minister said that if you do not apply the levy in this manner you have to apply a specific tax on the excess profits, and I believe that is the policy which the Prime Minister should have exercised in this particular year because he will find that the small plantations, the small farmers, must fold up and it is because of a financial position. The Prime Minister must remember he himself has placed a \$20 levy on fertiliser. The oil crisis has affected the small man more than the large farmer. I brought something to this House, but because of the numerous seats on that side and the unwillingness to accept suggestions coming from this side, when I came to the House a few years ago I made a remark here. They had just incorporated what is called Barbados Sugar Factories Limited. I told this Hon. Chamber that it had come to my knowledge that the directors of Barbados Sugar Factories Limited had agreed that they would pay the shareholders of the factories \$1.00 a ton more than they would pay any person, and I was told it was not true, but sometime later I heard the Government had intervened and everybody would get the same price for canes. At the moment Barbados Sugar Factories Limited has a policy where they direct certain plantations where to send their canes but at the end of the year they pay a different price for sugar. Internally they manipulate the finances of Barbados Sugar Factories Limited to offset the losses from one factory to another factory.

They have certain built-in privileges for certain people in the sugar industry where they get a cartage charge extra that most small farmers in this country do not know about, that many plantations in this country get a kick-back on their cartage, they get a kick-back on the number of tons they supply, but the small farmer in this country is still getting one constant fee for sugar cane whether he sends it from Christ Church to a factory in St. Joseph or from St. George to the factory next to his house, and this is what the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture do not understand, because they allow the magnates to sit down and advise them and they do not get up and learn what is going on in this country. Barbados could have been better off.

The Prime Minister said he figured the optimum figure for producing sugar in this country should be about 167,000 tons. Three years ago when I came to the House and asked questions about the burning of sugar cane the very Sugar Producers' Association at Edgehill has produced figures to show that Barbados cane fields were producing five tons per acre less each year as a result of the burning, and the questions were never answered. The Sugar Producers' Association found itself in the iniquitous position whereby they were paying \$80,000 for what is called a Don Misi cane harvester coming from Australia as against \$22,000 for the MacConnell harvester in Barbados that could have reaped green canes, and they had one of their employees walking around from plantation to plantation telling the people not to work behind the MacConnell tractor because it was created by a man in Barbados, but they could work behind the Don Misi which burns canes.

I have today a document out of the Sugar Producers' Association which shows that when the man was challenged he said he was collecting certain labour figures for his own personal use, but he was selling information. I have no qualms about it, I can call his name at any time. The same Mr. Erskine Ward who the Prime Minister relies so much upon, I say here and now whether he likes it or not, he tells the Prime Minister one thing and he tells the Opposition something different. Whether the Prime Minister likes it or not I say so now, because I believe the worker in the industry should not be penalised in a year like this. The small sugar farmer should not be penalised in a year like this.

There is a story going around — I like to talk because I can back up anything I say — that if the plantations accept the Prime Minister's levy we will get the money from the World Bank for the 24 cane harvesters that we have applied to bring in, and you will get it at the interest rate of 3%. Yes, Mr. Prime Minister, I can tell you who is saying so. Ask me outside and I will tell you in your ears.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, I would like to explain to the hon. member that the World Bank is not giving any loans to the sugar industry, and the reason is because we have our own funds.

Mr. BOLDEN: That is not true.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I ought to know better than you, I am a Governor of the

World Bank and you are a spectator, so I should know.

Mr. BOLDEN: I do not disagree with that, I would be rather rude and ignorant to disagree with that, but the World Bank team has said if the Government of Barbados is prepared to take money out of the industry they cannot now be borrowing money to put back in the industry. I telephoned this morning at a quarter past two to get the news. I have my friends too, Mr. Prime Minister. Let the Prime Minister get up and deny that an application has not been made to the World Bank for money to buy the MacConnell cane harvester and it had not been considered up to the point in time when the Prime Minister made his famous friendly discussion on CBC. I am telling you now when you deny that the fellows holding from 200 acres down will tell you what the answer is because those are the men who are upset, the fellows in S. Philip. I am not talking about the big plantations in St. Philip, I am talking about the fellows who recover ten to twelve tons an acre that for the last two years have not been recovering anything to improve their expense. Those are the men who are worried today. I am talking about the sugar worker who is expecting his windfall to repair his roof and buy necessities.

I agree with the Prime Minister when he says that the money should not go into imports, consumer products, but on the other hand I believe the sugar worker should get what he is entitled to, he should not be short-changed for anybody else. That is how I see it. The Prime Minister has been most vindictive against the sugar industry in this country. Yes, he has been. The first thing he talked about was the no-cane-blade speech. That in itself pushed people away from the sugar industry. When I came to this House in 1970 I said my belief in agriculture was that we should proceed now to modernise the industry so that people working in it will no longer have to work with the basket, hoe and fork. They should be able to go to work like the man in North America or the man in Europe who wears his tie, gets on a tractor and does his work. He should have the facilities to clean himself up, he should be able to meet Tom, Dick and Harry in the nightclubs in Bridgetown because he is paid a wage commensurate with his Bridgetown brother's. Our philosophy was misunderstood. The Prime Minister and his cohorts said that we wanted to put the men back into the field with a basket and hoe. Who would want to go back into the field with a basket and hoe?

4.30 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, an example of the willingness of the people to support an industry in order to support themselves has been shown by the turn out of Barbadians to go into the cane fields in the 1975 crop season. I have said repeatedly that people have walked around Barbados begging for jobs cutting cane this year, and the sugar producers have turned them back saying that they did not register. Imagine a situation in Barbados where you have to register in order to get work, and at the same time labour is being brought in from abroad. If the Minister of Agriculture, or the ex-Minister of Home Affairs, wants to be truthful, they will tell you that there are certain magnates in the sugar industry who planted sugar cane which was specifically fit for burning irrespective of the returns they expected to get from sugar. When questions were asked about burning sugar cane in this country, we were told that it was necessary to burn the cane because they could not get enough labour. The very first year that they decided not to burn sugar cane there was more labour available to reap the cane in this country than there was cane to cut.

I join with the Leader of the Opposition in saying that this Government must create a National Sugar Marketing Board which should not only deal with the marketing of sugar, but should seek to control the whole sugar industry of this country. If you look at the waste of money that is going into the sugar industry, you will find that, at least, three or four sugar factories in Barbados have started to change their cane carts and machinery for the mechanical cane-cutter which is designed only for cutting burnt canes.

The Prime Minister was right when he spoke of the Sugar Rehabilitation Fund. When a man is right you will have to admit he is right, but if you had a Central Authority to look into the entire aspect of sugar, you would have a National Committee to determine what is good for the industry and for the country. With regard to the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are a number of people who belong to that Company as well as the Sugar Producers Association, and they are very worried about the mix up between the two Associations and the two Companies. Some of them do not know the levies that are charged because of the officers at Warrens. They do not know for what they are paying when they take out the fantastic sums from sugar called levies, subscriptions, etc., and they are not bold enough to open their mouths and speak. At the last Annual General Meeting they were told, if they made any noise, the Government would take over the Industry.

When the Prime Minister says that the Clerk of the House, himself, and other people have been carrying the Sugar Industry, then it is tantamount to the Prime Minister admitting there is something wrong in the sugar industry of this country, and it is up to him to protect this country by having an Inquiry into the sugar industry. I have called for an Inquiry into the sugar industry in here more than two years ago. I was not in the House when the Prime Minister had made his famous statement. The Prime Minister has made famous speeches throughout the time he has been in this House: you have brought the wrong Resolution at the wrong time, in the wrong place, and before the wrong person. That is all the Opposition ever gets, but I hope, from his own admission now, that he has sent abroad for somebody to look into the sugar industry, and he will really make a National Inquiry into the sugar industry to determine whether or not the Government should take a more positive role in deciding what should be done for sugar in this country.

You cannot hope to dispossess, or to run, the small man out of sugar. The Prime Minister must admit that his Ministry of Agriculture is not working. (*Asides.*) I am not providing the answers for you today.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but we have some bad-behaved people in here —

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will deal with them. That is my duty.

Mr. BOLDEN: The Prime Minister said that he is cutting up the land for development in St. Lucy and St. Peter in 20-acre lots. He does not believe in 10-acre lots. What must the man with 1 acre or ½ acre do? From the Prime Minister's speech, as I understand it — I know that the Prime Minister will get up and say that he means something else — the man with ½ acre, or 1 acre, had no right growing sugar cane. That is the same philosophy being pronounced by the magnates in this country.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of correction, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the whole thrust of what I repeated several times during the course of my Second Reading speech was that it is impossible in Barbados to raise a family on 10 acres of sugar cane. I pointed out that all the small cane cultivators had other jobs, or professions, or occupations. I never, at any time, said that the man with an ½ acre of land should

not grow cane. As a matter of fact, I saw some people in Prince of Wales Road, Bank Hall, growing two or three beds of cane. You grow lettuce, but they grow two or three beds of cane, and I am all for that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are *ad idem* on that point. His philosophy seems to indicate that a man with this size holding has no right to plant cane.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have already said that I am all for the two or three beds of cane, as I have seen in Prince of Wales Road and other parts of Bank Hall. I just said that it is not possible to raise a family on 10 acres of land in Barbados.

Mr. BOLDEN: He is all for the man with two or three beds of cane. This is 1975, but before now he was all for a situation where he would not see a cane blade. When I came to this Chamber I said that I believed the Prime Minister meant that he would like to see the scientific development of sugar cane in this country reach such a stage that sugar cane would grow without cane blades. He wanted the Research Centre at Groves to produce cane that would grow without cane blades. The greenery of the situation dazzles his eyes, but the green bucks sweetens his heart and his fingers.

That is why I say the Ministry of Agriculture is not working. If you are going to decide on where you are going to grow sugar; if you are going to keep the small cane farmer in sugar, as the Prime Minister has admitted, the man has to do something else. If you go back to the history of sugar in the Caribbean, we have to understand that sugar was introduced into the Caribbean because of the laziness of the British and Scottish people who came to the Caribbean. If you read the history of sugar, you will find that the overlords — up to now you are still hearing of Bulkeley's Great House. The big man would sit on the hill at Bulkeley's Great House drinking his rum punch, and he would give orders to the Manager. The Manager went every morning and said to the overlord, who knew nothing about growing cane; he ran from Guyana and other territories where they had Malaria mosquitoes, and he settled in Barbados. The Manager would say: "We are going to work the farm tenantry today; Long Pond today, and we will be planting first-crop cane next week." The Manager would then give the orders to the senior overseer or book-keeper. The book-keeper would then give the message to the driver who would go to the field with the third gang or the first-row man.

4.40 p.m.

But they did nothing; because if you look at sugar cane it is a period crop. You weed and you put in fertiliser, and when the blades grow up you leave it and sit down; so sugar production in Barbados has always been sandwiched between the large producers and the small producers who do it on the part time basis. So the Prime Minister must not come in here and talk about the 10 acre man.

Let his agricultural experts tell him that the 10 acre man must find something else to do because after November or December he is not going through the cane ground unless he is going to recreate the situation where the manager or then overseer rode through the cane ground and looked for the third girl gang whether you liked it or not.

So the 10 acre man must look for something else to do. If you want to change that situation you will have to find an alternative situation for the man with his one or two acres; you will have to find an alternative crop. You have not yet decided on your agrarian policy, as the statement by the last Minister of Agriculture and the statement about the 20 acre settlement that you have down at Spring Hall now shows; but you must not penalise the small man until you have found an answer to your problem. Let the Prime Minister say to the Minister of Agriculture I cannot penalise every Tom, Dick and Harry because you have not been able to put into operation in his country a satisfactory agricultural policy so that I can feel sure that when I levy taxation everybody is feeling the burden with equal strength.

That is how I feel about the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we must not talk about what Trinidad is doing or about what the sugar workers there are getting. This is now said to be one of the most burdensome operations in this country because of the wages which are paid to agricultural workers.

If you ever talk about a profit sharing industry in this country, it is the planting, harvesting and production of sugar. It is a profit sharing industry. The Prime Minister was right when he said that the price should be fixed right first and the wages fixed last. What do you think that bonuses are going to be? This is a profit sharing industry.

The Prime Minister must notice that in the last five or six years there was the question of the sub-division of large plantations that were proving uneconomical to run. I say this, and I

know that many people are vexed with me for saying it. I have no objection to sub-division because I believe that it is the only way of equalising the society so to speak; but you cannot have a policy of sub-division without a proper agricultural policy.

The Prime Minister came here and said the other day that you are not going to be able to sub-divide and let the Permanent Secretary and the man down Broad Street go and buy a two or three acre lot and make a whole Macadam garden out of it. I do not believe in that philosophy, but if you had a proper agricultural system you could sub-divide without fear because what you lost in sugar you could gain in something else.

Sir, I will tell you now that even these 20 acres lots that you are talking about now down in St. Peter are not going to work because there are people in the Ministry of Agriculture who have said openly that they do not intend to allow the use of small machinery or the importation of small machinery into this country; and the division of large holdings into small ones is based on the fact that a farmer and his family who intend to work the lot must have available at all times the necessary equipment to work that land.

Look around the country now and you will see that every cane field has a 20 foot border around it. Can you tell me that Barbados with its limited land could grow 167,000 tons of sugar and accommodate this waste of land around the cane fields? But you have experts sitting down in the Ministry of Agriculture who, as I said in here before, at the end of a year write a report that will take one side and a half sheet on the other side; and his report will be based on who went on holiday who acted in which position or the next, what equipment came in and what is lying down idle at Graeme Hall and has not yet been able to be put into operation.

But then comes the time of calamity, the time when the country is reeling under the weight of the oil crisis, the time when the industries which that Government banked upon are closing down day after day and turning people out of work; the time when the small man feels the brunt of the burden first and then you resort to the Sugar Industry.

Then the Prime Minister gets up here and says that the Sugar Producers have not paid their way for a long time; but if the Prime Minister would only collect the information

from the Ministry of Agriculture and the various institutions he would see the magnitude of the problem.

When I came to this House I asked the Prime Minister to relieve Agriculture of the duties which recently had been placed on it — on things like spraying cans, pesticides, weedicides and so on; and the Prime Minister in answering that question said that it was as the result of an international agreement that these things were so. I said then — and I do not regret saying it, and I will say it again — that when the Prime Minister and his Government sat down and allowed what is called an international body to tell them to restrict the use of certain pesticides, weedicides etc. in this country I told them that we should not at this time be restricting the use of certain weedicides and pesticides in this country because we have a developing agricultural situation whereby we can feed our people if we try; and he should show me statistics whereby people have been hurt or have died as a result of using these various chemicals.

The result is that there are only one or two companies in Barbados selling weedicides and pesticides. Costs are rising every day, and what is the result? The large plantations in this country will eventually win out and the small ones will collapse.

I am no expert on finance. Let the Prime Minister hear that. I am not going to tell him how to apply his tax; but I believe that in this particular instance he has not applied the tax in the correct manner. The Prime Minister talks about the Tate & Lyle interests in the refineries in Great Britain. I may sound stupid but I certainly believe that it is time, when we talk about CARICOM, it is time that we talked about a method of refining our sugar. Why should we have to export and re-import again?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has two minutes to conclude his speech.

Mr. BOLDEN: By my watch I believe that I have five minutes. So the Prime Minister must look carefully again at the situation. I have to plead today for the agricultural workers, the man who has always been at the bottom of the ladder. I have to plead again for the small farmer, the man who has never let Barbados down.

I am telling you that from the time there was a good price for sugar you saw plantations that had land lying idle re-cultivating them. Look at the Scotland District. If you drive through St. Joseph, St. Andrew and certain parts of St. Peter you will find that lands that have been covered with bush for the last five or six years are today fields that have been recultivated. You will see the sugar cane that has been planted because you create an incentive for people to do so by having a good price.

But, Sir, if you put on a penalty, these people will again let that land lie fallow. You see young people going into the industry because of the good prices.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your time is up.

Mr. BOLDEN: But because of the levy now they do not know whether it is worth their while to go into the industry. But the sugar producers.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are still continuing? I am very sorry, but your time is up.

Mr. BOLDEN: I will finish now. Give me a minute to finish.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Others will be asking for minutes too.

Mr. BOLDEN: The sugar producers have never in my opinion produced the necessary facilities to uplift the industry; and it is the big magnates who know that when they squeeze out the small man they will have the whole hog in their hands; and that is why they have advised the poor Prime Minister to act in a manner that is detrimental to a lot and which will satisfy the few. I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.
4.50 p.m.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to reply to certain remarks and allegations made against agricultural policy. First I must make it clear that I am not involved in the marketing of sugar. I am only involved in the growing of sugar, and I am convinced and I know that the Ministry of Agriculture has for several years been committed to a policy and programme of producing 160,000 tons per year, and we have geared our whole agricultural policy based on sugar cane production and diversification. We know from our researches

that we would need about 6,000 acres of land to go into diversification of crops, that is, food crops and root crops; so we could not ever envisage a policy which would retire land from sugar cane cultivation. We have always over the years insisted on a minimum of 160,000 tons of sugar cane by way of sugar production and we have pursued that policy in the past year.

We get a lot of talk when money is being divided around by all sides, and what I have discovered in my brief stay as Minister of Agriculture for the past 15 months is that there is a growing lack of moral integrity both by individuals and agencies in this country in every field of human endeavour, and it is very much pronounced in the agricultural sector where you have to deal with the sugar producers' association and other associations, and where everybody who talks about agriculture has a different story to tell from the people who are supposed to be involved in it. I have my own story to tell, the Prime Minister has his own story to tell, the Shadow Minister has his own story to tell, and all of us are supposed to be getting information from the same quarters; so this is the climate in which I have to operate; but I deal with the truth as I see it and on what has been represented to me. This is how I am seeing it today in this House of Assembly. I am talking the truth; I am not attacking anything, and I am more or less confirming what has been said by the Prime Minister.

I am saying that is what I have discovered from my dealings with the Sugar Producers' Association as far as production of sugar is concerned. You all will remember I was the lone voice in this country this year appealing to people to go back and reap canes because the price was good. I appealed on three occasions that there should be no cane fires. I made that appeal because from the time I took up this Ministry I was concerned about sugar production, and I did all in my power to talk with the sugar producers about having canes reaped green, and I carried through my commitment to the people of Barbados by saying that this year there should be no cane fires at all in Barbados; and I am going to even reinforce that more next year to see that we reap our crops green. The very money which is now causing contention has only resulted because what looked like a very poor crop and was estimated to be about 80,000 tons has ended up by producing 96,000 tons because of that no cane fire policy. Nobody has ever given any credit for that. We know that there has been a very good recovery on the juice this year, and you will see if you read the returns

from the sugar cane varieties at the stations, that we had the lowest recovery of 8.58 tons of cane per ton of sugar. This has helped, and because we were committed to no cane burning and we made several appeals to the public, we were able to reap almost 60 per cent of that crop green.

In the interim we have been plagued by a lot of problems in the past years in sugar cane production. It has been represented to me by the sugar producers that they have worked out a level of production of 137,000 per year because they have attributed a lot of reasons for the decline in sugar cane production. They have listed the fact that we have pursued a policy of diversification; then they said we have put more ground into cotton especially in the Christ Church and St. Lucy areas, and there have been smaller cane crops island-wide, and at present there are only about 40,000 acres under sugar cane production. In quoting those figures when they were going to close down Searles factory, they only quoted at the time half the story. If you were to examine the sugar cane industry in the last five years you will remember that we were plagued with drought from 1971 until this year. There have been dry areas and these same areas were the ones selected by the sugar producers in making their point about our reducing yields in sugar. We have had the incidence of cane fires in these years which have had their own untold damage on the amount of sugar cane production, and also we had the evidence that producers were paid very low and uneconomic prices for sugar during those years, except last year and this year, and we need time to take advantage of the rising prices.

There have also been labour problems in that period and the overall unfavourable climate in sugar has encouraged a certain disinvestment in the sugar cane industry, and when you get other things happening, you get a further disinterest in sugar cane production. They have talked about the land being retired from sugar. Now I am not the one who has permitted the estates to be cut up, and my submission is that applications have been made by plantation owners from time to time for subdivision of estates. They are the ones who make the applications, and in my tenure of office, whenever applications come to me for my comments, I am always guided by the advice of my technical division, and I have no interest whatsoever in the subdivision of estates one way or the other. I am not a salesman and I do not intend to be a salesman, and I have no interest

whatever in the outcome of any application for subdivision; therefore you abide by the decision because I do not know about subdivisions otherwise.

We have tried to work towards a policy of mechanisation and we have gone out of our way to talk with the Sugar Producers' Association on this matter. The McCall Harvester which you talked about was the one that I got them to use in my first months in office. I was the one who gave the green light and support to Dr. Hutson about that harvester and then they decided to accept it, and even now that we have reserved \$700,000 from the Price Stabilisation Fund to allow sugar producers to borrow from these funds to buy machinery from McCall Harvester, ask them how much they have taken up so far? They send people to ask me what is my policy on mechanisation, and I have told them what the policy is, because we decided that in those flat areas in Christ Church and St. Lucy which are easily mechanisable and which have the lowest rainfall in the Island, we would have a planned programme of phased implementation of mechanisation. I have talked with Dr. Hutson, and we have decided to bring in mechanisation in areas on the south and west coasts gradually, acquiring probably 30 machines per year where the incidence of labour is very low because of people gravitating to the hotel industry and you have less people around to work on the sugar estates. So it was a very good policy in that there was less labour available on the south and west coasts because of the hotel infiltration, and because the land was easily mechanisable and we could gradually move in because these were the areas where the amount of production per year is very low in tons per acre, the average being about 12 tons per acre. We said we would use this normally and move in gradually and with a three phase development we would eventually, after three or four years to correspond with the ages in the labour force, be able to complete mechanisation in five years when we would move into the central area which is the high producing area and which would take longer to mechanise and also which is more hilly, and by that time we would reach a stage where we would be able to solve a lot of problems, and with information from the first and second stage machines develop a third stage machine which would be able to work in more hilly surroundings.

5.00 p.m.

But despite the fact that we had an application for a World Bank loan we went on

and recommended from the Ministry of Agriculture that funds should be made available from the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund to the plantation owners in order for them to take up the loans to buy MacConnell harvesters, and that has not been done.

My other experience is that when I told the sugar producers that I was going to resort to green cane harvesting and they wanted to have another year of controlled burning, and they realised that I was committed, that I meant business and that I was not going to allow any more burning, either controlled or otherwise, and that if anybody was burning they would have been burning illegally and not with Government's consent, they told me that in order to reap the crop green it would require X number of labourers, I think it was in the vicinity of 5,632 workers, to reap this crop green. I, again with Barbados and people in general at heart, undertook on myself to go out there and appeal to people to come back to cut canes because the price was good and my appeal was heeded by the people of this country. To my surprise when people turned up on the first day of the crop they were told that there was no work for them. That was my big disappointment, and I would never live long enough to forget what happened on that day. They had figures, they said it would take this amount of people to reap the canes green, and then on that very day when people responded to the call — because they always said years ago that Barbadians did not want to cut canes, which I never believed — but that is why I went out there on my own trying to appeal to the workers to cut canes, because I was not happy with the infiltration of people from overseas coming here every year to cut canes and the money going back to another country. As a matter of fact, I think the workers from St. Vincent took back \$³/₄ million to St. Vincent during the last crop, and that is money which could have been earned by Barbadians, but with that kind of information and with the kind of tricks that are being played on innocent people of this country by people who should know better it leaves me very disappointed with the whole future of mankind on this planet.

I am not one to play cheap politics. I am not concerned about votes, I am concerned about being true to myself as long as life lasts. I do not live because of votes, I live because God has permitted me to live and to have my being. It is not that the Ministry of Agriculture is not working, we have always seen the dangers, we have seen the signs of the times, we

have tried to put ourselves in a position that we could give useful advice in these areas, but in the field of agriculture where there are a lot of major constraints when it comes to tropical agriculture and production of food crops, we have a very limited experience in the area of food crop production. As a matter of fact, all the research in this country up to the year 1968 was done for sugar cane production. The majority of research was done for sugar cane production. As a matter of fact, the first Deputy Director of Research was appointed in 1965 in this country and we never got down to a real, meaningful programme for research into other crops until we had an OAS expert here, Dr. Hevis, who was assigned here from 1969 to 1972 and who did very good work on the crop patterns of various vegetables and things like that.

We have gone on from there and we have produced a lot of work in our agronomic section in the last seven years, but we cannot undertake the kind of massive research because we are constrained first by financial constraints, and Barbados with a limited budget has to make do with what it has, and we proceeded by using methods which have been developed in other countries and adapted those methods to our conditions in Barbados to see if they were workable. I am satisfied that good work has been done, what I am not satisfied about is that despite the efforts being made by some people in that Ministry you will find the prophets of doom and the ones who like to stir up trouble before they do meaningful work for the money they are getting, they set about to frustrate the policies of people who intend to make agriculture a go in this country. I am not here to spend a whole lifetime fighting against intrigue and back talking, we want to get on with the job, so I have never permitted my mind to generate to the point that I want to know what is happening over yonder. I have always dealt with that Ministry on the facts before me. I do not have any friends, I do not have any enemies as far as I am concerned, but I deal with information as presented through the right channels, and on the information I receive I try to make decisions which I feel are worthwhile for the good of this country.

I cannot regulate the behaviour of agriculturalists in this country who have other ideas about what it should be, I cannot regulate the manoeuvres of other private individuals who feel that they should have a big say in the agricultural policy of this country, I can only operate in an area, given a responsibility by the Prime Minister, a portfolio, to carry out that

portfolio to the best of my ability without resorting to "talk name" or to reporting or saying bad things about people or trying in any way to undermine the work of any other fellow Minister or any other individual for that matter. I operate strictly on principle. I like principle, so my learned friend from St. Joseph might know a lot more about agriculture.

A point has been made about the funds not being made available for the small man at the Agricultural Credit Bank as is available at the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. There are some funds available for crop cultivation at the Agricultural Credit Bank, but when I was making an appeal during the Estimates for this fund to be increased, because this very point I made in this House, that the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank is very well financed and has always been over the years, and what I want to do is to try to get the Agricultural Credit Bank similarly financed to take care of small farmers, and I share the concern of members because I find that whenever there is inefficiency in this country or carelessness it is always attributed to the small producer, the small man. The only person who can make mistakes in things like this is always the man from a low background, the small man.

5.10 p.m.

I see that the errors, or the mistakes, of society are more or less sheltered when it comes to people from the higher walks of life, so I would not be party or privy. I am not insensitive to the problems encountered by small farmers in this country, but we operate on a very tight budget.

Mr. BOLDEN: I wonder if the Hon. Minister would tell us whether he has made an appeal to the Prime Minister to channel some of this money into the Agricultural Credit Bank to help the small man, since he has helped to produce the windfall?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Prime Minister has earmarked some of the money for agriculture, and I am going to recommend that some of those funds be channelled into the ACB for disbursement to the small farmers. I do not have to ask him about that. We have funds, and I do not believe that the Cabinet would be averse to my, with a proper programme for small farmers, using some of the funds. We have been very hardly hit, and last year a lot of unfair reasons were given to us. I have been very much concerned about certain things, and I have made recommendations in the right quarters about the high transportation cost encountered by people in transporting canes to the various factories. We are now working on a scheme whereby during the next crop season

there will be sufficient trucks to transport people's cane to factories at a uniform rate, and not at the excessive rates we have had in St. Lucy and St. Peter where it is \$20.00 a ton. If a man had 5 acres of cane, nothing would be left for him after paying for transportation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not spectacular in our work, but we are conscious of the problems. I am more conscious of the problems than a lot of people, because I can only reflect the class from which I came, and I do not intend ever to deviate from my class in society. As a matter of fact, I love it there. I do not have to praise small people in order to love them. That is the way I have lived all of my life. I do not have to make an appeal to small people because they are in my heart and my heart reveals them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are satisfied that there is land out of agriculture. There, again, I have made proposals. Dr. Smith has almost completed a paper on how we should get people to utilise those lands again. We want to put some sort of penalty by way of taxation on land that is unused, and to reward those people who have been working their land. The 2-acre subdivisions, to my mind, was a very good thing because of the unequal distribution of land in Barbados. We have a very terrible imbalance in land. Now 46 plantations own land of over 500 acres, almost nine-tenths of arable acreage, and the other 18,000 people have less than 5 acres, and a few people own about 50 acres or more.

I think it was a good policy to subdivide, but because of the presence of land sharks in this country, and because the land was sold at a very high premium — I do not subscribe to the fact that any agricultural land should cost as much as \$8,000 an acre, if a man is to make a success of farming. If he bought 2 acres for \$16,000, he would have to do a lot of work before he could make that money. Because of the high price of land in Barbados, and because some of the people who have money were prepared to get in by all kinds of means in years gone by, they were able to buy those 2-acre lots which should have been made available to the people who really work land. They held the land and the speculators saw the advantage when you could buy two acres of land for \$16,000 as compared with a house spot in a developed area for \$15,000.

Naturally, the middle-class people who wanted to buy a house spot would buy 2 acres of land for \$16,000.00. This is where things went bad, because the wrong people were able to purchase those lots. They put a few trees at the back, a big lawn, and a big house in the centre of

a 2-acre lot, and this has made things look very untidy. As you drive around the countryside you will see large acres of land lying fallow. Several people have bought the land and they have not been able to build yet, and the land is there fallow. This has been abused, but I feel that if we impose a penalty which would discourage people, who are not genuine agriculturists, from buying agricultural land, we would then have those lots available to agriculturalists who could contribute something to the economy of this country by farming small lots. The whole idea of social reform is to make more land available to the people who never had land before. I am in that landless class of people in this country. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I have covered most of the points raised by members. I agree with the measures taken by the Minister of Finance. It is a financial matter, and I have just tried to give a few explanations as far as agriculture is concerned.

Mr. GREAVES: If I may crave your indulgence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to comment on some of the points which were raised here, particularly the points made by the Leader of the Opposition. You will recall that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, at the outset, indicated that the brunt of his attack would be on the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Never at any stage in my speech did I say that. It is a very serious misrepresentation of my motive, my speech, and everything else.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, one knows how to wave a red rag before a bull, metaphorically speaking. The indication which was given at the outset of the speech by the Leader of the Opposition led me to believe, and I am sure led a number of Members on this side to believe, that he had intended his main thrust to be the defence of the sugar workers.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Is the hon. Member saying that because I said I am going to defend the workers that means I have to attack the Union?

Mr. GREAVES: I will deal with him, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am going to make him rise as often as he wants to during this debate, because I am going to lay bear the illogical approach and, indeed, the illogical points which he made during the course of the debate as well as the entire

illogical position which was taken by the Opposition, particularly the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for St. Joseph. 5.20 p.m.

You will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition stated that the campaign which was mounted throughout this country was a campaign in the interest of, to quote him, a campaign in the interest of the agricultural worker who remains the most depressed worker in the community.

Then you heard the hon. member for St. Joseph in his speech — which was a very rambling and disconnected speech, in my opinion — say that it was as a result of the burdensome wages which were paid in the Sugar Industry that a lot of problems were being experienced in the Sugar Industry and in agriculture generally.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. This particular member of the union gets his views from other people and he cannot even talk straight. Let him quote me correctly. He was not in here when I made my speech. I never said those words. He is looking for something to say. As long as his leader is not in here he will gargle like a drowning duck.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member for St. Joseph is noted for his ability to shout. His shouting does not mean anything to me. I was sitting in here and I heard the member for St. Joseph. I made a note of the points which I considered worthy of note, and as a matter of fact there were very few. I only had two that I considered worthy of note.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. If my friend over there cannot understand a proper argument to allow him to make only two notes, that is his ability to understand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. That is only a point of interruption.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: I think that he has just discovered that he contradicted the Leader of the Opposition and he is trying for me not to get it into the record to remind this Hon. Chamber that he described the wages paid in the Sugar Industry as burdensome; and yet you had his Leader in the main speech for the Opposition indicating that the wages paid in the Sugar Industry were low wages, and that he had to go around the country to get more wages and

impress upon the people that the sugar workers were depressed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard people describe the Leader of the Opposition as a skilled debater. In my opinion a skilled debater must be a person who is capable of understanding the facts and getting the facts straight. I would like the Leader of the Opposition to deny that he said that there were workers who got their production bonus in July and how much taxes they paid. I would like him to deny that before I make the point that I want to make.

He is talking about production bonus. Obviously he is talking about something that he does not even know about. Perhaps it was an error on his part. He probably did not mean production bonus, being the skilled debater that he is, and being in possession of the facts.

Now the arrangement for production bonus is on the basis of production over a certain tonnage — 131,906 tons of sugar. If this is produced, production bonus at the rate of 2½ per cent is paid right down to 156,906 tons, a production bonus of 10 per cent.

Now, Sir, we have not in Barbados for some time produced sugar the equivalent of 131,906 tons which would bring less than the rate of production bonus; and furthermore, July is not the time that production bonus is paid; but he knows everything involved in sugar. He is Mr. Know All. He is in possession of all the facts and he will want to mislead some person into believing — not misleading — he will want to make some person believe that he knows....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. He must be careful with "misleading". A man can mislead himself if I said production when I meant ad hoc. The hon. member, since he has no other point to make, can parade. I will sit down and take it; but he must not say "mislead". I believe that the percentage was paid in June or perhaps July, just as the Prime Minister cannot remember whether it was in 1962, 1963 or 1964 that something happened.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is made.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether it is an ad hoc bonus or a production bonus, July is not the time and he knows that. I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition would like to see in the newspapers and, I suppose, hear on the air that he made the suggestion that cane cutters should be guaranteed

\$1,000 a month during the crop season. That is political talk. We take that for what it is worth.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we heard the Leader of the Opposition talking about the Prime Minister assisting the sugar producers in getting what rates they are able to get for their sugar; but we did not ask the Prime Minister to help us. What I want to state, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Barbados Workers Union, when it goes into negotiations does not solicit the help of the Prime Minister or any other group of persons. We consider when we go into negotiations that we are capable of dealing with the matter we have in hand, and we have done so. I think that the record of negotiations in the Sugar Industry clearly demonstrates this.

Sir, I want for the sake of the record to give some idea of the record rise in the wage levels, the rapid rise which the member for St. Joseph has found now to be burdensome. They talk about representing sugar workers, but at the same time you have the hon. member for St. Joseph who represents a rural constituency stating that the wage levels in the Sugar Industry are burdensome. I just want to give you for the purpose of the record....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. If the hon. member cannot understand the English Language let him go back to the university and try again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order. Both hon. members take their seats.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Fair enough.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point of order, please. I must take the hon. member's point of order. If there is no point of order I will ask him to take his seat.

Mr. BOLDEN: What I said was that Barbados is noted for the higher prices paid to agricultural workers, and therefore you should not deplete the revenue from those who are getting money because in that case the small man will go out and the magnates will flourish. If he cannot understand the whole statement, let him go home and study it and come back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is made.
5.30 p.m.

May I hear your point of order?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I object. He has again attacked my motives. He said that I said that people should get \$1,000 a month for political reasons. He is attacking my sincerity and I will call on him to withdraw that. If he feels that \$1,000 a month is too much for a sugar cane worker to get, he must also say so; but I do not feel it is too much and he must not attack my sincerity in saying so. If he for the Union feels that \$1,000 a month is too much for a sugar worker, that is up to him, but I do not feel it is too much.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is made. Will you please take your seat? *(Asides)* Let there be some order in here or somebody will go out now. I will rule on that.

As far as I have written down here, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned a \$1,000 a month guarantee for cane cutters, so the hon. member for St. Lucy is in order in what he has said up to now. Do you wish to continue?

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Certainly. In spite of the fact that the hon. member for St. Joseph has run out of the Chamber, I do not think the point I am making would be any less great. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I was saying, the hon. member for St. Joseph referred to the burdensome wages which are obtaining in the sugar industry. Bearing in mind that the whole thesis of the Leader of the Opposition was that the wages in the sugar industry were not what he considered to be proper wages or excessive wages, if he wants me to use that word, I should like to indicate that in 1971 the price of cutting canes was \$1.83 per ton, in 1974 it was \$2.40 per ton and in 1975 it was \$5.00 per ton. Can anybody in his right mind say, from the point of view of representation, and from the point of view of being able to push up the wage levels of the workers in the sugar industry, and in view of what has been taking place in the sugar industry, that this is not proper representation?

As I said, we do not have in the Barbados Workers' Union to call for any support when we are going into negotiations. We have been battling with the Sugar Producers' Federation for a number of years and we have done this single-handedly. Towards the end of 1974 when the price of sugar went up, the Barbados Workers' Union saw to it and made representation on behalf of the workers in the industry to share in the excess benefits which accrued to the industry, and this amounted to the tune of \$2,350,000 that was divided among

the workers in the industry before we started the 1975 sugar crop; so that when one talks about representation one has got to know what one is talking about. Of course, one remembers that the Barbados Labour Party in 1963 or 1964 started a Union in the sugar Industry, but one does not know what has become of that. The fact of the matter is that as far as representation of the workers is concerned, the field is wide open. If the Opposition feels that it can go and represent sugar workers better than the Barbados Workers' Union, they are quite free. Under the Trade Union Act several of them can get together, form a trade union as they have done before and try to represent the sugar workers, and one would see what will happen. They have done it already and have failed miserably; but if they want to try it again, they can. So I do not see the point they are making. *(Asides)* Mr. Deputy Speaker, can I be relieved of this heckling?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am listening to the hon. member for St. Lucy. Members not speaking must not be heard.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said at the outset that I wanted to reply to some of the points which were made because I was really listening and hoping that we would really have had some quality debate from the other side on this particular matter, but it is fairly obvious that what the Prime Minister had to say as far as this levy is concerned has taken a considerable amount of wind out of the sails which they had set to sail on what they considered to be a rough sea. Things did not turn out the way they had anticipated. We know for example that the Barbados Labour Party went throughout the length and breadth of this country talking about this sugar levy. I understand that the campaign which started in Bridgetown culminated somewhere in Crab Hill with a meeting which was supposed to be a big meeting, but it turned out to be not so big, and it has petered out, and one has to wonder what has become of the support which they had hoped to get. From the way they started out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one was under the impression that the whole place would have been in turmoil, that they would have had the sugar workers walking up and down the streets demanding money and what not. As has been pointed out, the sugar workers under the agreement will share in any additional benefits from the negotiations which we have carried out.

The other point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I would like to go back to, particularly now that the hon. member for St. Joseph has returned to his seat is this: I want him to deny that he said that there was a high turn out of

workers for the 1975 crop who were walking from plantation to plantation in search of jobs. If this is the case, just let us look at the logic of the situation. Of course I will credit him with some logic in that particular one because he said that and then he went on to talk about burdensome wages. I understand the position from which he is speaking, because I suppose as a person who has to pay wages which are negotiated in the sugar industry, and being a person who is involved in agriculture, he must view wages in that perspective. So any person who is involved in business who has to pay what he considers to be high wages would call them burdensome. He was logical in that he talked about these burdensome wages and he talked about the numbers of people who walked around trying to get a job in the sugar industry. Now isn't that an indication that the wages in the sugar industry were so attractive as to have a number of people who previously did not want to get involved in agriculture wanting to come and work in agriculture because of the wages which they felt were good in agriculture? Furthermore, this was on the 1974 wages because the new wage agreement for 1975-76 was not concluded until some time in May. So that if people on the basis of the 1974 wages.....

Mr. BOLDEN: It just shows the ignorance of the hon. member, because I said and I repeat that the wages in agriculture are the highest in the Caribbean with which the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture agreed, and the Minister of Agriculture also agreed with me that people walked around Barbados on the opening of the crop and could not get work to do in the sugar industry so what is the hon. member talking about? He is trying to make up thirty minutes and the only way he can do that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point is made. Can the hon. member for St. Joseph hear the Chair?

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what have you risen now?

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. I wonder if you have referred to the Standing Order which deals with repetition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is for me to decide on.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: I see that the hon. member for St. Joseph would like to be relieved

of the attack, and I will really conclude by drawing to his attention as I was doing that if you have people who are so anxious to get into the industry, an industry which people were running from, isn't this an indication that the wage levels were becoming attractive to such an extent that you were getting people who had previously turned away from the industry coming back into the industry, and walking from plantation to plantation in search of jobs? 5.40 p.m.

And is not this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in direct contradiction to the words of the Leader of the Opposition about the position that he took on the wage levels in the industry? What I want to point out, as I have obviously been able to do by the response coming from the other side, is to show the chaos, the confusion and indeed the lack of leadership which exists on the other side.

The Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. LOWE, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. GREAVES, Mr. WEEKES and Hon. F. G. SMITH - 10.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 5.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The count is wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member for the City voted with the Government. I heard the hon. Member for the City say "Aye" with the Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been informed by the Clerk.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I was present in the Chamber. I am on a point of privilege, I say the vote is wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ascertain from the Clerk.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, an hon. Member can only speak of his own vote, not anybody else's.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat, I am putting it to the vote again.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, with all due respect to the Chair, there is no rule which says the Deputy Speaker can call for a second vote.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down. If you want to address the Chair you must sit down.

Mr. BOLDEN (*Sitting*): Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no Standing Order which says that the Speaker, Deputy Speaker or Chairman can call for a second vote after he has been informed of the votes by the Clerk of Parliament.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, you cannot put the Clerk on trial like this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am ascertaining from the Clerk what took place. Let there be some order now. I have been officially informed by the Clerk that the vote is ten hon. members voting "Aye" and five hon. members voting "No."

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a further point of privilege. This is an Hon. Chamber, I am sitting here as an hon. Member. Hon. Members sat down and heard the hon. Member for the City say "vote with the Government." How can the Clerk in all honesty tell you that he did not say "Aye"?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is the Clerk's duty.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But I am an hon. Member. I say the Clerk has counted wrongly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. Member take his seat? By the Standing Orders the Clerk is supposed to inform me. I have accepted the Clerk's word, and that is my final ruling.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order now, I have ruled.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 1 — do not let the Clerk confuse you, Mr. Chairman. If we can have a little order, I am dealing with clause 1.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister must not make those allegations against the Clerk. If he is annoyed with the Clerk, he should deal with him in a different manner. The Prime Minister must not tell you not to let the Clerk confuse you. It was audible and clear, the Prime Minister should not do that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will take his seat.

Mr. BOLDEN: Thank you, Sir, I will so do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister got up on Clause 1 to make an amendment and I was waiting to hear the amendment to Clause 1.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think it is right for the Clerk to be standing between me and the Chair when I am moving a motion, but you see, I am not a member of the Debates Committee because I would deal with the Clerk in the Debates Committee. The Clerk has to recognise that he has certain duties and it does not matter to me whether the vote is 10-5, 8-6 or 9-8, we still won, so it does not matter to me. Statistics do not count. I said that the Clerk should not confuse the Chair by standing. (*Asides*). You still would not get the additional money for the CPA.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir, what is the Prime Minister dealing with? I thought we were dealing with the sugar levy. Why should the Prime Minister point at me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to know what the point of order is.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it is grossly unfair to let the Prime Minister stand up and make statements and then one cannot reply. When the Prime Minister says I am not going to get the extra money for the CPA it does not worry me, I am not the CPA, I am a sole individual. I am pleading for members of his Party. Does he want to shut me down on bribery? I cannot be bribed, I cannot be bought.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has made absolutely no point of order and he will take his seat.

Mr. BOLDEN: I cannot be bribed neither can I be bought and the Prime Minister knows

that since 1965. I move according to my own spirit and the Prime Minister knows that. The Prime Minister knows that I am a man who talks when I get angry.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was only telling the hon. Member that his colleague, the member for St. James, reminded me that I told him in 1965 that I got the message too late, and there were no little Ministries, there were only big Ministries for big men.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, if his emissaries carried his message too late and he was disappointed, that is their business, not mine, he should have dealt with them. He sent out his messengers and they got the message wrong, so the only saving grace was to say that it was too late.

The Question that Clause 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.50 p.m.

Clause 2 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2(2)(b), delete the words "at 96° Palarity". I beg to move that Clause 2(2)(b), as amended, stand part.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this. It seems as if the Prime Minister is dealing with a different Bill from the one we have. Clause 2(b), as I see it, reads: "The rate shall be determined on a bulk basis." (*Asides*.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Bill which the hon. Member has contains the amendments, but he has the original and the amendments which I saw him receive from the Clerk on Tuesday last week. What we have done is to reprint the Bill, as amended. The original Bill that they received with their Order Papers did not have the amendments, and we circulated the amendments last week. I saw him receive the amendments from the Clerk with my own two eyes.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister is speaking inaccuracies. He did not see me receive any Bill from the Clerk with his own two eyes. The Prime Minister is famous for making statements which are inaccurate. Today a Bill was left on the Table here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am not finished yet, Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister has no legal authority, nor political authority, to jump up in the middle of my speech to tell me to sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both hon. Members will take their seats.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to correct the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear the point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point of order is that I was trying to explain to the hon. member, who does not appear to have done his homework, that the Bill which we have today has been reprinted. I did not say that the Clerk gave him that Bill. I said that last Tuesday he was in possession of the original Bill, and I saw the Clerk hand him the amendments. What we have done with this Bill today, which I did not see him receive, but which he has in his hands — (*Asides.*) Everybody in here heard me say that. The Bill which he now has in his hands is the Bill with the amendments, deletions, corrections, and so on. When I get up at this stage to move an amendment it is on the original thing that they received with the circulation of the Gazette plus what I saw the Clerk hand him, which was a single sheet or two sheets of amendments last week. I do not know when he received this Bill.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister must not try to make statements as if he is God Almighty. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh, but he gives and takes on that side — not on this side. If the Prime Minister wants to be accurate, he should get up and say what is the true position. If he can frighten the members over there, he cannot frighten me. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh for that side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with Clause 2, as amended.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What is the noise he is making on this Clause? Does he understand the Clause? Has he read it?

Mr. BOLDEN: There is no noise. The Prime Minister should have explained the matter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If he had done his homework, he would not have had to ask those silly questions. He has an amended Bill in his hands, and he says that he does not see it in there. This is really lower-primer work, and responsible legislators should not have to contend with this sort of nonsense.

The Question that Clause 2, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. E. E. GREAVES; Mr. R. StC. WEEKES; and Hon. F. G. SMITH — 9.

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 4.

Clause 4 was called and it stood part.

Clause 5 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 5 be amended as follows:

- (1) By deleting the words "the sum in payment of the sugar export levy so estimated" appearing in the last two lines of sub-clause (1) and substituting therefor the words "a sum on account of the sugar export levy so estimated calculated by applying the rate of sugar export levy prescribed under section 3 to the amount received by the exporter in respect of the sale of the sugar at the date when the return is made".
- (2) By deleting sub-clause (3) and substituting the following —

"(3) The Minister may for good cause shown to him by an exporter extend any time limited by sub-section (1) or (2) for such period as the Minister thinks fit."

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Prime Minister did not see the necessity, despite the fact that one has to acquire a licence to export sugar, for establishing a register of sugar exporters which might help for a more orderly arrangement of the business?
6 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: As far as I know, there are not so many sugar exporters in Barbados. What we are investigating is the whole question of sugar exporting. There is a fee of 7/8th of 1 per cent which is charged by the sugar brokers. I do not know what they do for this fee; I honestly do not know. Last year it was \$300,000 — I am speaking purely from memory — and this year it will be at least between \$800,000 and \$900,000. I do not know that any more paper work is involved. As a matter of fact I would have thought that there would be less paper work this year than last year.

Since the whole market strategy was being dictated by me and the Ministry of Finance, I thought that maybe this 7/8th of 1 per cent should go to some superannuation fund for parliamentarians. I would gladly give it up for that. I do not see how the cost to the sugar brokers and the exporters could have risen because we got a better price. When they were only getting \$56,000 a prominent member of the business community told me at that time — I do not wish to call his name and it was not the past Director of the Sugar Producers' Association — but a prominent member of a prominent firm told me that he did not think that the \$56,000 was justified.

We are investigating this. The time at our disposal was too short; but we are hoping that by next year the whole question of marketing will be on a permanent and more realistic basis. If you kept a register of sugar exporters the register would probably contain the names of three companies only, and they are known to everybody. I do not think that any practical purpose will be served particularly since we may be removing from them the authority to export sugar from and on behalf of Barbados. As such we will be removing the fees or very substantially reducing them.

The Question "that the words proposed to be left out" stand part of the Question was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The Question "that those words be there inserted" was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Question that Clause 5 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE and Mr. R. St.C WEEKES. — 9.

Noes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 3.

Clause 6 was called and it stood part.

Clause 7 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it seems pretty strange to me that the period of years in Clause 7(1) should be seven years when, as I am sure the Prime Minister knows very well, there are certain Limitation Acts which say six years. I wonder what is the necessity for making it seven years in the case of this particular section which would seem to be contrary to the general run of legislation where certain charges like this are brought after seven years. I would like the Prime Minister to explain that seven years would begin to create havoc in the run of things for limitation of actions.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in the first place there is no Limitation Act in Barbados. The hon. member is going to tell me that I am wrong. I want to hear him on that now. The Limitation Act which we have was brought to the country in 1623. It is not on the Statute Book of Barbados. It is still law in Barbados, but as I say, there is no Limitation Act in Barbados. There is a Limitation Act imported from outside and used by the Courts which does not appear on the Statute Book, the law being what the settlers brought with them — the 1623 legislation.

The point is that in that English Act you have limitation for various periods. In some causes of action it is only two years; but they are still working on a six year basis with this two year action. I think that the Leader of the Opposition knows what I am talking about. In so far as Crown Proceedings are concerned the limitation is one year; but there are some personal actions.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. Under the Intestacy Act where there is a fatal accident you have to bring a case within one year.

Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow: I am not talking about that. That is the difference, you see? He now wants to show off and I am talking about what I am talking about. The Limitation Act — I think that it is 22 or 23 Charles the something.

(Aside: Mr. ADAMS: James). James, that is right. That is the limitation under which you operate. The period is not six years all the way through. It varies. The point that I will make now in answer to the hon. member for St. Joseph is that in our Crown Proceedings, in fatal accident cases etc. the period of limitation varies. In some cases it is only one year. Therefore in any Act that you introduce here there is no conflict because you fix the limitation period according to what you think the requirements are. That is the only point I want to make. The English legislation which is not on our Statute Book has varying periods of limitation.

The Question that Clause 7 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. E. E. GREAVES and R. ST.C. WEEKES — 9

Noes: M. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 3.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I have circulated to the Leader of the Opposition after the Second Reading speech the gross figures for the sugar receipts this year including fancy molasses which amount to \$112,936,492 — Barbados dollars — on sugar exports of 96,889 tons of sugar and then fancy molasses — \$2.2 million, in addition to that.
6.10 p.m.

The Question that Clause 8 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 9 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 9 stand part.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not opposing Clause 9 because it deals mainly with the civil method of recovery of any levy as a debt due to the Crown, but what I am particularly worried about is the amount of

legislation coming down to this Chamber in which the Magistrate's Court of District "A" is given jurisdiction over sums far in excess of that which is customary, and members of the magisterial bench and other members have been saying that this is placing an added burden on the jurisdiction of this particular court. The volume of cases which now can be adjudicated in the court far exceeds that of a couple of years ago. I am wondering whether it would not be wise and advisable, as has been canvassed before, for the Government to take a serious review into the limitation of the amount which can be recovered in this court. I believe the Government itself can look at the question of the creation of a senior magistrate, because I am sure in cases like this one we may run into heavy sums of money as we have in the Severance Pay Act and other Acts which have over-ruled what is written in the Magistrates Court (Jurisdiction and Procedure) Act as amended, where the magistrate can normally recover \$1,000. We have got the Hire Purchase Act and the Severance Pay Act and now we have this Act, and there are several other Acts which have by-passed this statutory limit.

I would wish that the Hon. Prime Minister who I believe deals with the Court under the Ministry of Legal Affairs will look at this and take a serious decision as to what is going to happen to the Magistrate's Court particularly of District "A" and the number of cases which can be heard. I know there have been expressions of disapproval and dissatisfaction and Magistrates in the District "A" jurisdiction have been saying that the Clerks in the District "A" jurisdiction have got to deal with matters of this nature which at one time would have been a Supreme Court matter. The salary they are receiving does not merit the volume of work they are doing and therefore I believe that the Minister should take a serious look at this particular aspect of legislation which throws this amount of work into the District "A" Court.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make one point clear and it is this: the Crown is undoubtedly placing itself in an entirely different position from its subjects in this respect, that the Crown is here given the right to proceed to the District "A" Magistrate's Court to collect an amount over which the magistrate's court would normally not have the right to deal with. What I am saying is that if one of the subjects of the Crown wanted to proceed against the Crown in a similar matter for a similar amount, he would have to take the matter to a higher court. Is it right for the Crown to place itself in this position? In other words, should not what is fair

for the Crown be equally fair for the subjects of the Crown?

The Question that Clause 9 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 10, 11 and 12 were called and they stood part.

Clause 13 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 13 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there should have been a broader view of this matter with respect to the matter of a sugar export levy. We believe there should be a Sugar Board in dealing with all matters relating to sugar, and we do not see ourselves being able to support this suggestion here for the establishment of this Sugar Export Levy Committee.

You will agree, Mr. Chairman, that the excursion, if I were to so call it, which the Prime Minister has led us into, and the depth of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and undoubtedly with the fair and balanced production of knowledge and expertise harnessed by the hon. member for St. Joseph, must give us to understand and appreciate that there ought to be a broader view of the whole matter of sugar and marketing, and the establishment of a Sugar Board would in our view serve the purpose much better.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the view which has just been expressed by the hon. member for St. Peter has also been supported by the Minister of Agriculture in that he himself declared that on his own initiative he went out and appealed to people to come into the sugar industry. This would clearly indicate that it is in Government's interest at this time not to create a Sugar Export Levy Committee only, but that there should be one national board dealing with the whole aspect of sugar which would deal with such things as planting, harvesting, export, levies and so on. I believe that this would be in the national interest as the Prime Minister said. He said that the whole country must benefit from the wind-fall which comes to sugar, therefore we should have a broad-based Committee which can look at all aspects of sugar and not only a Committee dealing with strictly the levy. This is why we

cannot support this particular section, and I will entreat the Prime Minister to look at this again in the national interest and do something about it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. members really know how many sugar committees there are. Under the Price Stabilisation Act of 1947 there are at least two committees established, then there is the Sugar Production Export and Control Board to which members of this House are appointed at the beginning of every session; then there is the Tripartite Committee which is constituted of members of the Government, the workers and the sugar producers; and you can go all the way down the line and find there is this kind of Committee and the other kind of Committee. I am inclined to agree that the whole question of sugar marketing and so on would call for some centralisation. I believe that the institutions which provide financing need a certain amount of centralisation as well, that is the Agricultural Credit Bank, the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and all the other little facilities they have in small corners. All these things need tidying up.
6.20 p.m.

I believe that the institutions which provide financing need a certain amount of centralisation as well, that is, the Agricultural Credit Bank and the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank and all the other little facilities they have. All these things need tidying up, but the point is that the cane farmers are waiting for their money and this is not the Act to do it in, consideration is being given to all of these things, and I have already indicated here today that there are certain aspects of sugar exporting in this country, there are certain aspects of the accounting systems of the sugar factories; the hon. member for St. Joseph has mentioned the confusion between Sugar Factories Limited and the Barbados Sugar Association where the left hand does not seem to know what the right hand is doing, the people who are shareholders, like the Government, do not appear to have any say in Barbados Sugar Factories Limited. They are a law unto themselves. All these things need investigation, but we do not need any high powered commission to do this, we are investigating these things. We have a model in that Jamaica has taken a step in this direction in setting up a Central Sugar Authority, and we do not exclude the possibility of such an Authority being established even although the hon. member for St. Joseph has mentioned it on the floor of this House.

I would like to assure him that because he mentions something it does not mean that the

Government is opposed to it. If that were so I think he should keep silent a little longer and more frequently and he would get more things done if this were the case.

The Question that Clause 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. E. E. GREAVES and Mr. R. StC. WEEKES — 9

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 3

Clause 14 was called and it stood part.

Clause 15 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 15 stand part.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, since we are dealing with money which has to be distributed at some period of time, I would have liked to see the Prime Minister carry through on the words he has spoken so many times in this Chamber, that you cannot get reports out of certain Government offices. He himself has had to come in here and complain that his reports have not come to him on time, and this could have been a beautiful opportunity for the Prime Minister to have some sort of penalty or some alternative method for getting these reports submitted to him and to this Chamber, or in the Official Gazette within the time specified in section 15.

I would very much like to hear the Prime Minister on this. Why has he let this opportunity slip by when he could at least introduce something new into the Government's accounting whereby accounts can be up to date? Not only would this House but the Government itself would exactly know what is happening with the finances of this country.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I really do not understand, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member wants me to do, because we have said in clause 15 that within six months after the end of each year a report has to be prepared by the Accountant General and laid on the Table of the Senate and of the House of Assembly. Is he suggesting to put in a penalty clause? As far as my Departments are concerned I think I laid the

report here for the training scheme last week, which is only three months after the end of the year of the training period.

As far as my Departments are concerned, the officers prepare their reports. I cannot say anything for the other people, particularly when it relates to accounts. Is he suggesting that we put in a penalty here for not submitting a report? I do not know what he wants me to do.

The Question that Clause 15 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. E. E. GREAVES and Mr. R. StC. WEEKES — 9

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 4

Clauses 16 and 17 were called and they stood part.

The Schedule was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill as amended be now read a third time.

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

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. E. E. GREAVES and Mr. R. StC. WEEKES — 10

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN - 4.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill as amended do now pass, and be cited as the Sugar Export Levy Act, 1975.

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

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. R. StC. WEEKES and Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY - 11

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and C. L. BOLDEN - 4
6.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next item is Order No. 3 standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, who was Chairman of the Committee, and it is to move the Honourable The House of Assembly to adopt the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report to the Honourable the House of Assembly on the Succession Bill, 1975.

THE SUCCESSION BILL, 1975

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Order Paper shows, this Report was laid on the Table of the House on the 7th October at the last sitting. The main point of this Report is that it introduces a new class of persons who may benefit on intestacy, or have a share in the legal estate and that class is called "dependant" in the Bill. The Report also extends to those persons who would be excluded from taking on intestacy, or to entitlement of a legal right - that is Clause 102 of the Bill. In other words, a spouse who has been separated, or has ceased to cohabit with the other spouse, for seven or more years will not be able to take on intestacy as of right, or entitled to share in the legal estate. It also removes any doubts as to whether a statutory spouse could include a divorcee. It refers, for good reasons, to all those persons who see an inequity in an

illegitimate child being the sole child of a deceased person taking two-thirds share of an estate on intestacy, whereas the spouse of the deceased person would only be entitled to a one-third share. The position is now reversed so that the spouse, in cases where there is only one child, whether that child is legitimate or illegitimate, the spouse will take two-thirds of the estate and that child will only be entitled to one-third. Finally, the other amendments are for the most part consequential on the introduction of the new laws as from the 1st September, 1975.

I should like to state that the Committee was ably assisted by Messrs. Errol Chase and J. C. King to whose research and industry the Committee was greatly indebted, and I think whose sterling contribution should be placed on record.

I now move that the Report be adopted.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I introduced this Bill a couple of months ago. I really was not in favour of its going to a Select Committee because, traditionally, when you want to stifle debate or to kill a Bill, in my early days in this Chamber, 25 years ago, you would send it to a Select Committee. I am very pleased with the alacrity with which the Report has emerged from the Select Committee, and I think that there are certain reverend gentlemen who ought to be informed that the members of the Opposition have even gone further in the reform that the Government tried to introduce. I think this is merit-worthy on their part.

I do not feel, however, that we have gone far enough. I think that we ought to introduce in Barbados legislation to remove the word "illegitimate" not only from the legislation, but from the dictionary of usage in Barbados. It is a word that has no place in our social thinking, no matter what the gentleman of the cloth may think, as far as I am concerned, where 70% of the citizenry of this country are born into a certain state. Whether he thinks I have run out of ideas or not, he can have the 30%, and I will take the 70%. That is the way I feel about it. I do not think that there is any such thing as an illegitimate child. His sociology is deficient and defunct. I think there may be illegitimate parents, but there is no such creature as an illegitimate child. I think the whole word

ought to be removed from our thinking, from our vocabulary, and even from the dictionary. That is how I feel, and I make no apologies for it.

I think it ought to go on record that the legal profession was 100% behind us. There was a convention held here of Churches throughout the Caribbean who sent a Resolution to me. There was the Caribbean Conference of Churches; there was a United Nations Resolution which was also sent to us. It was in our Manifesto, and I am here to carry out the mandate which the people have given me. I am not concerned with the mouthings of these unfinished people who get projected into positions to which they never felt they would ever qualify. That is the whole problem. We have too many unfinished people in Barbados. There are too many people in this country who are being put into positions because they are black. I want to say here on the record of this House, no matter how anybody may criticise it, that it is as defective reasoning to put a person in a position because he is black as to exclude him because he is black, or to put a person in an exalted position because he is white. It is worst because we are they who came out of great tribulation. I was born in the Church before they knew about it, so I can quote the scriptures. They say even the devil can quote the scriptures and that is acceptable to God. If hon. members on the opposite side do not have the courage to speak out, I say here and now I am against the whole connotation of illegitimacy, and I think we ought to remove it from our vocabulary. I am very pleased to see that the members of this House were unanimous in the support of this Bill. There is only one problem, or one social disease, we have. There are people who suffer from a want-noticing complex, and if you do not notice them they will go crazy. Well, I will leave those people to their own devices.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr, Deputy Speaker, I really think the Prime Minister should not have made that attack on the hon. member for St. Lucy. Apart from that, I will like to say that as far as his words relating to the Dean are concerned,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Where does he come in?

Mr. ADAMS: The reverend gentleman. Whoever the Prime Minister meant, Sir. I do not know what church the Prime Minister was born into; I do not know what reverend

gentleman he means, but whatever reverend gentleman he is referring to—
6.40 p.m.

As far as we are concerned, you can disagree with the strict churchman's view of legitimacy and illegitimacy without making it necessary to abuse people who express those views. I believe that the exercise on the Succession Bill is one of the finest non-partisan exercises that I have seen since I have been in the House; and the Prime Minister is perfectly right in saying that Members of the Opposition perhaps went further than Members of the Government in trying to establish the interest of — to use the most neutral expression possible — of persons born to parents who are not married to each other.

I do not believe that it proved possible to go as far with definitions as some of us would have wished. As far as I am concerned there was no party strife or any hostility on that aspect of it. It was a matter of honest views honestly expressed.

I would like to pay tribute to the chairmanship of the hon. Member for St. Michael North West who presided over a great number of long and difficult sessions of the Committee which took longer to deliberate than it was thought that it would take. It was not due to time wasting. As I said it was an honest expression of honestly held feelings; and I would not like to be so churlish as to say anything about this Bill which would reflect ill on anybody. I think that it reflects well on all of us.

As far as the use of the word "illegitimacy" is concerned, I believe that for the first 12 months that I have been in this House I have always put forward a whole series of ideas designed to carry into practice the provision that we should issue birth certificates which do not reveal whether the parents are married or not. I have said in here that I believe that you should issue a birth certificate with the maiden name of the mother on it even if she is married.

I believe that as far as humanly possible you should remove entirely any stigma, any drawback, any discomfort social or otherwise that a person might feel as a result of having been born to parents not married to each other. I do not know if there is anybody in this House who can go back as far as his grand parents and say that not only were his parents married to each other, but all his grand parents were married. I would doubt myself that anybody in this House could say that. I beg the Prime Minister's pardon. I did not know that Mr. O'Neale was in fact married to the

Prime Minister's great grand mother. (laughter) That being so it would give more weight to what he has just said. It would be best coming out of his mouth because he would not be suspected of having any family axe to grind.

I think that if the spirit which informed the whole deliberations on the Succession Bill could have informed the social measures that the Government should have been bringing to the House — and some may take time to bring — the House of Assembly will rise in the respect of the people of Barbados.

I would like to thank all the Members of the Select Committee with whom I served, and also the Chairman and the Clerk of Parliament, Mr. Boyce, who attended so indefatigably, Mr. Errol Chase, Mr. J. C. King, the Secretary, and also the Reporters who attended in very difficult circumstances and made sense and a verbatim report out of our deliberations.

Mr. BOLDEN: I believe that arising out of what the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have said that it is now very important that the Government should take a quick look at what I brought to this House in 1970 — that is a shortened birth certificate which is necessary now in this particular Act if you are removing the word "illegitimacy" and making provision for such persons to inherit. I believe that it is incumbent on the Government to introduce a shortened birth certificate.

Secondly, where two persons have cohabited together and have had children and consequently married they should have what is called a re-registration of birth whereby the question of illegitimacy is removed by a new birth certificate. I would like the Government to move quickly on this. It only needs now to have a printing of the new forms. I hope that the Government will issue instructions to stop the issuing of the present forms and issue a shortened birth certificate and also make the necessary provisions where parties do not have to go and give sworn affidavits etc., also removing the expense and difficulty in having these new birth certificates issued. That would go a long way in removing the stigma of illegitimacy.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, this has been an all party effort, and I believe that the Government has the initiative, the proper facilities and the manpower to put this into operation as quickly as possible. You can achieve a situation whereby the question of illegitimacy will be entirely removed from our society.

The Question that the Report of the Select Committee on the Succession Bill, 1975 be adopted, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the Bill as amended by the Report of the Select Committee be now read a third time.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the Bill as amended do now pass and be cited as the Succession Act, 1975.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. In fixing the Order Paper, Item No. 1 will be the two Money Resolutions — supplementaries — and the other items will be done seriatim.

I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 21st October, 1975 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

Mr. ADAMS: I have nothing against that; but first of all I would ask the indulgence of the House to give me leave of absence for six weeks with effect from tomorrow.
6.50 p.m.

There is something else I want to say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There being no objection, leave of absence is granted the hon. Member for six weeks as from tomorrow's date.

Mr. ADAMS: It is to visit India for the purpose of attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference.

The other thing is this. I find myself rising every week to raise something extraneous. This has nothing to do with C.P.A. or anything else, but I would like before I go away to take this opportunity of thanking the Clerk and the Debates Committee of which I am not now a member for doing something which is well nigh unheard of in Barbadian Parliamentary practice,

namely, bringing the debates up to date. I am informed that the debates are very nearly up to date and that this debate may be published next week. I think it is something the public ought to know, and to Mr. Boyce in particular whom I know has spent months and months of steady attendance and hard work at the Government Printery, the Leader of the House also under whose portfolio I believe this still comes, I think that all of us owe a tribute to these persons — all the Clerks, Mr. Connell and Mr. Branker, the Reporters and the whole staff who are responsible, the Minister, the Debates Committee and the Government Printery — for doing something that I would not like to tell you how long since it has been done, certainly not since I have been in the House. Hon. Members may not be aware that the public is commenting very favourably on the matter. People who read the debates regularly are telling me that they cannot believe that they are actually reading debates for September and this is only October. I would just like to mention that. I may not have a chance to say it again before Christmas so I have said it now.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On that point I think that due credit must be given to the Government Printer. The Government Printery cannot do debates which they do not receive, but as long as they can keep the debates coming through the pipeline — and I congratulate the Clerks and the Reporters and whoever are responsible — we will get them printed, and the Leader of the House will see to it. Our ambition is to have the debates printed and on the road by Friday of the same week in which the debates have taken place. I do not think it is humanly possible for them in the office of Parliament to

get the debates to the Government Printery before the Thursday following the Tuesday debate, and that is why I say Friday; but Friday certainly would be a useful time to get them on the street, and we will work towards that.

I join with the hon. Member in saying that it is a welcome feature. But do not let us delude ourselves. There is still a large backlog of debates which are either lost, stolen, strayed or unavailable, and I will not be completely happy until we get this backlog of debates from years past, in the Fifties and Sixties — I do not mean every single year — but there are great gaps in the records, and I do not think that we should congratulate ourselves until we are able to fill in all these deficiencies which now exist in the official records of the debates of this Chamber.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I should just like to add that apart from the efforts of the Clerk, the Deputy Clerks and the Reporters here, the fact is that only recently we have taken the step of appointing two more members of staff at the Government Printery, a proof reader and a copy holder, so that there are four in all. In other words, we have two working one way and the other two just concentrating on the debates of Parliament, the Order Paper and other Parliamentary papers. Two are doing this work specifically and giving full time attention to this, and already it is bearing fruit.

The Question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st October, 1975, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.57 p.m.