

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, 11th December, 1935.

The Council met pursuant to adjournment, His Excellency the Governor, SIR GEOFFRY A. S. NORTHCOTE, K.C.M.G., President, in the Chair.

PRESENT.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, (Mr. E. J. Waddington, C.M.G., O.B.E.).

The Hon. the Attorney-General, (Mr. Hector Josephs, K.C.).

The Hon. F. Dias, O.B.E. (Nominated Unofficial Member).

Major the Hon. W. Bain Gray, C.B.E., Director of Education.

The Hon. J. S. Dash, Director of Agriculture.

The Hon. E. A. Luckhoo (Eastern Berbice).

The Hon. E. F. McDavid, M.B.E., Colonial Treasurer.

The Hon. J. Mullin, O.B.E. Commissioner of Lands and Mines.

The Hon. F. J. Seaford (Georgetown North).

The Hon. M. B. G. Austin (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. W. A. D'Andrade, Comptroller of Customs.

Major the Hon. J. C. Craig, D.S.O., Director of Public Works.

The Hon. J. A. Henderson, Surgeon-General.

The Hon. M. B. Laing, District Commissioner, East Coast Demerara District.

The Hon. Percy C. Wight, O.B.E. (Georgetown Central).

The Hon. J. I. De Aguiar (Central Demerara).

The Hon. Peer Bacchus (Western Berbice).

The Hon. E. M. Walcott (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. A. R. Crum Ewing (Essequibo River).

The Hon. C. R. Jacob (North Western District).

The Hon. A. G. King (Demerara River).

The Hon. S. H. Seymour (Western Essequibo).

The Hon. J. W. Jackson (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. F. A. Mackey (Nominated Unofficial Member).

MINUTES.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 10th December, as printed and circulated, were confirmed.

UNOFFICIAL NOTICE.

SALARIES, ETC. OF TEACHERS.

Mr. DE AGUIAR gave notice of the following questions:—

1.—(a) Have the number of teachers in the First, Second and Third Class been fixed in accordance with Education Regulations, 1934, (Sec. 12), which came into force on January 1, 1935?

(b) If so, when were they fixed?

(c) Are the teachers who qualified in the certificate examination held recently included?

2.—(a) If the number is not yet fixed, why have the teachers who passed the examination not yet received the increased salary to which their new qualification entitles them?

(b) When will they receive the increased salary?

(c) Will they receive arrears of salary, dating from the first of the month following that in which the examination was held?

(d) Will a supplementary estimate be introduced to give effect to (b) and (c); if so, when?

3.—(a) Do pupil teachers receive an increase in salary on passing the annual examination?

(b) If the results are late in being published, do pupil teachers receive arrears of salary; if not, why?

COCONUT PRODUCTS (CONTROL) BILL.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, before the Order of the Day is proceeded with I crave your permission to call attention to the publicity given the remarks of the hon. Member for North Western District in this Council yesterday with reference to the Copra Board. With your permission, sir,

I will read what appears in the newspaper report:—

“The coconut producer required protection from beginning to end and the price of coconuts for export should be fixed. Quite recently when the price of copra was one cent per lb. members of the Copra Board and others interested took advantage of information gained and contracts were made for the supply of coconuts which could either be exported or turned into copra with the result that the producer was not protected.”

Now, sir, yesterday afternoon I gave that Member the opportunity of withdrawing the remarks he made, because I hardly thought that he would have wished intentionally to belittle the personnel of the Board. The Copra Board was brought into existence by this Council and I think this Council should protect the members of that Board. There are only two Members of this Council who sit on the Board, and it is for Government to protect the members who sit on the Board at the invitation and as the direct result of the Board being brought into existence by this Council. If those members of the Board can be attacked by a Member of this Council in the way they were attacked yesterday, then I do not think that Your Excellency will find any man who would be prepared to sit on Boards or Committees of that kind in future. My attention was called this morning to the report in the newspaper, and I think an opportunity should be given to this Member to withdraw his remarks. Failing that, I shall have to ask Your Excellency to take steps in the matter, or have the remarks expunged from the minutes of the meeting yesterday.

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: As a member of the Copra Board I join in protesting against the remarks made by the hon. Member. I do not know of any occasion that information in the possession of the Board was used outside, and I do not think it is fair that such allegations should be made against any member of the Board. I think the Board has been carrying on from the time it was created in a very genuine manner. The business of the Board is known to the producers of copra, nothing being concealed from them, and I protest against the allegations made against the Board.

THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps the hon. Member for North Western District will

say whether he intended to make any reflection whatever in what he said upon the honesty of the Board.

Mr. JACOB: I do not remember the hon. Nominated Member referring to me in his speech yesterday. I said information *may* have been taken from the Board. My information is substantially correct, and the remarks I made with the word “*may*” are substantially correct. However, I did not wish to cast any reflection, but if what I said referred to any member I can offer no further explanation.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I think I may be able to help somewhat. I think that yesterday after the hon. Member for North Western District had made what apparently could only be construed as a reflection on the Board, by saying that members had taken advantage of their position on the Board, the hon. Nominated Member in dealing with the point controverted it and distinctly pointed out that at the time when copra was one cent per lb. there was no Board in existence and that since the Board came into existence in 1933 copra has never been one cent per lb. If that be so then it follows that there is no foundation for what the hon. Member for North Western District has stated.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. Attorney-General is quite correct. I not only stated that the price of copra had never been one cent per lb. since the Board was started, but I also stated that it was as the result of the low price of one cent that the Board was brought into being for the protection of the coconut producer. If the hon. Member was right there might be some slight excuse—I will not say reason—for remarks of that kind being made in this House, but when it could easily be proved that his remarks were wrong then he should take the opportunity offered for correcting them. Remarks of that kind going out to the public, as happened on this occasion, give the impression to the outside world and people in the Colony who are not intimately acquainted with the working of the Board that we have rogues and vagabonds on that Board, and I strongly object to it on behalf of my colleagues and myself. If the hon. Member wishes to name any particular member of

the Board let him be man enough to do it, but don't hide behind other members of the Board. I must ask that these remarks be expunged from the minutes of yesterday's meeting, and I hope the hon. Member will withdraw them. I cannot sit in this Council and allow remarks of that nature to go unnoticed.

THE PRESIDENT: I cannot expunge from the records the remarks that have been made, but I consider that the hon. Member should withdraw any statement of his which casts any reflection whatever on the members of the Copra Board, unless he can justify those statements. I think he should make a frank statement either that he did not intend such reflection or justify it. I ask him to do one or the other.

Mr. JACOB: Sir, I stated just now that I did not wish to cast any reflection on any member of the Board, but I do maintain that contracts were entered into and coconuts supplied members of the Board during the time when the price of copra was very low, and if the hon. Member wants to know I have no hesitation in saying that applies to him.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no reason why contracts should not be entered into at any time, as far as I am aware, by any person who deals in coconuts. I understand the hon. Member to say he wishes to cast no reflection on the members of the Board. Is the hon. Nominated Member satisfied?

Mr. WALCOTT: I understood the hon. Member to say I deal in coconuts. Everybody knows that I deal in coconuts, but this is not the place for hon. Members to come and try to carry on malicious petty persecutions, and remarks that are malicious should not be allowed.

THE PRESIDENT: I regard the remarks as having been withdrawn. I think they might have been withdrawn more handsomely.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

SALE OF DRUGS.

Mr. DE AGUIAR asked the following questions of which he had given notice:—

1. What steps are being taken to prohibit the sale of drugs by unqualified persons?
2. Is there any control of the sale of drugs by unqualified persons? If not, why not?
3. Is Government aware of the danger to the Public Health of permitting the sale of drugs by unqualified persons?
4. Will Government undertake to introduce legislation, if necessary, at the present session of the Council to remedy the matter?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. Waddington) replied as follows:—

1. The sale of drugs and poisons is regulated by the Pharmacy and Poisons Ordinance, Cap. 103, and the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance, 1929, and the effect of these Ordinances is at present under investigation by a Joint Committee of the Medical Board and the Board of Examiners of Chemists and Druggists.
2. The reply is in the affirmative. All drugs and poisons are subject to the restrictions imposed by the Ordinances cited in reply to Question 1, except those set out in Schedule III. to Cap. 103, and those patent and proprietary medicines gazetted under Ordinance 40 of 1930 by the Medical Board.
3. The reply is in the affirmative.
4. Government is not aware of any situation calling for immediate remedy. On receipt of the report of the Committee referred to in the reply to Question 1 above, the matter will be fully considered.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. JACOB, on behalf of Dr. SINGH, asked the following questions:—

1. How many vacancies existed this year in the following branches of the Civil Service:—
 - Probationers, Assistant Clerks, Class III. Class II. and Class I.?
 - (a) From when did the above vacancies become vacant?
 - (b) How many of the above-named vacancies in each class have been filled and for how long did these vacancies now filled exist?
 - (c) How many vacancies are there left to be filled?
 - (d) What time did the vacancies in (c) exist and when will they be filled?
2. When will the Committee appointed by Government since 1933 to deal with "Unclassified Officers" function?
 - (i) For what period have these officers been in their respective class?
 - (ii) For what period were they drawing their maximum salary in their present class?
 - (iii) How does Government intend to remunerate their hardships and difficulties suffered by these officers?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

1. Eight vacancies and twenty-five new posts.
 - (a) 3 Class II. on 1.1.35; 1.2.35; 18.7.35.
 - 2 Class III. on 1.1.35; 1.5.35.
 - 1 Probationer on 1.9.35.

2 Assistant Clerks on 1.10.34 and 8 10.34.

(b) With the exception of one of the Class II. posts which became vacant on 1.2.35 all the vacancies have been filled.

(c) See (b).

(d) See (b) The vacancy will be filled next month.

2. As was stated in Legislative Council on 15th October, 1935, it is not the intention of Government to convene this Committee which has not yet functioned. The question of how best to deal with unclassified posts has been referred to the Officer appointed by the Governor to advise upon certain questions relating to the Civil Service for his recommendations.

(i) and (ii) A list of the officers showing particulars of salary drawn can be seen in the Colonial Secretary's Office.

(iii) The Honourable Member is referred to the first part of the answer to this question.

REPAIRS OF LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. JACOB asked the following questions:—

1. When did the Transport and Harbours Department receive locomotives "Sir Wilfred" and "Sir Graeme" and when were they assembled, also the dates when each started to work?

2. What amount has been spent for repairs on each for every calendar year since, and to 30th September last? The amount for supervision, labour and materials to be given separately for each completed year and to 30th September, 1935.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

1. The locomotives mentioned were received, assembled and put into service on the under-mentioned dates:—

Engine.	Date of arrival in Colony.	Date assembled.	Date placed in Service.
"Sir Wilfred"	... March, 1924.	April, 1924.	May, 1924.
"Sir Graeme"	... do.	do.	do.

2. The information asked for is set out below:—

LOCOMOTIVE "SIR WILFRED."

Year.	Overhead.	Labour.	Material.	Total.
From May,				
1924	\$ 27.56	\$ 184.20	\$ 28.65	\$ 240.41
1925	157.71	762.32	180.78	1,100.81
1926	274.94	1,450.25	354.67	2,079.86
1927	177.78	723.98	190.39	1,092.15
1928	315.04	1,470.93	507.68	2,293.65
1929	272.36	1,035.37	465.45	1,773.08
1930	457.45	1,353.71	1,296.17	3,107.33
1931	217.83	773.98	378.44	1,370.25
1932	305.62	1,229.80	464.95	2,000.37
1933	309.41	1,338.67	950.95	2,599.03
1934	240.44	781.58	731.81	1,753.83
1935(9months)	125.78	535.33	566.78	1,227.89
	<u>\$2,881.92</u>	<u>\$11,640.02</u>	<u>\$6,116.72</u>	<u>\$20,638.66</u>

LOCOMOTIVE "SIR GRAEME."

Year.	Overhead.	Labour.	Material.	Total.
From May,				
1924	42 71	271 52	45 99	360 22
1925	150 10	788 25	228 52	1,166 87
1926	154 33	727 32	204 34	1,085 99
1927	343 36	1,612 61	763 47	2,724 44
1928	204 64	922 53	451 27	1,578 44
1929	373 00	1,375 21	923 19	2,676 40
1930	373 26	1,158 77	955 74	2,487 77
1931	278 00	986 91	620 56	1,885 47
1932	319 27	1,331 28	1,191 38	2,841 93
1933	359 80	1,387 91	979 41	2,727 12
1934	415 42	1,523 76	898 20	2,837 38
1935(9 months)	361 91	1,217 64	1,129 54	2,709 09
	<u>\$3,380 80</u>	<u>\$13,303 71</u>	<u>\$8,396 61</u>	<u>\$25,081 12</u>

COPRA PRODUCTS (CONTROL) BILL.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and resumed consideration of "A Bill to make provision to regulate the manufacture and sale of certain products obtained from the kernel of the coconut and for purposes connected therewith."

Clause 28—Taking of samples.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Mr. Hector Josephs): When the Committee adjourned yesterday afternoon I was dealing with the proviso of sub-clause (3), which it had been moved should be struck out. To exemplify what I was saying I will give an instance of a retailer who may be selling some coconut oil product which the sampling officer had to take a sample of. The retailer may choose to keep in his shop a very small portion in a bottle to sell from as distinct from where it was offered or exposed for sale. That is an instance where the sampling officer would be at a great disadvantage if positions of that kind could occur. The proviso is not intended to be oppressive by any means but is a protection to the public.

Mr. JACOB: I would like to put it in another way. Supposing the sampling officer takes a sample and adulterates it, what is the position of the retailer? I have been asked to raise the question and to request that the proviso be deleted. If the Attorney-General considers that it is a safeguard and in no way reflects on the seller I have nothing further to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: The suggestion that the sample would be tampered with is not worthy of consideration.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: At this

stage I should like to move an amendment to the clause. The clause deals generally with the taking of samples. In these matters there is usually a provision making it an offence for a person to prevent the taking of a sample by removing, throwing away or destroying the substance which it is desired to take a sample of, and it is well that the usual provision should be inserted in this clause. I therefore move the insertion of a new sub-clause (3) and ask that the other clauses be re-numbered:—

(3) Any person who removes, throws away or destroys or causes to be removed, thrown away or destroyed any oil capable of being used in the manufacture of any coconut product in order to prevent or impede the procuring or purchase of a sample by an officer shall upon conviction be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars.

Question put, and agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move that in sub-clause (5) the word "may" be inserted before the word "require."

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 29—Power to enter and inspect factory and broker's premises and inspect books.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: This clause is the old section 24. In order to work the machinery of the Bill efficiently it is necessary to amend it by making provision for a search during the night. With that idea I move the insertion of the following proviso to sub-clause (1):—

Provided that a commissioner or commissary of taxation may enter any factory or any premises whatsoever during the night if he has reason to believe that any coconut product is being manufactured therein.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 30—Permit required for removal of coconut products.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In accordance with what was done before I move that in sub-clause (4) the word "fifty" be substituted for the word "forty."

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 31—Discharge of defendant from prosecution in certain cases.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: To rectify a clerical error I move that in sub-clause (2) (a) the word "twenty-six" be substituted for the word "twenty-five."

Question put, and agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move the insertion of a new clause 36:—

36. This Ordinance shall come into force on such day as the Governor shall fix by Proclamation published in the *Gazette*.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. JACOB: In the Schedule of Ordinance 23 of 1934 there is a note in respect of the certificate that "the Analyst may insert, at his discretion, any opinion concerning the sample and should state what foreign ingredients, if any, are contained in the sample." I don't know if Government is going to oppose the addition of those words. I do not know where I am. I can neither look to precedent nor have some principle to go by. I ask that those words be included in the Schedule.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I think the first part of the certificate covers that because it says "I certify that I have received . . . sample purporting to be . . . and declare the result of my analysis to be as follows." If there is any foreign ingredient in the sample he would say so. The note is really surplusage, and that is why it has been left out.

Mr. JACOB: I press for its inclusion in view of the fact that clause 28 (3) has been passed. The seller will have to abide by the certificate, and if it does not state the quantity of foreign ingredients he might be penalised very heavily. I think it should be inserted in justice to those concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: It appears to me that the hon. Member has not really studied the certificate form. It is quite clear from the form that the full analysis would be stated after the words "as follows," showing all foreign matter and all quantities of foreign matter in the sample. The Attorney-General's point is that it is unnecessary to state it twice.

Mr. JACOB: I maintain that if it were necessary to add the foot-note in the 1934 Ordinance it is essential to put it in this

Bill, but if the constituent parts of the analysis will be put in the certificate that meets my point.

The Council resumed.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move that the Standing Rules and Orders be suspended in order that the Bill may be read the third time.

Major BAIN GRAY seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Major BAIN GRAY seconded.

Question "That this Bill be now read a third time and passed" put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

IMPORTATION OF BEES BILL.

Professor DASH (Director of Agriculture): I beg to move that "A Bill to regulate the importation of bees and beekeepers' stock" be read the second time. This Bill has become necessary owing to the extension of the beekeepers' industry and the necessity for protecting it from the danger of introduced pests and disease. There are quite a number of very dangerous bee diseases not only in countries which supply beekeepers stock, such as Europe and the United States, but bee diseases are now in some of the neighbouring Colonies into which they have been unfortunately introduced. It is extremely desirable—and the Beekeepers' Association have so intimated—that such legislation is essential for the future welfare of the beekeeping industry of this Colony. It is an effort which has received considerable attention during the past three or four years and has made certain strides, and a Bill of this sort is now necessary if we are not to lose the progress which has been made in our efforts to build up a very useful minor industry. There is nothing really controversial about any of the clauses. The important clause is clause 3, which gives power to the Governor in Council to make regulations for the purpose of regulating

the importation of bees and beekeepers' stock.

Mr. MULLIN seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and considered the Bill clause by clause without discussion.

The Council resumed.

Professor DASH: I move that the Standing Rules and Orders be suspended to enable the Bill to be read the third time and passed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Professor DASH: I move that the Bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. MULLIN seconded.

Question "That this Bill be now read a third time and passed" put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

ESSEQUEBO COAST.

Mr. SEYMOUR: I beg to move:—

WHEREAS the report of the Essequibo Coast Commissioners has been laid on the Council table;

And whereas His Excellency the Governor's Annual Speech at the opening session of this Council stated that population of the Essequibo Coast must discover means whereby it can adjust itself to the disappearance from its midst of the many sugar estates;

And whereas there was a definite modest co-operative scheme for the establishment of sugar on this coast on a definite forward policy which the Commissioners did not investigate in detail, neither were they in a position to do so;

And whereas in paragraph 22 of their report the Commissioners recommend that the proprietors be allowed to pay the outstanding arrears of drainage and irrigation rates in ten annual instalments;

And whereas this would under the existing economic conditions be impossible:

Be it Resolved.—That His Excellency respectfully recommend to this House that the period of repayment of the arrears of drainage and irrigation be spread over a period of twenty-five years, and further

Be it Resolved.—That a small expert Select Committee be appointed with a view of examining the co-operative scheme suggested, which

was submitted to the Essequebo Coast Commissioners.

In moving this motion it will be necessary for me to cover several parts of the Commissioner's Report, but I will endeavour as far as possible to condense my observations. The report has undoubtedly placed before Government the existing conditions and it will no doubt serve a useful purpose. There are naturally exceptions where, through either misunderstanding or insufficient evidence, the exact position has not been arrived at, but these as a whole do not materially affect the general findings. There are certain points, however, which I think will stand further analysis. I do not intend to burden the Council but at the same time I ask to be given a little latitude. I cannot congratulate Government on accepting the report as the final word on Essequebo.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. Member must confine himself to the subject of his motion.

Mr. SEYMOUR: Very well, sir. However, I sincerely trust that this report does not mean that there is to be no further action or statesmanship to endeavour to restore a fraction of the county's former prosperity. It will appear that Government's policy is one of following the line of least resistance, by accepting the theory that the farmer should leave the coast in search of work rather than cultivate the enormous area of empoldered land available near at home. Paragraph 19 of the report adequately offsets such a proposal, and, further, what has been essentially lost sight of is that unless the lands are cultivated it will be impossible to pay the very large sums of money owing to Government for irrigation and drainage taxation, and also annual maintenance and new works for sea defences.

Paragraph 20 of the report definitely advises Government that rather than expend any money in assisting labour to migrate, permanent or seasonal, such money should be expended to rehabilitate the economic position of the coast. Assuming that seasonal or crop migration takes place, it would only be by the young men who are the mainstay of their families in producing ground provisions, fuel, fish and pursuing other avenues of work

to keep their homes going. Inevitable sickness likewise calls for family concentration. Seasonal migration would be a dismal failure in Essequebo from many causes. An all-important fact has been lost sight of: that the farmer being confined to agriculture it is imperative that he should be on the spot. With the artisan and industrial class of workers it is entirely different; they must necessarily go to the work. Attempts have been made in England to remove part of the population from the depressed areas but thus far the success hoped for has not materialised. The recent unrest amongst sugar estate labour must also be borne in mind before any attempt is made to encourage movement of the people from one part of the Colony to another.

I do not propose to go fully into the cause and effect of the deplorable condition now existing on the coast, but it is obvious that where rice and sugar are grown side by side the neighbourhood is reasonably prosperous. This is essentially a grass-growing country. The only economic crops that can be grown by the farmers are sugar and rice on the coastal belt: the one is dependent on the other, sugar the money crop and rice the cheap food crop. All other crops are but an infinitesimal factor in either export or home consumption. I exclude coconuts, which cannot be considered a small man's crop and which are grown with more or less success in certain areas. If the sugar industry collapse in Berbice and on the East and West Coasts, Demerara, their plight would be worse than Essequebo's is today. The present system of growing two crops of rice per annum on the Essequebo Coast must necessarily give place to one. The lands are becoming water-logged, which precludes ploughing by oxen, and the yield per acre is uneconomical. It is therefore imperative that one crop of rice per annum only be planted. We are forced to one crop a year and must make that change as early as possible.

Reference has been made by Your Excellency to a beef-cattle centre near La Belle Alliance, which we appreciate. But with cattle being sold at \$10, \$12 and \$15 per head, and sometimes no one willing to buy at a reasonable price, I visualise that cattle rearing on a big scale

would be ruined as rice is today. We welcome the proposal, but here again the breeding of cattle will not go far to restore our economic condition. A suggestion has also been made with reference to the establishment of a ghee industry. While I agree that if a ghee manufacturing industry could be established it would be of value to dairy-cattle owners, at present I cannot hold out great hope for the successful operation of such a factory on the coast owing to the uncertain supply of milk. Secondly, without adequate protection there is the question whether it would be possible to compete with highly organised and mass-output manufacturers abroad. I should like to see this and other small industries investigated, but only by private enterprise sponsored by a sympathetic Government with an agricultural loan. I entirely agree with the Commissioners' view, in paragraph 6 of their report, that "a livestock industry must be considered only as an adjunct to some other industry or industries providing more employment and putting more money into circulation." That is the kernel of the position.

The only such other industry is sugar, which for the past six years, since the preferential protection afforded by the Home Government and locally, has been the most stable raw-product industry throughout the world. I quote from the "West India Committee Circular" of October 24, 1935, for the St. Madeline Sugar Company, Ltd., the average f.o.b. price Port of Spain, per ton of sugar: 1930, £10 15s. 10d.; 1931, £10 5s. 11d.; 1932, £10 11s. 9d.; 1933, £10 11s. 7d.; 1934, £10 9s. 4d.; 1935, £9 11s. 11d. Were it not for this subsidy sugar to-day would be in a worse position than rice. Sugar is our backbone and I would like to see it get all the help it could. Realising that, nobody has the right to presume that that protection is going to be withdrawn. If it is withdrawn we might as well close our books, and you yourself, sir, would get the sack. So it is no argument to say that the protection given to sugar is not going to continue.

In paragraph 37 of their report the Commissioners deal with the co-operative scheme put forward by me and they set out six reasons for its rejection. I would like to know on what grounds they chal-

lenge my estimate for the cost of erection of a factory. It is all very well to say that you challenge my figures. I am quite prepared to challenge their decision before any committee of experts. Their statement is summary through either a misunderstanding or insufficient investigation. I ask that the scheme be given further minute examination when I can explain it in more detail than merely by giving evidence. I know that estates' figures cannot be as low, and I am prepared to lay my views before them. We should be given an opportunity to do what we set out to do. I admit that the proposal bristles with difficulties and requires expert advice. Further explanation should have been called for. It is impossible for any body of men to interpret in detail local conditions, and what appears to have been entirely overlooked is our policy to hasten slowly on sound economic lines over a five-year programme or longer.

The finding of the Commissioners that a factory of the proposed size is too small to provide the employment required in Essequebo or to be operated as an economic unit is contradictory to Mr. Palmer's advice that a cultivation of 1,500 acres should be maintained at Hampton Court. The factory contemplated by me will allow for increased output by additional units as the cultivation is extended, and it could crush 1,500 acres of canes. This is, however, a point for expert decision, which I would welcome. One very important point which should be borne in mind is the cultivation of the available empoldered lands not under rice cultivation with an economic crop. It is not so much a question that the factory must pay big dividends; rather is it a means of reducing unemployment and providing the money for the proprietors and farmers to meet their home commitments and taxation and yet pay its way. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on unemployment, thousands of them in Essequebo in the wrong channels. If the money spent in Essequebo had been spent on productive works we would not be squealing to-day. Nobody seems to want to come and cheer us up and I am asking the House to join me in this appeal to-day. It is interesting to note that in Grenada a factory to crush 8 tons of cane per hour has been erected this year to handle approximately 3,000 tons of crystal sugar annually, and there

are to-day operating in Barbados and the French West Indian islands several factories with an output much below that proposed by me.

I have been urged by a feeling of humanity to bring forward this motion, and I am appealing to the same feeling of humanity of the Members of this House. We do not expect the factory to pay large dividends. Our ambition is to cultivate the land and get something out of the soil. That must be a very strong point in the scheme. We are ourselves endeavouring to create a popular factory, not for the purpose of paying dividends but whereby we will all share alike. The cost of a small factory as proposed in my scheme is certainly not prohibitive but within the realm of economic possibilities. There is no necessity for expenditure for field equipment; the factory will be merely grinding cane produced at the door-step. I endeavoured to make that point clear to the Commission, but I may not have made it quite clear. The delivery of cane at the factory is a most important factor. I also made it clear that it is not proposed to recondition rice lands. Neither are the canals in such a condition as to require heavy expenditure. A personal inspection of available lands for sugar and canals by a competent planter would dispel any fear on those grounds. The proprietors are going to guarantee a minimum of 50 per cent. of the cane, and 1,600 acres of land can be put under cane immediately. I do not know why the Commissioners should say it is proposed to recondition rice lands when they had my memorandum with the details before them. Our intention is to cultivate rice in conjunction with sugar.

I fully realise that it is uneconomic and hazardous to operate a sugar factory dependent entirely on small farmers for cane. There, again, the Commissioners have forgotten me and other proprietors. I have carried people on my estate for 12 years growing rice. Am I not able to carry 700 living on my estate growing sugar? There is nothing unsound in my planting 50 per cent. and leaving them to plant the balance. We shall encourage the farmer in every sense of the word. The success of the people of Essequibo will be our success, and that is our motto. Conditions in Essequibo

are most favourable for the adoption of such a scheme, and cane would be delivered to the factory within a radius of four miles.

The Commissioners say that the proposal to pay labourers part of their earnings in shares is not practicable. If it was not practicable I would not have suggested it. I am too old to make wild statements. The Commissioners do not know the people. I can lead the people and, if they say they will take part of their earnings in shares, what right has any man to say it is not practicable. I can assure Government that not only will the people take shares but they will guarantee to work in order to bring about some measure of success of the scheme. Unless something is done on the lines I have suggested, Georgetown will be inundated with the human flotsam and jetsam, and that is what we are trying to avoid. We may not get all we hope for, but if we get 50 or 60 per cent. something will be achieved. The scheme is a revolutionary one. It is the first of its kind in British Guiana—to run a factory by the people for the people. It will be the biggest cane-farming scheme in this country, and if cane-farming can be done successfully in the West Indian islands there is no reason why it should not succeed here. We have excellent lands and good irrigation, perhaps not good drainage, and my proposal embodies a scheme whereby something can be done to provide employment for the people of Essequibo. I am willing to co-operate in any movement for the resuscitation of sugar there.

I congratulate the Commissioners on their work, but cannot concur in all their findings. It is inconceivable that no further action will be taken by Government. Recently we raised loans of a very large amount to keep the estates on the East Coast from the ravages of the sea and to assist the Canals Polder. The Canals Polder is a small area of 2,000 acres as compared with several thousand acres in Essequibo. Are we to be denied a few thousand dollars in Essequibo and go adrift? It is not equitable and Government must revise its view regarding that very important part of the Colony. The people have a right to ask to be assisted, directly or indirectly. The West Indian islands are not as large as Essequibo, and

I cannot think for one moment that the British Government would tell the people of those islands to emigrate elsewhere. Here is a scheme to enable us to help ourselves, and it should not be turned down for a few thousand dollars.

I must here sound a note of warning. Unless the land is cultivated it will be impossible for us to meet our obligations. There is a grave duty on Government to endeavour to resuscitate the coast, which has vast potentialities, and Government should give serious consideration to the position and take steps to investigate it. I stand here pleading. Consider the poor people in Essequibo, what they suffer, and what they are likely to suffer if nothing is done. If the scheme is turned down I will be like a fish out of water, and I am sure that the Council will feel with me and support the appointment of a small committee to analyse the scheme. If they will do that I hope in another five years' time to stand here and ring the joy bells of success of the scheme. I ask that we be given a sporting chance, and I assure you that all my efforts will be centred in Essequibo. If Government adopt the recommendation that the arrears for irrigation and drainage should be paid in 10 years it will be impossible. I say frankly that it cannot be done. We are asking that the period be extended to 25 years. There is the precedent of the ratepayers of Georgetown being allowed that period for payment of the sewerage scheme, and in equity we claim similar consideration for the people in Essequibo. I hope Government will see its way to extend the time.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I second the motion for the sake of discussion. I made the reservation to the mover of the motion that I did not consider myself competent to approve of the scheme initiated by him. What I am particularly concerned about is the term of reference: what would be the position which will be created in the Essequibo district if Hampton Court were abandoned as a sugar estate. I do not propose to traverse the grounds that the Commissioners have dealt with, but I crave indulgence to make reference to one or two paragraphs in the report. Paragraph 4 states: "From our own observations and from evidence obtained, it appears definite that unless sugar is cultivated rice will become the

sole important industry on the coast. At existing prices (\$1 per bag of padi), the rice industry cannot adequately maintain the population and provide the Essequibo proprietors with the means of paying rates and taxes." The Commissioners go on to say that "the cultivation of other staple crops was considered but none appears to offer any solution of the problem." I am perfectly satisfied to accept the conclusions of the Commissioners, and it seems to me that Government owes an obligation to the people in the Essequibo district to do something for them. I hear that if Essequibo is allowed to be abandoned the people will be reduced to a state of penury and want, and the capital loss to the Colony will be greater than can be realised at the present time. When I say "capital loss" I do not mean the capital loss the population will suffer, but the capital loss Government is bound to suffer if Essequibo is allowed to be left in a state of ruination. Reference has been made to the people's obligations to Government. I do not propose to cover that ground because that question has been very clearly put in the report.

In paragraph 7 the Commissioners state: "With the estate entirely out of operation, with no hope of finding new avenues of employment to supplement the diminishing revenue from rice, the situation on the coast in the next few years is not difficult to visualise." That is a serious note of warning to Government, and I am sure that Government must realise its responsibility and be prepared to face its obligations to the people there, because any proposal for providing them with seasonal labour would be unsatisfactory from every point of view. In paragraph 28 they state: "There appear to be three courses from which Government must select: (1) to allow matters to drift without taking definite action to right the situation which has given rise to this enquiry; (2) to provide facilities for the migration and the settlement in other parts of the Colony of labour from Essequibo; (3) to resuscitate the sugar industry." I propose to confine my remarks to the first course. The Commissioners say "If the first course is pursued, the Essequibo sugar industry, which is in the last stages of collapse, will completely disappear. It has been pointed out above that, in the

absence of sugar, rice and such supplementary sources of income as may be obtainable cannot provide the district with an adequate means of livelihood." The Commissioners were absolutely certain on the point that if sugar is removed the people will not be able to earn an adequate means of livelihood.

Paragraph 30 states that "in spite of the inevitable hardships which will be experienced, many of those residents who have purchased holdings, who own their own cottages and have lived in the locality all their lives, will not leave the district." And, as the Commissioners add, "for the section of the population remaining, Government must provide public services." Even assuming that 50 per cent. of the population was removed to other parts of the Colony, can Government say it is sound business to provide public services for the remaining population? Would it not throw an additional burden on the people in other parts of the Colony? It has been admitted that sugar is the backbone of this Colony. Government has admitted it and the people have admitted it, and to allow the last sugar estate to disappear from the Essequibo district is to court disaster. I shudder to think what will happen in the next three or four years. I know from my own experience what has been happening in that district for the past five years with the curtailing of the activities of the present sugar estate. Government must not expect that the rice industry is sufficient to carry on with, as the people cannot live by rice alone. If that is the view of Government its experience in these matters is extremely limited. Unless something is done to keep the sugar estate running on the Essequibo Coast there will be no rice industry. It is common knowledge that the rice industry is financed by people outside of Government, and I cannot visualise these financial arrangements continuing because the risk will increase and the possibility is that these advances will gradually disappear.

As to whether Government should adopt the scheme of the mover of the motion I am not competent to advise, nor am I competent to advise Government to acquire the existing estate; but I do advise that everything should be done to keep a sugar chimney on the Essequibo Coast if it is

hoped that the people will at some time or other be able to help themselves. Quite a number of people do not seem to realise in what way the rice industry is financed. It would be impossible to ascertain—and I speak of the Essequibo district in particular—the amount of floating credit that is given by shopkeepers to the growers. Does Government think that merchants will continue to give credit to shopkeepers, who in turn will issue supplies to rice growers, in the hope that something will turn up later? I can tell Government definitely that will not be the case. The position at the present moment is very acute, and everybody is depending on Government to do something to save the coast. For the reasons I have expressed I support the motion.

Professor DASH: In the first place, I should like to congratulate the mover of the motion on the activity and enterprise he has shown in connection with Essequibo. He and I have worked together on many occasions for the good of the coast, but I must say that on this occasion he has placed me in very great difficulties in connection with the reply I ought to make to the motion for the reason that he scarcely argued to the motion at all. He has rambled along very considerably and I do not propose to follow him in those ramblings. The position that he related in regard to crops and conditions is very well known to Members of this Council and colonists generally. Moreover, the Commission's Report dealt very fully with all matters affecting crops and conditions as they affect Essequibo. The unemployment question, too, was stressed, and all the points relating thereto. Looking over the debate as a whole up to the present juncture, I think I am safe in affirming that not a single new point has been brought into the picture that has not been fully dealt with in the facts which are elucidated in the Commission's Report.

The motion before the Council is divided into two parts. One part deals with the extending of the time for payment of the arrears of drainage rates due to Government by the Essequibo proprietors over a period beyond the time which has been recommended by the Commission. With this proposal I am not competent to deal. It is a matter of policy, but I am sure

that it will receive the fullest consideration which it deserves from Government. In regard to the matter of selecting an expert Committee to examine the proposal previously turned down by the Commission, the hon. Member appears to be satisfied that there were not sufficient experts on the Commission when the scheme was submitted. I do not think that this Council will agree with him if he thinks that that is true, and after listening to his remarks the Council will regret that he did not always keep his feet on solid earth. The Commissioners were inclined carefully to consider every sugar proposal put before them, realising the full value of the sugar industry to this Colony and fully aware of the value of a sugar factory to any area that adjoins it. I think that one of the greatest economic tragedies that has ever befallen this Colony has been the passing of sugar from the Essequibo Coast, and the Commission that examined the project, composed of several members fully experienced in sugar matters, appreciated that position. As Chairman of the Commission I can assure the Council that if the Commission's Report was slow in appearing it was due entirely to the fact that a great deal of time was necessarily taken up in examining all the facts and figures which had accumulated during the consideration of this intricate and important problem.

The Council adjourned for the luncheon recess.

Professor DASH: When the Council adjourned, sir, I had stated that the mover of the motion had placed me in a rather difficult position on account of the fact that he had not really and strictly argued to the motion but had gone over a considerable amount of ground which had been fully covered in the Commission's Report, and furthermore that in the debate as a whole no new point had really emerged. I was on the point of coming down rather more definitely to the proposals which the hon. Member had put up to the Commission. Those proposals were of a modest nature and naturally were very attractive to the Commission at first blush, but the more they were studied the more obvious it became, apart from those furnished by the manufacturers of the mill and actual factory equipment, that the figures were incom-

patible with local experience for similar work. Indeed, in some instances they were so far out as to give cause for wonder as to what the compiler of these proposals really had in his mind. Witnesses on the spot, too, after being closely questioned, frankly admitted that these proposals had not been very carefully studied and many of them were not in a position to tell us how far some of the proposals could be actually put into practice.

The proposal whereby labour was supposed to take shares on a co-operative basis was something entirely new in this Colony, and I think we all agree that it could only be adopted in the nature of an experiment. Any scheme of this sort involving the expenditure of considerable sums of money, and of which we have no experience whatever, it would not be businesslike to experiment with in that way. In fact, judging the position as we know it, such proposals would fall to the ground. When everything is taken into consideration four or five times as much capital would be necessary in the long run as compared with the estimates put before the Commission. The Commission felt that production on the lines which were envisaged could not possibly solve the problem as they saw it. I have no desire to wound the susceptibilities of the hon. Member, who has certainly worked very hard in connection with the scheme which he put up, nevertheless I must say the Commissioners felt that the scheme would not bear close examination of anyone who had any experience of labour conditions in this country, the value of work and the main factors joined to the issue.

Hon. Members would have read the Commission's Report and the grounds on which the scheme was rejected. Apart from the actual expenditure on the factory and equipment, there are conditions affecting the development of the industry generally which must be borne in mind. The point was overlooked that cane-farming, while it should be encouraged in every possible way, can only be encouraged as an adjunct to some large scale nucleus, which does not mean 20, 30 or 40 acres but something which will be proportionate to overhead charges and other expenditure. In fact, experience has shown in this Colony, as in every sugar producing Colony, that the small factory is coming

to an end. The hon. Member mentioned one in Grenada. There you have a special local market to satisfy and around which artificial conditions of price can be built up. You have the same thing happening now in British Honduras, where an effort is being made to meet local needs. He also referred to the French West Indian islands. Everyone knows that there it is not so much a question of sugar; it is largely a question of rum and the benefits they derive from a high protective tariff in their home markets. All those points, I think, escaped the hon. Member's attention or his knowledge when his scheme for a very small output was placed before the Commission. I have no intention of going through all the details of the figures that were supplied. I am not competent enough to do so, but on the Commission there were several members who were capable and competent to examine the figures from an engineering and construction point of view, and doubtless those members of the Commission in this Council will be able to say something more on that aspect of the question.

I think I have said enough to show that the idea of appointing an expert Committee to go further into the proposals is not necessary at the moment. However sympathetic I am with the views put forward, I do not think a case has been made out for another expert Committee to consider the question, nor do I feel that any good will accrue at the moment by reopening the sugar issue in Essequibo. Since the Commission's Report was published the sugar outlook has undergone a considerable change. It has been ventilated in the Press and we are all familiar with the marketing situation, so that on those grounds alone I do not think that any good will accrue by reverting to discussion of sugar so far as Essequibo is concerned at this juncture. That does not mean that I as Director of Agriculture am oblivious to the difficulties which beset Essequibo's agriculturists, and I am sure that Government will do all in its power to help in every way those difficulties. I understand that the position more recently has improved somewhat. More seasonal labourers have been finding work on the estates, and from time to time doubtless the numbers will increase and they will carry back to Essequibo the money they have made, which will help them to continue their rice cultiva-

tion on economic lines. Once more I would like to say that I am fully sympathetic, and I admire the hard work the hon. Member has put into the study of Essequibo economic conditions. At the same time for the reasons I have given, which I consider are sufficiently strong, I am unable to recommend acceptance of the motion.

Mr. WIGHT: I desire to congratulate the members of the Commission on their very able report, which is very constructive as far as I am concerned. I also congratulate the hon. Member for Western Essequibo on bringing forward the motion. I am satisfied from personal knowledge that it is impossible to collect the rates and taxes on properties in Essequibo at this moment. I go further and say that the blame for the waste of money there is attachable to an officer other than the present Director of Public Works. He was not here at the time when the money spent by the Department was literally thrown into the sea on the Essequibo Coast. I instance a case where \$30,000 or \$40,000 was spent on an estate that was not worth \$12,000. I digress to say that I bought Lima, which was indebted to me, for \$8,000 and after paying my money Government played me the dirty trick of seizing \$5,000 of it for somebody's debt. I bought Golden Fleece and was similarly dealt with. There is another estate that is indebted to me and I am going to make the owner an insolvent and see what Government will get out of it.

I think it is inadvisable that the second part of the motion should be submitted to the Council. I do not see what committee of the inhabitants of Georgetown or Essequibo can be selected to go into the scheme of the mover of the motion again. It would be a waste of time. It would be much more advantageous to consider the suggestion that Government should undertake to give a guarantee for the working of Pln. Hampton Court under different management. I have floated several companies and have come to the conclusion that there are only three firms that can run a sugar estate or take a wrecked estate and carry it on. There is one proprietor who runs his own estate and is doing remarkably well, but time will show him that he is making a mistake. If under different management Government will

give an undertaking to guarantee the estimated expenditure to maintain Hampton Court the approximate loss is \$17,420 per annum, but I expect the price of sugar to rise and the loss will be about \$10,000. Such an arrangement would work much more advantageously to the taxpayer than to let the estate go out of existence.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. Member must confine himself to the motion. I stopped the mover from referring to Hampton Court because I did not consider it germane to the issue.

Mr. WIGHT: I bow to your ruling, sir. I was going on to say that if you do not do that you will have to contribute more than \$10,000 in doles to the Essequibo Coast or increase the prison accommodation. We sometimes fritter away thousands of pounds with nothing to gain. In this instance we will be only running a risk. I am satisfied that under proper management the estate can make ends meet at the end of every financial year. I hope Your Excellency will see your way to recommend to the Colonial Office that the period for payment of the arrears be extended to 25 years. It is in the same position as the arrears for sewerage rates, and I feel sure, sir, that you will do what is in your power to get the time extended. I have no self interest in making this suggestion as I owe nothing on my properties there.

The mover of the motion made the statement that cattle in Essequibo is fetching between \$10 and \$15 per head. I offer him 350 head there at \$6 per head; it shows what a parlous state of conditions is existing in Essequibo. I do not agree with the Director of Agriculture that all propositions with regard to sugar on the coast have been gone into. I do not think the view I have expressed of conditions in Essequibo has struck all the Members; it is something that I think will save Government a considerable sum of money. To close Hampton Court would mean bringing between 700 and 1,000 people from Essequibo, who will be unemployed in Georgetown. The British Government lend money to foreign countries to buy sugar and other products and sell the surplus in England at a profit. I feel sure that it will not cost Government \$10,000 a year to run the estate

under proper management, and it will be a considerable saving to the Colony.

Mr. SEAFORD: I would not have spoken on this motion at all because my views are already expressed in the report of the Commission which has been laid on the table, but the mover in the motion says "there was a definite modest co-operative scheme for the establishment of sugar on this coast on a definite forward policy which the Commissioners did not investigate in detail, neither were they in a position to do so." With that statement I cannot agree, and if the adoption of the motion rests on it I shall be unable to vote for the motion. I admit that the proposal is a modest one. I and other members of the Commission went very carefully into the scheme, and when we were in Essequibo we asked the mover of the motion certain questions and even pointed out to him that he had forgotten about working capital and other things. An amended scheme was then sent in which was again gone into very carefully. Although we may not be experts, we had evidence on the points as well. We called and examined several proprietors who were to supply the cane, and they gave us their views on the feasibility of the whole scheme.

The hon. Member stated that Mr. Palmer in his report said the factory was too small. I do not think that Mr. Palmer expressed any opinion about the proposed factory. What he said was that the cultivation should be 1,500 acres, and not less, in order that the scheme should be an economic proposition. You cannot run a sugar factory making less than 5,000 tons economically, and Mr. Palmer therefore estimated that there would be over 3 tons from that acreage. It is not to be expected that you will get that return from cane-farming, but only where you deal with an area of land on a large scale and are prepared to invest capital in irrigation, ploughs and such things, and go in for flood fallowing. The area put under cultivation would have to be considerably more than 1,500 acres if you are going to bring the factory up to 5,000 tons.

The Commissioners dealt with the proposals put forward one by one and dealt with them very carefully. They say that "the submitted estimates for the

cost of erection of a factory are not accepted." For one Sterling boiler the estimate is \$1,920. A new boiler of the size proposed will cost \$20,000, and labour and the foundation alone will cost \$1,900. You will note in the report that in the scheme there is no mention of a free gift by Government, and I do not know how many thousand dollars Government is prepared to give to this co-operative scheme. The next item is a chimney the estimated cost of which is \$1,872. This chimney will require a very heavy foundation which the estimated cost will about cover only.

Mr. SEYMOUR: The hon. Member—

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. Member must allow criticism of his own proposals which he has brought before the Council. He will have an opportunity to reply subsequently.

Mr. SEAFORD: My reason for referring to these estimates is because the preamble of the motion says that the Commissioners did not investigate the scheme in detail, and I want to show that they did investigate it and go into the figures. 500 cubic yards of concrete work out at \$7 per cubic yard, and I will give the hon. Member numerous contracts at that figure. The Commissioners considered "the estimates for operating the factory are too low." The estimates work out at \$4 per ton, or \$2,000. It must be borne in mind that in a large factory dealing with 50 to 60 tons of cane per hour you will have practically the same number of persons working, and I do not know of any factory which can do it at under \$12 per ton. With overhead expenses it works out at about \$16 per ton, and at the wages it is proposed to pay the people in Essequebo I will try to get Essequebo people on any estate I am connected with.

The next point is that "A factory of the proposed size is too small to provide the employment required in Essequebo or to be operated as an economic unit." We considered that the number of people that the factory would give employment to and the amount of money it would circulate would not be sufficient to put Essequebo on its feet again. The hon. Member referred to the factory in Grenada, which he said is about the same size, but he did not mention that in Grenada, as in all the islands, the sucrose contents of the cane is 50 per cent. higher than in this Colony. We take 12 tons of cane to make 1 ton of

sugar and they produce 50 per cent. more sugar with the same amount of cane. We also have different conditions to some of the islands in regard to weather. Grinding takes place at the beginning and end of the year, and sometimes in the wet season it is impossible to have a steady week's work, therefore it is not possible to say that we are going to grind so many days during the year.

The fifth point is "it is recognised as uneconomic and hazardous to operate a sugar factory dependent entirely on small farmers for cane as suggested." That is recognised throughout the world. While in Trinidad canes are supplied to the Usine St. Madeline by cane-farmers, the amount supplied to the factory is becoming less and less in proportion to the supply by the proprietors, and it is a generally accepted principle that no factory can work properly unless it has got about 70 per cent. of cane grown by the factory proprietors themselves. The question of new factories in the islands has been dealt with already by the Director of Agriculture.

The mover of the motion made the point that we had forgotten the personal factor. I do not think that was forgotten, and no one who knows the hon. Member would forget the personal factor. His whole heart and soul are in the scheme, and it is his duty to do what he can for the district. We are not disputing that, but we cannot bring the personal factor into this matter and have to look at it from the business point of view. The hon. Member might be here to-day and gone to-morrow, and if we look upon the personal factor it is going to recoil on us in years to come.

The final reason in the report is that "the proposed suggestion to pay labourers part of their earnings in shares is not practicable." That was the unanimous opinion of the Commission, and it was also the opinion of persons who proposed to grow canes as cane-farmers in Essequebo. They definitely express the opinion that they do not think that is likely. I do not see in the estimate of the mover any provision for breakdowns, repairs, renewals or depreciation. All those are considerable items, and in new factories there have been breakdowns in the very first year. The hon. Member asked the House to consider the poor people in

Essequibo, what they suffer, and what they are likely to suffer if nothing is done. I do not think there is a single Member who would not like to help as far as possible everybody in Essequibo. If I am not mistaken he went on to say that irrigation and drainage schemes in other parts of the Colony have been paid for by Government, and I gathered he suggested that the same thing had not been done for Essequibo. There are several schemes in Essequibo which have been paid for by Government. I need only refer to certain questions which were asked by Mr. Brassington on the 22nd January, 1935. One question was: "What amount has been spent on drainage and irrigation schemes in Demerara, Essequibo and Berbice with the object of increasing the production of rice during the last five years and for the ten months ended October, 1934? The table giving the information shows that in respect of Essequibo the expenditure: 1929, \$29,612; 1930, \$2,724; 1931, \$1,852; 1932, \$36,270; 1933, \$20,505; 1934, \$19,217. I do not think, therefore, that Essequibo has suffered so much in comparison with other parts of the Colony. I must admit that I am not prepared to say what are likely to be the results of these schemes, but that money has been spent and I hope that the spending of it will be justified.

The Commission went very carefully into all the points, although the hon. Member said they did not, and I cannot see the advantage of appointing a committee to go into them a second time. If the hon. Member can persuade me that I am wrong I will be the first to admit it and to do my best to persuade Government to advance any sum of money, but I am afraid his task would be a somewhat difficult one. With regard to the first part of the motion for payment of the arrears, I adhere to the opinion of the Commission that it should be spread over a period of 10 years, but if Government is willing to make the period longer I will agree to it. I cannot agree to the second part of the motion. I feel sure that the hon. Member has the interest of the people at heart, but in bringing this proposal forward he has been carried away by kind-heartedness rather than by his well known business ability.

Mr. JACOB: I rise to add my quota to

the debate and to urge that Government should make an appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies that something should be done for Essequibo, and I shall base my arguments on the points of reference. To deal with this matter comprehensively will take up a great deal of time, and I do not wish to take up too much time, but in order to put forward something comprehensive I crave Your Excellency's indulgence. I wish, first of all, to congratulate the Commissioners on their very able report. At the same time I do think that certain pictures have been overdrawn. I refer particularly to paragraph 20, in which the Commissioners say:—

"Should it be considered that there is no alternative to migration—which has to some extent already begun—then the Commission consider that the cost of erecting cottages and of transportation will have to be borne by Government. It is estimated that the cost of housing is about \$300, and of transportation \$10 per family. If 1,500 families leave Essequibo, the cost to Government will therefore be approximately \$465,000."

That position, to my mind, has been a bit overdrawn. Let us assume that Government will have to spend \$465,000 to accommodate 1,500 families on other estates, it would be far better to adopt the scheme suggested by advancing \$385,450 to carry on the estate.

THE PRESIDENT: There was never any conception of Government spending that money on housing labourers. Government never had any such intention.

Mr. JACOB: Well, sir, the Commissioners made three alternative recommendations, viz., (1) to allow matters to drift without taking definite action to right the situation which has given rise to this enquiry; (2) to provide facilities for the migration and the settlement in other parts of the Colony of labour from Essequibo; (3) to resuscitate the sugar industry. I have been connected in some measure with the Essequibo Coast for nearly a score of years, and I still have the privilege of being connected with Hampton Court particularly for 18 years. I was also connected with the Anna Regina Land Settlement Scheme which for six years was worked so successfully that Government lost practically no money. One of the reasons for closing down Anna Regina was that it was considered that rice culti-

vation would have been sufficient to carry on the existing population of Essequibo because the price of rice was high. Conditions on the coast have changed considerably since 1928. The Commissioners themselves admit in paragraph 4 that from their own observations and from evidence obtained it is not possible, with the present prices of rice, to maintain the population by rice cultivation alone. When *Anna Regina* was closed down Government lost only \$5,000. It was a cane-farming scheme—somewhat an experiment—and in sustaining a loss of only \$5,000 Government did very well indeed.

Mr. SEAFORD: That loss was not made only on the running of the estate. Government were given that property at a very low price. Where they made money was on the re-selling of the property.

Mr. JACOB: I am not prepared to contradict the hon. Member, but I was Secretary and town agent throughout the scheme. The fact remains that Government lost only \$5,000 on an experiment, which lasted six years and was of tremendous benefit to Essequibo as a whole. Had Government not stepped in then the position in Essequibo would have been even worse than it is today. The value of agricultural products on the whole has depreciated and cattle is worth practically nothing at the moment. Those are factors that must be taken into consideration. What I am concerned with more particularly is: What are the people on the Essequibo Coast going to do? I heard the Director of Agriculture say that the disappearance of sugar in Essequibo is one of the greatest economic tragedies. Government should do all in its power to help, and I am going to suggest one or two means whereby Government may be able to help. The position in Essequibo is far from satisfactory. The suggestion was made that Government should take over the estate and give it to one of three firms to run it. I think that is a very good suggestion. Something ought to be done and the onus is on Government to do it. The difficulty of the proprietors of the existing estate is that they cannot get money to carry on that estate. This House accepted a motion 10 years ago to organise and establish an Agricultural Loan Bank to help existing industries or industries that

may be started. Government itself loaned a sugar estate \$50,000 to erect a pumping plant to improve conditions on that estate; and it is the wish of the people of Essequibo that something similar should be done for them so that they may be able to earn a livelihood.

Mention has been made that the Imperial Government lends money to foreign countries. Here is an industry of commercial value to the Colony—a value that is very well recognised by the Secretary of State. By helping the sugar industry on the Essequibo Coast the Imperial Government would also be helping other industries and the population as a whole. I have had the privilege of getting information from London that there was some doubt as to whether 1,000 or 17,000 people would be assisted by the continuation of Hampton Court. I am sorry that the details of the evidence are not appended to the report of the Commissioners so that the Secretary of State could see what was stated by people who ought to know. If the evidence is sent to the Secretary of State we might get the matter reopened for the benefit of Essequibo. The scheme is one which would probably do a great deal of good. The Commissioners say that if the estate is taken over in the first year 255 tons of sugar will be made and the second year 1,565 tons. I am in a position to inform this House that since June, when the estate was practically closed down and practically no work done, 150 tons of sugar was manufactured, and from now to June next year another 500 tons can be manufactured. The Commissioners therefore erred in their estimate of 255 tons.

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. Member says the Commissioners erred; the Commissioners did not err. If he would read the report he would see that Mr. Palmer recommended that the standing canes should be used for drawing down for planting. It is not meant that those canes should be ground but should be used to establish the cultivation.

Mr. JACOB: I accept the explanation. I was endeavouring to make the point that there are different ways of carrying on an estate, and if the proprietors of this estate have been carrying on for practically 20 years with very little capital at their dis-

posal one can see the reason for assistance to the extent of \$150,000. The money can be expended on the property, and even if the scheme fails Government would be adequately secured by having the property in their own hands. I agree that the management of the estate should be in the hands of someone who is competent. What I want to see is that something is done. The statement that Government will do all in its power is not enough. What I want the Secretary of State to understand is that we want something more than mere words. We want to be able to arrange matters here with the help of the Imperial Government, and so make conditions stable for the large number of people in Essequebo who are entirely dependent on the sugar industry. If the sugar industry cease to exist the Colony will go, yet when it comes to helping Essequebo we hear some other argument. I do not know how it is possible to transport 1,600 people from one part of the Colony to another without some effect on the revenue. If it is not the intention to transport all these people from Essequebo, how must they live there? The position is rather serious for these people. I would like to warn Government that there will be serious repercussions.

If it is the intention of Government—and the policy appears to be that—that certain sections of the Colony must go, then the sooner Government puts forward the policy that it is not prepared to help certain districts the better for all concerned. It does appear that Government is not seriously concerned whether Essequebo remains or not. It must be apparent to Government that rice and other industries in Essequebo cannot maintain the population there. The Commission accepted the evidence that the people there cannot live on the existing cultivation. What then must the people do? It does not only affect Essequebo but also the Pomeroun and other districts in that locality. I conceive it to be my duty—in fact I consider my duty to be a very sacred one—to put the facts before Government as plainly as possible. I cannot help referring to an article appearing in the “West India Committee Circular” in which suggestions made by Members of Parliament are recorded. It is not necessary for me to read the article because it must be known to all

concerned, but the suggestion is that if the Imperial Government does not intend to develop her Colonies they should be handed over to others to develop them. It is not right or fair to the people that this Colony should remain undeveloped. We want this Colony to be developed and want to be assured of financial assistance. When it comes to developing agricultural industries we are told that they are not of commercial value. To our appeal for help for Essequebo we are told there is no money. What, then, must we do? It is for the Secretary of State to consider these matters and tell us definitely what our position is. I am submitting that if the British public were aware of the actual position of the people in these Colonies the position would be different, and I suggest that something should be done to make the Imperial Government realise that the people of this Colony must not go half served. Something must be done to make the people feel that they are British subjects and are entitled to live as British subjects.

I quite agree that the term should be extended for payment of sea defence and other rates. It is well known that the people cannot afford to pay these rates and the sooner the position is settled the better for all concerned. We have done all we possibly could to advise Government on this important question, and I think it is only reasonable to expect that Your Excellency will give us some undertaking that the matter will be reopened and the Secretary of State will have some further time to reconsider the whole position. The position in Essequebo is very grave. The people there can hardly eke out an existence. The rice industry, as I said before, cannot maintain them. That position is not peculiar to Essequebo alone, but it has been aggravated by continuous low prices, and the time will surely come when the people will have to go to some other part of the Colony with the result that there will be serious labour troubles again in the near future. I think it is my duty to say that something ought to be done, and done very quickly, in order that the financial stress of the whole Colony may be relieved.

Mr. WIGHT: The hon. Member in the course of his remarks said that Government helped an estate on the East Coast

with a loan to erect a pumping plant. That is incorrect. He must have seen a mortgage advertised for some pumps bought from the Public Works Department. The mortgage was not for a loan. Government had some derelict pumps and they were purchased and a mortgage given in respect of the purchase.

Mr. JACOB: Am I to understand that the Public Works Department has separate funds from Government funds?

Major CRAIG (Director of Public Works): The pumps were under the Public Works Department, but they were paid for out of Government funds. They were under the Public Works Department because that Department deals with executive matters. The mortgage has been pretty well repaid.

Mr. SEAFORD: I can explain this question. Government had more pumps than were needed and they got the estate to take them over for \$50,000. The estate gave a mortgage on the whole estate, but the mortgage has been paid off some time now.

Mr. JACOB: It is a distinction without a difference. The fact remains that that estate was helped by pumps bought with Government money. When the question was raised one Member said it was hoped that when other properties were in a similar position Government would help in some way or other.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In placing this motion before the Council the mover spoke in somewhat general terms. He referred to the economic conditions on the Essequibo Coast at the moment and stated how important it was that support should be given to any industry—major or minor—which could in any way improve those conditions. In seeking for a remedy he, first of all, pinned his faith to the scheme which he had placed before the Commission and subsequently dealt with the matter on the grounds of a general plea, which was summed up in the words actually used by the hon. Member for North Western District—"that Government must do something." The Director of Agriculture and other Members have already dealt with the scheme itself, and I have nothing to do but to agree with the words of the hon. Member for Georgetown North when he said that

the personnel of the Commission appointed was as competent to deal with a scheme of this sort as any committee that can be selected. As to the plea on general grounds, although this is not really pertinent to the motion itself, I would like to say, first of all, that the often used expression "Government must do something" is really not very useful in any vexed matter, and certainly not so in this.

The development of industries of a minor nature, such as ghee and the beef industry which were mentioned by the hon. mover, and any other industry which can be shown to be at all feasible, will have the whole support of Government. Government is investigating these schemes as quickly as it can and is doing all that it can to further these industries, but it must be understood that the schemes must be feasible and not be in the nature of a gamble with what is called "Government's money." After all what is called Government's money is the taxpayers' money, and Government has not the right to gamble with the taxpayers' money on any foolhardy schemes that may be put forward. They must be properly investigated first. The hon. Member stated that he could not see why this Colony should not get some money in the same way as other places from the Imperial Government; and the hon. Member for North Western District rather inferred that this Colony was not in any way helped by the Imperial Government. If these hon. Members will refer to Your Excellency's speech at the opening of this session, they will see figures of the extent to which the Imperial Government has granted assistance to this Colony for the last few years. Apart from the Colonial Development grants we received \$1,256,978 as free grants and \$2,190,605 as loans in aid.

I will now refer to the second part of the motion, namely, the question of the arrears. I wish to say that Government does appreciate the fact that the present accumulation of arrears for irrigation and drainage rates in Essequibo cannot be paid in a lump sum. Government will therefore give sympathetic consideration to a funding scheme. Such a scheme, of course, must contain adequate safeguards for Government money, and when I use the word "Government" it is the taxpayer

again. The financial and other officers of Government are being instructed to draw up for Government's consideration a funding scheme, and I can assure the hon. Member that it will be considered and put into operation at a very early date. I can hold out little hope that Government will be able to extend the scheme to the 25-year period, nor will it necessarily be restricted to the 10-year period which has been recommended by the Commission. The details of it will have to be considered and laid before Government by its advisers, and Government proposes to consider it and to make public its policy as early as possible.

Mr. SEYMOUR: I feel as if I am cornered, but I hope it will not be considered that I am rambling. The Director of Agriculture said I did not produce any evidence. I thought I did. I tried to impress on Government that I have not been given a fair and square deal. This is no place to go into expert details and I am quite prepared to meet the hon. Member for Georgetown North and convince him. The Director of Agriculture spoke about the drainage of the lands. We do not intend to cultivate the front lands. It is not only a question of going into figures as an expert but a question of facing conditions which call for sound practical ideas. Had it not been for the protection given to the sugar industry it would not have been alive to-day, and we have a right to the same protection which other parts of the Colony enjoy. Sugar is in a flourishing condition to-day and it is stabilised, and if the assistance sought is given some prosperity will return to Essequibo. The opposition to my scheme is based on the argument that the scheme as a whole is wrong. That is an arbitrary view of it. The Director of Public Works and the hon. Member for Georgetown North are in the same boat as myself as engineers and I do not agree with the argument that my estimates are thousands of dollars out. I have provided \$5,123 for unforeseen expenditure, \$2,823 for a reserve fund and \$16,000, for working capital, so even if we suffer a loss in the first year we have a very good chance of recovering it in the next.

A good deal has been said to the effect that cane-farming cannot succeed. It did not appear to me in my rambles that half-a-dozen influential proprietors, including

myself, would put \$2,000 or \$3,000 into a scheme which will eventually mean our ruin. We are not so foolish to do a thing that is going to do us no good. It is the first time I have been called soft-hearted, and I accept the compliment. But the scheme is not a gamble. It is the result of very careful investigation and not of selfish motives, and it is intended to benefit the district as a whole. No matter what reception the scheme has received from the Commission, the absence of a representative of Essequibo was conspicuous. I expected to have seen sugar very sympathetic to the scheme, and if they can extend a helping hand to Essequibo it would be a good gesture for their further success.

Mr. SEAFORD: I do not think that the sugar industry can make any stronger plea for Essequibo than is contained in the Commission's Report.

Mr. SEYMOUR: Reference has been made to the expenditure in Essequibo. None of the proprietors know how that money was spent; its expenditure has been a gamble right through. \$75,000 was spent last year. That was another gamble which is a dead loss, yet we are told that Government cannot gamble with the taxpayers' money. A dredger was imported from Trinidad for use in Essequibo and to-day you can drive over the trenches. Everything is a gamble. I plead for justice and fairplay on behalf of the people of Essequibo. Let my figures be criticised constructively, let me answer the queries, and let me show what the possibilities are. This is an honest scheme backed by everyone in Essequibo. If Government will adopt any other scheme or resuscitate Hampton Court I will be satisfied. I will give in to anything for the benefit of the people, and I will play a very important part in it. With regard to the arrears, 10 years will not be sufficient. The people will not be able to pay until prosperity returns to Essequibo. I hope that when Government deals with the matter we shall hear that 25 years will be the period.

THE PRESIDENT: I have very little to add to what has been said by the Colonial Secretary. He has touched on a point which caused me some surprise: that it should have been stated in this Council that this Colony receives no help

from the Imperial Government. As the Colonial Secretary has shown, we are indebted to the Imperial Government for about three-and-a-half million dollars, most of it as a loan grant-in-aid which has been given to help us to carry on. The hon. Member for the North West Constituency in his first speech in this Council said he considered that this Colony should be reduced to the rank of a fifth-rate Colony. I can assure him that if it had not been for the assistance given by the Imperial Government to British Guiana it is probable that that would have been British Guiana's fate. It is due to the fact that the Imperial Government has come along readily and generously that we have not sunk to that state 10 years ago.

I tried in the first instance to exclude from the discussion the recommendation with regard to Hampton Court because I wished to confine consideration by the Council to the motion put forward by the hon. Member for Western Essequibo. I thought it would be more proper that the mind of the Council should be turned fully on the real point of that motion. However, perhaps inevitably, the question of the Commission's recommendation regarding Hampton Court came into the discussion. I wish to say here that I personally take full responsibility for the decision which was taken with regard to the Commission's recommendation. It is true that I discussed the matter with the Executive Council, and the Council after discussion was of the same opinion as myself, but I do not wish it to be believed that the decision was other than my own. I took that decision because I did not feel justified in placing on the shoulders of the taxpayers of the Colony, which is already deeply buried down with debt, another sum which was put down roughly at \$600,000. That would be an additional capital burden, and even when the estate had reached its full production there would still be an annual deficit of \$17,420.

That deficit was estimated with sugar at the price of \$45 per ton. I believe I am correct in saying that sugar at the present time is somewhere about \$39 per ton. What the prospects are of that price rising I have no means of telling. But so long as sugar is at that price on 4,000 tons you have to add another \$24,000 to the

deficit, making that deficit \$41,000 annually, even supposing that the estimate in this instance comes out at the figure which it is supposed to do and not as too often happens. Because I felt that expenditure could not justifiably be placed on the shoulders of the taxpayers of the Colony, who, as the Colonial Secretary pointed out, are often disguised as "Government," I came to the decision I did, and on reflection I still consider it a correct one. It is true I am very anxious to do everything I can for Essequibo. I shall very gladly and willingly consider any scheme put forward that the proposer thinks would be of advantage to Essequibo. There are one or two minor schemes which are under consideration now, but they are by no means exclusive, and if anyone can bring forward a practical scheme which will help that unfortunate part of this Colony he will have my most grateful thanks.

On the terms of the motion it is a difficult one for Government to accept in this sense. The second part of it, I regret to say, cannot be accepted. I cannot think of a more competent body of men than some of those who were on the Commission and who examined the scheme. On the other hand Government is sympathetic, as the Colonial Secretary has said, towards the first portion of the motion and will give it immediate consideration; in fact, it is already under consideration. If therefore the hon. Member will be satisfied, having ventilated his subject, to withdraw the motion he will have the satisfaction of knowing that the earlier part of it at any rate has the acceptance of Government for consideration. If, on the other hand, he wishes to press his motion to a division he will understand, nevertheless, that although the motion may be lost Government will still continue to give the same consideration to the first part of it. I leave it to him to say whether, having ventilated the subject, he wishes it put to a division or is satisfied.

Mr. SEYMOUR: I withdraw the motion, but I can assure you, sir, that I shall come back again. What line I shall adopt in the near future I don't know, but I shall study the problem further and I will hammer at the door of Government until I get something done.

THE PRESIDENT: I welcome that statement from the hon. Member. I shall be glad if he would further consider his

scheme and put it forward. The motion is withdrawn.

CULTIVATION OF BANANAS.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I beg to move:—

WHEREAS there exists in this Colony, in view of its economic condition, an urgent need for the development of new industries;

And whereas there exists a remunerative and steadily increasing demand in the world's markets for bananas;

And whereas it has now been established that bananas can be produced commercially in the various river districts in particular of this Colony;

And whereas the recently organised Association known as the British Guiana Banana Producers' Association has successfully aroused interest among local farmers in the production of bananas for export;

And whereas this Council is of the opinion that it is in the interest of the Colony that a serious effort should now be made for the proper establishment of a Banana Industry;

Be it Resolved,—That His Excellency the Governor be respectfully requested to provide in the estimate of expenditure for 1936 a sum of money to meet expenditure.

(a) for the experimental cultivation of selected plots in each of the counties of the Colony;

(b) for assistance for a period of 3 years to the Association recently formed to deal in the export trade of bananas on a co-operative basis with such safeguards to Government as may be deemed necessary; and

Be it further Resolved,—That early steps be taken by Government to obtain the necessary sanction from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies to give effect to this proposal.

In view of the importance of the subject I make no apology to the Council for having tabled this motion. It is my earnest desire that something should be done which would tend to improve economic conditions in this Colony. Having that in mind I have endeavoured to study various problems, especially in view of the fact that times without number in this Council the Elected Members have been charged with failing to put up constructive proposals which in the opinion of Government will receive favourable consideration. The question of a banana industry in this Colony is not a new one. I must confess a deep interest in the subject. I have endeavoured to do a little bit of research work to find out something about the history of bananas in the Colony, and I hope hon. Members will bear with me if I take up a

little more time than I ordinarily would have done, because it is my earnest intention to point out that the question of a banana industry is nothing new. In 1889 Lord Gormanston, who was then Governor of British Guiana, made a very lengthy speech on the subject in what was then the Combined Court. It is unnecessary for the purpose of this motion to quote exhaustively from that speech, but I desire to draw the attention of the Council to one passage where he said:—

“And now, gentlemen, I wish to call your attention to the burning question of the day—the fruit industry—and I must ask you, gentlemen, to give it your most serious consideration.”

The outcome of that speech was the appointment of a Commission, of whom Sir Charles Bruce was the President. After a lengthy battle a subsidy of \$24,000 per annum was granted by the Combined Court and \$10,000 was set aside as a contingent fund. Perhaps I ought to say that the subsidy was granted as the result of a lengthy petition to the Governor, which was largely and influentially signed by people in the humblest walks of life, peasant farmers, merchants and those who represented the sugar industry. I think it can truthfully be said that the name of the man who was then associated with the scheme became a household word in this Colony. In fact, it can also be said that he was responsible for the nickname of what is known as the Gros Michel banana. That man was Captain E. T. White, who grew this species of banana, which the people termed “Captain White's banana.”

It is just as well at this stage to make reference to the report of the discussion on a resolution which was passed at a meeting of the Royal Agricultural and Commercial Society at that time on the banana and fruit trade. The late Mr. B. Howell Jones in his speech on the subject said he had on other occasions brought to the notice of the Society the desirability of its assisting in every way to encourage the growth and marketing of fruit. It was a subject that had been taken up with very great success in the island of Jamaica and to a very great extent in Trinidad, and he thought we should not be behind-hand at all but should do all we possibly could to bring to some issue the question of the fruit trade of British Guiana. That motion was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

Unfortunately, the people who were interested in the project could not agree to some of the terms laid down in connection with the subsidy, and from the records it would appear that the matter was allowed to drop. That, no doubt, accounts for the fact that the Colony never embarked on the industry. That was in 1849.

There is a report of the Imperial Economic Committee on the marketing and preparing for market of foodstuffs produced in the overseas parts of the Empire with a view of increasing the consumption of such products in the United Kingdom in preference to imports from foreign countries, and to promote the interests both of producers and consumers. In that report there is special mention of bananas, and I propose to read certain passages and amplify what has been said by the members of the Committee as to what I consider to be the conditions that exist in this Colony. The Committee say:—

“There is no doubt that throughout the tropical belt there are vast areas in which bananas could be cultivated on a commercial scale

for outside markets once the organisation of production was taken in hand. The provision of shipping would not present any serious difficulty, but it must be remembered that the maximum period during which bananas can be carried under refrigeration at the present time is about 21 days. We are told that the ideal period is from 16 to 17 days. This is the only limitation which present conditions would impose upon a greatly increased exportation of bananas from the tropical to the temperate portions of the world.”

In so far as British Guiana is concerned there has never been at any time any organised effort in the production of bananas for export, and the reason is obvious. We have never been able to interest capitalists to come here and engage, either by contracts or by themselves, in the production of bananas for export. On the contrary—particularly recently—we have had the misfortune to receive visits from people who are interested in the export trade, and who pronounced the death knell on the cultivation of bananas in British Guiana.

The Council by effluxion of time adjourned until the following day at 11 o'clock.