THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th April, 1961.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, *(Speaker);* Hon M E COX, *(Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour);* His Honour Mr L E SMITH, J P , *(Deputy Speaker);* Hon. R. G. MAPP, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing);* Mr. T. O. BRYAN, *(Chairman of Committees);* Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, *(Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries)* Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN, J.P..

Prayers were read.

Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. MOTTLEY and Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

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

LATENESS OF ORDER PAPER

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that owing to the short space of time between the last meeting and this meeting of the House, and taking into account that Good Friday came inbetween the two sittings, the Order Paper is not yet ready for circulation amongst hon. members. However, I understand that the Order Paper will be ready in about half-an-hour's time.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Tractors) Order, 1961.

The Customs Duties (Agricultural Machinery and Appliances, etc. Order, 1961.

PETITION

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition to incorporate the General Assembly of the Church of God in Barbados. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

WHEREAS a Statement was laid in this House on 17.3.61 by the Minister of Social Services regarding the publication of a Report by an Advisory Committee on Staff Structure at the General Hospital;

AND WHEREAS said Statement disclosed, *inter alia*, "it is not proposed that the Advisory Committee's Report should be published";

AND WHEREAS it is in the public interest that such Report, obtained at the expense of the Public Treasury, should be published without further delay, in the interest and for the information, of the inhabitants of this Island, who are profoundly concerned at the refusal so far to publish said Report;

AND WHEREAS great public dissatisfaction exists *a propos* of the management of the Hospital, particularly in respect of the long periods undergone by (a) patients in Casualty, before being seen by a Medical Practitioner, (b) patients on Surgical waiting list, before being notified by the Hospital Authorities that they may come in for their operations in the Free Wards;

AND WHEREAS acute concern amongst members of the Nursing Services at said Hospital, as well as of the non-technical staff, in respect of their conditions of service;

BE IT RESOLVED that forthwith the Report of said Advisory Committee be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament in this Island.

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to give notice of a Bill to incorporate the General Assembly of the Church of God in Barbados.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. BRYAN, seconded by Mr. STRAUGHN, the Bill to incorporate the General Assembly of the Church of God in Barbados was read a first time.

12.25 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 5

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the Day, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1 and 2 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, now that the Order Paper has arrived, I am asking leave to withdraw that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to withdraw that motion, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Orders Nos. 1 and 4 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, we never objected today to a meeting of the House with this Order Paper; but if the Leader of the House is aware of what he is talking, we are accommodating the Government because no other Orders exist today. The other Orders do not exist because they are not printed; therefore the hon. member is saying that he is exempting the only two Orders he has on the Order Paper. There is no point in referring to Item 22 because that Order is not printed; the only thing we have in our hands is the Local Government Bill and the Teachers Amendment Order, and those are the only two we can deal with today.

It would be outrageous in the extreme, Mr. Speaker, to come today and ask us to meet until morning or any time after 9 o'clock - that is the substance of the motion - because we did not have the other substance of the motion — because we did not have the other Bills to study; therefore when we have finished these two items, we have to go home anyhow as we could not go on with the other Orders under Government Business. I did not want to say anything prior to this because the Hon. Leader of the House should have known that today is the day after a Bankholiday. We met on Holy Thursday and the next day was Good Friday, a closed day, and the following day, Saturday, was half-day, along with Sunday and yesterday being closed days; so he will realise that to meet today would have been the height of stupidity. I was not here to remind him because he says it is the duty of the Government to do its business, but I want to tell him that we are not little children to come here and meet until 3 o'clock tomorrow morning and then come back next Tuesday to deal with the other Orders. I do not see that the hon. member should insist on exempting Orders Nos. 1 and 4 from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 so that we could meet after 9 o'clock, because there are the only two items that we can deal with. I do not think it would be fair to tell us that we are going to meet on these two matters after 9 o'clock and then come back with a long Order Paper when the Bills are not yet finished.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member who has just sat down is not singing any solo. I am going to be very firm on this. This is not a matter for the Leader of the House; it is a matter....

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when objection is taken the question is put and there is no question of debate; this cannot be debated. I take it the hon. member for St. Peter has made an objection; therefore the question should be put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that when leave is asked and objection is taken, then the question is put; but this is a motion and the hon. member can speak on it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very firm on this. This is not a matter for the Leader of the House at all; it is for the Speaker who is not in any sense a Party Speaker and who should see that all sides in this House get a fair and square deal. (Mr. Speaker: There is no question at all.) It is a question, Sir. You will appreciate the fact that we raised no objection. (Mr. SPEAKER: I have appreciated it and I have informed the hon. member.) The hon. member will appreciate that we sat and waited until he put this in our hands, but there is nothing to deal with except Orders Nos. 1 and 4; so what is the point of making that motion? We did not say that we had no Order Paper, because Your Honour would then have had to rule; but we offered the maximum cooperation. The hon. member does not seem to realise that Friday was a closed day, Saturday was half-day and Sunday and Monday were closed days; so we come today to do business. To suggest by the motion that we are to go on makes it a matter for Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion is before the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: A motion can be before the House of Assembly, but we cannot discuss a Bill that is not printed and which we have never seen.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not on all-fours with this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think it is; I cannot see any difference in it at all. If the hon. member comes in and suggests that Orders Nos. 1 and 4 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 with the idea of going on all night, he will appreciate that any time he sees me walk in here, I am ready. (Hon. M. E. COX: Some of us over here are ready too.) I am not afraid and I am going to stand my ground. All I am saying, however, is that the hon. member should not ask for these Orders to be exempted but should take them in the normal way. You must have discussed it and decided you were going to pass it, and therefore we are entitled to speak on it; and there can be no doubt that we are going to do that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. members, the position is that if any item under discussion is still being discussed at 8.30 p.m. and it is regarded as a controversial measure, it can no longer be discussed. All I am saying is to exempt these two items from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 so that if by 8.30 p.m. we are still discussing one or both of the items, the House can continue after 8.30 p.m. I cannot see how the hon. member could say it is unfair to come in and ask to have these items exempted when there are only these two small items, as it were, although the hon. member knows that sometimes these small items are dragged on for endless hours. 12.35 p.m.

What is this Government doing? The Government is making this motion in order to be able to have this matter settled as quickly as possible. We are not prepared to do any of the other items. Sir, you accepted what the hon. member said about the two items on the Order Paper.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. It is a pity. If the Hon. Minister would only pay attention to what is said he would not make these blundering statements. I said that there are two items on the Order Paper with which we can deal today. I went on to say that if we wanted to embarrass the Government, we were not even obliged to meet because there was no Order Paper printed.

What the hon. member is importing is that he can go on and deal with the other items on the Order Paper. That is why I always challenge his propriety.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I do not know where this 'embarrassing the Government' comes in, because I am sure this House is legally constituted. As long as this House is summoned and so long as nine members turn out, the House is duly constituted and can proceed to do the work of the people.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is the hon. member suggesting that because this House was adjourned last Thursday until today that the Government has a right to come in here and deal with the orders on the Order Paper? What state of affairs are we reaching?

The question that Orders Nos. 1 and 4 be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order No. 5 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HOUSE RESUMES LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

On the last occasion, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking at the moment of interruption. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking Your Honour's permission to continue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not my permission; the House's permission.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I was not back in my place after the adjournment was taken for dinner on the last occasion and the hon. senior member for Christ Church was speaking up to the moment of interruption.

I am asking this House for leave to continue to finish my points which I would have liked to make in respect of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave of the House to speak again on item No. 1.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you said "again". Is that correct?

Mr. SPEAKER: "Again" is technically correct. The hon. member is asking leave of the House to speak on Item No. 1. To resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. Is there any objection?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir. We on this side are always willing to hear more and more of what the Opposition has to say, but surely the hon. member when this question was under discussion was in here and spoke on it until the suspension. If he intended to continue his speech, as soon as the House was reassembled, the hon. member had the opportunity to speak.

Leave was not granted.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I want to make one or two points on this matter. I hope to be brief in reply to some of the points raised by hon. members who preceeded me. As far as this Bill is concerned, the Government gave very, very careful consideration indeed to this question before we came to this House of Assembly to ask that a uniform rate of trade tax be provided for the whole of the island.

The Hon. Premier in his speech made two important points in respect of the basic question on which this matter would rest. One is, so far as the industrial development of this country is concerned, it was absolutely necessary that there should be a uniform rate of trade tax because one knows quite well that if industries are established or if people are to come here to establish industries, they want to know what the position is. I would like to say that not every industry that is established in this country would qualify for pioneer status; therefore, would not be entitled to trade tax concessions; therefore, we should be able to let our industrialists who come here know what the rate of tax would be if they establish industries in any part of the island.

In addition we do not think it is fair for a shopkeeper in St. Andrew, for example, to pay a rate of 40% as has been the case before the establishment of Local Government which is far in excess of that of a similar person in the metropolitan area. We do not feel that shopkeepers and people like this should pay different rates. If you say that you are representing them, you must approach all these matters in a broad way. No doubt, the Government has been accused of being malicious and of wanting to do something with the hon. senior member for the City, and because we can do nothing with him, we have brought in this Bill. The hon. senior member for the City would not even approach it at that angle. The hint which he gave on the last occasion was that he would even vote for it but after this talk, he caught on to it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

12.45 p.m.

At no time did I ever say that I was opposed to a uniform rate of tax. I have not caught on to anything because I have never expressed any view. I withheld my views until I came here to speak because I said that there should be a uniform rate of tax but that the Government should give the subsidy and not the Municipal area.

Hon. M. E. COX: I have not yet reached that point. I repeat that when this matter was first under discussion, the hon. member said that he agreed in particular with it. (Mr. MOTTLEY: I still agree in principle with it.) He did not feel that this Bill was brought down here maliciously just to oust him out of power. I would like to say that if it were a question of trying to push the hon. member out of power, one simple thing could be done, and that is to repeal the Local Government Act completely and centralize the whole service of the island. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What will happen then?) (Mr. WALCOTT: And you will go where you live, because the people are afraid of you.) I am accustomed to that bad behaviour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to hear the hon. senior member for St. Michael; therefore I would ask hon. members to control and contain their asides at least to such a degree that I will hear the hon. member who is addressing the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: I was saying, Sir, that there is no question of hitting at the hon. senior member for the City; it would be a question of doing what you consider best in the interest of the community in general. What is the argument? We hear that we are depriving the metropolitan area out of all this money and passing it on to the District Councils. Let us examine this question objectively; let us put it in its proper perspective. Although I represent a metropolitan parish, I am not so naive as to say and believe that all the money which is being paid into the coffers of the City is earned by the City Council. I have made a few notes of the various business houses which are sited in the metropolitan area and which do considerable business with the country folk. Let us take, for example, the first one: motor vehicles in every sense of the word — lorries, motor cars, buses, whatever you can think of. As regards every item which is imported into this island, the business houses are sited in the metropolitan area; all the country people buy motor cars and they have buses and lorries, but the business place is sited in the metropolitan area. In addition to that as to all the spare parts and things of that sort which are used for servicing these vehicles, the agents for all of them are sited in the metropolitan area. All the gasolene, oil and so on is sited in the metropolitan area.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I do not want to hear all of this nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to hear it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Highway tax cannot be regarded for Local Government purposes; you cannot vote for that or run on it. The tax which people pay on lorries has absolutely nothing to do with it.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member is so limited.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot tell me that I am limited; you have not gone as far in school as I have gone. Your public life is such that you should be in prison. That is where you should be.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the debate is resumed I want *(ASIDES)* I think I may get the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Peter now. I was at pains to ask the hon. member to listen to the Chair. The hon. member must remember.. *(ASIDES)* I am trying hard to get the attention of the hon. member and with much patience too. The hon. member rose on a point of order and got completely out of control in replying to the hon. senior member for St. Michael. The hon. member completely ignored my instructions to him that he should listen to the Chair. I would like the hon. member, now that he is quiet and calm again, to realise that although he may want to reply and state his objections or difference of opinion with what the hon.

senior member for St. Michael is expressing, he still owes something to Parliament. Unless Parliament is under control, all of us will suffer. I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Peter to apologize to the Chair and to the House for his outburst of temper.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am profoundly sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I caused you pain and you had to ask me to apologize. I must say that the extremely provocative and unwarranted attitude of the hon. member would give rise to things other than words. When a man can be so patently and unwarrantably uncharitable in remarks which he makes which are untrue and uncalled for, that aggravates any serious situation. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry, and I apologize to Your Honour and to the House for having lost my temper, but it was not with any intention of disrespecting either Your Honour or the House.

12.55 p.m.

I do have a trying time in dealing with the hon. member who in and out of season has no regard for truth and fair-play.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I think Your Honour heard me talk trade tax, and I said that these business houses are sited in the metropolitan area and carry on their business houses there even though quite a lot of the business comes from the country. I do not know how road tax and dog tax got into this. (Mr. WALCOTT: The only dog is you.) I always understand that abuse is no substitute for argument.

However, Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that these business houses which do all this business are sited in the metropolitan area, but the large revenue which they get from the sale of their items comes from the country areas; it is island trade, so to speak, and I am sure the hon. senior member for the City cannot dispute that. As I said, the agents for gasolene, spare parts and everything you can think of are sited in the metropolitan area. Let us take lumber; all the lumber that comes to the island comes to the City of Bridgetown, but these business houses sell the lumber to people in the country districts, and pay their taxes down here. The same thing applies to cement for construction all over the island. The business houses for radios, electrical equipment and things of that nature are sited in the metropolitan area, but the people in the country buy all these things.

On the agricultural side, fertilisers come in and the agents for these are also sited in the metropolitan area. Animals are reared in the country districts, very few are reared in the metropolitan area, and feed is also sold to the people, but the business houses are in the metropolitan area, and they pay tax on the business they do in the metropolitan area. The agents for the importation of meat, groceries, hardware, beds and everything you can think of are sited in the City of Bridgetown. There are four rice agents in the metropolitan area, but they distribute rice throughout the island.

We come now to the public utilities and commercial Banks. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What about buses?) Ever since when I mentioned vehicles, buses were included. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What about Transport Board buses?) I understand you do not get anything out of those. I know that you get something out of bicycle houses, and I think the hon. member would agree with me when I say that more bicycles are sold in the country than in Bridgetown, and the agents are all sited in Bridgetown.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member repeat that?

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that more bicycles are sold to people in the country than to people in Bridgetown. If the hon. member challenges that, I am sure he will agree that a substantial number of bicycles are sold to country people but the business houses are sited in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, there are commercial banks which are all sited in the City of Bridgetown. (Mr. SPEAKER: Not all.) I know you have one in Speightstown, but I understand that is only a branch, and there is another branch somewhere in Christ Church. They pay their rates in the City, but people all over the island go in and bank their money at these Banks.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I do not want the hon. member to mislead the House because I do not think he himself understands. Is it possible that you are suggesting that the Southern District Council would be ignorant of their duties as to have business carried on in their area and not collect money on it?

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not at all saying that. All I am saying is that the Commercial Banks are established in the metropolitan area. There is a branch of one of these Banks in St. Peter and elsewhere, but I refer to the main Banks. When you compare the business done in a small village in Christ Church and that done on an island-wide basis, it is a different thing. I am dealing now with quantum, the amount of tax you get from these commercial houses as compared with what you get from a small branch undertaking.

Now, Sir, let us get to Public Utilities. You have Rediffusion sited in the City of Bridgetown, and people throughout the island, even though electricity is not supplied throughout the island, have Rediffusion installed. (Mr. MOTTLEY: All?) I am not saying that all have, but I know it is in every parish and a considerable number of persons in these parishes have Rediffusion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order, the hon. member occupies such a responsible position in this House that I should not like him to go down on the record as referring to Rediffusion as a public utility. Since when and by what definition can he say that Rediffusion is a public utility?

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member knows that Rediffusion has not been included in the Public Utilities Bill, and that is all he is saying.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, quite seriously Mr. Speaker, it is not that I know that Rediffusion has not been included. He referred to it in this House as a public utility. I maintain that you can find in no part of the world that the service of Rediffusion, which is a transmitter, is a public utility, and I want to put him right on that.

Hon. M. E. COX: All I need say is that it carries on business in the City of Bridgetown, but it has a lot of customers throughout the island and collects money and pay its rates to the City Council. I am sure the hon. member would not try to dispute that.

1.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Now, you have the Electric Company. The same applies. It branches all out to St. Lucy, St. Philip, St. John and so on and we are hoping in the not too distant future that it would cover the whole island and that the rates would be collected and the money paid into the office in Bridgetown and the profits made from that company will be submitted to the City Council to be rated. Then the City Council after rating that company would collect the rates for its own benefit.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not like the way the Hon. Minister says that. He says "for its own benefit". The Hon. Minister is so accustomed to making political speeches that he makes them in here. He means for the services which the Council renders, which services are treble and double-treble the services which are rendered by other areas.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not saying for the benefit of the hon. member. What I was saying is that this company is spread throughout the whole island but the money which it gets from people all over the whole island is paid into the office in Bridgetown and the rates which that company pays are used for the benefit of the City Council, and not the Northern and Southern District Councils.

Now, Sir, we can go a bit further and we can deal with the ice making plants. All these factories are established in the City. Do they not pay taxes to the City Council? But do not the people all over the island buy ice from them?

Let us take the racing industry. People throughout the island buy tickets. It is their business to sell tickets to

people from all over the island but do they pay taxes to the City Council? I presume that they pay taxes. (Mr. MOTTLEY: For what?) I know that they pay income tax and entertainment tax, but do they not pay trade tax?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I will have to ask the hon. member questions. I am not supposed to know more than the instruction which I received from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. The Hon. Minister is inferring that racing in Barbados is an industry and therefore, we collect from that company a trade tax.

Hon. M. E. COX: You do not?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I asked you to say.

Hon. M. E. COX: I cannot accept that from the hon. member when all the returns from trade have to go before him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member should not say anything like that. In the Local Government Act, it is stated that no member of the Local Government has any right to see any trade returns. As a matter of fact, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue can only send it to the Treasurer and he cannot divulge it to anybody. Nobody sees it. That is the law as it stands today.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I accept what the hon. member has said. I also know that hitherto, under the Vestry system all trade returns went to them and even a taxpayer had the right to go and see them.

Last but not least, let us deal with undertakers. I know that they have a few small undertakers in the country districts, but the majority of large undertaking establishments which do the cream of the business are sited in Bridgetown and, therefore, what I am trying to say is that they pay taxes into the City Council and from that the City Council gets their revenue. What can be wrong in saying if there is a general rate that the City Council should pass on $200,000? I am going to show the hon. senior member for the City by argument in the reverse what can apply. What can be wrong when maybe 50% is earned from the people of the country districts if the Council collects $2 million, they pass on a quarter of a million dollars to the country areas?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I rise on a point of order. That is a local rate.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order; the hon. member need not get up every minute to explain things.

Hon. M. E. COX: If Government in the interest of this country and not in the interest of a particular Council says that out of the quantum you collect, give 80% to the City Council, give 11% to another and 9% to the other, what can be wrong with that even though that amount which the City Council contributes to the other areas comes to $200,000? There can be nothing wrong in principle with it when, as I pointed out to this House, so much business that is being done in the City area comes from people in the country area.

Sir, it is only by accident that all these business houses are sited in the metropolitan area and not elsewhere. What is wrong if you collect so much, and out of that you have collected so much as a result of the spending power of the country people, therefore, you say that you are going to pass back to them some of that? Let us say for example tomorrow, next week or next year those business houses moved to the other areas. Let us say that the Electric Company goes to the Southern Ward. Let us say that a lot of them were transferred from the City Ward to the Northern or Southern Wards. What would be the position? The position would be that a lot of revenue which the City Council now gets would be transferred to the other Councils. This is one point which I am going to make. Why then, if these businesses were transferred to the other areas, should the people in the metropolitan area suffer as a result? I am trying to say that this system of pooling is a sensible and equitable one.

1.15 p.m.

Morally it is right. I repeat that if you transfer your business houses into any of the other areas, automatically the revenue which is being earned by the City Council will be considerably reduced, and since it is reduced it would mean that the people of this area would have to take a dip in so far as the services which are supplied to them today are concerned. A child can understand that. If it should happen that these business houses were transferred tomorrow and put into other areas, it would mean that the City Council would be collecting far less money than it is collecting today. As a consequence, the services which are now given to the people in this particular area would be considerably diminished. That is why I say that you have to look at this matter objectively; you have to take it in a comprehensive way. I am trying to justify the correctness, the morality and otherwise in so far as a common rate is concerned, and we have set it out in this Bill.

I would like to go further into the aspects of this matter but the Hon. Premier is handling it. However, I felt that not only as Leader of the House but as a representative of the metropolitan area, I should make these remarks. The hon. senior member for the City has said that he would not fight this Bill in here, but he would fight it in Queen's Park, in the Lower Green, in the alleys and so on. He will tell the people in the metropolitan area this: " I would have been able to spend more in giving clothes to the poor children; I would have been able to give people a little more soup in the Park but that Socialist Government which you support has prevented me from doing it by taking away this money." The intelligent, sensible people, those who have evenness of mind and who are not prejudiced by those political chameleons will know that it is sensible and it is right that a Government should take care not only of particular people in a particular area, but that it should take care of all the people in all the areas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. At no time did I say that the Government should take care of particular people in a particular area. At all times we say that you should have your equality of rate, but let the Government give a subsidy to these two areas.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had no need to answer and therefore he did not rise on a point of order. He has nothing to explain; therefore, he is breaking the rules of the House. It seems to me to be a habit being indulged in for hon. members by way of statements used as repeated objections, to interrupt the hon. member who is on his feet in the course of the debate. They are purporting to rise on points of order when they are really contradicting the hon. member. Those hon. members do not belong to any one particular quarter of the House. It is becoming general, too general, and unparliamentary, and it is working a hardship on me to determine these things. This state of affairs is present with us in this new era and I cannot tolerate it.

Hon. M. E. COX: When you tell people that they are not capable of thinking seriously and analysing what you tell them, that is all right. I want the hon. member to understand that a substantial majority of people in this island are capable of understanding and they have been so for many years. If it were not so, then we, as a Labour Party, would never be in this House. You can tell the people whatever you like, but whenever you are finished they will examine what you tell them. *(ASIDES)* The hon. member is saying that you should not boast of tomorrow. I agree with him but he boasts more than any other hon. member. He says that whatever goes up must come down.

Mr. SPEAKER: How does that square with Local Government? It might amuse the hon. senior member for the City, but it does not interest me.

Hon. M. E. COX: The only person who will not come down is the hon. member. If you look at the balance which the City has had, I think it is over $200,000 in 1959-60.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point or order. That is a reckless mis-statement; that is not true.

Hon. M. E. COX. It is revenue over expenditure.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. That is not true. I must enlighten the hon. member on that. A tremendous amount of tax not collected for the past three years is included in that balance, because there was no law for writing off anything and everything had to be brought forward. Do not let the hon. member talk any nonsense; he can be enlightened by the hon. member who is on his left.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the hon. member has said that, then it is all right. I am quoting from the Bridgetown City Council Estimates.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Again on a point of order, I must draw to the hon. member's attention that nothing could be brought forward unless you showed it, so that *ad infinitum* you had to go on because there was no law which said you could write off a debt from 1902. You can take the precaution of saying you have written off a debt for the last fifteen years, but the Hon. Premier and the Minister of Agriculture could have explained it to him. He sees these things and does not understand them.

Hon. M. E. COX: I understand a little better than you think. However, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not want to be long and I think I have brought out the point I want to make, because as I said, I represent the metropolitan area and I will no doubt have to go and put wrong things right. When people mislead others on this question, I will have to explain. One thing, I think which is obvious to all of us is that I believe that many of us have our friends and family living in the country districts, and we believe that those persons should enjoy similar conditions and privileges as are enjoyed in the City. (Mr. WALCOTT: Who says they should not?) Mr. Speaker, that being so, the position is that the Government which the people have elected says that this is best for the people, and they are the only people who can do it, not the Opposition.

As far as the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter is concerned, I just want to say that I am going to treat that as it deserves. (Mr. WALCOTT: I am in here today.) It is all right, Mr. Speaker, to come here and accuse people of being malicious and everything that is bad, but if you examine you will see what is malice and what is hatred. People go before the Court for cuffing and beating people, (Mr. WALCOTT: And some do not go there for carrying away money.) and that is not regarded as malice; but to express an honest and reasonable point of view, a point of view which can be appreciated by any intelligent individual, you get certain things thrown at you. It is said somewhere that the serpent will bite without enchantment and a babbler will do the same. I can only regard his vitriolic remarks as another of the regular venting of the spleen which no doubt we hear from time time. Finally I would like to say that it appears to me and I can only regard it as malicious madness.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be right for me to allow this Bill to pass without saying something about it, because I am a member of the Northern District Council. The first thing I would like to find out is what good has been done from the change over from the Vestry to the Local Government System. The only possible means of relieving the plight of the people is by having a re-assessment of the existing system, and I am sure that neither the Northern nor the Southern District Councils would have to appear to the Central Government for a subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I had a peep at the rate books, and I saw that thousands of dollars that used to be collected from the estates are no longer being collected, but the small taxpayer is paying twice and three times as much as he paid before. The weight has been taken off the big man and thrown on the small man, and that is because the Valuation Officers who were sent out to value the land were lacking in understanding. I heard the hon. member say something just now about babblers, and I would be glad if he knew the meaning of the word. They are Ministers and should set the example when someone is speaking.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, we would be glad to hear the hon. member. Did he say something about babblers? (Mr. WALCOTT: Ask him what he used to do when he could not pronounce the words. He used to go over at Dan Springer.)

Mr. CORBIN: There are many people, Mr. Speaker, who were paying $3 or $4 and are now paying $50; those who paid $50 are now paying $150. What is the reason for that? It is because the estates are relieved of their burden, and in order for the administration to be carried out, the poor people's tax has been doubled. The Valuation Officers went out in haste, not knowing what they were doing. When they asked the Manager or owner of an estate how many acres he had, they were told 1,000 acres. When they asked how many acres are being worked, they were told 600 acres out of the 1,000 acres. The Valuation Officer therefore only valued 600 acres as arable land, and the other 400 acres were not rated. That is the reason why the districts are so burdened.

Mr. Speaker, if you trace back through the books of the Vestry, you will see that the thousands of dollars which the estates used to pay are not being paid today, and from the books you will see that people who were paying $16 are today paying $53. That is the first thing we must look into. When the Government was making the change over, every man in this island thought it was a change for the better, but instead of getting better, we have got ten times worse. What is the cause? It is because the big man is not paying as much as he did before while the small man is carrying the burden.

Mr. Speaker, I know of a case of a man who had a shop, and as soon as his business developed, he built four more houses on the same acre of land, and gave one to each of his children. The Assessor went to this man and assessed the shop and the house, and then asked what about the other four houses. The man told the Assessor that one belonged each to Tom, Mary, John and James, and the Assessor assessed each one of these houses individually; therefore the man had to pay for five homes and a shop.
1.35 p.m.

He assessed each one of those houses individually; therefore; that gentleman had to pay tax for each of them. He is a small man. Go down to the hotels and you will see those big hotels have fifteen and sixteen guest houses attached to them and they only send in a return for the hotel. I am saying that each one of those houses should be assessed and rated separately. Wherever you go, you can see plenty of houses around an estate or plantation. Each one of these houses should be rated individually and this is not the case. You find that they assess the estate for so much. Sir, in all these matters you tax those whom you should not tax and that is what brings a burden on the poor people. It is not so much the Government who has caused it, but it is the assessors who have caused all this worry in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn to taxes on houses. When I was in the Vestry, if a little house was rated for $45, the owner did not have to pay taxes for it. Now, today if it is a shack with three shingles on it, the poor person who owns it would have to pay for it. What is the cause of that? That has caused poor people to be crying and mourning to death. It is caused by bad management and bad supervision. If we had proper supervision, things would be better run. The only thing which can be done to relieve the Northern and Southern Districts is to go and have a re-assessment and then tax a man according to what he is worth. Why is the big man not crying over taxation? One of these big men told me that he prefers to pay his taxation into the Local Government because he formerly had to pay it to the Income Tax Department.

The Central Government has now to give a subsidy to the poor people in these two districts. Why does the Central Government now have to give it and when the Vestries were in existence, the Central Government did not have to give the subsidy? What is the cause of it? Bear in mind the people in those days were not crying as much as the people of today are crying over their taxation. In those days, they were not crying, but today they are shedding tears. This Government should not even give one dollar to any one of the districts until they made up their rates and find out what they want. How long would you be able to continue to give a subsidy to those two districts? Why not make a re-assessment and cause each of us to bear our own burden? I am certain that there are thousands of

acres of land in each of those districts for which no taxes have been paid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they talk about rab land. Look at the magnificent buildings which you see in and around the City. They are built in rab land. Those buildings bring in a lot of money: so you can very well see that all the money does not come from land bearing provisions. Go to Gregg Farm and look at the lime industry which pours out thousands of tons of material. Look at the Clay Products which you are getting from Greenland. Haggatts and Greenland sold out rab land recently and it was sold at $1,200 and $1,400 an acre. Go and look at that land. Will you call it rab land now? It is being cultivated into new houses. The Government sent out assessors but they were blind and they did not know what they were doing. They were inexperienced and because of it, the poor people are crying. Recently, a woman brought a tax bill to me and told me that she was formerly rated so that she paid a tax of $16.17: but as soon as the Local Government took over, she had to pay for the same place taxes amounting to $53 odd.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has just spoken of the difference in taxation then and now, as regards taxation under Local Government. What this Bill really concerns and deals with is a uniform trade tax.

Mr. CORBIN: Sir, when I first heard that this uniform trade tax was to come into existence throughout the whole island and that all of it will be pooled together and each one would bear one another's burden, I was very glad: but now I see something different. I thought Joe was pooling his and Tom was pooling his with Harry's, but by this Bill I see it is seeking to relieve the people who pay trade tax. I hope that the appropriate authorities who will receive this amount of money, will take it and not only distribute it to the traders but between everybody else. The money should be distributed proportionally to everybody because we all are suffering. It should not help only those who are in trade.

Sir, I am not criticising the Bill but what I say is that not one of the districts have people who can help themselves. They all need help. I am speaking of the Northern and Southern Districts. I cannot resist against this Bill because I am one of the members of the Northern District Council and if a man is giving you something, it is hard for you to refuse it. I am glad this little bit is given to us and I hope more would be coming in.
1.45 p.m.

I hope that in the next year, whether this Government or any other Government, is in existence, we will have things run on a better basis in order to relieve the poor people who are carrying so great a burden. I do not think that we need go any further in this matter.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be as short and to the point as I possibly can. Various speakers have expressed similar views to those which I have, and it is no use my saying things which have already been said. I agree in principle with this Bill and I will give this Government my wholehearted support in it. I realise that this is the beginning of the end of the Local Government Act; I say that because this country is only 21x14 miles and I believe it is the smallest island, or it is smaller than San Fernando which has only got one Council. This island is so small that I believe if you were to get in the centre of it you could water it. (MEMBERS: With what?) (Laughter) It is good sometimes to have a little joke, but I am sure that if you were to take a hose and get in the centre of this island you could water it. What is the object of having three Councils with all the duplication in the world in these Councils, when one could operate the whole island? We have a Central Government and every single thing which is done in this country finds its way in Bridgetown. You have all sorts of things in Bridgetown controlling the expenditure of so many million dollars. You have three different Councils spending about two or three million dollars.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member is speaking on an Act. He is asking? What is the use of having three Councils? That is an Act of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I noted that when the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking but I was hoping that he would get away from it. I was listening to the hon. junior member for St. James and I was waiting to see how far he would go.

Mr. SEARLES: I do not want to deal with that extensively; that was only in passing. The Northern District Council met a couple of days ago and by Resolution which was unanimously passed, (Mr. MOTTLEY: How else could they pass it?) I am a member of that Council and I am in a position to say that a Resolution was passed by the Council unanimously. The Opposition members were there and they agreed in principle with the Resolution; they agreed in principle to the changing of the Act. I would also suggest to the Government that a re-valuation of the land must take place and certain conditions which exist today must be abolished. It was further resolved that the Government should consider the possibility of centralisation. That was passed by our Northern Council and it will probably find its way in this House within a short time, because it has gone to the Governor-in-Executive Committee *(ASIDES)*. I am nothing to do with who steals and who does not steal; he who steals my purse steals trash, but he who robs me of my good name robs me of that which does not enrich him but makes me very poor indeed. I want hon. members to realise that this is a House of dignity and if they disagree with things in principle, it must be realised that these things are for the good of the country, not for individuals, and personalities must not come into expression. I am in favour of criticism of Government but not "commonality".

Mr. Speaker we are here in the interest of our country; we are here to do the good we can for our country, not for individuals. When hon. members come into this House to debate any measure, there are pros and cons and they should realise that the man who pays must have as much consideration as the man who receives. We must give a square break to all. I am going to deal with a section of the Act and I hope the Government will bring about centralisation of the services; they must amend the Act with regard to valuation. I think it is Section 145 of the Act which deals with chattel houses. (Mr. MOTTLEY: That is out of order.) This is an amendment to the Local Government Act. I am not stressing that, I am suggesting that there should be an amendment. *(ASIDES)* This is not a Trade Union. (Mr. WALCOTT: You could not get into the Trade Union because you are a Conservative.) The hon. member is in a place where he should be dignified and behave himself.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I object to that remark. If the hon. member has any superior ideas about himself, he is dealing with the wrong person; however, I respect age. I said in a *sotto voce* remark that there is absolutely nothing against the hon. member in speaking on the whole Bill now that we are amending the Act. If he is dealing with the Act, such an amendment could be brought in too. The Trade Union is keeping this country from dictatorship; if the hon. member does not realise that, I can tell him.

Mr. SEARLES: I am not debating any Trade Union Bill; I am not opposing the hon. member for one moment. What I am saying is that all hon. members should behave and dignify themselves in this House. We must see that no discrimination takes place whatsoever.
1.55 p.m.

In passing I am suggesting to the Government that the section dealing with the assessment of houses should be considered before the next general election. (Mr. WALCOTT: When is the next general election?) I do not know; it will come in time. Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of a general election. (Mr. WALCOTT: We are afraid over here!) I am not suggesting that either. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, those asides are a bit too loud and not really intended for your ears; but they stop me from concentrating on what I have to say to the House.

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows my views on this Local Government, and I am not going over it. I am convinced in my mind that the administrative cost is too high, and that is

the reason why services cannot be rendered in these various districts as fast as we would like to do them. What could be wrong, Mr. Speaker, with the resources of this country being pooled for a common good? We are all part and parcel of this community, and St. Michael has absolutely no right to the amenities of this country when other parishes are void of them. It is known that in the city of Bridgetown there was a time when kerosene lights were used. It has taken this City forty years and more to put down services in St. Michael. Can it be expected that a Council which has only come into operation two or three years can give the country districts those services which the people in the City enjoy? The only way to do it is by pooling the resources of this country and then devising a common rate for the three areas. It can be done, Mr. Speaker, but if the City Council wants to do something beyond its resources at the expense of the North and South, a fight will come. I will see to it that if we cannot in the Northern and Southern areas get the amenities which the City has, it will bring trouble. (Mr. WALCOTT: What trouble?) Members in the Northern and Southern Districts are associated with people in the City; they have brothers, sisters and aunts in the City.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m.

2.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 24 was asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy who is not in his place.

Question No. 21 was asked by the same hon. member who is not in his place.

Question No. 10 was asked by the same hon. member who is not in his place.

Question No. 29 was asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is not in his place.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, in respect of those questions asked by my colleague, may I ask that they be held over once more, and also make a similar request in respect of those questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that they may be held over finally until the next meeting of the House?

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re SUGAR ENQUIRY IN BARBADOS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Philip: to resume debate on a Resolution relative to an exhaustive investigation into all phases of the Sugar Industry in Barbados by the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Carl Goldenberg.

On the last occasion, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was addressing the House.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when I was speaking on this Resolution, I was at pains to find out certain points and to put emphasis on certain deductions all embodied in this Resolution. I can go on speaking for a considerable time due to the knowledge which I have at my disposal. In the first place as I pointed out on the last occasion, the sugar industry in Barbados as in all these other West Indian islands is not a matter to be discussed lightly; it is to be taken very seriously in as much as it employs a higher percentage or at least the highest percentage of persons in the colony.

2.35 p.m.

Well, Sir, I would like this Honourable House to know that while this Government is not satisfied with all which is being done for the labourers, yet we do not intend to be panicky about anything or to be unrealistic or to be unscrupulous. The sugar industry as it is today, as we know it, is a business concern. It is the biggest business in Barbados and I cannot over-emphasize the fact that we have come to a stage in our existence where we must negotiate on very high levels. As the Minister in Government who has to do with the sugar industry, I am in a position to say that so often delegations come to me about certain points in the industry and we do not just quarrel with each other, we do not snub each other, but we go into figures and discuss things in a most amicable manner. I realise, as well as workers themselves realise, that we must have capital in the land and we must have capital in the factory. We are not saying because somebody puts up capital they must get all the profits. What we have to do is to work out in the most equitable way the profits of the industry and that cannot be done by quarrelling, but by goodwill. After we have worked that out, we then must distribute it in the most equitable way we can.

One would expect that in an election year, Barbados being what it is, there are certain people who would like to create a tense atmosphere and perhaps to embarrass the Government and to create problems so as to create a sense of ill-feeling among the workers of this country. That is why I made the statement that the sugar industry must not be the political football for any person or Party, whoever he may be. We have to realise that there are some of the West Indian islands where the agricultural land has now become derelict simply because capital was taken away, and there are some irresponsible people who are doing their utmost to deteriorate the good atmosphere in this country. We are not bent on that sort of thing. We realise that Barbados is a small island we have only at our disposal 65,000 acres of arable land. We also have a large population and I would say a fairly high standard of living when compared with the other West Indian islands and most of it is being maintained by sugar. As I have said, we are not getting all which we hope we should get out of it because, as you know, Barbados is tied to an international sugar agreement and we have got to show facts as to the expenses which we incur in producing a ton of sugar in just the same manner as the other Commonwealth countries. Therefore, we cannot do something funny and hope that the negotiators would take our inefficient industry and pay us more for it.

Quite recently, Sir, we had a very distinguished visitor here in Barbados from England. I think his name was Sir Donald Bacon. He is a big man in the beet industry and he came into my office and had a very long interview with me. I was astounded to find out that they are now growing beet in Europe from which they are producing sugar at a cheaper rate than our cane sugar. He promised to send me back some figures in relation to this matter. He told me that we are not sitting on any gold mine here and, as a matter of fact, they have had to curtail the growing of more beet so as to help us out in getting more of our getting more minded to grow more beet to be made into sugar. Knowing all these facts, I think it would be unkind to let Knowing all of these facts, I think it would be unkind to let loose talk go unnoticed or without my giving the facts as I know them.

I remember years ago, a little before I entered politics, that it was a sad state of affairs in Barbados when it came to the sugar industry. There were no holdings with pay for workers, no bonus, the wages were low and no consideration was given to the labourers. But what do we find today? We find that the wages have been increased from time to time due to the efforts of the Union and the Government. We find that some part of the wages are given by way of production bonus. We also have holidays with pay provided for the workers; so you can well see that we have moved a long way from the old days. We have been able in agreement with the Ministry of Food, London, to get a certain amount earmarked for certain social conditions, such as the Labour Welfare Fund, from which Housing loans are granted. I am not making a case out for the

cane farmers or the factory owners, but what I am trying to do is to put the case for the people as I know it. Facts are stubborn things; therefore, I do not have to be sensational. I think the people should know the facts as they really are.

Sir, I said that I was against Mr. Goldenberg coming here because of what I have heard when I was in Jamaica and what I believe to be an analysis of what evolved because of his enquiry. I do not for one moment believe that we should encourage any commission to come here merely to say: "Well, these workers say that they want more money" You can do it very well. If you now employ 100 of them, you can cut that number in half and mechanise the industry." That has been the result in Jamaica, so much so, that one factory has gone out of business and a certain number of them have become derelict. We know at the moment because of uncertain conditions that we in Barbados cannot afford to do without the sugar industry. In Jamaica, you have the bauxite people and they are large concerns. You in Barbados do not know how big those things are.
2.45 p.m.

One company I think is the Alumni. That covers an area of 65,000 acres of land. We have 68,000 arable acres in Barbados all told. You have the Kaiser Bauxite Company of 60,000 acres and then there is the Renold Group which cover about 65,000 or 68,000 acres alone. In talking about Jamaica you have to get a true perspective of the landed area. Barbados has an area of 166 1/2 square miles whereas Jamaica has an area of 4,416 square miles. If you were to lift Barbados and take it to Jamaica and land it at the Northern end of Jamaica the people in the East would not know it is there. What might be good for Jamaica is not good for Barbados; the techniques which they use there may not work here; you may get certain laws in England but you cannot dump them lock, stock and barrel in Barbados. You have to adapt these laws to suit local conditions. We have to take all these factors into consideration before we think about bringing Mr. Goldenberg here. This is not a matter of taking up a newspaper and reading certain clippings and deciding that this man has been there, he has made certain recommendations, a few more people get higher wages because of those recommendations and therefore this man should be brought here. The point is, what is the net result? Anybody can say that he is an economist and the people should have more money, but you will mechanise.

Quite recently I have been talking with planters and I have given them a piece of my advice. I told them that they are looking for trouble if they follow mechanization to the end. I told them that if they want to maintain peace in Barbados they will have to live and let live. In Barbados we have no alternative employment for workers in the field. We are trying day after day, stage by stage, to get new industries in Barbados, but we cannot hope overnight to industrialise a country such as this. In the first instance, what do industrialists want first and foremost? At least they want a favourable amount of local sales for their manufactures. If an industrialist is coming to Barbados, he wants to know what is the purchasing power of his commodity in this island. Since the new American Administration has come into power, it is saying: "Oh no, you cannot take out these raw materials and re-import these goods into America." Whether companies will be able to come into the West Indies because of cheaper labour and manufacture articles and ship them back into the Mother Country, I do not know. I have read that the new American Administration is saying "No" to that sort of things. We are faced with problems; agriculture is a hard job, but every country in the world must have agriculture; quite recently I had a survey made of unused land in Barbados by the Department of Agriculture and there are those who are not using the land to its full capacity. Some of them have abandoned the land. It is not because they cannot get any money from the Bank, but people do not realise that we are dependent upon agriculture and that they should develop all the land they have in full. Some of the West Indian islands have gone out of production and some West Indians make out a claim that Barbados is on the move, because we pay serious attention to agriculture. I say; God help the day when agriculture in Barbados should be used as a political toy among rivals. It is not to be used in that way. Things are to be done intelligently and with the best intentions and there must always be the spirit of give and take. You must always be negotiating so that the labourers can get more as time goes on and the producer can get a better price for his product.

Sometimes I am approached by planters and people in the community who say that we are not doing a good things if we do not increase the price of the local products. Many people do not realise that over a period of years new arrangements have been made, new claims have been given and so on. The planters are saying that every time they increase wages they expect sugar or the other commodities they sell to go up in price; but this Government has seen fit to control the price of locally grown food so that when you ask the Government to remove the controls and put up the price, we say emphatically "No." We cannot control the food coming from abroad, but we can control the local food in the interest of the inhabitants. We cannot control the food which is coming from abroad except to subsidise it. The people of Barbados know that we have prevented the planters from toying with them. If you make a few cents from the canes you must be satisfied with that, but the people of this colony must get some cheap food. Taking the plantation owners as a whole, they say that the cane is subsidising food production; every time they pay more money, they want more money for their produce; they say that what it costs to weed the land and plant crops before is costing them more today.
2.55 p.m.

It costs twice as much to weed and care as before, but we are persisting in saying to them that we know they make a little money in cane, the time has not yet come when they are showing a loss, and we have a duty as a Socialist Government to see to it that at least a few items are given to the inhabitants at a fairly reasonable price. Those things come under our control, and we are seeing to it that the people get those things at what we call a reasonable price.

I had the sad experience of receiving a couple of letters from my constituency, from a group of fairly large peasant holders asking me to raise the price of provisions, because they too were feeling the squeeze, but I had to let them know what was the principle involved and therefore they would have to abide by the conditions which prevail today just as the big landed proprietors. We have no intention whatsoever at the moment of allowing anybody to play ball, not even the big landed proprietors. We do not intend to do that with the people's industry and the people's food. As I said before, when we import something from Holland, and the people say the first cost is so much and then the duty has to be added all the way down the line, that is to be expected; but in this matter of locally grown provision and so on, we are trying to keep our eyes on that and see that planters do not get more than what they were getting before. Somebody might say it is unreasonable and political. If it is political and it is helping the people of Barbados to get a little cheaper food, I can only say that I am a politician and I have been put here by people who count me as a politician.

Mr. Speaker, this question is a large one; it does not border on sentiment. I am not going over what I said last week because I know that perhaps things might not end very well. However, I am going to say that I have always been in the thick of a fight; I have always welcomed a fight, and I think when I am fighting at my best, and therefore I am not afraid of any challenge or anybody; I never have been and never will be. There are certain people in this community, Sir, who know what the sugar industry means to the inhabitants of this country. They know that people are migrating from these parts because of the conditions under which they live, and the politicians who control these various Governments cannot do much about them so long as there is only sugar. That is a fact, Sir, even though you get a few industries coming in. Even though they get seven and sometimes ten years' tax holiday; what good is that to the country? They might employ a few

people here and there or tell you that they are doing so, but when you visit them how many do they really employ? A few people might be gathering a few cents here and there by way of wages, but look how much Government has to give up in these cases.

Mr. Speaker, the sugar industry is not the only local thing which needs an inquiry if the hon. proposer of this Resolution wants to help Barbadians. There is the hotel industry in which people come from all over the world and bring their dollars here, but the people who work there get little or no part of the profits made. I have a few stories to tell. We lend to hotel proprietors hundreds and thousands of dollars, but you do not hear anybody coming here and asking any questions about the wages of these hotel workers who are for the most part inside the hotel handing drinks and getting tips. Nobody makes a football about them or asks any questions concerning them, but here you have the mainstay of this country being used as a fulcrum by certain people. The people must know the truth and the truth will set them free.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the part which we as a Socialist Government played from time to time in making the agricultural worker feel and know that he is a man, but today he knows that better than any of us. If you want to know anybody who can take care of himself today, it is the agricultural workers, because I know some people who refuse to have anything to do with him. Their land is lying fallow and uncultivated because they do not want to have anything to do with agricultural labourers. I know, Mr. Speaker, that some people feel that the Government should confiscate land in Barbados and be unrealistic.

I want to tell this Honourable House right now that on my recent trip to Puerto Rico, I spent a considerable amount of hours investigating with the Secretary of the Agricultural Department there. My mission certainly was not a secret one and I can tell the House some of the facts I gathered. My visit had to do with agriculture and not with tourism. I am saying, Sir, that while I felt that we should during the next five years explore the possibilities of a profit sharing system or proportionate profit sharing system, I have read so much of what was happening in Puerto Rico, that I thought it wise to have a chat with the people who had tried it there.
3.05 p.m.

With that, perhaps having Dodds Plantation and land at the Pine, I thought that Government could very well begin to try something like that in Barbados. I hoped to make a return from it. What did they tell me? They told me that what little they have of that, they want to get rid of now. They went on to say that that was done at the time, just as I have said before, when we did not have certain things in 1944. That was done at the time when the Puerto Rican labourer was exploited and inadequately paid; therefore, the Government had to do something. The Government had to resort to the purchasing of quite a few plantations. As you know, you cannot do a thing like that unless you purchase the land. They had to buy quite a large tract of land in order to implement that scheme and they have told me with no uncertainty that only in one or two instances the people made a profit out of it. Only those who worked very hard got a profit out of it and Government in most cases had to make good the rest of them. That was done as an emergency. Those people also warned me that if things are going all right here not to worry with it. I have the Director of Agriculture and my Permanent Secretary to back me in that statement. While they were explaining that to me, a photographer came in and took a picture of us and if you see that picture you would see how depressed I was.

There are some things which you read of in a magazine or paper which sound very well, but when you learn more of them, you will find out that they are things which you should shy off. Where a particular problem may be in common in a country and they are able to use a certain solution, that solution would not be adaptable in another country. Because Mr. Goldenberg has been able to go to Jamaica and get a few factories closed and get a few of the people to mechanise the sugar industry in that island and to give the people who work in the industry a little bit more money, it does not mean that all is well. It is common knowledge that some of the workers received $300 and $400 and were told that there would be no further employment for them.

Further to that, I went to St. Kitts and when we were going around the agricultural part, one farmer told me that he was going to show me what was going to take place in St. Kitts if certain things are not done. He told me to get in his car and he will drive me to the spot. When I was taken to that field I saw a mechanical cane loader. No human being was there to put the canes on the lorry. It was just a mechanical piece of equipment travelling along and putting the canes on the lorry. I said to myself if that were to come to Barbados, I do not know what would happen. The last bulletin I got from St. Kitts is that only 4,000 tons of sugar have been made. Sir, do you think we want that in Barbados? We want to be sure that the workers are getting their fair share of the profits, but at the same time we are not going to allow anybody to come down here to say that the people in the industry can pay a few cents more but then they must mechanise and by doing so put thousands of people out of work.

Let this gentleman stay where he is. Let us negotiate, let us bargain. Let the Trade Union perform its functions and let the Government come in to do what they can to see that agriculture is not broken down. Do not get these high-faluting people to come in with all their modern day mechanical skill and place our people out of work. Do you know what disaster it would be with Barbadians today with their temperament and ability if an attempt were made to further mechanise the sugar industry? I have seen it with my eyes. I saw it in St. Kitts and in Jamaica: so I can foresee what it would be. I have been told about it in Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico today can sell 1,530,000 tons of sugar to America but she cannot more make than one million tons and she has to take out 300,000 tons for local consumption. They gave me all the reasons why and we have made serious investigations into these things. We are not allowing the sugar industry to go by default. We have had certain discussions about getting somebody in the Ministry to deal with that alone.

Sir, you can tell the people that I want them to stay in the field. I can say it. God sent cane here as our resource. Do not put people in the air and fool them. In every country you must have agriculturalists. In the United States, you have your agriculturalists and you have them as well in London and Denmark. Every country must have its agriculturalists. All over the world agriculture is the first industry. God made it so and no politician can change it. You get somebody telling the people that you want to keep people in the field. Do not care what scientists develop, even the material with which they make the pills comes from Mother Earth.

I want people to be clear. When we work under these proposals that we bring a man here to enquire into the sugar industry I want them to know exactly what this man would recommend, what would be the outcome of his recommendations and how the people of Jamaica fared by his recommendations. What would be the future of his recommendations if we bring him here? If Mr. Goldenberg were to come here and do in Barbados what he did in Jamaica, we would have a terrible problem on our hands. I say that he is going to recommend that you keep what you have and pay the workers a little more. But he is going to tell you that you must go in for some mechanisation. When I say that, I do not hope anybody is so dumb as to think that because I speak against more mechanisation, I am being backward. I realise that scientists must go forward and we must go forward. This is a scientific age in which we are all moving. We have nowadays automation in the various factories. I saw a little bit of it in the sugar industry there. They showed me where a certain man used to be, but now there is a certain button or horn to occupy that position.
3.15 p.m.

That is the price of automation; it is the price of scientific research. When we talk about completely mechanising the sugar industry in Barbados, when I say I am

against that, it does not mean that I do not know that science is moving forward all down the line. But the people in Barbados should learn to give and take, and the planters must realise that we have power in our hand for a long time to come, so that they must not do anything irrational. They must be led to do things even if it takes legislation to do it. A lot of hon. members may not know this as well as I do, but during the crop season a man who usually cuts cane carries his wife to load the canes. Under the system where you have fewer factories and you have less canes in the field, less will be cut in the fields because they are giving a certain quota. If you would normally get $15 a week for yourself and your wife comes along with you to load your canes, then that amount is doubled. So that your family, instead of having $30, will have $60. That is the old Barbadian practice.

If Mr. Goldenberg were to come here and seek to introduce mechanical loading in Barbados, I will foresee all sorts of things. That is not a thing for us in Barbados; we want to show an absolutely free spirit of goodwill among the agriculturalists in Barbados. We want to make the planters realise the fact that we are aware and we realise that with ownership of land, any individual who has more than he can work for himself has an obligation to the community. That is a Socialist philosphy; any man who has more land than he can work, owes something to the community. This is not a matter which must be dealt with lightly; it is a matter which must be given serious thought. You can advise and you may even make political speeches and say: "I asked for an enquiry and you voted against it". I am voting against it and you can go to Timbuctoo or anywhere else and say that I voted against it because I am doing my country a service.

Seeing the facts as I have been allowed to see them, I have seen them in Jamaica, in St. Kitts and quite recently I have seen things in Puerto Rico. I mean no harm when I say that. I have seen where agriculture has not gone forward as it has gone forward in Barbados. This Government should do everything possible to see that it gets some of the best agriculturalists, botanists, scientists and so on, so that our crop will go up and the land should not get in any way derelict. The day in which anything happens to us, the land will be in a very poor way if we allow that state of affairs to take place. I have heard that in Puerto Rico because a certain amount of attention has not been given to the land, some of it has become acid and sour and they have serious problems on their hands; therefore, we have to give a word of encouragement to these farmers. The very fact that they see that the land is properly cultivated, we owe them a meed of praise, because it is on the sugar industry of this island that we hope to build a better Barbados. As I have said, the Administration in America is calling a halt to these industrialists coming into other places and manufacturing articles and sending them back to America. That is the writing on the wall, so that even if you have got these small industries, the time will come when the tax holiday period will be over and they will pack up and go. If you are going to set up a factory where you want to get cheap labour and the Union is going to make you pay more, you may as well pack up and go home. You have to watch these things; you have to be sure as to what you are after and try and get it and do not allow unscrupulous people to come in and break it all up.

I cannot say that there is no room for improvement where agriculture is concerned. You will get some people who are working for the Government and who are drawing $400 or $500 a month, but they will still want something more. What I am saying is this: when you go to talk business, expecially on the matter of sugar, the people with whom you have to deal have many figures and they can tell you many things that you have not thought about.
3.25 p.m.

That is the reason why the peasant has never been able to go up to London in the sugar agreement, and that is why for the first time Trinidad last year succeeded in sending one member because of the association with this. Anyway, that is a long story; but they never had the facts and even though they have been able to send a man up there, he was not armed with any facts, because they are now getting their facts. We are so far ahead of Trinidad and Jamaica when it comes to sugar production that it is not funny. Trinidad has no protection for cane growers whereby the factory must buy their canes. There is no factory in Barbados which can refuse to buy a peasant's canes; the owner can be prosecuted, but this is not so in Trinidad. Even now in Trinidad they get together and see how many tons you sold over the last five years and limit your production to that amount. In Jamaica they are telling the farmers that they have an export quota of so many thousand tons, they need so many tons locally and somebody might have a short fall and they might be able to come in with their 466,000 tons. The people are told that if they over produce this sugar they are not so sure that they will be able to sell it. That is a fact and I have a White Paper on that from the last Conference I attended, so that they are not encouraging their people to grow too much canes. They say that if you go ahead and plant too big an area of cane you might have it on your hands, because they have no law to make the factories buy it and they have a quota system.

Mr. Speaker, that does not happen in Barbados. Up to now we have on our Statute Book a law which makes it incumbent upon the factory owner to buy every piece of cane that is grown in Barbados. I am saying, Sir, a thing which our dear friend in Cuba, Castro, has been playing with. He has been playing with that, and it seems to me that he is going to run into a lot of trouble. There is a law in Barbados which protects the cane grower; every joint of cane that he produces the factory must buy, but in Trinidad, it is not so. In fact, quite recently the Minister of Agriculture in Trinidad has been under fire because some of his proposals do not seem to be able to solve the problems, and their problems are big. In Jamaica the arrival of Mr. Goldenberg has not solved anything; it has just further confused the issue.

While we admit having our local problems, I do not think they are insurmountable, and as I said before, the Union and the Government can get together and solve them for the benefit of all concerned. I think, Sir, that up to now we have not been able to achieve all we would have liked to achieve but we do not want - I for one knowing the facts as I do - a man to come here only to theorise as apparently he did in Jamaica, and when he has gone to leave us with our laps full of trouble, because I know what this agricultural question is in Barbados. I have seen quite recently what it has been in St. Kitts and up to now the repercussions of the St. Kitts affair are not over. I repeat, Sir, that from the latest bulletin I saw from St. Kitts after weeks of reaping was the fact that only 4,000 tons of sugar is reaped and this is well into the reaping session; so you can see that they are having their trouble also.

I do not want to speak anything disparagingly about St. Kitts, but when I was there I was told that what is going on in St. Kitts today is the aftermath of political repercussions, because it was in the hands of certain people who knew not what they were saying and who said anything, and today the people are following that advice and going slowly not caring how they live, or what they do. They just feel they are carrying out political orders. I was made to understand that some of the leaders who told them that at the time would be glad if they would change now. Politicians ought to know this. If today they are in the Opposition and tell people not to pay the Government's rental for the houses in which they live, I would like to know if they came into power whether they were going to turn somersault and say to the people "Oh, no! We told you not to pay when they were there, but now we want you to pay us." Human beings are not like that. That is how you create Frankensteins in these things.

That is the reason why I was at pains to point out, Mr. Speaker, that whatever we do in the sugar industry must be done with the best of intentions, with goodwill on both sides, seeking and finding the best way out. When one looks at the figures of Government and see what is got from the sugar industry, were we to be deprived of that because of any disturbance in one year, in two years' time when we got the repercussion you would be surprised to see what a bad reflection it would have on our economy. Not only

that. Hon. members will observe that last year we had a slight drought; and what did we see during the year? Instead of plantation owners giving the people three, four or five days' work, they gave them two days' work. On top of that now we have had another drought this year, and I am very fearful of what is going to happen in what we call the hard time this year, because if they only got two days last year, in certain districts certain plantations are going to lose money anyhow, so they will shorten their labour. We have to face these grim facts. We want to do something to help people and not prevent them from getting bread when some of us have our bread prepared, anyhow. We do not want to get the relationship between the two people so embittered that there cannot be some spirit of compromise and goodwill and a spirit to see to it that the interests of the worker is taken care of and that goodwill prevails.
3.35 p.m.

I think, Sir, everbody knows that so far as the Ministry of Agriculture is concerned, it has to do with agriculture in Barbados and we have all of the facts coming in to us. I request them from many other countries. It is true that everything is not always on all fours. We are unlike them in some things and they are unlike us in some things. Agriculture is unlike the tourist industry which can pass out any time. If you have a war, the tourist industry is not worth you anything much and if you have a scarcity of cash, say something happening in Venezuela, these things will put you in financial difficulties because if you are catering to people coming from those countries and they cannot export any currency to you on this side, you are in for trouble. But it is not so with agriculture. Even if you have a drought and you do not have a lot of money coming in from your exports, you can still manage to keep body and soul alive.

You must not allow agriculture to become so derelict or to abandon our people so that on both sides, the farmer and the worker, would be neglected by the Government. Sir, this is a very wide subject and before I sit down, I am going to say one thing more. Some time ago, a mission went to Dominica and if you want to really know what abandonment of the land really means, you see it at its highest in Dominica. In certain places it is good land and in certain other places the people who live there do not even know what that land is. From the best sources, I have heard that not all of the land which is said to be good land is good because it is not so detailed. No soil physcist has dealt with it and if you want to see people migrating from a country which there is no hope in the land, it is there. If there was hope in the land, you would have been getting a few of the agriculturists staying a while until the better day comes.

The Government, the Trade Union and the people of goodwill must always get together and see to it that the agricultural worker is not exploited and is given part of the profits and that the owners of the land receive a fair recompense for his capital. I have no wild cat scheme of expropriating people's property. I have no such intention. I know at one time that was mooted. At one time it was said that one person should not own more than 500 acres of land. Nobody in Barbados can say that this Government has not been mindful when called upon to bring about an enquiry.

This is the last point which I am going to remind this Honourable House of. I think it was in 1946 that Professor Shephard was brought here by this Government to enquire into the sugar industry. While he did a good job in dealing with the labourers, when it came to fixing the price for peasant canes, he was hopelessly wrong. I was appointed a member of the Committee at the time and I sat in at every meeting. When Mr. Shepard wrote down his formula, the peasants who sold their canes to Carrington, according to his formula would have to give canes to Carrington Factory 75 cents on every ton of canes and the peasants who sold their canes to Oldbury, would have to give Oldbury 85 cents on every ton. His formula just did not work and we had to do away with it and put in our own formula.

I have pointed that out to show that we have to be very careful when we bring these people in what advice they give us. I am not speaking disparagingly of Professor Shepard. At the time he came here management and labour were at each other's throats and we were in a bit of a fix. He had really chaos from which to get something. In other words, if a room is dark and you light a match there is no more darkness; but if there is a little light, then you have something from which you can get something. When Mr. Shepard came here, everything was dark and gloomy; there was no light. Nobody was satisfied. He came and sat down with us and discussed the matter intelligently and he had the best knowledge from the people in Barbados - the people of goodwill to guide him. As I have said, the problems differ and therefore, the solutions differ. In this matter, having seen for myself the results of Mr. Goldenberg's solution to the problem in Jamaica as regards that country's sugar industry, I say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot vote for Mr. Goldenberg to come to Barbados to conduct an enquiry into the colony's sugar industry.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments rather than let it be felt that the hon. member who has just sat down is singing a solo. It was in 1958 after we had a breakdown in the negotiations between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers Association that the Government with a view to having negotiations settled amicably in the future decided to have an enquiry into the sugar industry and this House will remember that the Government brought here Mr. McKenzie who is an agricultural economist, to go into the industry. I have in mind the report of Mr. Mc.Kenzie. One can very well understand why the Government at that time decided to have that enquiry. It was decided to have the enquiry because we had strikes, a lot of sugar cane was burnt and no use could be made of them and they were ploughed back into the field and the island suffered a severe loss as a result of the breakdown of those negotiations.

You will remember that we set up a Commission of Enquiry under the chairmanship of Mr. Lewis who is now one of the Judges of the Federal Supreme Court. That Commission met and awarded a bonus to the workers on the 1958 crop.
3.45 p.m.

As I said, immediately after that, the Government got down Mr. McKenzie here to go into the sugar industry. Mr. McKenzie went into all phases of the industry and made his recommendations. It is true that he was more or less criticised by the Union, not so much on the Report or the recommendations, but because the Union did not get its way in which it wanted the enquiry to be held; that is, in public. (Mr. WALCOTT: We still feel so.) There was no question of any dispute; a dispute was in existence before and after that, a Board of Enquiry was appointed. The recommendations made at that enquiry were accepted by the Union and that enquiry was held in public. As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, we said that there was no dispute at the time and this was more a matter-of-fact investigation and it was more likely that we would get the facts from the sugar industry *in camera* rather than in public. We felt then and we still feel so now, that it was in the interest of the community in general to have that enquiry *in camera*.

Among the recommendations made by Mr. McKenzie which were accepted by the Union were these. Mr. McKenzie said this:

"The method of adjustment of the basic wage is incorrect and should be changed.

The differential between wages of field and factory workers in the industry is not justified. Any further change in basic wages, the ratio of benefits should be 75:25 in favour of the field worker".

That has been adopted by the Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member cannot speak for the Union. The Union never set up any such system. The hon. member is out of place; he said that the Union has accepted that, but the Union has not accepted it, because the Union objected to Mr. McKenzie's Report.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am in a position to say that the Union accepted the payment of an *ad hoc* bonus to the field workers and consolidated the bonus in the wages, whereas in the case of the factory workers, the Union accepted a lower bonus. I repeat that it was on the basis that the differential of the field workers should be greater; in other words, that you should try to narrow the differential between the field workers and the factory workers and the Union agreed to the proposals.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member must know what he means by "differential". You may get the same rate as far as money is concerned but the percentage differs. The production bonus is absolutely nothing to do with basic wages. Bonus payment is not basic wages.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I do not interrupt the hon. member when he is speaking. He wants to break the tenor of the speech but he cannot do that. I do not mind his nastiness.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I could not be as nasty as you; you were born that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sometime earlier in the day I had to rise to my feet and caution hon. members, especially the hon. senior member for St. Peter, as to controlling himself. The hon. member must realise that he had to apologise for his actions. The asides are becoming too loud. The hon. member should not allow himself to be provoked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. If the hon. senior member for St, Michael makes an error, the hon. senior member for St. Peter is quite right to rise on a point of order and correct that error. That is all that is necessary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order, because it is the persistent policy of the hon. member to challenge the leadership of the Barbados Workers' Union; and whenever he gets an opportunity he challenges the leadership of the Trade Union in the eyes of the public. That is a wicked, calculated move which he has adopted. He is reading something to which the Trade Union has objected and now he says that the Union has adopted it. He will never be able to speak for the Union.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us suppose that the hon. member is right. He is now in Parliament and I think he has some means at his disposal to correct, in a public manner, any error which he thinks has been made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. Especially is that so when the hon. senior member for St. Peter admits that the hon. senior member for St. Michael is following a policy of aggravation and distortion. If the hon. member thinks so, he can deal with the matter outside of this House much better than he can in this House. That is so, especially when the hon. member is unable to contain himself. He gave evidence of not being able to do that already.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I will continue. It is all very well and good to say: "I will not accept any recommendations which anybody makes". Saying that is one thing and adopting it is quite another. I am sorry that I did not find that paper where I would have been able to give chapter and verse as to the Agreement which was reached between the Union and the Sugar Producers' Association to prove that although he says he is not accepting the Report, yet he is following the recommendations in truth and in fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: All we have is a Resolution before this House which asks for the setting up of a Commission to go into matters relating to the sugar industry. The hon. member may not be dealing with something pertinent to the Resolution - I hope he is doing that - but at this stage it seems to me that it is likely to result in a clash between himself and the hon. senior member for St. Peter. 3.55 p.m.

I might be probably a little too much in anticipation of where the hon. member is now going. Maybe I cannot see it yet; maybe I am slow on the uptake - and I hope I am- but I certainly want to bring the hon. member back somewhere to the meat of this Resolution. We have listened to a long discourse by the hon. member but he has kept to the Resolution throughout. In every sentence you could see something pertaining to the Resolution, but now the Hon. Minister may be going somewhere. As it is now, I can see nothing to it but statement, denial, clash and counter-clash between the Hon. Minister and the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I regret if it appears to you remotely.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no appeal to me being associated with it remotely or otherwise; it is a question of pursuing the question and keeping to the bone and meat of the Resolution. That is what Parliament is interested in and nothing else.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is exactly what I am doing, and when Your Honour refers to a clash, as long as I am in this House, and as long as I am putting forward an honest, truthful, straightforward point of view, I expect to have clashes with the hon. member, and I am prepared to take any clash that comes. I am no coward and never could be. (Mr. WALCOTT: I am one even when I am facing Ananias.) Some people are afraid to face up to the truth.

Now, Sir, what is the position? I am showing in no uncertain manner that this Resolution has nothing in it but political vote catching, and I will get on to that a little later. What I am prepared to show, Mr. Speaker, is that this Inquiry was instituted in 1958 and the people who were immediately and directly concerned in this issue were the Unionists - that is, the workers in the sugar industry - and the Sugar Producers' Association or employers. Since this investigation was made and recommendations were submitted in 1958, everything has been going as smoothly as one can hope for in that industry between the Union and the people. Only recently there was an increase in the price of sugar. The Union asked for a 10% increase for the workers and the people agreed to give them 9%. The Union agreed and everything is O.K. Where is the trouble because of which you are going to have this enquiry? There is absolutely no trouble in the sugar industry, and I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that among the things recommended by Mr. McKenzie was the question of a Provident Fund. That has been discussed with the Government and the Union has accepted with modification the recommendations made by Mr. McKenzie. I say with modification because Mr. McKenzie recommended that 40 cents per ton of sugar should be levied and put into a Provident Fund to finance the Fund in addition to, I think, $2 1/2 million from the Price Stabilisation and other Funds, the interest from which would be used to boost the Fund. That has been changed and that is why I said "with modification". The Union has asked for $1 and it has been agreed that the 40 cents should be increased to $1.

Mr. Speaker, this is what Mr. McKenzie had to say:-

"The provision of a Provident Fund which gives comprehensive benefits is very costly, and requires a large administrative staff."

Even before I read this, Mr. McKenzie's recommendation was that the Board to administer this Fund should comprise seven members: three from the Union, three from the Employers and one from the Government as Chairman. Even that has been accepted. The Union proposed that to the Government and the Government accepted that three members from the Union, three from the other side and the Labour Commissioner as Chairman would comprise the Board.

In my up-bringing as a boy, thank God I was able to see a mother and a father - a legal father and mother - and I know that they did everything possible to teach me the truth, the fear of God and things of that nature. If other people did not have that, it is not my fault; I am sorry for them and I can only sympathise with them.

This is what Mr. McKenzie said:

"The provision of a Provident Fund which gives comprehensive benefits is very costly, and requires a large administrative staff. This I am convinced is not feasible at the moment, as the industry has neither the financial ability nor the administrative staff to implement such a scheme; furthermore such a scheme should be a contributory scheme on similar lines to other well-established schemes elsewhere. Under the conditions in Barbados I would suggest that a comprehensive scheme of such a nature should not be left to the industry to implement, but in view of the Old Age Pensions Act and other possible changes in social security it should be the subject of serious consideration by Government."

Mr. McKenzie referred to the agreement already reached in 1956 and pointed out that from 1956 to 1958 when he had examined this scheme there was a sum of $68,000 accumulating from this 40 cent per ton sugar levy. I would like the utmost attention to be paid to what he further said. He said "it is clearly impossible to establish a Fund so inadequately financed, on the basis of each person having amounts credited to this or his personal account. The amounts would be so small as to be somewhat farcical; and administrative costs would be prohibitive."

We have discussed this with the Union and they agree with Mr. McKenzie in putting this money into a Fund instead of crediting each person as was suggested.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The hon. member takes Mr. McKenzie as a Bible.

4.05 p.m.

The Union made no suggestion whatsoever. The hon. senior member for Christ Church was Minister of Agriculture at the time and the Union submitted to the Government of Barbados a request for a Provident Fund in the sugar industry and that it should be set up by the industry. A compromise was reached by the Government because the suggestion came from the Government that it should not be from the industry but it should be from a Fund. The Union then said that we need not now protest for them to say that we did not want it to work. No suggestion was made from the Union. The Hon. Minister now says that Mr. McKenzie suggested a Fund as against individual credits. Mr. McKenzie made a suggestion to increase the fund by having a loan.

Hon. M. E. COX: Is that a point of order?

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a point of order because you said that it was he who came and changed it from individual credits which presupposes that the Union said that is should be individual credits.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will read again:

"These monies have already been earmarked since 1956, but such a cess will only provide an income of some $68,000 per annum, which even on a very restricted basis of benefits is inadequate to meet the needs of such a Fund. It is clearly impossible to establish a Fund so inadequately financed, on the basis of each person having amounts credited to his or her personal account."

Mr. WALCOTT: That does not state a fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is still reading.

Mr. WALCOTT: All the legislature decided was that it should be 40 cents taken out of the sugar industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is just reading. As long as he is reading and reading correctly, you should not stop him. He said that he will read again.

Mr. WALCOTT: It was agreed that it was not to be by individual credits which presupposes that it was individual credits in the past. It is just a fund lying down somewhere.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Minister is reading, I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Peter should comment so long as he reads correctly.

Mr. WALCOTT: His comment was that the full recommendation of Mr. McKenzie was to have this money funded as against what it was — individual credits. I rose on a point of order to point out that this money was never credited to any persons. I want to say that the Union never agreed to individual credits.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose in respect of a comment made by the Minister.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rose on a point of order to make it clear that the Union did not agree to individual credits; so it is not a question that the Union now agrees with Mr. McKenzie. The Union agreed with Mr. McKenzie that there should always be a Fund. The Hon. Minister is going back over the same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can the Minister not read, read and re-read? There is nothing for the hon. member to rise on a point of order if the Minister is reading correctly.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to rise each time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is quoting and so long as he does not read wrongly, I think the hon. member would have to wait until the Minister draws a conclusion from such.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I am sure the House will not understand me to say that there was even a fund established. I said that there was a levy of 40 cents a ton which has been set aside since 1956. No fund has been established.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member does not know what he is talking. The Legislature agreed to set aside a levy and no Fund has been set aside because no agreement has been stated as to how the fund should be utilised.

Hon. M. E. COX: If I remember correctly, the Legislature agreed to the levy of 40 cents a ton. I say again that no fund has yet been established. This is what Mr. McKenzie says:

"It is clearly impossible to establish a Fund so inadequately financed, on the basis of each person having amounts credited to his or her personal account. The amounts would be so small as to be somewhat farcical; and administrative costs would be prohibitive."

I was away from the island on two occasions. I do not know if a fund has been established, but as far as my knowledge goes, I would have been told about it because it concerns my Ministry.

Mr. WALCOTT: He said that $68,000 was there and that this amount is inadequate. A levy of 40 cents a ton was to establish a fund. A levy of 40 cents per ton was taken out of the Fund by a resolution and brought down by the Minister. That is how the Fund was set up.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I did not say any Fund of $68,000 because that levy has long past anything like $68,000. Again, I was reading and I said that these monies have already been earmarked since 1956 but such a cess will only provide an income of some $68,000 per annum. That is what I said. This is what Mr. McKenzie says:

"The amounts would be so small as to be somewhat farcical; and administrative costs would be prohibitive."

He goes on to say:

"If a scheme is started on the basis of a pooled Fund, from which benefits can be paid to persons in need, I would recommend that the Fund be restricted to — sickness benefits; maternity benefits for women; death gratuity to contribute towards burial expenses."

"In view of the small income derived from the cess," — note that he talks of a cess — "I have examined the possibility of raising further funds which would not necessitate further levies on the industry or require any direct contribution from Labour."

"I recommend that as large sums are held in reserve in the Price Stabilization Fund, these monies could be put to productive use to assist a Provident Fund."

That would show that no Provident Fund exists at present or was in existence.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I am speaking from memory but in 1956 numerous investigations and interviews existed between the Government and the Union.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the hon. member wanted to correct something but he is now making a speech.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, at least I can be granted the opportunity of making a short preamble in order to explain what I am going to say.
4.15 p.m.

The object of creating this levy of 40 cents was for the purpose of establishing a Provident Fund and it was my intention to see that such a Fund was established before the end of that Session. Although the amount of 40 cents was small, it was accepted by the Union in order to get the Fund established. However, that does not mean that it will always be at the figure of 40 cents per ton because there will not be all the numerous things which should be done; and it is no surprise to me to find that the Union has got the rate increased to $1.00. When Mr. Mc Kenzie comes with his conservative report he speaks about assisting the Fund which was already in existence.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order to clarify where the Union was misquoted. I have a letter dated the 8th January, 1959, addressed to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Labour and this is a letter which the Hon. Minister would have read. This letter reads as follows:

"Dear Sir,

With reference to your letter, No. C626/1, dated 15th November, 1958, concerning the Report by Mr. A. F. Mc Kenzie on the Sugar Industry, and the request made by you to submit the comments of the Union on the recommendations contained in the Report regarding the Provident Fund and the payment of severance Gratuity, I have been instructed by the Executive Council of the Union to submit the under-mentioned reply."

Now this is the relevant portion of the letter.

"The Report states that the Provident Fund was created on the basis that each person would have amounts credited to his or her account. This is a conclusion drawn without supporting evidence. The Union suggested from the beginning to have a Fund, but before such a Fund is operated the details should be created with specific amounts. The Union cannot accept these conclusions as representing evidence submitted by those responsible for the creation of the Fund."

This letter is in the hon. member's possession and he is getting up here with this letter in existence and saying something to the contrary. It is only by accident that I have this letter with me. You sit down and discuss matters with the hon. member and no matter what I talk, he would say anything. We have this documentary evidence; how can we deal with the hon. member?

Hon. M. E. COX: As I said, I will treat those hon. members with the contempt they deserve. The hon. senior member for Christ Church has helped me because he said that it was his intention to establish this Fund before the Session ended. This Fund was never established. Not until now.....

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I said that I wanted to see a Provident Fund established before the end of 1956. I wanted to see something done to help the workers instead of playing ball. I spoke to the Assistant Secretary of the Union and the hon. member knows that we went all around it for years, and nothing concrete was reached.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said that it was his intention to see that this Fund was established before the Session ended. He was then a Minister of the Government. I presume he meant that he would like to see the Fund established before the Election of 1956. As I say, he was a member of the Government and therefore he was trying to carry out the policy of the Government.

At this stage Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was going to quote paragraph 85 of Mr. McKenzie's Report which says this:

"I recommend that as large sums are held in reserve in the Price Stabilization Fund, these monies could be put to productive use to assist a Provident Fund. I recommend that two and a half million dollars of the reserve in the Price Stabilization Fund be invested in such securities that will yield at least four per cent per annum of interest. This earned interest should be paid annually into the Provident Fund for its use. This will give the Fund a further $100,000 a year. This together with the 40¢ cess already agreed will provide a total annual revenue of something like $168,000: a sum which should be sufficient to meet a limited Provident Fund on the lines proposed above."

In paragraph 86, this is what he says:

"Unfortunately there are little or no reliable statistics to guide anyone as to the level of benefits which will be required. I would suggest that a special committee be set up to consider the details. The Fund will have an annual income of $168,000, it will also be able to draw on funds already reserved which should now total something in the region of $190,000. This accumulated cess from previous years should be kept as a reserve fund from the very beginning, so that in the initial year or two, the operation of the Fund will be covered by a reserve of approximately one year's revenue."

Then Mr. McKenzie goes on and he deals with the question of Severance Pay. What I am trying to establish is the fact that all of these points and proposals have been discussed between the Ministries concerned, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association and we have reached agreement. It is only a question now of having legislation; as a matter of fact, I think I am correct in saying that the legislation has already been drafted and copies have been submitted to the Union for its comments. All of these things have been gone into and settled as far as the parties are concerned. To tell the Government to set up a Commission of Enquiry to do this and that is a cheap political stunt, the usual stunt or stunts which is or are thrown up whenever an Election is here. The hon. member who has moved the passing of this Resolution has no Union, no Party or anything. In that Party over there, there are all Generals; I understand that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew who has just joined is also a General. *(Laughter).*
4.25 p.m.

The position, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that they have no Union to fight for anybody, no machinery to negotiate with anybody for wages or conditions of work in this island. What is the trouble experienced with them? What is wrong and whom do they represent that they come to the House of Assembly and say you must have an inquiry? This Resolution would have you believe that the sugar industry in this island is chaotic, workers are dissatisfied, peasants are getting nothing for their canes, and there is no machinery existing to remedy this situation other than to come to this House of Assembly and ask the Government to set up an inquiry to go into this industry.

I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that only two years ago this matter was thoroughly gone into, and that relationship between the people concerned is good today, so much so that the workers knew even before they were going to cut the canes as well as the people working in the factories what price they would have received. I repeat that the Union asked for 10% increase and the Sugar Producers offered 9% which the Union accepted. Who are these dissatisfied people therefore whom the hon. member is supposed to be

representing now? What machinery has he got to test whether or not these workers are dissatisfied? What Party is there in existence so far as his side is concerned that is able to test the feeling?

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, the House will now revert to Government Business.

On the suspension, the hon. junior member for St. James was addressing the Chair.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to sum up. There is one point which I would like to bring to the notice of the Government, and it is this: we have under the Local Government Act a Trade Tax Bill, and under that trade tax all people doing business in the various constituencies or the various Councils have the right to make a return. In the absence of a return, the Income Tax Commissioner has the right of assessing, and in his assessment he gives the trader who is selling salt fish, pork, beef and things of that nature all his expenses and only assesses him on 50 percent of his net clearance. I have no grouse about that, but when it comes to a man's house which he has rented out — he is the same trader as anybody else but he is trading in capital invested in a house — he is only allowed 25% on his rental value. That to my way of thinking, Sir, is not right; it is not fair nor equitable.

If a man who is a trader is allowed all his expenses and then rated on 50 percent of his net profit, the man who invests in a house for the purpose of making an income should be given the same allowance. When you tell me that the Income Tax Commissioner is justified in taking 25% of the gross income of that house to cover all conceivable expenses, you are doing that man an injustice to such an extent that you are telling that man that he should not own a house or live in a house, but he should live in a case or rock hole. I am not going to belabour this point because I believe that they themselves realise that it needs some adjustment. If the Local Government Act deals only with trading, the Income Tax Commissioner should be told in no uncertain manner that he must deal with all of them under tax.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you take 25% of the rent of a house at $40 a month, that is $10 a month. The tax on that $40 a month house will be in the vicinity according to the rates we have in the Northern District very near $80 or more. Twenty-five percent of $40 is $10, and $10 x 12 are $120; so when you take out tax which you have to pay on that property you leave the man with $40. Tell me in the name of goodness what they are asking this man to pay out of? He has to look for $80 for taxes, then he has to pay insurance and make repairs, and there is no man today who can tell me that he can repair a hog-pen for anything less than $4 a day; and when you consider lumber, materials and things of that nature with that $4 a day for the carpenter, the extra $40 which you have cannot pay the insurance on the house, the wear and tear of it and the hire of a mason or carpenter for more than a week. Is that fair to the people?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are things that must be rectified, and if you want an equitable taxation, everything must be done in such a way that every man will be given his latitude and his right deductions. I have in my possession now a piece of land in Orange Hill. A man died and left this quarter acre of land and on it he left four children each of whom has a chattel house on certain portions of that land. The Income Tax Commissioner has sent out two bills for that one property: one for the land and one for the houses too. Could that be equitable? And besides they have sent out the bills to the estate of the dead man. (Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, do not pay them.) I know exactly what to do. I do not want any promptings as to what I should do, but I say that we must avoid a repetition of these things. 4.35 p.m.

It does not spell right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to prolong this debate because I believe another hon. member who is associated with me on the Northern District Council wishes to make his contribution. I have been requested to read to this House the Resolution which was passed by the Northern District Council. It reads as follows:-

"Copy of Resolution passed by the Northern District Council at the meeting held on the 27th March, 1961 to be forwarded to the Governor-in-Executive Committee...

"BE IT RESOLVED that this Council agree in principle with the proposed amendment to the Local Government Act, 1958, which seeks to provide for a uniform rate of trade tax for the three Councils. This Council is also concerned over the fact that it has collected less revenue from rates of land than was formerly collected by the respective Vestries and accordingly implores Government to review the whole question of valuation as soon as possible;"

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Council ask that Government consider the possibility of a complete centralisation of all Local Government activities."

That is the Resolution which was passed by the Northern District Council and it covers every conceivable argument today both from the Opposition and Government benches. We have come to the point that administration of Local Government is too expensive and something must be done to curtail those expenses so that the people can get those services which they need more cheaply and I would say that it should be done as soon as possible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will now leave the balance of the debate to my hon. friend, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, and I suppose that he would do justice to himself and to the Council. I can assure the Government that I am with them 100% and anything which I can do to encourage people to support this Government, I will do. This Government has done a good service to the country. Admittedly, there are one or two things on which I cannot see 100% with them but the few things which people can throw at them are so infinitesimal that you can think nothing of it. An hon. member referred to old age pensions. When it comes to old age pensions, I will have something to say but this is not the time for it. I think we all would agree that no structure is greater than its foundations. With those few words, I am going to finish and let my hon. friend have the opportunity of saying something on this matter.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when various hon. members have dealt with a number of points which one would have written down it means one would not have to repeat them. One of the members of the Northern District Council has also spoken and touched on many points which I have written down, but there are a few things which I must touch on before I talk of the merits of this particular Bill.

Quite a lot has been said and generated about land valuation and things like that. I am quite certain that there is nobody in this House, and certainly nobody in the Northern District Council, who does not recognise that there is need for something to be done about valuations in general, and in particular to valuation of land. Indeed, we have been saying from the inception of the Councils, from the time we got our rateable valuations and say what the returns were, that there was need for something to be done about them. I do not think the Government has ever said that they do not recognise that particular part of the problem. Indeed, we have had to put these things to the public. We have discussed them at Council meetings and we expect that there will be some consideration given to the early reassessment on the whole question of valuation, which includes the valuation of land.

I think some very good points have been made in a way of trying to criticise this Bill on land valuation. It is accepted by all concerned that there is need for reassessment of the land valuation and I do not think we need to labour that point. We have gone so far as to say that there is

nothing really in the Bill for rab land. We have seen in our own area of the North where what can be regarded as rab land plantations have been leased or sold. As the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has said, you find the same kind of land being used as big factories and things like that. That has been ventilated on many occasions: so I will quickly pass over from that because I consider reassessment of the valuation of land is one of the essential things which we have to do. That in itself does not approach what might be termed as the merits of this particular Bill.

One thing which I must question very strongly — and this was done by the first member who spoke on this, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, who is also a member of the City Council and it was followed in one way or the other by several speakers — is this talk of the City Council through the objects of this Bill subsidising the Northern and Southern Districts. The Hon. Leader of the House gave some examples of the trade in the island to show that whenever one thinks of trade or gets a windfall or a great amount of trade coming in, you will find that the greatest amount will always go to the City. It needs to be examined how much of this extra amount you can use from the metropolitan Council for helping the services of the other Councils and I think that is the purpose of this Bill. We do not want to contribute to the feeling that this is a particular subsidy from the City Council to the other Councils. If one were to imagine the Deep Water Harbour being constructed, say, 25 years ago in Speightstown, you can easily see what the situation would be. The flow of all the commodities from outside of the whole build-up of commercial interest would be in that area and you will get the same situation as you have around Bridgetown now, in Speightstown. You will get the extra amount available where there is one port and because you have that additional amount you can spread it more evenly and equitably over the other areas. It is not a question of taking it away; it is a question of putting back some of the income and wealth which you got from the outside areas back into those areas.
4.45 p.m.

I do not want to go into all the details as to how many people spend their money in the City. I feel that the question to be pointed out is that there is no genuine question of the City Council subsidising the other areas; I think that it is just an equitable way of going about one of the problems. It was said particularly by the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. junior member for Christ Church, that everything in this Bill is arbitrary; that we reached the figures in an arbitrary way and all of that. Supposing we were even to grant that that may be so; suppose it is an arbitrary figure; it can be found from the calculations which are before us, that whereas the City Council would have, in the last year estimated that they would have received $1,356,250 from their trade value, it has actually turned out that at the same rate of 17.5%, they are receiving up to the end of February the sum of $1,649,630. In other words, even when they estimated for something, they are receiving in less than a year in round figures the sum of $293,000 more than what they estimated for at the same rate of 17.5%. It cannot be argued that anything which they would have to do would disrupt the services of the City Council or cause people to pay more. They estimated their expenditure; they did not come down for supplementary estimates or anything like that; if they estimated that they were spending $1,356,250 and they were getting it from trade tax, then their expenditure is geared to that. If it turns out that more income comes to them than they estimated for, it does not mean that they have increased expenditure. You might find that it is a working balance carried over for the next year.

According to calculation, the City Council would have budgeted for $1,356,250 from trade tax. When you pool the tax and give them 80% of it, they will get $1,455,430. In other words, they would be getting $194,000 more than they estimated for. What has happened is that they have actually got $293,000 more than they expected. By pooling the tax you would give them not $293,000 more than they expected, but $194,000, and you use the rest of that money to spread over the Northern and Southern areas. They have estimated at less and got more, therefore you will find that this Bill cannot disturb the services of the City Council or those of the other Councils.

The question which I would like to put to the hon. senior member for City is this: what is the present trend of revenue from trade tax in these days or during the past two or three years? The hon. member could only answer that question in one way and that is, that the trend is up and every Council is receiving more from trade than that for which it is estimated. The Southern District Council received $2,000 less than what they estimated for; the City Council actually received $1,649,000 from trade in the past year. They had estimated for $1,356,000 and they have actually got $293,000 more than they expected, which is an increase of 14% more income than they calculated for. Let us compare the figures with the Northern area. We had estimated that we will be getting in $98,494 from trade and we actually received with our rate at 26.62%, the sum of $100,442; in other words, we got $2,000 more than we expected. The City Council found a windfall coming to them and they received 14% more than their calculated amount. What would be the cause of such a trade increase for the City Council and such a small increase for the other Councils? Is it that the trade has been concentrated in the City. Has the City found itself giving 14% more services and the other Councils giving only 2% more? That is not the case.

The Premier told us in his Budget Speech about the things which we were bringing into the island; we were really living above our means in that respect. That is why you find the City Council getting actually 14% more from Trade tax than they had even estimated for and the country areas getting no more than about 2% increase from trade. Therefore, you are not robbing the City Council taking away from their services when you bring down a Bill like this. Anybody would think that this is the only thing you may do so as to rectify the situation. I think it is an accepted truth that there was an under-valuation of land; I do not want to expatiate on that any more at the moment. I think enough ventilation on that has already been given.
4.55 p.m.

Coming back to this trade tax situation, you have got a windfall in the City, more than they themselves calculated for, and unless they are running all over the place now trying to spend up the surplus balance before the Estimates are submitted or approved by the Council, you will have this surplus. It is possible that the City Council right now and in the next two weeks may be seeing how they can shove in $230,000 expenditure just for the hon. senior member for the City to prove his point. You have to look into these things. The rates are not yet submitted to Council even though the rates of expenditure have been, and the rates have not been approved by the Cabinet, and it is quite possible that within the next few weeks when by the end of April the rates would be approved, you may find the particular Council trying to justify their case by shoving in another $23,000 expenditure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is nothing to stop them from doing that because they would be doing that in their own Council and submitting the rates afterwards. If they do not try to juggle the figures in that way, it becomes evident that they get such a heavy increase and no corresponding increase in population. The population all over Barbados has increased in the normal fashion, and you cannot say that more babies are born proportionately in the City than are born in the rest of the island. (Mr. WALCOTT: You do not know that because you do not have the actual figures.) If you have no statistics to prove, then you cannot say it the other way either; so in that case, I am quite sure that the premise I used is correct. You can get the returns from the Registrar and see the births, because they will be registered as being born. (Mr. WALCOTT: The country is more conducive to production.) Therefore you expect a greater percentage.

As has been done by the representatives of the City Council, I would not like to use the argument that we are robbing the City Council or that they are subsidising something. That is not correct because they have all the time

under-estimated what they were going to get. The hon. senior member for St. Peter did not have the figures the first time and I do not know if he has any of them today, but I have just illustrated again that the figures themselves prove that they have consistently estimated for less revenue than they had been getting. That itself is not justification enough for making a uniform tax, but what makes the justification is that when you get a 14% increase in one Council which has the most money and just 2% in another, then you see there is that much of a difference where you can see that a uniform trade tax will assist. That does not solve the problem and I would not for one minute feel that the problem is solved; but at least you are taking one of the first steps - one of the easiest steps and one of the quickest steps that one can take.

I know that if the representatives for the City were present, Sir, we would have had to hammer this particular point some more, but as they are not here, I would just like to make a few other comments on the particular nature of this amendment. Now it has not been said - and I am very glad that it has not been said by anybody so far - that the purpose of this Bill is to make sure that any difference that needs to be made up in the North and South is going to be completely met by this uniform rate of trade tax, and that it would be absolultey unnecessary at any time in the future for Government to consider subsidies if such become essenital and imperative. I do not think the purpose of this Bill is to take the place or to substitute for any Government subsidy as such. Government may find themselves hesitant, since they have made a uniform trade tax, to consider any particular subsidy; but I do not consider that the argument can be used that the uniform trade tax itself takes the place of any subsidy if it is necessary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will illustrate why. This is now the third year of the Councils. In the first year the Councils without doing anything at all but merely taking over from the Vestries with or without any books as we knew, taking the valuation that came down from the Inland Revenue Department, with a few minor additional services such as scavenging and ambulances and just a 10% or 15% increase for regular staff, found themselves with very heavy rates. There are a number of us who felt that the only Council which might afford to keep its rates the same or lower then would be the City Council, and even they did not do that. They had very high rates, and it only meant that the valuation struck them with quite a jolt; so I would not be so mischievous as to say that they sent up their rates deliberately. If they did, they know they did and they would have been the only ones who could have kept their rates at par anyhow; but if they did not, it means that the valuation struck them with such a jar that they also found that their own constitutents in the municipal area were also complaining about the heaviness of rates. All round the hue and cry went up. The Government found the rates were prohibitive in the North and South and therefore offered in the first year to lower the rate by giving a subsidy to lower the rate to the lowest it had been in any one of the parishes previously.

In the second year of the Council it also happened, and I was out of the island at the time when we got a grant of a certain amount of money which meant we could reduce the rate by up to 15% - the rate of any property owners on $300 or under. I thought from a distance that that was one of the amendments that had come down; I thought it was the long awaited amendment to Section 145, but when I did check I found it was just a grant to help in that situation. Government did that on those two occasions. If, on those first two occasions when there was not this money circulating, the Northern and Southern District Councils had to find this subsidy, not necessarily to improve their services, but almost to maintain the *status quo*, you are faced with a situation now in the last year of the Councils where you need to improve your services: and all this is going to do is probably fill the gap in maintaining the *status quo* and allowing you to reorganise public health services to some extent that you would not find yourself making an exorbitant rate because of your reorganisation.

5.05 p.m.

You are going to be in a position where it does not provide you with enough to improve your services to any great extent. I think the figures are going to prove that. One member of the Northern District Council when we discussed this made a telling point. He said: "If we are keeping a uniform rate of trade tax and we want to improve our services, taking for example public assistance, and we want to increase the amount which we give for that purpose to measure up with what obtains in the City, how are we going to make the grade if you keep the trade tax at 17.5%?" He said that the trade in our area is only going to yield a particular amount. I had some figures with me but I cannot put my hands on them now. However, in any case, the figures are going to show that by reducing our rates from 26.6% to 17.5%, we are going to lose some of the amount which we got in, although the amount which we are going to lose would not be as much as when you take your percentage which you get from the Bill. When we want to increase our rate of public assistance, how are we going to do it? We have already calculated our expenditure on what we are getting now. How are we going to increase all these services if we do not get any more assistance? Although this particular Bill seeks to even up some of the uneven grounds, to increase and improve your services, it is still going to be in such high demand that you are going to find it necessary at some time in the future to request that there should be a different kind of subsidy. You are going to find out sooner or later that you must have public assistance as a Government Department or that you give some equalisation grants for public assistance.

This present amendment to the Bill is not going to provide for that contingency. We are only providing for the particular situation which we are in now: but when we increase public assistance rates, this amendment does not make provision for it. You are going to find the same things facing you when you improve your health services. We of the Northern District Council are now in the process of making a reassessment in respect of health services, and because of that you are going to find that you need people to cover a greater area and to do more detailed work; inspectors would find themselves, as a result, doing more travelling. The increase and improvement of your services are going to call for some further amount of subsidisation. I do not consider that this amount which you are going to get from this provision in the Bill is going to be enough to handle it and that is why you get these arguments about undervalue of land. If we intend to make a uniform rate and as we have been made to understand, land has been undervalued, when we want to improve our services and we want to know where money is forthcoming for that purpose, just as we have a uniform trade tax, we can have a uniform land tax because we would know that trade tax alone cannot help us to provide the services which we want. Therefore, until you get a revaluation of land, all the District Councils are going to be in a position where they cannot improve their services. Therefore, I say that the points made by other hon. members agree with the second paragraph read by the hon. junior member for St. James of that Resolution which said that this Council is concerned over the fact that we are receiving less revenue from land than the vestries themselves received, and because of that fact, we would like with the greatest possible haste to see a reassessment of our valuation because if we get that reassessment we will then be able to improve the services facing us. If you do not get that reassessment, you will find that this amendment alone, being the first step and being the most expedient step, does not fill the hill when you think of the other changes which need to be made.

I think I have examined and explored these points with sufficient clarity and I do not think one needs to labour them any further. The hon. junior member for St. James did mention that there are other sections of the Act which he thinks need to be amended. I think he was in place to mention the ones he did mention. I will not worry to go over his remarks. We are very conscious that more far reaching amendments will have to be made to the Local Government Act if we want it to work in the way we want.

There is the second fact which we all must take note of by the introduction of this Bill. We noticed that this when established, would be a Fund to be operated under the control of the Local Government Commissioner. I believe this Commissioner and the officers in his office are quite capa-

ble and have the necessary knowledge to handle this matter. But two points need to be brought out. One is, I think, that this is the best place to handle this Fund and that this particular Local Government Officer is known by all Councillors and by all who have to do with Local Government as a very efficient and hardworking officer and a person who puts his energy into his work. This is an accepted fact.

It is possible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you have a good horse, to run him to death. We know that the Local Government Commissioner is also charged with the responsibility of registration now. He is the Local Government Commissioner and as such he has to attend all the Councils' meetings. Now, he is to be in charge of this particular Fund. Although he might be able to do the work, he is going to find that this particular Fund is going to involve much ungainly mechanics to handle it. It is an additional duty to his office and he has also the office of registration to attend to now. When you find yourself in that position, I think Government must look out that it is a possibility that you may find yourself that you are overburdening a particular section of your administration. I would not like to feel it is so, but this is something which has to be considered. If because you have an efficient person you find yourself so working that particular person, you may find that you cannot get the maximum productivity out of that person. If you are getting the maximum service from that office, you should not overwork it.

Another point to be noted is the fact that now Government says trade tax is going to be so-and-so, it means that Government is taking another step towards the centre of the core of Local Government operation.
5.15 p.m.

I think that is also fitting. Normally, the Councils were responsible for getting their trade tax and property rate formulated and trying to meet expenditure in that way. The Government has said that in order to make a better distribution we have found that we have to say that trade tax must be so much and so much. We have taken a step nearer to the core of the operation of Local Government. I do not entirely agree with the fulsome sentiments which may be expressed to the effect that the Government should centralise every office and make it a Department of Government, but this is an example that the Government is taking a step closer to local administration. With equalisation grants for public assistance, you will find that the Government will be more involved in Local Government than previously.

I have said on more than one occasion that in any change which we make in Local Government, we had better regulate these things in relation to how we stand with the Federal Government. I do not want to get into that particular phase of the debate, but Dr. Williams had to say something about two years ago in Trinidad in some local Government Election. Some of his Councillors asked: "Do we not have to reorganise our Local Government system? Dr. Williams replied: "I do not know: show a sense of touching that now and we would know to work a better thing as a Federation. When we see what we can do with the Federal Government, we will see what we can do with Local Government." It is no sense going just halfway and touching Local Government without seeing your relationship with Federal Government. The matter is one which must be studied in totality and not in just small sections. It is a fact that the Government has found that it is necessary to go a little closer to the operation of Local Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not covered all the points which I have written down, but there is no sense in touching upon points which have already been touched upon by several speakers. I would like to say in summary that I do not think it can be justifiably argued that this Bill has no merit. I think it is known and it can be proved that this Bill has merit in itself. It must be accepted that this is only one of the steps of revamping your Local Government taxation system. If we admit that there are other things to be done, I would like to take up the opposition which we have had to this Bill on that ground, because the Opposition seem to think that this Bill is one-sided, and if we had a more comprehensive Bill, they would be more interested in it. They have agreed that more needs to be done, but it does not necessarily mean that this thing should not be done. There must be some merit in this Bill even although we recognise that the whole method of Local Government administration has to be looked into.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, so many silly and absurd things have been said during the consideration of this Bill that I do not intend to answer some of those things. I happen to be in charge of this Bill and there is one thing I want to be correct. I notice that the hon. senior member for the City, who is not in his seat, is also lending his support to a silly thing, that is, that this is a Bill to stop him in the City. I am not concerned with the hon. senior member for the City; I mean that generally. I want him to know that I do not go in for that sort of thing. I see principles; I do not see men. Of course, it is good political propaganda at this stage to make use of things of that sort. Even my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, feels that, because I do not get up and be as verbose as he is and in a militant manner say things, I allow other people to push things down my throat. I think that the hon. member ought to know, from his little knowledge of me, that I am by nature a quiet man. I do not talk a lot of foolishness and I do not agree with anybody talking a lot of foolishness either. But nobody is going to get around me when I have made up my mind. I do not get up and talk a lot and I will not do it at this stage.

The Hon. Leader of the House spoke fully, comprehensively and forcefully in putting forward the arguments for this Bill. Relative to the sale of goods, Bridgetown being the Headquarters, all goods sold must pass through the agents and everybody else in Bridgetown. I said that at the beginning and I do not think it needs to be laboured. Of course, years ago, when we had the Vestry system, the Vestry did as they liked, but since the system has been changed, we have the Councils which are, so to speak, watched by the Government. We have to watch the Councils. We feel that there is some justification for a Bill of this sort. It is not fair to ask the residents of the other parishes and the other areas outside of St. Michael and the City to spend their money, so to speak, in Bridgetown and Bridgetown should thereby reap all the benefits.
5.25 p.m.

These people in the country areas, Sir, have to face a bigger trade tax. After sending all their money to Bridgetown, they are still called upon to pay a bigger trade tax to contribute to their area. We do not consider it is fair. That is the reason for this Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not go any deeper into that phase because the hon. senior member for St. Michael has spoken very comprehensively and plainly so that anybody can understand. There are just a few points to which I want to refer. I am sorry the hon. junior member for Christ Church is not in his seat, because he referred to this being an arbitrary figure. It is no such thing. The matter which forms the subject of this Bill was under consideration for at least a year. In my opening remarks I mentioned some figures in connection with the taxable income of the City, and that was also applied to the other Councils. This rate is therefore based on the taxable income of the Councils; it was not done by guess. A committee was set up by Government comprised of persons knowledgeable of figures and in working out the rate of taxation. That Committee reported to the Cabinet in about one to one and a half years, the Cabinet studied it and probably made an alteration or two here and there and found that the Report was one which could be adopted and passed into legislation.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph did give some figures which were rather striking, and which bears out to a great extent the contention of the Government. Now as he said, it is a source of some satisfaction that the City Council's rateable income for trade tax is increasing year by year, so much so that the hon. member mentioned a little while ago that they found themselves with a little more money than they thought they had; but that fact did not influence the Government. I repeat, Sir, the rateable income of all three Councils was taken into consideration; we calculated the services rendered by each Council, the City Council being the biggest with the greatest population

and with more services than anybody else, and on the figures produced on what they spent in social services, the rate of 80% to the City Council was decided on. Similarly taking into account the services rendered in the North and in the South, we decided on 11% for the South and 9% for the North. Those are the figures and I repeat there is not a bit of arbitrariness about them.

Now the hon. junior member for Christ Church also referred to a subsidy and said that in England all the Councils and Borough Councils get subsidies. My information is that they do get subsidies when they are called upon to perform a specific job. When they are called upon to, say, build a road or drainage or put in sewerage or something of the sort, then they get a subsidy; but for the ordinary day to day running, no subsidy is taken into consideration. It appears from the speeches of a few members that they are very solicitous – I use that word advisedly – about the big businesses in the country areas. Their trade tax will be reduced if this Bill is acepted. I notice they did not say anything about the small fellows or that they were glad to see the small fellows get a reduction. Naturally we could not be discriminatory and say that this Bill should not apply to big businesses, factories and so on, but should only apply to people of a lower grade.
5.35 p.m.

Unfortunately, we could not do that. If we could do that, we certainly would have done it, but it would not be the right thing to discriminate and we would be considered lunatics. We had to make this apply to all the persons in the area.

As regards income tax, those who make trade returns know what the rate of income tax is going to be. Everybody knows that and I think it would be an advantage to the particular Councils to know every year how much they can expect by having a fixed rate of trade tax. It will help them very much in making up their Estimates. They would know exactly how much they would be getting and, therefore, how much they can spend. Most of the points were answered by the hon. member on my left and to a lesser extent by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

A lot has been talked about land tax. For the information of this House, I would say that the revision of land tax is under consideration and we hope to be able to come down with something by way of an amendment in that direction. I think it is well known to this House that in the days of the Vestries on all land paid there was a fixed tax irrespective of what you produced, unless there were some rebate in some cases in certain types of land. Now, I think, taxation for land is paid on production and it is not a fixed rate as it was before. That question is now receiving active consideration and we hope very soon to come down to the House with something in respect of land tax.

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

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called separately and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to reply to some of the arguments which Government members deduced on this part of the Bill which deals with the uniform tax of 17.5% on trade generally. It is true that I did not hear all that the Hon. Premier said on his introduction of this Bill but I heard what he said in reply. In reply, he said that so far as he is concerned, he was not motivated by any improper motives in so far as the City Council and the attitude of the hon. senior member for the City. I said that I believe that: but all of the speeches of the members of his Party have convinced me that the Government is motivated by that. Their argument is spurious about people coming into town and spending their money in town and that because they spend their money in town they should get back something. It is a question of political bankruptcy when you use that argument.

The Hon. Minister of Trade said that he is not as verbose as I am. English is a language which provides you with plenty of words to use for a particular thing. You will say 'verbose' somebody will say 'loquacious', and somebody else will say 'talkative'.

This is where I say that the Hon. Premier must be realistic. It is true that this is an occasion which has shown that the talent in Local Government is very lean indeed. This shows that they did not know what to do. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you were in here and you heard what members of the Government said. You were led to believe that Local Government would be better and cheaper; they have failed in that. They are now making a redress of the situation at the expense of the one Council of Local Government that has made a success of its political campaign. If this Government did not fail by producing to this country a taxation rate that exceeded anything that existed before, the Hon. Premier would not have brought a Bill like this to this House. It is the result of the paucity of their ideas and of their knowledge of the Local Government situation that they landed into these Councils men who never paid any taxes in this community.

This Bill has nothing in it to commend itself and there can never be any principle involved in it. If a principle has been involved, when section 133 was framed by the same Government, why did they not see then that it was clearly lacking of principle? What was pointed out was that the method which you are now using under the present Act has produced these anomalies and you would create heavier taxation for the people. The Premier says that this is motivated by principle. Let me examine the principle. The United States of America has Local Government taxation. I am just back from there.
5.45 p.m.

The City Council has a trade tax. If you buy anything in the boroughs of Manhattan or Brooklyn or the Bronx, you pay a trade tax but in New Jersy you do not pay the same tax. They have failed the people and this Bill is a means of getting something with which to go back to the people. This taxation had the people vexed over the whole affair. When they went down to St. Andrew, how did they know that this question did not have something to do with the Elections?

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order. The bye-election in St. Andrew took place before this; I think that the hon. member is somewhat mixed in his dates.

Mr. WALCOTT: When I said that, I was not as emphatic and as dogmatic as I would have been otherwise. You say the worst thing about your opponent if he would stick it; if you call him an honest man and he sticks it, that is all right. If calling him an honest man means something good, then you would not say it. The Premier says that it is a matter of principle, but what is the principle? Let us examine the principle. You have a rate of 17.5% on trade, but based on what? I believe that the hon. member tangled himself up in his own logic. If you make an analysis of what he is saying, what principle is involved? If you say that more of the trade resides in this area, on what basis are you going to compute what can be regarded as a uniform tax? It is the antithesis of providing a uniform tax when you think of the vast iniquities which exist. A uniform tax could be justified where the basic conditions are uniform and the net result of the money accruing from it has a greater benefit. The Hon. Premier's mind is motivated by the fact that he is the Premier of Barbados and he is legislating for local Government as he would legislate for the Central Government. There are three methods of taxation which you are using; you are using taxation on trade, on land and on property and you take a full assessment of the whole island and say: "This is the greatest value to Barbados in relation to the things which we are going to tax."

Of this gross valuation these estimates should be utilised to provide the taxation necessary for these services. In that context, you would be able to have a uniform policy because you are taking the matter as a whole. That is the easiest and most convenient thing for everybody because all join to buy, and therefore you are doing things.

More people as a percentage shop in London than those who shop outside and that is the same thing obtaining in New York. The trade which takes place in Bridgetown takes place because the tourists shop here. You are using the parish pump, political argument where you go down to St. Andrew or St. Lucy and tell people things from a platform because they cannot query you, just as people have been told that Frank Walcott built the Deep Water Harbour. That is the type of low thinking which you get at political meetings conducted by the Labour Party; their plank is that they are trying to get everybody to pay the same thing. They will say: "Frank Walcott did not agree with that because he wanted Mottley and the Conservatives to maintain their status." You are using the argument as if there is a matter of policy involved.

The hon. junior member for St. James muddled up himself. He said that Barbados is only 21 X 14 miles; what does he know about the geography of the world? Does he know that Grenada is smaller than Barbados?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not get too far away from the Section which we are now considering.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am a man who can read. Must I read so as to deal with the Section?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member listen to me? You were going on pretty good with this Section. What the hon. junior member for St. James has said is nothing to do with this Section.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order,....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Man, sit down. You have not spoken yet in Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: He never had a child yet and he can tell somebody to sit down. You cannot make me sit down. I know how to work for my living. From the time you knew me, I have been working for my living; I have never been or never will be a political lackey.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I said, Mr. Chairman, was that I would take this opportunity of dealing with the arguments that had been used. You have been up to the United Kingdom, Mr. Chairman, to learn Parliamentary procedure; so you do not need somebody to tell you as Chairman when you are dealing with a Bill of this nature and the substance has some relation to what any hon. member has said before, that a person has not yet spoken on the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is why I did not cross you when you were making references to what the Hon. Premier said because it had some relation to the uniform rate.

Mr. WALCOTT: This is the most important section of the Bill, and the hon. junior member for St. James said that he would like to see something uniform in Barbados which is only 14 miles by 21 miles. He said that instead of having these bits and pieces, he would prefer to have one controlling authority. The hon. members do not understand what they are talking about, because I said that Grenada is smaller than Barbados with its 80,000 people and has Local Government; but with the Local Government system in Barbados, being a place run after the British constitutional system, in order to prevent what is taking place in Russia, Italy and Germany, one has to divide authority so much at the various levels that it becomes extremely difficult to have a dictatorship, because all the power is not centralised. From what I see happening here today in this debate, members do not realise what they are talking about, and their children's children will suffer through their giving up the authority which the Local Government provides for the ease of not taxing themselves and their friends, and by not having a proper assessment of the responsibility that has devolved upon them. They are now saying to the Central Government as if it is some magician, "you take over all this and do it for us and we in turn will hand it back to you."

The hon. member in his closing remarks said he would always support the Labour Party for all the Government has done. We want to make an analysis of that. The hon. member is a Local Government Councillor and he says that they passed a Resolution asking Government to do this. Their job should have been to sit down and call the other two Councils together and put forward a plan to meet the situation. Why did they go and ask people to vote for them on the basis that they were inefficient? I am satisfied that they are and if we had an age limit for members in this House, some members would be disqualified, because if a man has passed the age of thinking and cannot see the problems that confront this community, I say he is not fit to be in public life. Mr. Chairman, you are asking us to underwrite this 17.5% and somebody says this is trade. You are trading in Bridgetown because you come to town and buy a pair of shoes; so if I go to Dunscombe and buy yams or in some other part of the country and do something, I am trading. That is the argument you are using.

Now let us take the 17.5% for trade which you say would apply to the whole island. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that the City Council never estimates properly. The Government does not estimate properly; they estimated for a deficit last year and ended up with a surplus of more than the amount they said the deficit was going to be; so there is no question of that. Now I do not hold any brief for the hon. senior member for the City. I can stand four square to anybody in this House because I do not owe anybody any money; there is no mortgage being held over my head and nobody can come at my door tomorrow and say "Come! let me get it." I have nothing to sell other than my body; so I do not hold a brief for anybody. I am not a member of the City Council; I represent a rural constituency; so if I owe an allegiance to anybody it would be to the people in the parish of St. Peter. But I can tell the people of St. Peter quite boldly that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and his colleague whom they have elected in St. Peter have bungled their affairs and have caused the small people to pay more money than they were paying before under the guise that they were going to pay less.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. junior member for St. James is a Councillor, and I can say to the people in St. James that he caused them to pay more money because he did not know what he was doing, and if he did he would have told them, but he only found out afterwards. It is just like the boy who failed. He said that just as he was going to pass, they stopped working. He had absolutely no knowledge. They are now sitting back to see how they can redeem themselves. Why should the question of a principle come this year? This is the year of election and I think there is going to be Local Government elections next year. Why has it taken three years to find out the matter of principle? It has come now because they realise that they cannot stand up to people in this island; they realise it is a burning issue with the people on the taxes they have to pay and they have no answer.

I am saying to the Premier, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is utilising the Central Government taxation policy for Local Government areas for the first time. This is unique. Hon. members talk about London but they do not read Local Government affairs, because each County in England lays its own rates. As soon as you talk about Local Government, you think of different rates. Do you realise....

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, I do not think the hon. member should be allowed to get away with that. All that is irrelevant in terms of trade tax because trade tax is unique so far as Barbados is concerned. In England there is no tax to correspond with trade tax. Throughout the other West Indian islands, in America and in England you do not find a similar tax.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot tell me this is irrelevant. How could it be irrelevant, Mr. Chairman, when they introduced the Bill that deals with that? What I am saying is that the very fact that they used England as an example, means that they are going to approach a matter like this in this way which forms part of their Central Government taxation policy; so they should review the whole structure of Local Government.
6.05 p.m.

I agreed with the hon. member but he did not listen to hear what I said on this Bill. If you are using a type of income tax for a Local Government taxation policy, it interferes with your whole policy. When you take it out, and utilise it in a different way it must have a different effect on the other aspects of your Local Government. If you have 17.5% now instead of 26.2%, unless you restrict the services at one point, it means that your other taxation policy would be unwieldy. As it is now, 17.5% would mean that these trading companies will be paying less tax because they will pay this 17.5% of their profits to Local Government and then you only get 40% of the remainder and that will produce a figure which will mean less tax for them.

Mr. Chairman, I did not think that I would have had to spend so much time trying to make them understand that. They wrote up a whole foolscap sheet and could not see it. These are things which if you went to school you would be able to do in your head. The hon. member knows that I only went to fourth standard. I challenge him to call a school boy who knows him when he went to school. I will give him $50 if he does that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. You are dealing with Section 4 of this Bill. Please keep to Section 4.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is what I learnt in fourth standard. They have boys of Wesley Hall who know that I have been to school there. As soon as I start to deal with members on the other side, the Chairman rises to stop me. I bet you the hon. senior member for St. Michael does not call the name of a schoolboy who went to school with him. He is the only man who went to school with a surname; he never had a Christian name!

The Hon. Minister for Communications said that this is unique. Is he suggesting because it is unique that it should be done in this way? He has instituted an income tax condition for the whole island and he says that because of the fact that the trade rests in the town and not in the country he is correct. If that is your argument, you should have a complete re-evaluation of all the trading factors of the whole island. In years gone by, you never regarded a plantation as a place of trade because you said that it manufactured something, but in the narrow concept of things you still make it pay income tax. Another man who is keeping a business, you call it trading. A man owns a motor car and hires it out and you say that that is trading: but as regards a man who owns a plantation and sells the produce from it, you say that he is not trading. The sugar industry being the backprop and the backbone of the island, you felt that you should exempt it from certain taxation.

I do not take the Hon. Leader of the House seriously when he speaks of developing industries, and I am sure the Hon. Premier could not be serious when he spoke of that because there is nothing to prevent you from passing enabling legislation and from telling anybody who is setting up a trade that they would have exemptions from it. Trade does not follow these patterns; they follow patterns of service. The reason why everybody is coming to town to buy this and that is because your transport is such that everybody can migrate to the City. Today, it takes less than half an hour to get from the farthest point of the island into the City. No trader is going to reside in Holetown until you build up the town in itself. That is why I do not agree with the criticisms made against the transport service. The people who make money in the island are the commission merchants. Those are the people who strangle-hold the people of the country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has gone astray from Section 4 again.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is really pathetic to know that we are dealing with a section which is dealing with trade tax which is levied on the same commission agents, and the Chairman is telling me that I am dealing with commission agents and straying from the section.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are travelling so widely that you are bordering on a second reading speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you will only listen to me, you will understand what I am saying and would understand that I am dealing with this 17.5% taxation on trade. I am dealing with trade and I am saying that the commission agents are the people who are making the money and because of that you say that I am bordering on a second reading speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am warning you to deal with Section 4 and do not go from it.

Mr. WALCOTT: What does Section 4 say? I am quite capable of knowing what I am dealing with. It is no wonder that some members come into this House for twelve years and have not grown up. You are challenging me for making a second reading speech on this Clause. If it does not suit you or the Government, it does not suit you. Do not stop me every time and say that I am making a second reading speech. I am not stopping the Government from making a speech on it. Who is going to determine that I am making a second reading speech?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to keep within the bounds of Clause 4.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am speaking on commission agents and anybody who pays trade tax. The Hon. Premier said that it was on this and that basis that they brought down this Bill. He said that it was these people, the commission agents and the people who were doing all the trade in town, that motivated the Government to bring down this Bill and to make the taxation what it is in this Section.

Now, you are telling me that I have no right to speak on that. What sort of thing is this? The Premier said the reason why they are doing this is because people come from the country districts into town and buy what they want from the merchants in town. Now that I am replying to the Premier's speech, you are saying that I must not speak on this. What sort of equality is this? The Chairman cannot compose himself comfortably in the Chair but is always up in the air when I am on my feet. This sort of thing must give you a nervous tension. Wait and see. When the Hon. Premier gets up to speak, you are going to relax. I say that there are too many political lackeys in this country. I see the hon. junior member for St. James looking at me, but I think there is a saying that cowards die a thousand deaths but a brave man faces death but once. I think that is a good maxim for the Chairman to follow.

I would say that the burden of the Premier's argument would fall down by the method which he is using because he is using a Central Government's method to deal with a Local Government problem. That is why I say I cannot agree with him.
6.15 p.m.

I was one of the stoutest opponents of the Vestry System. I felt that that system was an anachronism, and it should have gone long ago. Moreover, as regards the little that the Premier knows of me, he knows that I am not afraid of speaking my mind if I feel strongly on anything. I will tell the people in St. Peter this because I feel that none of the members of the Local Government Councils has any clear-cut policy of providing the adequate services. The Premier will still have to provide a subsidy because this Bill does not wipe out the provision of a subsidy. Why do we have to provide a subsidy for the same services which we were rendering before at cheaper costs? That is where you want an examination. One of the Local Government Councils said

that the administrative expenses were too high, but could you not revamp the administrative expenses to suit the situation which you have? You must still have your Sanitary Inspectors and I see that some of them had Road Refuse Collectors. There is an old time song: "Anything you can do, I can do better". If you take your picture along with a refuse collector, I take mine with a dog and *vice versa*. *(Laughter)*

I do not subscribe to the view that you should get rid of Local Government; it is wrong to take away from people in the community the opportunity of having these services. It need not be an exercise that every time somebody moves something from here you should have to pay him for doing it. All the members of the Councils are ratepayers in the main and the majority of the members of these Councils are now small ratepayers; therefore it is a question of adjusting the balance. I believe that what is taking place is this; the Premier talks about the big man and the small man. Like the Premier, I talk about principles; if you have to pay rates, then you must pay rates. You want to see that a man should not pay any income tax in relation to the house in which he lives. I think that it would have been better for the Government to have decided, without taking any precipitous action, to examine this whole matter.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph says that if a thing is right, to make a start with it is better than doing nothing; but what sort of start are you going to make? Are you going to start backward instead of starting forward? The hon. member could not be serious about that. If this same problem had resided in the City Council and not in the other two Councils, then this Bill would not have been amended.

I am faced with hon. members who are trying to get rid of an opponent. You try to get rid of me, I try to get rid of you and everything is all right in war. You are trying to get rid of the hon. senior member for the City in this way; but do not say anything about the question of principle. If you said that you would abolish trade tax, you would levy an income tax equivalent to the amount of trade tax on everybody and say that everybody should pay forty percent; you take out trade tax and the balance is calculated on income tax. Sometimes a man may be better off in paying individual trade tax than company tax.

I leave this with the Premier; you are now dismissing Local Government policy. I wager a bet that unless you subsidise the Local Government Councils, unless you have a review of the taxation system before the next rates are laid, the rates will go up on other things and the problem in the other parishes is that you will not receive enough money. The sudden reduction of labour at the Port will mean a sudden reduction in purchasing power. When your purchasing power is reduced, your trade and profit will also be reduced. You will find yourself in a situation in which the same Northern and Southern District Councils will be better off inside the Treasury, but out of the taxation policy which they will have to utilise to get their amount of money, you will see what their amount is going to be. The same man who cried out last year about taxes will not be any better off. It will be the same problem with him.
6.25 p.m.

You will find that the same problems will be with him; he is going to be paying a higher rate on his house than a man in the City or St. Michael; because if you say the rate is going to be 17.5%, it does not mean that you can tell the men in the South that his rate would be 17.5%: so you reduce for him but put the cost up for the other man. The man with his land is not going to pay any less; so it does not necessarily mean that this is going to mean something to the people for whom it is meant. If you are evening up the whole taxation policy in these areas, it would be a matter of reviewing the whole system, and that is why I say I do not regard it as a matter of principle. Like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I say it is the easiest way to do it, and more a matter of expediency than it is a matter of principle.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the whole problem of Local Government, Local Government taxation and Local Government revenue appears to be a very great mystery to the people who are administering the Local Government Organisation in Barbados, particularly, without in any way being disparaging, the representatives, of course excepting our members, of the several District Councils and the Rating Authorities. There is a diffusion of authority which needs investigation, after which you will see, Sir, that a lot of confusion has been caused because the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing.

There must be a great deal of mystery to the persons more intimately connected with the Ministers on the advisory level, whose offices and names I will decline to call in detail at this moment or at all. I do not want to be long, Sir, because this debate has been of a rather protracted nature; but it might be salutory at this stage to review the history of the Local Government Bill in Barbados very briefly in about three minutes, and you will appreciate the confusion which has arisen over Local Government in Barbados.

The Government had ample time from 1952, 1953 and 1954 to have developed a rational basis of taxation between one local authority and another and to have simplified the whole system of rate laying and assessment of trade tax, because we have had Commissioners down here. They paid Mr. Lightburn and other people enormous sums of money long before Local Government even was established in 1959, and yet we find such abject nonsense embodied in the amending Bill which we now have before us. The whole trouble started, in my opinion, through the lack of appreciation by the local Councils that they did not have to lay the same rate at least in their first year of operation as they contributed to trade tax.

We know from the figures which have been provided for us in the House that in the City the rateable value of property was $3.8 million and the assessable value of trade was some $7 1/2 million in the first year of operation of the Local Government. I personally feel, Sir, that in this question of the 17.5%, in the appropriation of a percentage on trade and the percentage on the rateable value of the hereditaments within the rating area, the Bridgetown City Council particularly has deserted the taxpayers, because they themselves appear to be confused on this matter.

There was not a single member of the Bridgetown City Council who appreciated that in the present reading of the Local Government Act of 1958 it was possible for them to relieve the burden on the householder — the man who is not paying because he has made a profit on living in his house, but paying tax purely because he is alive and because he is keeping or owning a small bit of property. It could never be equitable that a man who is paying a tax purely on profit, after all his expenses have been deducted, should be shouldering the same burden — and not a greater burden — than a man who is paying tax purely because he owns the house in which he lives or which he rents out.

Even if you leave out the question of renting out property — because one can consider that this is a sort of income which may not be directly acquired from carrying out his daily work — you still were confronted with this situation, Mr. Chairman, in which a man living in a house the annual value of which was over $125 a year or over in the first year of operation of the Local Government Act had to pay the same tax as a person who is carrying on trade, had deducted all his expenses, lunches, all his water rates, electric bills, paid his staff and that kind of thing, and was taxed purely on his profit.

The first thing that the Official Opposition did was to draw to the attention of the Bridgetown City Council in particular, because the others did nothing about it, that a greater burden should be put on the shoulders of the people who were paying a tax on profit as against the people who were paying a tax purely for the sake of being alive. A man perhaps with six or eight children living in a house worth $40 a month had to pay the same tax as a merchant who made $1 million. Like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I myself was slightly sceptical, knowing the position of the Councils and their lack of an intelligent approach to the problems of Local Government.
6.35 p.m.

I think that is one of the features which we should check on. You are putting people in positions of authority who do not take time off to familiarise themselves with the mechanics of the jobs which they have to carry out. There are in the Northern and Southern District Councils lots of representatives of the Government Party who do not know the first thing as regards Local Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I ask the hon. junior member for St. John not to go into the history of members of these Councils? As a matter of fact, the hon. member has not started to deal with the Section yet.

Mr. BARROW: I am dealing with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are now telling me about the composition and the intelligence of the people who comprise the various Councils, and I do not want you to stray too far from the section with which we are dealing.

Mr. BARROW: I think that it is an undesirable feature that any time one appears to be criticising the discharge of duties by members of the Government Party, you take exception to it. May I remind you that you are Chairman of the House and not Chairman of the Government Party?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All I said was that I did not want to hear a history of the Councils.

Mr. BARROW: If I were giving a history of the Councils, I would say how many times a man was bankrupt.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are dealing with Section 4; do not let us argue that.

Mr. BARROW: Let us be big about this matter. I think you will be able to grasp my point. When I criticised the City Council, I noticed that Your Honour did not stop me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was only waiting for you to develop the point.

Mr. BARROW: That is what I was waiting to hear.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, you are going to the other two Councils.

Mr. BARROW: All three of them are in this matter. I am not taking any sides. I am saying why we are confronted with this. Despite all the captains and princes of industries and all the Labour Party pundits who sit on the Councils, they do not appreciate that they can levy a different rate on the trade tax. When it comes to the other districts, we are faced with this situation of not being asked to do anything to impose a universal blanketing trade tax throughout the country and that appears to me to be the antithesis of the *rationale* of the Local Government Organisation. The other part of this is due to the fact that people who are in this Local Government, including the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the whole lot of them, do not appreciate the functions, the organisation of Local Government, and are unable to interpret the Local Government Act as it should be interpreted. I say that it is a regrettable feature of our political life that people go into offices through their allegiance to a particular Party and they do not equip themselves or do the necessary homework in order to discharge their functions efficiently and properly.

Mr. Chairman, you will see the reason for all this which I am stating. What I am trying to show is that if people like the hon. member for St. Joseph were doing.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Which of the hon. members for St. Joseph is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph who very soon will not be the colleague of the hon. member who just spoke.

When the Local Government Act of 1958 came into operation, you had prior to that the eleven vestries — the St. Michael's Vestry and the others. These are figures which you will find analysed by the Hon. Minister of Finance. You will find that in the year 1957 — and this is what I consider fantastic — the sugar industry of Barbados according to the report of the Lewis Commission made a profit of $9.5 million.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for St. John is now making a second reading speech.

Mr. BARROW: I am talking of the 17.5%.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are now going off to 1957 and what profits were made in the sugar industry then. I am asking you to confine your remarks to Section 4.

Mr. BARROW: I am talking of 17.5%.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is that to do with 17.5%?

Mr. BARROW: What is the next thing I am going to say? You do not know. The sugar industry according to reliable reports — not according to my own report — made a profit of $9.5 million in 1957. I am dealing with the 17.5% and if you listen you will understand what I am driving at. There is only one sugar factory in the whole parish of St. Michael — I am not talking of Fairfield Factory. You will find, Sir, that there are probably ten or eleven or twelve within the Northern and Southern District Councils which would account for handling at least 94% or 95% of the island's sugar crop. Sugar is the most important crop of Barbados. Now, listen to this carefully. If the system of rating was correct, with something between $43 million and $41 million as your gross income from the sugar crop in 1957 which as far as I remember was a peak year, how is it that the Northern and Southern District Councils have between them a rateable value of trade of roughly speaking only $950,000 and not $9.5 million as it should be? That is what I want to know and that is something which you will be interested in. If Your Honour will allow me to digress, is it not a fact that every time a Government member cannot answer a question or has not thought out a question, they ask a Civil Servant, which is a ridiculous thing to do?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you get back to Section 4?

Mr. BARROW: I am coming straight back to Section 4. I am just demonstrating to you that in the year immediately prior to the institution of Local Government, the sugar industry of Barbados had a profit of $9.5 million and how is it that in the next year the people who were in this industry were rated on less than $950,000 which is less than one-tenth of their earnings. If you look at Section 173 of the Local Government Act, subsection 3, you will see what it says.

6.45 p.m.

This is what Section 173 (3) says: "For the purposes of this Part of this Act, a trader shall be deemed to be carrying on a trade in a rating area if he has in the area any premises or other place in or from which business is carried on or, if he does not carry on trade from a premises or other place within the Island if he carries on business in the rating area." It is clear from that Section that every sugar factory is carrying on business; it is selling sugar to the sugar exporters. The Sugar Producers' Association is not registered as a company and they are not paying taxes as a company. Something is wrong somewhere. Every sugar factory is carrying on business in the area and the total profit made outside is more than the whole taxable income of all business in Bridgetown. This is something that we know from cost of production, and we know that they made $9 1/2 million profit. I am a taxpayer in Bridgetown; whether they are in St. John or in any other parish, they have these monolithic manufacturing plants producing this fantastic profit which cannot be disputed, and they come to us and tell us that the whole taxable value of their trade is something like $900,000 when they make a profit. The Trade Tax is levied on the profits.

This whole Bill is ill-considered and what is wanted is a thorough investigation of the rating valuation throughout the island. These people, like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, are pleading poverty, that they have to car-

ry out these services and people come to town and do all of their shopping, as if the Local Government Act says something about taxing dry goods merchants and leaving out the sugar magnates. The hon. member fulminated against previous theories which were proposed by the sugar people. It is a question of using favour or patronage and each Council has its idiosyncrasies when it comes to making assessments. Some of the people they had going around as assessors — well, I would not like to say that they could hardly read and write, but they really had no disciplined nature in the approach to their jobs about raising taxation. I say that without fear of contradiction. How have they arrived at the rate of 17.5% as a basic rate? They went around to the Sugar Producers' Association and asked the registered Trade Unions what is the value of sugar factories in Barbados and that added up to $16.5 million. That is in the face of the Rehabilitation money which they have been spending from year to year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask the hon. member to stick to Section 4 of this Bill. That Section has nothing to do with what the hon. member is now saying.

Mr. BARROW: That is the trouble. The people in the Councils operate under the fallacy that this is nothing to do with the trade tax. Before you get to the trade tax, you must have an assessment; if the trade tax is wrong then the assessment was wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All of what the hon. member is now doing should have been done during the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill. The whole Local Government Act, the way in which it is framed and the way in which the assessment is made, the hon. member is now dealing with.

Mr. BARROW: With due respect to you, Mr. Chairman, you are wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member listen to me?

Mr. BARROW: I thought you were finished. If you want to make a speech, I am sure that somebody else would go into the Chair for you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with Section 4 of this Bill.

Mr. BARROW: And Section 173 of the Local Government Act is being amended by this Section 4.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to hear either the history of the Local Government Act or the history of the assessors. All that the hon. member is saying must bear relation to Section four of this Bill; therefore, let the hon. member confine his remarks to Section 4 of the Bill and not attempt to make any Second Reading Speech.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, if I wanted to deal with the Local Government Act, I would start with Section 2 which deals with the Local Government areas and go on; but I am dealing with trade tax which is in Section 173 of the Act and which is being amended by Section 4 of this Bill. If you think that you can argue these things in a vacuum, you will be making the same original mistake, that you must not see the rationale behind these things, and you can deal with this matter by saying that Mr. Mottley is getting a universal tax to be paid. I am saying that the tax is wrong, because the method of assessment is wrong. Instead of putting on a blanketing trade tax of 17.5% — this is what Section 4 is dealing with. If you examine the structure of industry in Barbados you will see that everything that the hon. junior member for St. James and everything that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph have said is wrong and misguided because the bulk of trade is carried on outside the Municipality, and not inside at all.
6.55 p.m.

We can prove that by figures because they have said that inside of Bridgetown the rateable value of trade is $7 1/2 million. I believe the Premier gave some amending figures, but I am dealing with the first year when he had the figures for that base year 1958. In that base year 1958 the assessable trade outside Bridgetown in my opinion was $9 1/2 million as against $7 1/2 million inside Bridgetown; so how can they plead poverty? They are looking through the telescope from the wrong end, because nearly all the sugar factories in Barbados that come within the definition of Section 173, subsection 3, with the exception of one sugar factory which is Lower Estate, are situated within the province of the Northern and Southern District Councils, and Mr. Justice Lewis published in his findings that these factories had made a net profit of $9 1/2 million as against $7 1/2 million from inside.

Mr. Chairman, the whole thing is that in their anxiety to try to embarrass the Mayor of Bridgetown, in their anxiety to play up and be emperors in the Northern and Southern District Councils, they are doing this. I understand that one of the members of the Labour Party was dismissed because he said he wanted to be another Mottley. That was a member from the Northern District Council. That is parish-pump petty politics. If we say we are operating Government, let us get down and analyse if they know what they are doing. Somebody is getting away with millions of dollars in taxation in this country, and this general rate is completely unjustified in the light of the existing situation. What then is the process by which they arrive at this low taxable value in the Northern and Southern Districts? It is not by going up to the sugar factories.....

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order, the hon. member is enlightening us: so I wonder if he could really advise us who are the "they" who arrived at the taxable income. He has said it so often that I do not know if he is referring to the House or the Council. I wonder if he can tell us whom he means.

Mr. BARROW: Just imagine the Chairman of the Northern District Council who is drawing $100 a month asking that question! Does he not know who is responsible for rating and valuation?

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order, I am asking him if he can enlighten us who are the "they" to whom he is referring; because when you use a pronoun like that, we expect that you have a noun to which you referred some time previously. He did not use one previously, and he keeps saying "they" all the time. To whom do the "they" refer?

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. o'clock.
7.00 p.m.

On resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the House was in Committee.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the Suspension, the hon. junior member for St. John was addressing the Chair.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I will counsel members on the other side to examine this situation very critically, a little more critically than they have been doing in the past. This is a very serious situation, because it may have the implication that there is a colossal amount of tax evasion going on in this country at the present moment. If I may just clarify one or two points, I would just like to say, first of all, that I was making out a list of the number of factories and discovered that there were some twenty factories operating in 1957-58, three of which — Warrens, Lower Estate and the Belle — are in St. Michael.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order, the hon. member has admonished us to look at this more seriously; so I would like a little more information from him. I did not catch certain figures which he gave just before we adjourned. I believe he said that Judge Lewis estimated the profits of the sugar industry at something over $9 million, but I did not catch the figure which he quoted for rating the profits of the sugar industry and whether he said last year

or the year before last. I wonder if the hon. member would just repeat them, because he has admonished us to look at this very seriously. We would be glad if he would repeat what he said.

Mr. BARROW: What does the hon. member want me to repeat? The figures I quoted relating to the rateable value of the sugar estates are the figures given by the Premier. What I was pointing out was that the Premier gave us some revised figures for this year. I was dealing with the base year of 1958-59 which would the year of income 1957-58. The Premier gave us the total taxable income for the Southern District Council for trade at $592,147 at present. Those were the figures given on 28th February. On 21st March he gave us slightly different figures for the Southern District Council which were $600,000, and the Northern District Council $370,000. The figures we received were $592,000 and $377,000; so in round figures they are the same. That is the overall taxable income from trade in these two districts. I was pointing out that there were twenty factories operating. Three of these factories I mentioned are actually in the City Council area; these are Warrens, which is on the borders of St. Thomas, Lower Estate on the borders of St. George and the Belle on the borders of St. George; so it still leaves 85% of the sugar factories operating in the areas of the Northern and Southern District Councils.

Mr. Chairman, according to Section 173, subsection 3 of the Local Government Act, a person is carrying on trade if he has premises and is doing business in that taxing area. I am saying that sugar factories carrying on business or selling sugar - it does not matter where the registered office is, so long as they have premises in these rating and valuation areas - are liable for tax. This is what I want hon. members to examine and analyse. If they are carrying on business in those areas because they have factories, it would be as ridiculous to say that they are not liable to trade tax as it would be to say that the Ford Motor Company in London is not liable to pay tax on their factory. 7.50 p.m.

Because it is a sugar factory, it does not mean that it does not trade. They are not doing it for sport; they are doing it for profit or reward. The situation appears to me to be that it is because of this low income valuation that the Northern and Southern District Councils are pleading and stating that most of the business is carried on in the metropolitan area of Bridgetown, and therefore, the burden should be shared by the St. Michael and the Bridgetown trade taxpayers, and redistributed, by the controversial payment machinery which we are now invoking, to all the depressed areas of the Northern and Southern Districts. And all that I am stating is that far from being depressed areas, they constitute about 50% or 60% of the trade of Bridgetown; by virtue of the fact that these factories are constituted outside of Bridgetown the bulk of the trade of the island is carried out in those areas. As I have said, 80% of the sugar factories in Barbados only pays taxation on a valuation of $960,000 which is something like one-tenth of their income. I say that something is wrong in the assessment.

We are carrying on a new system of taxation of land. Under the old Vestry system, plantations and estates used to be taxed at so much per acre. Let us say that 50,000 tons of sugar cane are produced and all the trade tax derived from the sale of that sugar cane comes to $500,000 - 50,000 acres of land was planted; it means that it is less than $20 per acre. Of course, that is an absolutely ridiculous figure; it would be more like $200 per acre. What I am trying to point out is that the valuation should not be on acreage but on the profit made out of the acreage: and if it were done that way, you will get ten times the amount of assessable value on which to impose your rates. Notwithstanding that, when we appraise it in that way, we have not even talked of the sugar factories yet. If we put the profit made out of the sugar by the factories alongside the profit made from the sugar cane, you will see that the figures are almost astronomical as they are at present. They are looking at us in this year of grace, 1961, and telling us that the total amount of profit made from the sale of sugar cane and the sale of sugar in 85% of the factories of the island is less than $1 million. The tax is purely a tax on profit and it is absolutely fantastic in an island in which sugar is the stable crop.

We have been accused of having a one-crop economy. This is the sort of situation which would start a battle of words between the Physiocrats and the Mercantilists which went on up to the nineteenth century. I do not know if it is clear to hon. members on the other side, but it is clear to me that a great amount of tax evasion is taking place, and somebody thinks that the Sugar Producers Association is a company registered under the 1910 Companies Act and not a Trade Union as registered under the Trade Union Act of 1939. How then is it that in arriving at the taxable income of the major industry in the island, the people responsible should approach the Sugar Producers Association and not go from factory to factory and plantation to plantation and let them produce their books and show their net profits?

It can only happen in one or two ways. One is that the Government is unaware of the situation whether the planters tax themselves on hereditaments or it would be felt that the loss of income by way of Central Government taxation would not redound to the benefit of the Treasury. Let me give a simple illustration of what the Government has to lose by not carrying out a proper method. The Company tax is 40% of net profits. Let me say that the Northern and Southern District Councils put on a trade tax of 20%. If the estates and factories do not declare a trade tax on arable acres and on hereditaments like managers' houses and rental value of factories, the Government would collect $40 in every $100 from the net profit which that company or estate now makes. Let us say that that profit is $100, and the trade tax is 20%. The Government will lose the $20 which would go to the Local Government and then they would get 40% of the balance which would be 40% of $80 which would be $32 and which would be $8.00 less than what they would have got if it were only for income tax purposes. It is not a question of quantum; it is a question of levy. An entirely wrong approach has been perpetuated. They are not being taxed on trade profits. If they were, they would be subsidising the Bridgetown City Council instead of the Bridgetown City Council subsidising them.

Let justice be done to everybody. They do not have to amend any Act here. As a matter of fact, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would have more money than he could deal with if that were done: that is to say, if these plantations were being taxed on trade profits. He would be able to build all the mausoleums and other monuments he wants to his existence. The company tax of 40% on $100 is worth $40. If $20 out of that $100 goes to City Council, then the Government does not lose the $20; they only lose $8.00. They only could tax 40% of $80 which would come to $32 and which would be only $8.00 less than the $40 they would be getting. That $8.00, if you work at those figures, would be less than the subvention which they are now called upon to make to these two District Councils. Therefore, Sir, this 17.5% general levy fails in two ways. One is in the manner pointed out by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. It does not mean that after they put on this general levy to show their authority, they will not have to give a subvention anyhow, because they are coming back with a slight redistribution here and there. They are apportioning it in this manner: 80% to the City Council, 11% to the Northern District Council and 9% to the Southern District Council. 8.00 p.m.

These excursions will be properly subsidised. It amounts to a little rounding off of figures. Unless they want a revolution, they cannot whittle down the million dollars which the Bridgetown City Council is spending on unemployment relief. I have not gone into the figures, but substantially, there would be no alteration except that they may be able to increase the travelling allowance and that sort of thing. The major services which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. James have been dreaming of, cannot be provided for in this levy and redistribution is not of so radical a nature as would detract from the services which are being provided in the City of Bridgetown. The idea of a universal levy is an indication of the responsibility of Local Government, because Local Government is essentially a rating and a taxing au-

thority in its own right; but the method of arriving at yourr revenue is dictated by the amount of money which you want to spend. You have your total rateable value plus your total assessment income; you take the sum of these and use your expenditure as a fraction of that sum and you arrive at the burden which each taxpayer has to shoulder in order to provide services which are peculiar to the locality - services which people in the other localities do not get and, perhaps, do not need.

The standard of street lighting in Broad Street is not the same as the standard of lighting, if there is any, in Coffee Gully or Jack-in-the-Box Gully because there is none. The *rationale* of taxation is that the authority puts on a tax which meets the expenditure which is peculiar to the citizens of the area who enjoy it. Nowhere is it a principle of taxation in England that the people of London have a levy made on them to subsidise the social services. When one examines a Bill like this, no matter that people use tactics, this matter does not affect any member of the Bridgetown City Council at all. If they start debating this, there may be disclosures that there is a terrific amount of business in the Northern and Southern Councils which has not been taxed at all. The whole reason why people go in for Local Government at all - merchants and planters - is to make sure that taxes are not levied on them, and therefore they have got an opportunity to advise the Government. They will not tell people what the Official Opposition would tell them and so upset the whole apple cart. If you examine the statistics of the sugar industry, if you examine Section 173 (3) of the Local Government Act, 1958, you will find out that the bulk of trade is carried on in the Northern and Southern Districts. You will find that instead of rating plantations, managers' houses and charging people by the acre, which was the old Vestry System, if they were to carry out the spirit of the Act, they would not have had any trouble and they would have been able to make a substantial contribution towards the City of Bridgetown. It is a lack of appreciation of the fundamentals both on the policy-making side, the Ministerial and administrative level; and in the same departments concerned, none can escape the responsibility for this amendment which has been brought in here and which has brought us to this predicament of confusion and utter chaos.

You have an amendment to the Local Government Act which destroys the whole principle of the Local Government administration. We cannot agree with the hon. junior member for St. James. There are more things in Heaven and Hell, per ratio, than are dealt with in the hon. member's philosophy. Local Government is a question of devolving responsibility on people so that in a democratic set-up they feel that they are participating in the running of the country. If you disrobe them of any vestige of authority, you are destroying the fundamentals of democracy; and if we set about to do that sort of thing, it should be done only when there is no other alternative to solve the problem with which you are confronted.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, ordinarily, I do not speak on Local Government matters in this House because I am not really familiar with all of the intricate aspects of Local Government. However, on reading this Bill, it did appear that Clause 4 is perhaps the heart and meat of this Bill.

8.10 p.m.

The more you study it, Mr. Chairman, the more you see that there is a great inconsistency in Government's thinking and approach to this matter of the revenue which is to come from trade in the Northern District Council. Until I heard the hon. member who has just sat down speaking, I myself had always taken a narrow view of the definition of trade for the purpose of this Act. I used to think, for instance, that when you spoke of trade you meant only - or nearly always only - the buying and selling in shops and other things allied to it; and I must confess that I did not quite understand for Local Government purposes that trade means the general economic activity of the island so far as Local Government is concerned. That is why I said, Mr. Chairman, that the arguments used in his speech by the hon. junior member for St. John have thrown considerable light on this matter and have revealed the inconsistency in Government thinking, and it shows that a considerable amount of slack thinking has gone on for the last three years not only in the Local Government Councils but in the Central Government itself. Here we are told, on the one hand, that the sugar industry is the backbone of this island's economy, and now for the purposes of this amending Act we hear that the bulk trade in the island is carried on in Bridgetown. I do not need to labour the arguments with which that contention has been put forward: they have been ably dealt with by the hon. member who spoke before me. On the other side they have not been telling us at all. But the point I want to make with respect to Clause 4 is this: Mr. Chairman, if it is true, as he has disclosed, that the sugar factories in this island have been badly rated or have not been rated at all, it means in effect that we have got to develop an entirely new approach to this matter of trade and the trade tax in the areas under consideration.

It was disclosed in the course of the hon. member's speech that market value as given to the Income Tax Commissioner of the sugar factories has been fixed at as low a figure as $16 million; that is to say, the Sugar Producers' Association have fooled and deceived the Income Tax Commissioner into believing that the total market value of their plant and equipment is $16 million. I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to double it and say that that would be a conservative estimate. I would say, for instance, that if you took three factories like Searles, Carrington and perhaps Bulkeley, the three together so far as plant and equipment are concerned, must be worth $5 million alone. As I said, I know little or nothing about it; but, just by looking at it, if you tell me that the total market value of all the factories with plant and equipment is no higher than $16 million, something is wrong somewhere. I do not blame the Sugar Producers' Association for telling Government that that is their estimate. Their idea is to escape paying the tax and they are therefore within their rights from their point of view of fixing it as low as possible. I blame the people opposite for not having an independent market valuation of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, if the Sugar Producers' Association tells you that all the plant and equipment are worth $16 million, get somebody else to look at it independently and discover whether they have not cut you short of $10 million or $15 million. In the last few years almost every factory in this island has made use of the Rehabilitation Fund and new plant and machinery have been put in. In most of them, at least, after every crop new rollers have been put in the mills. All these things cost money and all this new equipment put in the factories from year to year raises the market value of the plant and equipment. Should hon. members sit down and accept that low figure? If you therefore allow the Sugar Producers' Association to fool you into believing that their equipment and plant are worth no more than $16 million, you have also allowed them to force you into this position which you have been forced into of taxing the people who have voted for you and of letting off from taxation the people who support you. That is not the nicest and best thing, and that is why in the Northern and Southern Districts all sections, and particularly the majority section of the poor taxpayers are crying out. That is the reason for it. There has been too low a market valuation placed on plant and equipment.

Mr. STRAUGHN: On a point of order, the hon. member is talking about valuation on plant and equipment, but we are really referring to the trade tax here and valuation, and plant and equipment are not the same as valuation on trade tax.

Mr. TUDOR: Well, if the hon. member says that it is a different thing, the whole point at issue is whether the sugar factories are in fact paying trade tax. I have not heard it denied and I would like to hear an explanation from the other side on this. Our grasp of the matter is that the Sugar Producers' Association submitted - perhaps on request; I do not know - to the Income Tax authorities figures giving the market value of the total plant and equipment of all the sugar factories, and the figure submitted by the Sugar Producers' Association was $16 million, and that then a percentage of the market value was taken by the Valuation Authorities to be the rateable value for Local Government taxation purposes.

We feel that if that has been the method used, the figure given for the market value of the plant and equipment was definitely too low. In short, we feel that if they told you that the factories with all the equipment and plant are worth $16 million, we say they must be worth twice as much because they would not give you all the figures. The second point we want to make is that we feel that if the Income Tax Commissioner has then taken a percentage figure of the total market value for the Northern and Southern District Councils, the percentage figure taken by the Income Tax Commissioner should be high and not low. In other words, there is perhaps merit.....

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On a point of order, I thought that the hon. member was an economist, but he is going so far away from this subject. This has to do with the sugar produced in the factory, this is trade tax, and not tax on the building and machinery although it comes in indirectly, because depreciation has to come out from the finished product. This Bill seeks to do something about trade tax, and you have to think of the fact that the factories themselves do not sell the sugar; the sugar is sold through brokers. The people in Bridgetown make a lot of money out of this sugar, and that is the reason why sometimes the peasants cry out and want a better price for their cane. Too many people handle the sugar, so that you cannot take the building and machinery into account at this time. This is trade tax as such.

8.20 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: How can you arrive at a proper reassessment even of trade tax unless you have a proper valuation of equipment? Presumably if trade tax is a consequence of the profits, the profits have to be properly assessed from the value of the equipment.

Hon. M. E. COX: The higher the cost of the machinery, the greater the depreciation: and therefore, less profits.

Mr. TUDOR: But, then, that cannot strictly be so because if the factories are renewing their equipment regularly every year, the rate of the depreciation is less and, in any case, to answer the hon. member who has just sat down, to say that the factories are not making a greater profit, I cannot accept that. That is why I am wondering whether this thing has been properly gone into from the valuation side.

I see here, Mr. Chairman, in subsection 3 of Clause 173 the following:-

"For the purposes of this Part of this Act, a trader shall be deemed to be carrying on a trade in a rating area if he has in the area any premises or other place in or from which business is carried on or, if he does not carry on trade from a premises or other place within the Island if he carries on business in the rating area:

"Provided that in the case of a public utility undertaking, the undertaking shall be deemed to be carrying on a trade in every rating area in which it provides a service."

Our point is that every single factory is a business in the area and has to be dealt with accordingly. (A VOICE: You do not understand it.) If I do not understand it, nobody on that side understands it because you have not given us a proper explanation. I would like to be satisfied that the maximum amount is being got from the sugar factories in the Northern and Southern Districts because I am convinced that if the maximum amount was got from them you would not need this Clause which we are discussing and you would not have had to make subventions as you did in the past. I want to know that all the loopholes are closed: and that is an assurance which hon. members on that side, particularly those who administer Local Government, cannot give me. (A VOICE: You have one in your Party.) The hon. member of my Party who is a Councillor does not control a District Council. If he did, we would not have the problems with which we are now faced. The hon. member said he is not here to touch the untouchable. Sir, while it may appear that we are prolonging debate on this Clause unnecessarily, it would be well when the Hon. Premier gets up to reply, if he can deal with this matter thoroughly and explain it so that even I can understand it.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, we are not going through the valuation business again. I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was present when nearly every member spoke on that. Touching on another point which might interest him, when he talks of volume of trade, apparently some of the figures given in the recent Budget Speech may help him. When talking of domestic exports, the figures of 34.9 million are compared with the figures of imports which were $83.3 million. There is only one place which we get imports in Barbados and that is right here in the City of Bridgetown. If you have the figures of $83.3 million which are something like $49 million more than the exports, you can easily see where your greatest volume of trade would be.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 14 were called separately and passed.

Clause 15 was called.

It Reads as follows:-

"This Act shall come into operation on the first day of April one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking that an amendment be made to this Clause. After the word "shall", insert the words "be deemed to have". The Clause will now read:-

"This Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of April one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one."

I beg to move that Clause 15 as amended stand part.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

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

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

8.30 p.m.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1961.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which seeks to amend the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1957. This amendment Order, 1961, seeks to provide for an increase in the number of Teachers in Elementary and Secondary Modern Schools from 835 to 870. As the Addendum to the Resolution states, this is due to the fact that during the period July, 1959, to July, 1960, the school population in Elementary and Secondary Modern Schools has been increased by 1,740. In order to maintain an adequate ratio of teachers to pupils, it will be necessary to amend the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order so as to increase the establishment by 35 teachers. This increase will include four posts of Specialist Teachers for the Pine Secondary Modern School. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, sometime ago the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, speaking on the matter of education, pointed out something to the Minister. On that occasion, it made the Minister rise in a heated manner and he spoke on the question of compulsory education. The hon.

member said that it was a false idea for us to continue in the belief that only three streams of education are the means of meeting our educational requirements. This Resolution seeks to increase the number of teachers in Elementary and Secondary Modern Schools. The Minister has shown a most refreshing attitude towards criticism on matters of education because education in itself is purely a matter of mental development. If you are going to regard it as a matter of mental development, it must come in for mental changes. I do not know if there is any system which is sacrosanct or cannot be changed, and the system which we have followed comparatively slavishly in Barbados is not suitable for a country which has not an indigenous English background but an indigenous African background. There is no question of difference between the Cockney and somebody from the North and nobody said that the Cockney should be removed from England. There is that which is as much a part of English life as the University of Oxford or Cambridge is.

As a Trade Union Leader, I come into contact with thousands of people. I say that the three streams of education are not serving Barbados well. I can say that there is a wide gap now in the Educational system although you have your Secondary Modern Schools which have not been with us long enough. I will give you this example. As to the number of carpenters and masons in Barbados today who can really and truly understand theoretically something which is simple, something which they should have learnt in an elementary school, if they have to tell you that an area of land is so much and the blocks are so many, how many blocks you require for doing a job – that is too difficult an exercise for them. I hope that the Minister, as an ex-headteacher, would see that he should not go on allowing us to stop short and not implement a system of compulsory education because of the apparent cost of such a system. I would say this to the Minister: there should not be, in our time, the slightest holding back on any question of compulsory education. It is next to something criminal to find boys and girls of school age not being in any school. Relative to the excuses which they make as to difficulties in places where they have compulsory education, I would say that this is one of the things on which you should spend money. I am asking the Minister to look at this matter extremely seriously. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you must have had some experience of it as a member of the Trade Union.

We are told that we are the most literate people in the West Indies; but literacy only means that you can read and write. What I find in Barbados as compared with some of the other territories is that when people are in certain positions all of them can express themselves well. There is no question about that. I have been to all of the Wes Indian islands and I can say, taking the case of places where they have compulsory education, people who hold any position of responsibility have benefited from their education.

8.40 p.m.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of compulsory education has allowed Barbados to be satisfied with these half measures, and that is why you find all the housewives saying that domestics do not know anything. What do you expect a domestic servant to know if she comes out of school too early or if she does not attend school long enough to acquire some of the things she should know? We are getting half-baked education for our money, because children are not going to school long enough.

Mr. Speaker, teachers are not being fully occupied. Nobody has yet given me the numbers, but let us take the number of ten children entering a primary school. I would like to ask what percentage of that ten goes through the elementary school and finishes the course. Do five of them finish the course so that I can say that 50 percent of your total population gets a full education? That is where we are losing productivity. I come across a mass of people and I have letters by the dozen at home in which you can see that people did not have the opportunity of a full elementary education, and that is why I say there should be compulsory education.

Mr. Speaker, we are too smug about serious matters; and when the hon. member says that we do not have the money for compulsory education, I would like to know what money he would put in front of educating the community. We have a heavy population and we therefore have to educate it because it is the only exportable material or the main source we have. I should like to ask the Minister if we are lacking in teachers or the means of providing teachers. A place like Barbados should have more teachers than it requires. You will remember that in your time, Mr. Speaker, Barbados had a surplus of teachers which left every year and went overseas to find gainful employment in teaching. In those days they found it difficult to get employment because Combermere School, Harrison College and the various secondary schools could not provide a place for them.

The Hon. Minister should bear this in mind: yesterday was a Bankholiday and there were school sports at Kensington unconnected with the Government-aided schools. Do you see therefore what the situation is today? There are as many children or more in non-Government-aided secondary schools as there are in Government-aided secondary schools. Education in these days is part of a national concern. If the Minister goes back to the English attitude prior to compulsory education in the last century, he will see that it was not regarded as a public concern in which the nation should be responsible for everybody's education, and our concept now seems to be that education is not the nation's business.

With all due respect to the people in secondary schools, you tell a man that nobody else can serve as a doctor; a lawyer has to go to an Inn in order to save people from going to gaol; but, Mr. Speaker, anybody can open a school! Anybody can tell you to spell as you like or count as you like; it does not matter if you say two and two are five! Education is the bed-rock of all our progress. Splitting the atom, going behind the Himalayas and going into outer space – all that is education to the highest. Some of these avenues of education are for the physicists because they are not open to everybody who understands mathematics.

I find, Sir, that fundamental education is not regarded in Barbados as a right. You should not be able to take it only if you want it. There is nothing undemocratic in compelling a child to go to school, nor is there anything dictatorial in that. You do not say that a country is a dictatorship because it compels its children to go to school; at least it saves its children from the vulgarity we hear in here today, and you bring up men and women to be able to stand up in a community as they should. I do not think the Minister should stop at anything whatever in letting us have compulsory education in Barbados. I would say that he has a bad legacy. The former Minister of Education – not the Premier, but the Prime Minister of the West Indies – fooled the people here with the idea that he was a product of the elementary school, a product of Harrison College and a product of a Uniyersity, and that over his dead body there was not going to be any investigation into the educational system of this island, making people believe by that nonsense that Barbados is educated.

Mr. Speaker, Barbadians accept too many low standards, and I say from my seat in this House of Assembly that we are not going to sit and keep our mouths shut on these low standards which have seeped into the community today. You find in this community low standards and a low outlook, and being afraid of people is accepted as the order of the day and you have to think twice before you approach Mr. So-and-so. Even through lack of education you get people making vulgar references to the colour of a man's skin. Somebody may look at you, Mr. Speaker, and say you are only so-and-so but you are a gentleman; you are a black gentleman, which means that something is wrong with you otherwise. Why is that? It is based on this stupid low-brow idea in education that you make some people believe that they will be cowboys, and therefore they do not need education. For rough-necked jobs you do not need education. They do not realise that they are educating people for citizenship.

I am going to ask the Minister who are the children born in Barbados that should not be educated if you do not

have compulsory education. That is the minimum which you can give a child in this age, because I may say that with the technological changes taking place in this island, the unskilled worker is going to find in the next ten or fifteen years that he is nothing in the community. I am asking the Minister to give some thought to this matter, because I am very concerned about it. I have been concerned even with technical education and so forth, and I see the need for greater work on that.

This Order is an Order to increase the number of teachers in Elementary and Secondary Modern Schools from 835 to 870. It is stated in the Addendum that during July, 1959 to July 1960, the school population in Elementary and Secondary Modern Schools increased by 1,740. In order to maintain an adequate ratio of teachers to pupils, it will be necessary to increase the establishment by 35 posts for teachers. This increase will include four posts of Specialist Teachers for the new Pine Secondary Modern School.

Now within a year the school population increased by 1,740. I do not know if the statistics are available, but I think they should be and the Minister should get them. Does this figure of 1,740 represent the school population to which you can look forward or is this the figure which the schools were able to accept? It is different from saying that the population is 1,740 or 1,800 that you can expect, when in truth and in fact the number of children ready to go into school may be 2,500, 2,800 or 3,000. The reason why I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that before people used to boast about going to a secondary school, going to Harrison College, Combermere or Queen's College.
8.50 p.m.

Do you know what we are seeing today? Once before, any idiot could get into Harrison College; you only needed to have the money to pay. But I see today parents hustling and cannot get their children into that school or a Government-aided Secondary School. You are not regarded as a dunce today because you cannot get into Harrison College. The Hon. Minister of Education should see that that in itself shows that when it comes to fundamental education we should not leave that unattended.

I am bold enough in saying this. The working population of Barbados is a population which comes directly from the elementary schools; therefore the basis of the people who have to work in this community should be given an education and allowed to accept it for what it means. Education is no harm to people. In certain parts of south east Asia and certain parts of the Middle East, UNESCO makes substantial grants to them for fundamental education. I feel that there is nothing wrong in Barbados having a plan to put forward to UNESCO or United Nations or any international agency to buttress its educational programme in fostering fundamental education in order to have the expansion which you want. From the time I was a school boy, we have not added many schools and the concept of where you place schools seems to be the same today as it was for the last 25 years or 30 years. I have seen very few new areas where schools have been placed. What you see is larger schools and schools being expanded. For example, in St. Peter for the number of years that I know that parish, there was the Boscobelle Boys' and Girls', the Indian Ground, All Saints and the Speightstown Boys' and Girls' Schools. They have been enlarged; therefore, our foreparents seemed to have had a lot of foresight as regards their original concept of where schools should be sited. From the word given "go", they seemed to be meeting the needs. From what schools were in the past, they seemed to be meeting the needs but the economic conditions were such that many of the people could not make use of them.

The Hon. Minister sat there and heard. You can very well see that you have in this House the product of low education. You have in this House a member making reference to low education. That shows that you need compulsory education. If he had the mental development, he would not be talking about somebody going to fourth standard. You do not make those references to education even if they were true. It goes to show that he really wants to know that there are some boys who did not go any further than fourth standard so that he can laugh at them. I want to stop that. He fails to see that a lot of people who went no further than fourth standard voted for him. That is one of the diseases of the lack of education in a community. That is why I say that we want fundamental and compulsory education. If that hon. member had the full course of an elementary education, he would have seen the benefits of it and it would have been reflected in his mind. Do you know what happens today? There are many carpenters and masons who cannot do square root and cubes and areas. That is work which they should know, but they do not know it. You get some of them telling you to buy 500 square feet of board, and when it is used up they tell you that you want so much more, and when you get it and the building is finished you find that you have a lot of it to push under the cellar. When it comes to compulsory and fundamental education, we cannot pay too much for it.

It saves delinquency. If you do not have the people educated, you would not be able to keep them in check. The better you educate the people, the less delinquency you would have. The more science a man knows, the healthier he keeps and he is a better patient. That is what doctors say. I think that some people go to their deaths ignorantly. Ignorance makes people do things without seeking the advice which they should seek. I would like to see the Hon. Minister of Education assuring us, not in the next Five Year Development Plan, but before 1962 is passed that we will have compulsory education in the elementary schools. I will give him this suggestion. If you cannot do it in one swoop, begin to do it in one parish at a time. You have this idea that you cannot get the food to give them. They can get the food in Queen's Park. I went to Wesley Hall Boys' School and they had food provided there for those boys whose parents could not afford to give them a meal.

Now that I am on this, I must pay tribute to the Hon. Minister of Education for calling the school at the Pine "the Parkinson School", although I noticed that they seemed to be afraid to call it by that name in this Resolution. They are still calling it the Pine Secondary Modern School.

I was given an invitation to attend the function but it clashed with another previous engagement I had. I am not ashamed to say that I am one of the products of an elementary school. There are some of us who seem to be afraid to say that we have been to an elementary school. They say that they went to Harrison College and want to make people believe that they started off at Harrison College. We find people in this age of snobbery keeping their children far from an elementary school. You have them sending their children to all these fancy private schools and saying that their children cannot sit on a hard bench and they are paying $25 a month for them.
9.00 p.m.

We know that there is nothing wrong with Elementary Schools; our contemporaries are having their children go to the Elementary Schools. What is it that has now got into the community about the product of Elementary Schools, so that men of the working class no longer feel that the Elementary School is the school for their children? I have seen children between the ages of five and nine going to school and when you ask them: "Where are you going to school?" they want to say: "I have been to school at an Elementary School and I am going to a Private School". It makes you feel as if they had governesses. Why is it that people do not want to utilise the Elementary Schools? I have heard it said that if you send your child to an Elementary School it is hard for him to get into Harrison College; therefore you have to send him to a Private School. There was a time when children in the Elementary Schools were in advance of those who were attending other schools. No matter what the quality is, I would like to see every child in school: and if the Minister could not start any further than in the St. Michael area, if he started to get these children into school, the problem would be considerably lessened. Invariably when a boy or girl leaves school before the full school period he or she does nothing in the community which is worthwhile; such children end up in some blind alley job or around the Barbados Workers' Union, but not in the Union.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is the legal consequence of financial provision which this House made when we were considering the Appropriation Bill in Committee of Supply. On that occasion, when we came to the Education Head of the Estimates, Head XX (5) Primary and Secondary Modern Schools, Item 2, we made a provision in this current financial year for eight hundred and seventy assistant teachers as against eight hundred and thirty five last year. Consequently, having already provided the money to pay these teachers, we are now, as it were, formally and legally making their appointment established. Therefore, there can be no quarrel on that ground or on any ground with the Resolution which is before us. On the other hand, there can be comment and plenty of it too. I propose to make my contribution now.

First of all, I must take up where the hon. member who has just sat down left off, on the question of compulsory education. I believe that some well-meaning people in this island do express the fear that while compulsory education is a good thing and it is eminently desirable, it is not practical at the moment. The Minister, I believe, shares that view; he is not against it, but he wonders how it can be managed at the moment. I should like to say this: there are no valid arguments against compulsory education; all the arguments about compulsory education are arguments in favour of it. The chief argument for it rests on the principle that since in a democratic society you cannot permit people to contract out of the laws you make for the preservation of public health, that is to say, that since you do not allow people to throw refuse on their roofs instead of putting it at the roadside, or since you do not allow people to have refuse which breeds flies but that they should carry out the regulations for better health, in that sense education has value democratically. No person should be able to contract out of the provision which is made for enlightening the minds and spirits of the community. Just as everybody must do his share in keeping typhoid fever and all infectious diseases at bay, in the same way everybody must do his best to keep out ignorance and such things.

When the Minister says that he would like to do these things but he has to watch other pressing financial commitments of the Government, my answer is this: to the extent that you keep a proportion of the population ignorant or prevent it from getting primary education, to that extent you are denying your school of the direction which may be necessary to show you how to get the money you want. I am firmly convinced that the more money we can spend on education, even at the expense of certain things which may be of equal necessity, the better it must be for us. It would be astonishing to see what you could do if you were to try.

What is the problem? First of all, you have to see to it that every child between the ages of five and twelve attends compulsorily a daily instruction in accordance with a scheme of Government which has been laid down by the Department of Education.

9.10 p.m.

Now even if I accept the argument that tomorrow morning you could not get all of them in the schools you have now, that is not to say that you could not teach all of them; you could employ the retired headteachers and retired teachers to instruct the surplus number possibly in their homes — when I say in their homes I mean the teachers' homes — and the whole problem of compulsory attendance would be maintained as a liaison between the extra teachers and the Education Department by having your attendance officer call on them, perhaps weekly, to make sure that their registers are kept up to date. What I am arguing is that you should not let lack of space, if lack of space is the one big argument, to be a barrier to the introduction of compulsory education. It could not be lack of teachers really, because there will be people, as I said, who are retired and who are vigorous enough that if called upon they would gladly take up the slack of the extra pupils to be taught. I am sure too that the religious bodies would open up their buildings to ease the pressure on space. I am sure that if you made an appeal to the churches, most of them would be put at your disposal to ease that particular problem.

The only two difficulties, Sir, would therefore be lack of space and lack of teaching personnel. You should use as much as possible of the retired people to do the teaching if they are vigorous and capable, and you should use the religious authorities and all other organisations by asking them to provide in the interim period floor space and room space for the teaching to be carried on. I see no reason myself why every single little child between the age of five and twelve should ever be out of primary school or should ever be separated from primary school instruction; it is most important.

A lot of people, Mr. Speaker, although they appreciate the value of education, do not always see the significance of it especially in a community like ours in the West Indies now emerging into nationhood. People would be surprised to know, when they are told, that contrary to the general and widespread belief — it is almost a sacrosanct belief — that capital employs labour, it is actually the other way around, as you will see from a study of all big industrial cities. The greater the degree of knowledge, skill and experience among the working population, the easier and the more voluminous the rate of investment in that territory. In other words, where the skill is concentrated, people will put their money, because where skill is, money will make more money; and it may well be, although we are not thinking this way, that our difficulty in getting these islands industrialised at a faster rate may be due in large part to the fact that we are not rapidly enough raising the skills of the entire population.

The problem therefore is basically what you are going to do at the primary level, because it is the primary level that settles everything. I have said in this House already that if you want to know the different outlooks which exist on these matters between two equally honoured and honourable professions, you should use the example I used on that occasion. I said that if you put the Hon. Premier beside the President of the Royal College of Physicians, any layman looking at both of them, provided he knew their history, would accord to both of them the title of "Doctor", because he would know that each of them has had a certain basic training in his profession, although one may be a specialist and the other a general practitioner. He would see no difference of status. If you took an elementary teacher of any school and placed him or her beside, say, the Principal of the University College of the West Indies, what would the layman say? There is a school teacher and there is Professor Lewis. They do not regard both of them as teachers as they regard Dr. Cummins — I apologise for calling his name — and, say, Lord Evans as doctors. That is the difference, and to me it is a dangerous difference that in two equally honoured and respected positions the layman should discern a change and a difference in status.

Mr. Speaker, I will go further. If you want to know what is really happening with primary education in this island, look at what estimate the teachers themselves have on their own status and profession. Gather together, Mr. Speaker, the representatives of any or all of the learned or unlearned professions in any room; get your lawyers, doctors, engineers, statesmen, agricultural experts and your teachers and ask a representative of each group whether he would like his own children, supposing he has any, to follow in his footsteps professionally. No lawyer would object to his son becoming a lawyer, no doctor would object to his son becoming a doctor, no minister of religion would probably object to his son becoming a minister of religion; but ask any school teacher, no matter how successful he has been or the school over which he presided, if he would like his son to become a teacher, and you would hear or see a mountain of doubt creeping up between you and his reply; that frightens me.

When people in a profession cannot say that they would like to see their own children, if they have any, follow them in that profession, that profession is rapidly going downhill. I admit that teachers have themselves to blame; they are too subservient, and there is not a majority of them with a degree of positive self-assertion which we feel such a profession rightly has. If somebody says that I am only talking that because I am a politician, I will ask him this: have you noticed, Mr. Speaker, one of the main differences be-

tween the two answers you would get if you asked a boy thirty years ago and one now where he goes to school? Twenty-five or thirty years ago the real answer would be "I go to Thorne, Parkinson, Byer, Taylor or Wilkinson". If you ask him now he calls the name of the School and not the name of the Head. There has been a dampening of personality. Parkinson, Byer and old Thorne have stamped their personalities on the school and had by that fact given status to the profession. No personalities except in very rare circumstances are stamped now; and much as I agree with calling a school after the late Rawle Parkinson, the very fact that that has been done proves my point that you have to invoke the past to give character and the stamp of personality, whereas what you really need is for the people in the school to impress their own character on it. That is why I say that teachers are a bit too subservient and not as self-asserting in impressing their character and personality on their job and certainly on the people they teach.

That is important, Mr. Speaker, for this reason.
9.20 p.m.

An enormous amount of harm is done to the teaching profession by the feeling which some teachers have that they have to please the people in power. That has nothing to do with the people in power because the people in power in most cases are not aware that is the feeling on the part of teachers. They have it for this reason. Arithmetically, if you have 126 elementary schools and 870 teachers, the 870 teachers know that only 126 of them in theory can become heads. They know that. In practice, it is even less. Consequently, each of the 870 teachers sees himself or herself as a potential headteacher or a potential inspector; and if their minds and consciences have not been strengthened against this feeling, they feel that it is better to please the people in power because that allows for promotion. That is the most damnable belief that the teaching profession can have.

Let me give you a little illustration. I have already mentioned it to the Hon. Minister of Education; so he will not think that I am mentioning it to create a personal controversy. Last year, I was approached by persons who were then responsible for planning for the big Jubilee Teachers Conference and asked whether I would consent to deliver an Address at the Jubilee Session. I said "certainly, I would" and submitted to the persons responsible the text of the addresses and started to work on the lectures. You will be surprised to know that a month after I declared my acceptance and the sensibility of the honour drawn to me, that invitation was withdrawn: and you will be even more surprised to know that it was withdrawn on the ground that some other persons in the Teachers' Association felt that it would be more politic to ask the Hon. Minister of Education instead of the Shadow Minister of Education to deliver those addresses.

I would like to say that I was not personally offended by the withdrawal of the invitation already accepted. That was nothing to me and certainly there was no question of my not wishing to give way to the present Minister of Education. I felt that as Minister of Education, he should have the most prominent position at that function. What hurt me was that a profession so highly respected as the teachers' profession would issue an invitation and withdraw it, not on the ground that the person invited was not competent to speak, but because they thought it was more politic in asking the Minister. It was not that the subject chosen was satisfactory or unsatisfactory; the fact was that for political reasons the Minister should be asked.

I say this: Any group of people who go about their business that way and give the impression that they are only subservient not even on conscientious grounds but on grounds of expediency is not going to have the respect and status which it is due.

Now, I turn from that to question the Minister on the provision which is made here for the specialist teachers in secondary modern schools. I speak particularly of the one at the Pine. It says in the Addendum to the Resolution that this increase will include four posts of specialist-teacher for the new Pine Secondary Modern School. I am not aware of what those four specialist-teachers will teach at that school and consequently some of what I may say may be irrelevant, and I hope the Minister would take that into account. It does seem to me that such a large development of policy as this, the creation of four posts of specialist-teachers at a secondary modern school, throws this whole question of the nature and function of these secondary modern schools into focus again. It is well known that I have my reservations about these schools and I have said over and over again that I am not prepared to pronounce final judgement on them until they have their fair share of working. But meanwhile, there is this aspect of the problem which has to be settled once and for all. Are they secondary schools or not? If they are not secondary schools, then the people of the island should better be told that: and if they are secondary modern schools, a further problem arises. How is it that in a semi-secondary school you charge no fees and in the others you charge fees? The moment you admit that these are secondary schools, you have to justify the public of this island as to why these are non-fee-paying schools and you are not hastening the abolition of fees in the other secondary schools.

It may be that these four specialists are designed to raise the level of teaching in this particular school and so to spread to the others as time goes on. But why then are you doing it in this piecemeal fashion? I notice that the Government does not use the proper title to this school in the Addendum to this Resolution. Why does not the Parkinson School enjoy the benefit given to the Princess Margaret School? What special aspects from a curriculum point of view are being stressed in the Parkinson School which are not going to be stressed in the other secondary modern schools?

The next point is this. During the Estimates I asked the Hon. Minister of Education to give me a clear and factual definition of the status and functions of the supernumerary teachers, which he did. I am now to ask him if this extra thirty-five supernumerary teachers whose salary we have already voted and whose posts are now voted are to be recruited from the present number of supernumeraries which, according to the estimates are 220. I ask that for this reason. As I understand from the Minister on that occasion, the only difference between a supernumerary and an established teacher is that established teachers are established and supernumerary teachers are not established, but they are as genuinely qualified as the others. They do the work of fully qualified teachers when other teachers are away or absent from school for some reason or the other. The only difference is that they may not have gone to Erdiston.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to correct the hon. member there. I also on that occasion said that they do not get any increments when they are supernumeraries.
9.30 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: I am grateful to the hon. member. I am wondering if these extra 35 teachers will be taken from the ranks of these supernumeraries. If they are taken from the ranks of the supernumeraries, presumably 35 vacancies would exist among the ranks of the supernumeraries. In that list, will the gap of 35 in the ranks of these supernumeraries be made up from the Relief Teachers?

The second point is not an administrative matter at all. Does not the Minister think that if primary education is to be put on its soundest footing, he has got to find some means of doing that? I know, for instance, that there is provision made for refresher courses for those teachers particularly during the holidays, who have passed the age when they could definitely be fitted into the Erdiston structure. I am wondering if that process is going on rapidly enough; it seems to me that if in five years we cannot have ninety per cent of the teachers trained, those five years or the most of that period we will be devoting to the problem as it exists. With the population growth there will be more children at the primary level; the demand for more teachers will increase and if we have not broken the back of the entrance percentage within five years, then we will be defeating the very end which we are seeking to serve. I take this oppor-

tunity to ask the Minister if he thinks that enough is being done to speed up this training particularly of those whose age and experience render it unnecessary for them to go to Erdiston, but render it necessary for them to receive the necessary training.

Mr. Speaker, there is one last point which I would like to make. I would like the teachers at the primary level to be at one with those at the secondary level. This is no new thing. When one asks the reason for the snobbishness which seems to affect the product of certain schools, the answer is not a simple one; but there is an aspect of it which worries me very much. I have never been able to see the distinction between a man or woman who teaches at a Secondary school and a man or woman who teaches at an Elementary school. It is particularly wrong, in a democratic country, for one set of teachers to be more interested than another set of teachers because a certain value seems to be attached to the Grant-Aided Schools. It may be that the difficulties which both sets of teachers undergo and suffer may be due to the fact that neither side regards the other as proper teachers in every sense. If the function of the teaching profession is to be upheld, then there must be a common organisation housing all sides. If you have the thing on the wider national basis, there is no reason why professionals and lecturers in the U.C.W.I. should not be members of the same Federal teaching body as the humblest primary school teacher in Antigua or in Barbados. I think that we had better start working along that line. I cannot say that I am original in this idea, but it is something which is of value. The degree of unity which should exist among all branches of teaching today is something to be taken into consideration.

Hon. L. StA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I have enjoyed listening to the comments which were made in connection with this Resolution by the various speakers. I would be inclined to make short shift in an attempt to answer questions by saying that all of what has been said and wished for is extremely good. I should be failing in my duty to the community if I were to try to say different from that. As I have always pointed out, I cannot make bricks without the necessary straw. I experience very, very great and numerous nightmares where this matter of the development of the educational system of the island is concerned. I should like to draw hon. members' attention to the fact that if they would care to look at their copies of the Estimates, they would see exactly how the revenue of this colony is derived. We depend almost entirely on customs and excise duties which, in round figures, we hope will yield $11 million. Then there is the question of taxation, income tax mainly, which should bring us another $8 million, and we are hoping to realise $25 million from all sources, one of which is Royalties. All of us know that Royalties are a source of revenue which more or less provide a break for individuals who have to pay other taxes, because all the other taxes more or less come from the sweat of one's brow.

9.40 p.m.

Under the $25 million which this country hopes to raise during this financial year, it can only expect the princely sum of $26,000 from royalties; all the other monies, so to speak, must come from the sweat of our brows. Looking again at the Estimates, hon. members will see that the amount allotted for Education is roughly $4 1/2 million; that is a reasonably good slice of the revenue, but I am willing to admit that it is not nearly enough to meet my desires; but then there are other services which are equally important and which must be provided for. It is on that basis that I am forced to say that this Government has tried all it possibly could to provide funds whereby one has been able or will be able to introduce during this financial year certain necessary improvements. The addition to the staff of the teaching service is one of the first items which must benefit by this increase, and as the Order says, we are to add 35 additional teachers.

Here I should like to answer one of the questions put by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. Bearing in mind that the Ministry has absolutely nothing to do with the making of appointments — that is the business of the Public Service Commission — we in the Ministry would normally expect that these 35 teachers would be drafted from the ranks of the Supernumeraries. If I be permitted, I should like to draw attention to the fact here too that since I have been in the Ministry the teaching service has been increased to the benefit of all. When I took up the Ministry there were 750 Assistants; we added 50 the first year I was in office and then another 35, and now we are asking for 35 more. According to a decison which has been reached, it is a certainty that the situation will be reviewed annually and we will be making additions as time goes by.

Now on this question of compulsory education, one would be very glad to introduce that after other necessary things, but again it is a question of money. I am wondering whether hon. members when they make these requests are insinuating that we should increase taxation, because looking through the Estimates very carefully, I have been able to formulate the idea that it is as a result of the new taxation which was introduced by the Hon. Premier last year that I have been able to get this increase of about $460,000 this year. If you look at the Estimates you will see that the amount which is expected to be collected from motor car tax is $200,000, stamp duty $100,000 and pool betting $20,000 odd, so that when you put these figures together that would almost amount to the total increase which has been assigned to education this year.

I am wondering, I repeat, whether hon. members of the Opposition are insinuating that this Government should be prepared to increase taxation with a view to providing the necessities so far as education is concerned. I should be extremely delighted if the country could see fit to accede to such a request and let this money be forthcoming, because without making any idle boast, I want to assure this Honourable House that we have not come across problems pertaining to education for which we have not been able to find a solution. There are quite a number of plans and so on which are there ready, waiting to be implemented when and if the necessary funds are forthcoming.

I would say that all I need is the necessary funds with which to pay teachers properly, to provide the necessary school places, to provide the necessary training for teachers and the equipment for schools, and we can more or less deliver the goods, if I may use that colloquialism; therefore it is a question of dollars and cents.

In connection with the matter which the hon. senior member for St. Lucy queried about certain conditions at Erdiston, the four specialist posts are for woodwork, metal work and Home Economics. One of the principal defects of the educational system of Barbados is that it does not provide the necessary opportunities for pupils to obtain the vocational skills which they need in order to be able to take their places in this modern world with any possible chance of success. The academic side of our education system is not bad although it could be very much improved. But we fall over on our faces from the technical and vocational point of view, and it is that that we need to pay specific attention to if our up-and-coming generation is to be in a position to take its place on the world market with a very wide chance of success, because they will have to compete with people who have not only got the necessary academic training, but who possess also these vocational skills.

There is no point in making mention of the U.S.A. except to say that they are well ahead in this business of fitting the individual for some kind of work in life. In point of fact I was made to understand when I was in the United States that the idea there is not to waste money, but to find out what the individual child is most likely to be able to master, give him that sort of training and fit him for some kind of work and good citizenship, and then all the culture can come later on. In the United Kingdom I found that the emphasis was on culture and academic attainment and in Canada I found there was happy combination of both systems.

I repeat that our principal defect in so far as our educational system is concerned is the lack of the necessary provision whereby the majority of children will be able to acquire the necessary vocational skills. This Government

has committed itself to the policy of making provision whereby the acquisition of these skills will be made possible. If you will look at the Estimates again, you will see that a sum of money has been granted for teacher training and training of a technical kind, so that this question of training is a very wide and varied one. We are not merely concerned with the academic end of it, but we are prepared to make it possible for our teachers who show the necessary aptitude to develop some sort of skill, because surely we intend to see to it that all our grammar schools, our secondary modern schools and any other schools remaining are fitted with workshops for proper instructions. That is an essential.

9.50 p.m.

Now, I do not think it is necessary for me to say more to convince you of my sincerity where this matter is concerned, but it is all a question of dollars and cents. If the country can provide the necessary revenue, your humble servant is quite willing to introduce all the changes necessary to meet the situation.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 18th April, 1961 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

9.53 p.m.