THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1961

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 30th March, 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);* Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, *(Leader of the Opposition);* Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., *(Premier);* 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);* Hon. F. E. MILLER, *(Minister of Social Services);* Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, *(Minister of Education)* and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meetings held on the 7th, 9th and 14th March, respectively have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed. *(A Pause)* There being no objection, the Minutes of these meetings are now being taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. D. D. GARNER and Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took their seats.

ABSENCE OF CLERK AND DEPUTY CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the House that the Clerk of the House is still unavailable up to now. I have not been notified of the reason.

Hon. M. E. COX: May I ask Your Honour whether you have been notified that the Clerk would not be here this morning or his Deputy?

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that I have not been notified. *(A pause)* I see that the Deputy Clerk is now making his appearance.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will just like to say that this is most unsatisfactory.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is no fault of mine.

Mr. CLERK entered the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk has just made his appearance and has informed me that owing to a traffic jam he was unable to attend the House in time.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Barbados Statistical Service - Special Studies No. 4 - Census of Tourism: 1959;

Also, Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators January, 1961;

Also, The Housing Authority (Pensionable Posts) Order, 1961;

Also, The Peasants Loan Bank (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1961;

Also, Report of the Standing Insurance Committee and Statement of Accounts of the General Insurance Fund for the period 1st October, 1959 to 31st March, 1960.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Thirty-first Annual Report of the Executive Council of the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux.
12.25 p.m.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Labour Department Act, 1943.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936, and to make other provision in lieu thereof.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Housing Authority (Pensionable Posts) Order, 1961."

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Peasants Loan Bank (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1961."

A Bill to repeal the Chief Secretary's Office Act, 1903, and to make provision for the allocation of the functions of the Chief Secretary and for other matters incidental thereto.

A Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

A Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of a Public Service Commission, for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of a Judicial and Legal Service Commission, for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of a Police Service Commission, for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto.

A Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

A Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956.

A Bill relating to the appointment, conditions of service and dismissal of the Attorney General.

A Bill relating to the appointment, conditions of service and dismissal of the Auditor General.

A Bill to amend the Training Scheme Fund Act, 1953.

A Bill to amend the Promissory Oaths Act, 1870.

A Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts of this Island relating to the Police Force.

Oral Reply to Question No. 27/61 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy regarding cessation of payment to Clerks of the Court for supplying copies of proceedings.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded in each case by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Labour Department Act, 1943.

A Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957.

On the motion of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, a Bill to repeal the Peasants' Loan Bank Act, 1936, and to make other provisions in lieu thereof, was read a first time.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:-

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

A Bill to repeal the Chief Secretary's Office Act, 1903, and to make provision for the allocation of the functions of the Chief Secretary and for other matters incidental thereto.

A Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1801.

A Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1949.

A Bill to provide for the establishment of a Public Service Commission, for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto.

12.35 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Judicial and Legal Service Commission, for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Police Service Commission for the functions to be performed by such Commission and for other matters incidental thereto was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill relating to the appointment, conditions of service and dismissal of the Attorney General was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill relating to the appointment, conditions of service and dismissal of the Auditor General was read a first time.

On the motion of Hin. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to amend the Training Scheme Fund Act, 1953 was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to amend the Promissory Oath Act, 1870, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, a Bill to amend the consolidate the Acts of this island relating to the Police Force was read a first time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to resume the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

On the last occasion, the hon. junior member for Christ Church moved that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, as I said on the last occasion when we met on this amendment, trade tax for Local Government purposes is hardly known in any other territory of the Commonwealth; it is peculiar to Barbados and that was stated to us by Sir John Maude when he made his first Report on Local Government in Barbados. We have had that for all these years under the Vestry system and we found no reason to change it. In truth and in fact, it is a form of income tax laid on trade, business houses or persons carrying on trade in the area, and it was allowed as a deductable expense for the purposes of Central Government's income tax.

Trade tax as well as property tax has varied throughout these years from parish to parish; seldom was it the same in any two parishes. But the force of the argument goes back to two years ago when it was felt that to have anything but a uniform trade tax was a deterrent to industries to establish themselves in any other parish except St. Michael, because the trade tax for St. Michael was always lower than the rural parishes, the reason being that the trade tax particularly was heaviest in the city of Bridgetown and for that reason rates were kept down.

We in our Party are in agreement with establishing a uniform trade tax, and for that reason we feel that to have too great a difference in trade tax would discourage the establishment of new industries outside of the City of Bridgetown. Not that the City Council has objected to that; as often it would be better for the industry concerned to move out a bit and so lessen the crowding that has so far taken place in the City.
12.45 p.m.

Where we do not agree with Government is with respect to the Government's method of achieving that end. The Government's proposal, by this amendment, is to pool the trade tax in the entire island and arbitrarily divide it in the manner of 80% for the City Council, 11% for the Southern District Council and 9% for the Northern District Council. As figures show today, that division will indicate that trade tax in the City of Bridgetown and in the Municipality will be used to subsidise the other two district Councils to the amount in which Government had been subsidising them over the past two years. Therefore, it is arbitrary and we can only conclude that it is Government's decision to relieve themselves of this burden and so pass it on to the City of Bridgetown. With that we disagree. We agree that there should be uniform rates but that can be achieved by a subsidy from the Central Government as they have been doing in the previous years.

Of course, that subsidy should not be in the form of a general gift but it should be given for a specific purpose. We have been enjoying this new setup of Local Government for the last two years and it is about time that the Government pinpoint the weaknesses in any of the three areas, and where there are weaknesses - and they have shown up very much so in the Northern and Southern District Councils - the Government can raise that standard wherever it may be and where it needs to be relieved, whether it be in Public Health or in Poor Relief, by a direct grant from Central Government for that specific purpose.

Our objection to this manner of shifting responsibility of this subsidy from Central Government to the City Council is that this grant when taken from the City Council and handed over to the other two District Councils will not carry with it the responsibilities which it should have. At the present moment, the ratepayers by their vote can declare whether they are satisfied with the manner in which their funds are spent or disbursed in either one of the three Councils; but after this is done, no ratepayer in St. Michael or in that part of Christ Church which is attached to the Municipality of Bridgetown would have the opportunity to express themselves at an election for Local Government in the manner in which some of their money can be misspent. It would not even be the case in either of the two District Councils. That is taxation with representation. It boils down to that. They can only express themselves at a Central Government level and they would be inadequately represented even in that case. The representatives of the City and St. Michael would hardly have a powerful enough voice in relation with the population of the City Council. That is a strong reason for our objection in this matter. It can be a means for Government at some future date to do likewise in other things.

Sir, if this is accepted today without protest, when Government comes to the disestablishment of the Anglican Church, they can equally say that the burden which they now have from Central Government funds towards the Established Church could be borne by Local Government because it would have already had some form of precedent. Then the upkeep of Churches in the other two districts - the North and the South - could become a greater burden on the ratepayers in the Municipality. I am not saying that it is Government's intention to do so, but it can be argued, if we once accept this principle of allowing the ratepayers' money to be spent in this manner in which they have no voice as to how some of it is to be spent.

I know that it is argued, and not today but for many years, that much of the trade of the City of Bridgetown is derived as a result of the buying powers of the ratepayers in the other districts. There is something in that; but with regard to the public utilities, such as the Telephone Company and the Barbados Light and Power Company, they can argue that the ratepayers who are subscribers to those utilities - some of them in the other areas are contributing to the wealth of that company which is paying its taxes to the City of Bridgetown. I remember as a member of the Vestry of Christ Church that there was a method of computing the assessment whereby the returns from utilities were assessed for the other parishes on the basis of rental of posts. This is an arbitrary way and some other means can be devised for that purpose. It is not the right way to take taxes from the City of Bridgetown to be used in subsidising the other two Districts. That is a subsidy which rightly belongs to the Central Government.

I will even go as far as to say this: If the rates at any time become so burdensome even on the ratepayers of the City of Bridgetown and Government satisfies itself that the spending of the funds have been efficiently performed and the services which are being rendered are essential, they should come to the relief even of the City Council of Bridgetown with a grant from Central Government funds for a specific purpose. And that seems very likely.

The Hon. Premier gave us figures. I can recall that the sum involved is in the vicinity of $200,000; the amount of $95,000 for the North and $105,000 for the South. The Hon. Premier did not state one thing as to how he had arrived at the proportion of 80% to be retained by the City Council, 11% to be given to the South and 9% to be given to the North. But as the figures indicate, it is very closely connected to the subsidy which is now being given by the Central Government to those two Councils; so it does seem as if that figure was used as a basis. We are speaking today of trade tax and trade tax only, but it is going to have its effect on property tax in the future.
12.55 p.m.

I presume that if trade tax throughout the island is to be based on 17.5% this year and the Government will indicate that, you will have to amend this Bill if a change is to be made from year to year. I presume that the intention of the Government is to leave the rate there as long as possible, but that will send up the rate on property more than ever. Any increase in expenditure by either one of the Councils will be thrown directly on property and land tax. This Amendment provides that trade remains even. On the other hand, should the Councils be able to reduce their expenditure, property tax will also make a change if trade tax is to remain at 17.5%.

This is the principle of shifting the burden of control which belongs to the Central Government, to the ratepayers in any one district without equal representation. For that reason we are opposing the principle of the amendment, but we do not oppose the fixing of a uniform trade tax. The difference in rates is a great burden, and does not encourage industry or business to establish itself in either one of the two Councils outside the City if the rate is carried too

high. I recall when the rates in St. Lucy in the days of the Vestry was 38%. You can quite understand that business will be discouraged from establishing itself in an area with such high taxation.

On those grounds, I am opposing the amendment and again I say that it should be the responsibility of the Central Government to make a grant for a specific purpose where they find that the services which are being rendered are worthwhile and necessary, but that for the want of money, they will be below the standard which we want to see established in this island. If it is for the purpose of increasing the salaries of the Sanitary Inspectors or establishing services in the other areas which are now established in the City of Bridgetown, if the Government realises that a good job is being done, then it is their duty to relieve the ratepayers in any area. If the money is badly spent then the Councils should be turned out at an election. You will never get responsible local government if you continue to amend the Local Government Act according to your whims and fancies. You have a great measure of control today; but the electorate, by means of their vote, will eventually establish in this island a Local Government worthy of the ratepayers. If they are dissatisfied with the way in which their money is being spent, if the rates are too high and they point out the means by which they will be brought down, they will eventually strengthen Local Government not only in the City of Bridgetown but also in the two District Councils.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, this is a very sweeping change which is proposed here. Any change in your taxation policy is one to which the whole community should give careful thought and consideration. I have returned here and read that the Councils have agreed to this matter; despite what the Councils have agreed to, I will stand alone and say that it is not in the best interest of this community and I will proceed to show why that is so. A policy of persecution and of perplexity will never take the place of wisdom and commonsense. The Barbados Government has been constantly pursuing, in every walk of its political life, a policy of calculated persecution and perplexity since the Local Government Elections in this island; they have done so because they did not win the Election in Bridgetown. That persecution and perplexity has gone so far and some members of the Government have been so outrageous in their political conduct, that whenever they get an opportunity of scandalising and vilifying other members of this House, they do so to the extent of saying that they are associated with the Conservatives; and it is those members who have caused these Conservatives to get back into power. That is the type of malicious mind which is generated within a Party which is not run by wisdom and commonsense, but by persecution and perplexity.

The hon. senior member for the City is not in his place. However, the Government has been carrying out a policy to undermine the will of the people, because they have chosen the hon. member and his group. By gesticulation the Premier is saying something to me; the Premier by nature is no doubt without that essential characteristic of leadership which commands leadership within his Party, and he is today, by a method of force, being compelled to do things against his better judgment and against what his conscience would dictate.
1.05 p.m.

The Premier is surrounded by a gang whose minds are so bent on controlling this country that they would hang anyone else who has different views from them, and anyone they feel they cannot subjugate by political power to a position of being a menial. They have not yet been able to accept the verdict of the people in Bridgetown, and these measures are a series of measures that come up from time to time as a means of underlining that situation.

Mr. Speaker, let us look and see what Government proposes to do. The Government proposes to interfere with one of the few planks of taxation policy within the Local Government areas. It is true that the Premier must have given the figures. This taxation policy is what is known as trade tax, and in its modern term it is a political taxation anachronism anyhow to have such a term being used in circumstances that no longer require this. Why I am so serious about this policy, Sir, is that there are no longer eleven parishes; there are three Councils and the Government in power controls two of them.

I pause here to say, Mr. Speaker, that whenever any Government is aspiring towards independence and self-Government, the people who live in that territory or area must be prepared to preserve all of the fundamentals of liberty; if not, they will find in process of time that independence and self-Government means the subjection and negation of their own rights and privileges. The Government has control over two Councils, and I have seen since this Local Government Act came into action that the cost of Government in this sector has been more expensive than it was before, though not more efficient. What do we find? The minions of the Government are placed in power by the method of selection and not by the method of election, because this is another aspect of the inroads to nepotism.

Mr. Speaker, the Government introduced today Bills concerning the Public Service Commission and Public Services, but where you are taxing and where money is being allowed to be used, you get your friends and put them into office. This system of Local Government has reached such a ridiculous stage in Barbados that a member of the Government Party sitting as a member of a Local Government Council has circularised the other members in a private capacity and said that the Premier of the West Indies says he should be their Chairman of the Local Government Council. That is the biggest example of cajolery going on in the Government Party in so far as Local Government is concerned. They are all fighting for power; all want to be Chairmen and be bosses in order to go to the Treasury and inflate the bills for travelling allowance and all the other things for which they can draw money out of the Public Purse, and people are called upon to pay taxes and rates to keep these ne'er-do-wells and people who do not want to work for a penny going.

Somebody has to speak out, Sir; and if the mantle falls on me, I will bear it. The Premier must begin to see that he cannot be surrounded by this type of political bamboozlery and come here and ask us to put the gold seal on this type of political action in 1961. Now I see that the Local Councils have agreed with this. Why? With all due respect to the members of the City Council, I would say that they are not different in their concept of taxation than people of the Victorian or Elizabethan era, because the reasons that gave birth in Barbados to a trade tax were the reasons that were associated with the political concept when we had a plantocracy and a mercantile community running the island at every stage, and the taxation policy reflected the type of thinking they had. We do not want a taxation policy today to be so unscientific that the only change made is from the plantocracy and mercantile community to the small shopkeeper mentality, so that if a man is a small shopkeeper he does not want to pay taxes, or if you have anybody who wants to become a politician you are going to find somebody to pay for running him.

The Government uses the Local Government people as little political canvassers; their main function is to canvass for the Party, and they are paid out of public funds to canvass for the Party at election time. They have started to canvass in my own constituency, and one of the Councillors wants to come down there to run, but I will not say any more on that at this stage. The Premier has introduced this to the members of the Councils who say they agree with it, but I want to point out that they are still in the Elizabethan era. Three hundred years ago when this country had very little trade, it had no nation-wide distribution. The people who were in the City and the Vestrymen were of the same family. What happened therefore is that they decided to lay rates based on the only obvious things they had, land and households, and in addition they added trade. Let us make a complete analysis of this island bit by bit and see what is the revelation. Why are you using trade in this taxation policy as a Local Government policy?
1.15 p.m.

Now I do not want to go in for political niceties. I am no lawyer, but I want to tell the Hon. Premier this: Ordinary

propriety in its broadest sense must be the cornerstone of our civilization if we are going to improve in our democracy. When the Hon. Premier introduces a Bill like this within the period of the first elections to Local Government, he must bear in mind that it is a fundamental change which you are making to Local Government. When you talk of something for your election plank, this is one thing which we all can canvass on.

The Councils do not know what they are doing when they say that they agree with this Bill in principle, because it has nothing to commend it. The reason why it has nothing to commend it is because Local Government has very few things to spend money on. They do not deal with schools or education in its broadest sense; they have specific things to deal with, such as sanitation, repairing of roads and lighting. Local Government in Barbados is one of the weakest in the whole Commonwealth; and the reason for that was because the Government kept control over all these things because, as I have said, we have to be careful that we do not lose our freedom in a case like this.

Now, Sir, what has the Hon. Premier said on this matter? He said, "look at St. Lucy." What trade is there in St. Lucy? Well, Sir, there is land in St. Lucy. There are plantations and factories in St. Lucy. The only two businesses in that parish from which you can collect trade tax would be Fairfield Factory and Springhall Factory. Take them out and the amount of trade tax which you get from the other sources would be negligible. If you are still framing your taxation in these areas on something which does not exist, then you want a Committee to make a study of Local Government taxation and make recommendations and say how this taxation should be based.

Let us take St. Andrew. What do you have in that parish to collect trade tax from? You have just a few rumshops with a few nip bottles in them and almost all of them ask for tax relief. The only business you have there from which you can collect trade tax is Haggatts Factory; and I doubt very much that if under our Act a plantation is regarded as a trading company in the sense of trade, because they claim that they are not buying and selling; they are producing something.

Let us examine the trade tax which you say that you are now pooling. The amount of trade which resides in the island outside of St. Michael and Christ Church is a bagatelle. This is where I say that I do not want to go in for constitutional niceties. It is very strange that you have Local Government which in itself localises taxation and says that money collected must be localised and spent on this thing, and you are coming forward now with a Bill which is not in keeping with that theory, but which completely changes the whole concept of Local Government legislation and taxation by saying that money collected in this area must now be spent in other areas on other things. The question of integration can even take place by what you are laying down. When you come and say that you are going to change a thing like this, you are changing your taxation policy on trade; you are changing the whole fundamental of Local Government.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church says that he agrees with the argument that in view of the fact a man comes into town from the country and buys goods from Da Costa and Company; therefore, the money he distributes by the purchases he made should be reflected in the community as a whole.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I am not in favour of that. I said that was an argument in the past; but if you want to carry that argument so far, you can say that the ratepayers in Bridgetown are contributing to the people in the United Kingdom. You can very well see then that my argument is against it. Somewhere you must draw the line.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry that I misunderstood him. I thought that was the argument the hon. member used. I am going on in the same context of the taxation on land. A man runs a plantation in St. Andrew. What really allows him to pay land tax or any tax at all is what he produces out of the land. What he produces out of the land he comes to town with for the people in the town to buy. The people in St. Joseph do not eat all the breadfruits which grow in that parish; so they bring them to town for us to buy. Are you suggesting because I buy a breadfruit from a woman in St. Joseph that I have the right to lay down in the St. Joseph Almshouse? That is why I say that all of us are integrated as human beings. Therefore, if you use that as an argument – and you are using trade tax as a means of pooling, you can use any tax as a means of pooling.

Why I am against it is because you hear in this House every now and then this argument *vis-a-vis* the debate which we had on single-member constituencies, that nobody told the people about this, but that it was a Conservative plot. When it was shown to them that it was not a Conservative plot but was an argument which was used by the Party in power and something which they believed in, they said that they do not believe in it any more. What do you find now? You find that on this basis of taxing people and pooling trade tax, you do not go to the country; you say it is your job now to change the taxation policy. We can regard that as one of our planks in the next election on Local Government. The Local Government elections will come off sometime next year. The General Elections will come off sometime this year. But do you know what it is? You fear the hon. senior member for the City. You know that you cannot carry that to the people in the City and win. Why do you not tell the hon. senior member for the City: "Let us have that as a mandate?" Of course, the hon. senior member for the City agrees with you; so you would not have much worry about it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Who said that I agreed with something? Who told him that I agreed with something? The hon. member has not even misquoted me because I have not even spoken yet.
1.25 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have a good technique of finding out what people agree with and what they do not agree with. It is clear that the Premier has no mandate for this, but what is happening is that the hon. senior member for the City is also the Leader of his Party which controls the Bridgetown City Council. This calculated persecution by the Government is to see if you can unseat the hon. member, and each time you try to unseat him, the stronger he becomes. The hon. member has never been so strong and powerful in all of his life than he has been in recent years through the calculated persecution of the Government. The hon. member could not be so powerful if I had to deal with him. *(Laughter).* If a man has earned credit, let him enjoy all his credit; but when you want to take away credit from the hon. member, then the people add something more to him. We know that this persecution is to prevent him from being here. However, I am only saying that in passing. I am emphasizing this aspect of persecution. Now they come back with this Bill. The Objects and Reasons of this Bill are as follows: (a) the levying of a uniform rate of trade tax in the three local Government areas; (b) the payment into a special fund of all money collected by way of trade tax (c) the control and management by the Local Government Commissioner of the special fund....." This is not a pension fund: this is taxation. This House can make a man into a woman by legislation but that will not mean that it is a woman. They were in a hurry to pass a Bill, they had members elected to Local Government Councils and the members who have been so elected found themselves in a quandary.

I can remember the speech made by the hon. junior member for St. James in which he said that that Bill should have been torn up. I think he subsequently amended that and changed the tune. However, the Government was anxious to have control over the Local Government Councils because they have control over the island; but having got political power they do not know the mechanics of using this power. They found themselves taxing the people more, whereas they said they would lower the tax. Members of the Government said in Queen's Park that the hon. senior member for the City had his friends in the Department of Inland Revenue. They have put people on these Local Government Councils, but they have raised the rates and they had no

answer to give to the people. The Elections are coming off this year and attacks will be made on the leadership of the Trade Union; but we will tell the people that this is the sort of legislation which you will get. They have two seats in St. Michael and I hope that they do not get both or either of them again. I will do my best to see about that. The Elections are coming off and they want to make up the losses for the areas where the people have been hit; but the chances of their success in the City are like the chances of a snowball in hell. Therefore let us see what they have done for the people in the other areas.

The hon. junior member for St. James has said that that Bill should be torn up whereas others have agreed to a subsidy. Why is it that the members did not see that the impact of taxation would have fallen more heavily on those people who are least able to bear it? This is ignorance; you are running something and you do not know the fundamentals of the thing which you are running. Now the people begin to find that they have to pay much more taxation than they had to pay before without any additional services. These Councils did not have the conviction to say: "We have to pay ourselves, we have to get travelling allowance; we can say we are travelling whether we travel or not and the Chairman is too busy to see about that." Instead of putting down 20 miles they put down 200 miles; they put down another nought which means quite a lot; they did not tell the people that good services will require money. They come here with a Bill saying that they will divide the trade tax; from the least places whence they will get taxation, they are pooling taxation.

1.35 p.m.

The hon. senior member for the City does not see where his strength lies. His philosophy is from day to day, and not too far in front; therefore he does not see in this what they are doing. The City is the place where trade exists, and they are coming to utilise the tax which the City Council collects in order that the services in the City will be diminished. If you take an analysis of the amount of money put up by the City Council in trade, you will see that it is more than 80 per cent. What I would like to know from the Premier is the amount of trade tax collected since Local Government came into operation from the three Local Government areas. I should like to know how much came in from St. Peter, St. Lucy and St. Andrew; and I challenge the Premier or any of them to deny that the amount from the City of Bridgetown represents more than 80 percent of what comes in from those areas I have just called. If you add some of them together, you will see that it represents more than 80 percent; so your unscientific approach to the taxation policy is taking an aspect of taxation within the Local Government to use it as a pool.

Mr. Speaker, let us see the other disadvantages. The Government says that the rate should be 17.5 percent. Why 17.5%? What does 17.5% relate to so far as trade and the requirements for trade are concerned? What is the premise on which you say it should be 17.5 percent? Why is it not 10% or 2%? Why should this be 17.5 percent while the other rates remain the same? Look what the Government has done. They have passed legislation in the first instance to remove certain lands from taxation; they have removed land which had a valuation from taxation. Ask them what is the price that was paid for Ashford Plantation three weeks ago. The value of land today in Barbados, Sir, has risen faster than any of the wage rates of any other rates have risen; therefore it means that people who belong to the wage earning sector are completely further away from owning land today than their forefathers were. Do they know that? Now you have a taxation policy based on so much per acre. How do we know in this age that the land area is the true assessment of determining its taxation? It is unrelated to its value, which means that if a man buys an acre of land for £50,000 and he is stupid enough to get something out of it that is worth anything, he does not pay any taxation based on what this land is valued at; he pays on the area.

Mr. Speaker, a plantation does not pay taxes on the amount of money it makes; it pays on the land area it occupies, that is, so many cents per acre. Today you are dealing with a taxation policy which was imposed at a time when people who owned plantations were in power and taxed themselves. You are carrying on the same philosophy, and that is why I say that our economic thinking must change with our political growth, because this tax is out of consonance with what has taken place in this country over the last twenty-five years. We are underwriting something that was done by people who had no part with the masses that existed in this community in relating taxation to what it should be. Why should the Premier bring in a Bill like this in which you are sharing trade? Why trade? You are at a stage where you should have a standstill and let there be a proper investigating Committee to review the whole question of tax for Local Government purposes.

A business, Mr. Speaker, has a risk attached to it. When a man opens a business in Bridgetown he pays a trade tax to the City Council. If his brother puts the same value of the business in land, although he may be getting the same returns, he does not pay the same proportion. His taxes are based on the value of his property. So you see, the same way our fore-parents thought of striking a taxation policy to suit the era and to suit them, we have to think of one that suits not us but the time that we live in and one that can stand the test of time for many years to come. I do not know if the Hon. Premier gave this House any information about trade tax from these various areas. Did he tell us how much money they got? If the Premier can tell us the amount of trade tax, we would be able to assess it; but I am putting it to the Premier that he knows he is not getting any money in trade from these other areas, and yet he wants to pool those amounts which are negligible. What is the reason for pooling? Is it for the purpose of providing these people with money when they fall short?

I never agreed with a subsidy anyhow, because I do not think the Government can justify a subsidy. You have agreed to a taxation policy, Mr. Speaker, which says that certain lands are no longer taxable. If you agree to that, you have therefore agreed to increasing the other rates unless you want standards to remain low. I think you travel in the Northern area more often than I do. The Northern District Council controls the area in which you live, and I think we have two Chairmen in here now. Since the general elections or the elections for the local Government Councils, the Government has said that it wants to centralise. I do believe Government wants to centralise and bring everything under its control; so that is where you will get a complete cycle of dictatorship. Do you know what the gentlemen in the Northern District have done? In some bogus Act Holetown is supposed to be a town; so the only lights these gentlemen thought about putting down were those in the gap by Captain Simmons leading to the beach. These people are so dumb that they have not put one street light on the main roads in St. James.

1.45 p.m.

The only light which you have there is in a gap. Where is your imagination? I see the hon. junior member for St. James smiling and he now says that he is going to attack it. When you pass Holetown going to the Church, you do not see a lighted lamp, not even by the monument and the Police Station – apart from the blue light of the Police sign. You would have thought that at the monument which is a historical place of interest they would have put a street lamp to show that it is a place which connotes something. Of course, there are no lights in Mile and a Quarter, St. Peter either. These Local Government Councils have not done one thing to tend to create new towns. Of course, it is true to say that the hon. senior member for the City possesses more political imagination than any of them. As one writer says, he is an excellent voting machine, that is to say he is symptomatic of what people like to hear and to see. He is a first class indicator. It is typical of the Labour Party jealousy that when they see people getting on in life they say that those persons are not honest, which means that you are a thief whenever you are succeeding. They have a fancy for saying that the reason why they are poor is because they are honest and efficient.

Sir, I am putting this to the Hon. Premier. On what basis are you justifying this country to provide any subsidy whatsoever for Local Government purposes if you are not satisfied that the tax policy that resides in the whole Local

Government area is modern and up-to-date? Is it that the plantation owner is not in a better position to pay? I would say that in this modern age the trade tax has no meaning. If a man has to pay income tax, that is taxation on a direct source from which you can derive money. I do think that you had better have a different method of taxation. Let us take licensing for example. You can make the owner of a store pay taxes by imposing a license on him to sell a particular thing. You can have licensing as a means of making people pay taxes. I do not believe there is anything sacrosanct in one method of taxation. Your method of taxation must be examined in the light of circumstances. Of course, all over the world nobody likes taxation. We pay a purchase tax on *ad valorem* duty; that is to say when we go and buy our shoes and shirts, we pay the purchase tax because the duty which the merchants pay in advance has been added on to the cost of the goods.

What I do not understand is this. The Central Government is laying a rate of 17.5% for trade? What is the rate you are laying for land? Are you suggesting that there should be a general rate for land too? Barbados is comprised of 166 square miles and it has a population of 230,000 people. You have some boroughs in England which are bigger than Barbados. What justification have you for saying now that there must be a fixed rate for trade tax and an unequal rate for land? What justification is there for your saying that the land tax should be no more? You are going to ride into difficulties by that.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen recently that Ashford Plantation was sold here for a fabulous amount of money, which means that the workers will have to pay for that in the future because the interest rate, operational expenses and so on are going to be charges on the business; therefore, when they put those accounts in, we will have to pay for them. I still think that the best method of laying rates should be to lay them on land. Why is it that land in St. James bordering on St. Michael is still to have a different rate than that of St. Michael? What is the difference between land in St. Thomas and land in Jackson? If you are going to say that the man in the shop on the border of St. Michael should pay the same rate as the man in the shop on the border of St. Thomas, we ask you what is the justification of having two rates for land. My belief, Mr. Speaker, is if you touch one aspect of the fundamental taxation policy of the Local Government arrangement, it means that you should have a complete review of your taxation policy.

I will also point out to the Hon. Premier the fact that he is here dealing with the Local Government Act in a fundamental manner when your elections to Local Government have only passed one session and it shows that when you did come in to make your changeover, you did it hurriedly. People warned you when you came here and pointed out about this new taxation what would have happened. Their advice was ignored. You have created this mess which we are in today. You have created this mess which is one in which the Northern and Southern District Councils have found themselves in a worse position than that which the vestries found themselves in before.
1.55 p.m.

It is nothing which we have done; the Government did it. The Northern and Southern District Councils go cap-in-hand to the Government and many of them are young people and inexperienced in administration; they are not like the old people who had property; they are young people without any political science so as to challenge our foundation of the economic system. The Northern and Southern District Councils have not come to the realisation of things; and what you are now asking for justifies a complete review of the taxation policy. If you do not do that, what is going to happen when the services improve? Does the fact that you put 17.5% answer the problem? If you give the City 80% of the 17.5% you are going to stop them from spending money in other directions in which they would spend money. Are you going to reduce the social amenities which they offer? If you take away two from twenty, eighteen will be there, and in order to get back to twenty you will have to put back the other two.

At this stage, it now being 2 p.m., of the clock,

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

On re-assembling,

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

LOSS OF INCOME BY CLERKS OF MAGISTRATES' COURTS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 27 standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, is now ready to be dealt with.

Mr. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Hon. Premier:-

1. Whether he is aware that, since enactment of Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 (1956-7, Sec. 120), Clerks of the Court have ceased to be personally in receipt of payment of the prescribed fee for a copy of Proceedings?

2. Is the Premier aware that dissatisfaction exists amongst such Clerks at loss of income sustained by them who, before the passing of this enactment, were permitted to receive such fees for themselves instead of same, as now, being paid into Court?

3. Will the Premier take steps without delay to ensure that such Clerks are adequately compensated in lieu of their loss of earnings since the coming into operation of this Act?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Replies are as follows:

1. Yes, Sir.

2. No, Sir. Enquiries have revealed that no dissatisfaction was expressed at the change in practice.

3. No steps are contemplated to compensate clerks "in lieu of their loss of earnings". The amount paid to a clerk under the former Police Magistrates' Act, 1905, was paid "as compensation to such clerk for his trouble in making such copies". Stenographers have now been provided at some of the busiest courts and at such courts copies of proceedings are prepared by them. A court clerk is now in no worse position than if he had been transferred to an office in which there is no opportunity for extra earnings.

Mr. BRANCKER: I thank the Hon. Premier for the replies. Supplementarily, I should like to enquire whether the Premier is aware that when such proceedings were done by the Clerks, in some instances they were in receipt of substantial increases of income as the result of the remuneration which they received for each set of proceedings, the average price being $2 per set. Does the Hon. Premier agree that if such clerks have been accustomed to receive such amounts as fees, their present budget, as a result of their no longer being entitled to receive such fees, must be considerably and adversely affected?
2.35 p.m.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. Premier realise that up to now no arrangements have been made for the typing of proceedings by typists at the Courts of "D", "E" and "F" although there are typists available for "A", "B" and "C", with the result that the Clerks at "D", "E" and "F" still have to do the job for which they no longer receive remuneration? In consequence the litigants who are in need for themselves or their legal advisers of complete proceedings have to wait for an unduly long time to obtain such necessary copies of proceedings in a case which may well have gone to a Higher Court on appeal.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that supplementary questions 1 and 2 are adequately answered by the reply I gave just now to Question No. 3. With regard to the third question in which the hon. member is saying that the Clerks in these other Courts are still typing these proceedings, if that is still being done, I am not aware of it; but since he has brought it to my attention, I will make further inquiries. The answer given here is that stenographers have now been provided at some of the busiest courts, and a court clerk is now in no worse position than if he had been transferred to an office in which there is no opportunity for extra earnings. That is the point that should be taken into consideration. I repeat that I will make further enquiries with regards to Districts "D", "E" and "F".

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, does the Hon. Premier not recall that I have more than once in this Chamber drawn to his attention as Minister of Finance that there is the need for a typist for the Courts at "D", "E" and "F"? Does the Premier not realise that the Court of District "D" is within his own constituency, the parish of St. Thomas? And will the Premier, irrespective of its being an election year, take the necessary steps to ensure that without further delay a typist is provided for the Court at "D" which will also serve the Court at "F", and that similar steps be taken to ensure that "E" would not be the only Court in this island without a typist?

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

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

Question No. 30 was also asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy who is not in his place; and Question No. 21 was asked by the same hon. member who is not in his place.

Mr. Speaker, in respect of those four sets of questions by the hon. member, may I request that they be allowed to stand over until the next meeting of this Chamber?

MESSAGE FROM THE OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage, I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Other Place.

"The Legislative Council to the Honourable the House of Assembly.

The Legislative Council have the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly a Bill to provide for the hours of duty of domestic employees which has been passed with amendments which are shown written on the Bill."

I direct that these amendments be printed before circulation to hon. members.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 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 speaking.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion when this matter was being discussed, I was trying to make the point that there should be more specific information given by the introducer of this Resolution in order to convince not only members but the Government that something exists in the colony detrimental to the sugar industry before he could ask Government to institute an inquiry.

Now, Sir, I made certain remarks on the last occasion which I intend to carry a little further today. I want to say first of all that though it might be politically expedient to come along with a thing like this, yet I think that any Legislature or any legislator has a duty to perform so far as this country is concerned. I go further and say that irrespective of what anybody else thinks, agriculture in Barbados should not be a political toy in the hands of any individual or an individual party; it is the life blood of the people of Barbados, and it must not be used as a fulcrum for any individual or any Party. I know whereof I speak. I have suffered at the hands of certain things such as this where people use the sugar industry and the sugar workers as a fulcrum to prop themselves up, and to make people believe that they are their heroes and their gods, to the detriment, perhaps of the people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the long history behind sugar. On the other hand, I would say that I was very instrumental from my early political days in helping to solve some of these very vexed questions; but what obtained in 1944 does not obtain today in the year 1961. I am proud of the part I have played in bringing about these changes, but I am not the only pebble on the beach. There are those who have contributed immensely in bringing about these changes. The methods adopted in 1944 are out of date in 1961; and if you perhaps did a service in 1944, the method you use today in 1961 might become a deterrent. 2.45 p.m.

I am very glad that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has taken his seat because on the last occasion I made a few remarks and I would like him to hear them. Just for his information, I am going to repeat what I said before he came in. I said that the sugar industry of Barbados must not be a political toy for any particular individual or any particular Party because it is the life blood of all of the people; therefore, it should be handled in a statesmanlike and businesslike manner. The sugar industry before our time was in a mess. I have heard of the time when a manager would walk around with a few cents in his waistcoat pocket and pay the people; but today it is not so. We have fought a long drawn out battle and we have got the industry to the point where we can talk intelligently on the matter.

I was saying on the last occasion when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was not in his seat that the hon. senior member for St. Philip posed a question from which one would have to conclude that the Unionists are not doing their work and are not representing the agricultural workers of Barbados. It is essentially a matter for the Trade Union in Barbados and, so far as I know, the hon. senior member for St. Philip has no Union representing agricultural workers. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is, I believe, the accredited General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union; so, if something is wrong with agricultural workers, I think he would be the first person who ought to know: and if you want an enquiry into the industry, if it comes from him, it would bear more weight than if it came from a solitary politician.

I remember one day the hon. senior member for St. Philip brought a Resolution in here and the late Mr. "T. T." Lewis said that it was the biggest piece of foolishness brought on the floor of this House in that Session. Of course, there are tricks of trade.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We were told that the late Mr. "T. T" Lewis said that some Resolution brought in here was the biggest piece of foolishness brought on the floor of this House during that Session, but we were not told what the Resolution was about.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, I was saying.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to say that it is an inveterate lie for anybody to say that the late Mr. "T. T." Lewis ever characterised any Resolution which I brought here as foolishness. There

is no record of the House to prove it. There was one single occasion on which I brought a Resolution to this House with which the late Mr. "T. T." Lewis did not agree, and that Resolution asked to send a member of this House along with the Governor of Barbados at that time to the U.S.A. on an emigration mission — and that member gave his reasons for disagreeing with the Resolution.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this Resolution points out that the future of the sugar industry is uncertain. It reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the future of the sugar industry is uncertain and there is therefore urgent need to place every phase of its operation on the most rational basis;

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Government take steps to invite the Sugar Enquiry Commission under the chairmanship of Mr. J. Carl Goldenberg, Canadian economist-lawyer, which recently enquired into the sugar industry of Jamaica, with such excellent results for the workers and cane farmers, to undertake a most exhaustive investigation into all phases of the sugar industry of Barbados."

That is his request. Agriculture has something to do with my Ministry; it is the main thing of my Ministry. While I was in Jamaica, I made certain investigations and had serious conversations with certain people and I can say that there are certain aspects relative to agriculture in Jamaica which I do not like. Some of us are politicians and remain politicians. Some of us are statesmen and remain statesmen as long as we live. When an enquiry has to be made, we have got to think of the political philosophy of the person or persons who are going to enquire into that particular thing. If you have got a Conservative person to enquire into a Socialist matter, I do not think that you are doing the right thing. Therefore, you have got to know what is the person's political philosophy. Some people feel that Conservatism is all right and there is nothing wrong with it; therefore, it should be maintained. Some people follow a Socialist pattern and they would advise you on that.

I do not know the political philosophy of Mr. Carl Goldenberg, but this I do know. Immediately after his investigation into the industry in Jamaica, it ran into full mechanisation, therefore, throwing thousands of people out of work. There are some people who would give you a few cents with one hand and take away twelve cents from you with the other.

That is why I say that the sugar industry of Barbados must not be a political football. We have no other industries; therefore, anything which we do as regards it, we must do in a statesmanlike manner and with the best motives. Do not send these poor people starving. Let it be no political football.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and merely for the sake of putting the records accurate. May I say that Mr. Goldenberg conducted the enquiry into the Jamaica sugar industry late in 1959 and early in last year and that this mechanisation which we are hearing from the hon. member has been taking place there before.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I too rise on a point of order. When I came in here, the Hon. Minister repeated this talk of being a statesman twice. I do not know if it was for my benefit that he said that this matter should not be made a political football. He did say at first that on the last occasion, I was not here, and now that I am here, he wants to say something for my benefit. I do not know if the hon. member wants to say that I was making the sugar industry a political football. That is the reason why I rise to get a full explanation.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, up to now, I have not accused anybody yet. I am making general remarks. When I started to speak on the last occasion, hon. members will recall that the hon. senior member for St. Philip said that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was out of the island and therefore, I should not refer to the Workers Union as such.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Nothing of the kind transpired. My remarks deploring the absence of the hon. senior member for St. Peter at the time when the hon. junior member for St. Philip was speaking, referred most specifically and emphatically to remarks made by him about the Mc.Kenzie reports.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: That is right. At last the hon. member has made a true statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw the words "at last".

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member has made a true statement. I am not directing my remarks at any one person; I mean my remarks to anybody who does this thing. I am not singling out the hon. member as a member of the Union or anything like that. When I referred to certain remarks which the hon. member made, he was then negotiating with the Government; he was out of the Island and we did not know how he stood on the matter. I do not mean anything derogatory about him. Of course, if the hon. member could see into the matter as he saw years ago, he would have been the first to vote against this Resolution. As Minister of Agriculture, I am responsible to the people of this colony for things agricultural and I must make my contribution to this debate.

If the hon. senior member for St. Peter is really the General Secretary of the Union, certainly he has a moral obligation in this matter. He cannot get away from it. However he may dislike taking part in this matter on the Government side, he certainly has a moral obligation. This is a question of the people's bread and butter and it must be done in a dignified manner. I am saying that the vital point which the introducer of this Resolution did not make was the purpose for which he wanted this enquiry. Is it a question of a wage dispute, is it that the peasants are not getting enough money for their canes or is it that the canes are not taken properly or something like that? Is it that the Union has failed to represent the people in this industry and therefore you want to come along and make proper representation on their behalf? There are a number of things in this matter, but the three major things are those which I have mentioned. If the hon. member has seen a break-down or if he thinks that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not doing his work and he is in coalition with somebody else, well, let the hon. member say so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that my interpretation of my membership of this Chamber is not for the purpose of finding out whether the hon. senior member for St. Peter is doing his job or not? That is all I want to say.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I have to labour this question because I happen to be a member of the Government. If the Government has to see about this matter and some person has done some meritorious service, we must get a clear understanding of what is happening. What is the reason behind this? Is it just a major in a minor? The Government has to be a responsible body and it cannot adhere to the whims and fancies of everybody who comes along and suggests something without having certain substantial facts. Therefore, I ask, what are the general complaints? Is there a break-down in wages? On that score I think I am qualified to say that only quite recently there was a wage increase in the sugar industry for which I am very pleased. I will show my hand now; on occasions I have told the planters: "Please do not be stubborn because we are entering on Election year and I do not know what these people might be up to; so try and settle this question at once. Anything you can pay, please pay and do not be stubborn."

When I heard that this matter was settled I was absolutely happy; it was done as a domestic matter between the Secretary of the Union and the Sugar Producers' Association. Earlier in the year there was another agreement concluded. Therefore I would like the hon. member to tell the Government what are the reasons for this thing. What are the motives? Can the hon. senior member for St. Philip tell

us that the Union has agreed to less than what it should have agreed to? In the days when we were in the Congress Party the Observer would come out at every beck and call and say: "The agricultural workers are being taken for a ride; they should get 17% and now they are only getting 12 1/2%.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Those are the good old days. *(Laughter).*

3.05 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I do not see any such headlines today. Perhaps they have served their purpose. These are things which the Secretary of the Union should really make clear to us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, they did serve their purpose. They made the Government.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: No, no, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: I say, yes, yes, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I mean is this. The inference from the remark was to get a fillip in which they could get a majority of seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not the time for that. The hon. member has full time to reply.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member started out by saying the future of the sugar industry is uncertain. Is he serious when he says that? Does he understand what a statement like that means? Do you know what would happen? I would have to go to some island where there is a grant-in-aid and that sort of thing. Without sugar and proper management on the plantations, what would happen? That is why I made the remark earlier that this is not a toy in the hands of children. I think, Sir, that this should be dealt with in a statesmanlike manner and not thrown about like that. I think the hon. member knows too well.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member but he is not dealing with infants. The hon. member asked if I knew what I meant when I said that the future of the sugar industry is uncertain. Even to ask a question like that is so stupid that it hardly deserves a reply; but in my opening remarks, I explained what I meant in detail about the uncertainty in the sugar industry, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter not only understood what I said, but went further and added to my remarks the question of beet sugar. At full length I explained what I meant about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. senior member for St. Philip rises again on a point of order which is not a point of order, I will tell him that he is making things exceedingly difficult for himself and giving himself untold and unnecessary worry, because he has the right to reply. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture in contributing to this debate asked whether the hon. senior member for St. Philip knows what he is saying when he says that the future of the sugar industry is uncertain, but the hon. member did not wait and contain himself in the way all people who want to debate properly would do to hear everything that had to be said. The hon. member has said nothing approaching a point of order, nothing with the faintest association to a point of order.

I have given him unnecessary and undue latitude as he rose to speak because he did not attempt to speak on a point of order; but I am going to tell him now that I will rule him out of order if he gets up once again in this debate to reply on what I deem is not a point of order. Absolutely no point of order arises when an hon. member in the course of a debate asked whether another hon. member realises what he said. What does it mean? As I begun by saying, the hon. senior member for St. Philip is unnecessarily and unduly tormenting himself.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, those are tactics used when they want to cut my trend of thought; but I think the hon. member knows me so well. I am just like a bulldog; when you drive him back to the wall, he is at his best. Every time I sit down I get up with new ideas; so there is no use in trying that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter and the hon. member is trying to get out of it and trying to be facetious.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object to that. Facetious what? Let him keep that for the people sitting next to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Philip has objected to the use of the word "facetious". It is not unparliamentary and there is nothing to be unduly worried about. I believe that every hon. member in this ancient and Honourable House has made use of similar words and even of the word "facetious". No hon. member need be unduly worried, especially when there is the right to reply.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, am I to sit here and allow my attitude to be interpreted?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I said a while ago that the hon. member's Resolution started off by saying "Whereas the future of the sugar industry is uncertain". I want to know, Sir, what prompted him to say so and what are the motives, because he, like all of us, realises that we are not a big community with a large area of land. He knows our population number per square mile; he knows what sugar means; and he knows too that there is a Commonwealth agreement whereby the future of sugar at least until 1968 is guaranteed; so there is really no cause for alarm on that particular score. The price is also guaranteed, and only last year I think the price was up to £3. 10/- or £3. 8/- as it was originally, and these negotiations come up for review every now and again, so that the future of sugar in Barbados is linked up with the whole Commonwealth and international conditions. We would have to have a domestic upheaval or something disastrous for me to even think of this; because on the international scene we are taken care of until 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to be as clear as I possibly can on this point. On the international scene so far as the price and marketing of sugar is concerned, we are fixed until 1968.

3.15 p.m.

So far as the Union is concerned in Barbados, it has got the complete lot of agricultural workers and sugar workers and factory workers organised. I do not know what percentage of field workers they have organised, but I think the General Secretary told me that he represents agriculture so that he and I would have something in common. I forgot to bring along with me a little pamphlet which was sent to me from Great Britain by some of my Union friends whom I have over there. The Unionists and the Government should work in close collaboration in every country of the world. That is a fact. That has been pointed out most emphatically in that booklet. It has been stressed that all Trade Unionists should work in close harmony with the Government in power. It is for the General Secretary of the Trade Union and the Department of Agriculture to see to it that agriculture does not die in Barbados and that the workers get a fair remuneration and that the industry is kept alive. All of the problems which he cannot solve, he and I should get together and try to solve them. Sometimes I meet him on Broad Street and he and I shake hands and I must say that at other times we do not speak. It is incumbent on us to work together to save this industry from abandonment. Where would we be if agriculture is abandoned?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister might not have been specific but I think he said that I speak on occasions to him and on other occasions we do not speak. I do not know about the occasions when we did not speak. Maybe, I was speaking to him and he was not speaking to me.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member need not catch at that. We can do away with these grouses in order to get

together on much wider questions. I have viewed this as a matter of the moment and I do not think, as I have said, that this is the time for us to major in minor.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I can rise on a point of explanation? I think I should be allowed to explain now because it would give the impression that the Union does not go to Government in matters on which it should go to Government. In the majority of matters which the Union has been to the Government with, they have been settled amicably. There is one exception and that is the question of the McKenzie Report. That is the only matter on which I did not see eye to eye with the Government.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: What I was saying, Sir, when you get questions such as this, if they are not dealt with intelligently, they can bring fear into the hearts of certain people.

Now, Sir, I do not want to be spasmodic or to be sensational. By spasmodic, I mean that you introduce something into the House of Assembly at a time when it suits your purpose without the corresponding significance. I said that I do not want to be sensational because some poor people do not understand to all intents and purposes what finance is and how things are done in a businesslike manner; therefore, matters like this could better be resolved by the General Secretary of the Union in conjunction with the Director of Agriculture. Bulletins can be sent out and broadcasts made from time to time to tell the people what is happening and to educate them along certain lines: but this sensational way is just dealing with our life blood in a very casual way. Sugar is our life blood and the agricultural workers in Barbados are the backbone of the whole set up. They are the key to this whole thing and this must not be made a political toy. When something is wrong, let it be done in a businesslike way and get the backing of Government to support it.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip has been jumping up on points of order. You will have trouble getting up again, Mr. Speaker, I can see more clearly than any other person in this House or any person in Barbados why this Resolution has been brought about at this time because the hon. senior member for St. Philip and I have been buddies for years and this is how he managed to put me out of the House of Assembly. This is the method which he has been using to rise to power. He uses the agricultural labourers as his fulcrum and yet he means no good towards them. That is why I let this aspect of the matter get into this debate. You must have a beginning: so to get this beginning the hon. member brings this Resolution into this House only to get a big splash and then carry it in the Observer, so that the people would see that the Editor of the Observer was asking certain questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Hon. Minister not to question the motives of hon. members. I do not think the hon. member should say what the motives of the Hon. Mover of this Resolution are.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, I have expressed an opinion and I can carry it further to its logical conclusion. The hon. member and I were very good friends. That is a fact. On one occasion, he asked me to go through the length and breadth of St. Philip to carry out a political campaign more or less of this nature with him and I refused: and he used that same refusal to tell the people that I would not tell them something which I knew was true.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I must object most strongly to the remarks of the hon. member for the simple reason that the hon. member knows that every single word that he has said is an absolute lie.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: How is that?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Just before the 1951 General Elections I brought on the floor of this House a Resolution asking the Governor at that time, Sir Alfred Savage, to have an enquiry into the sugar industry, a thing which he did. He brought an economist here - Mr. Duffie - and that economist made certain recommendations for back pay for these workers. It was the first back-pay paid to workers in the sugar industry of this Island and it was something on which that Party rose to power in the 1951 elections. The point is this. Before I brought the Resolution in, I called on the hon. junior member for St. Philip to come with me to hold meetings in St. Philip to explain the position to the electorate and his reply to me was: "I cannot even get my canes cut. I had to ask Foursquare to cut my canes for me. Do you expect me to leave my house and go and talk to people like that?" What I am saying here now, I have said throughout the length and breadth of the parish of St. Philip.
3.25 p.m.

I challenge the hon. junior member for St. Philip to come with me to St. Philip on any night he likes next week and deny what I am saying. He can choose any place he wants.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has really explained his point of order.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: If the hon. member is so barefaced as to come in this House and repeat what he has been repeating on the soap-box, then he is a character. There is no hope for a character like that, and I ask Almighty God to have mercy on that man's soul.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Benediction is not necessary.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have never been charged with shoplifting *(ASIDES)*.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Philip rose on a point of order and waxed exceedingly warm and even got out of control. I know that the hon. member will regret that he got out of control.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I have never been reported for putting water in milk. *(ASIDES)*.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being disorder, I now suspend the sitting of this House for half an hour.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was addressing the Chair.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I was saying before the hon. member got up and interrupted, that while I know quite a lot about the best intention of similar Resolutions, it would only be logical for me, in the absence of anything factual in this Resolution and on the speech made by the introducer of the Resolution, to say that it is part and parcel of the old scheme of things. To this Resolution, I took exception. I went further and said what I have seen as a result of similar things like this, and the hon. member could not take it. I have a lot more things to say and if I do not say them now, I will say them at the proper time. Some people, because of a kind heart and because of tendencies do not think it right to ride roughshod over other individuals but I think that genuine charity should never be misrepresented as a sign of weakness. I say no more on that. The time is coming when I will say much more on it not only under the cover of the privileges of the House, but I will say them where I think they will be better felt.

Any man who sets out to destroy his benefactor is doomed to failure; any man who sets out to destroy, politically or otherwise, his benefactor has got to be watched in a community. Sitting beside the hon. member is the hon. senior member for Christ Church who knows of my benefaction and generosity towards the hon. member in every respect. On one occasion, the hon. senior member for Christ Church looked up at both of us and said: "You have not only found a godfather in St. Philip but you have found a father." Let either of them deny that; if he denies that, may God have mercy on his soul.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. That the hon. member has extended certain kindnesses to the mover of this Resolution, I have no doubt; but as to my having used the word "father" or "benefactor", I do not recall that.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I say no more about that. I could say a lot of things if I wanted to be dirty. I want to show

why the hon. member should have absolute facts in bringing forward a thing like this. As to the dirt and slime, I could go a lot further but I will not go any further.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I challenged you on that already.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not to be a dialogue; this must be a pure debate. *(ASIDES).*

Can hon. members so easily forget that not so long ago there was suspension of this sitting directed by me because there was disorder in the House? The hon. members for St. Philip have not yet quieted down sufficiently, it appears, in order that the debate may proceed in an orderly manner.
4.05 p.m.

Hon. members must remember that asides that are so loud as to provoke the wrong type of reaction on the part of hon. members should be discouraged in the House. If hon. members — and especially the hon. members representing the parish of St. Philip — would like this debate to proceed, they have it in their hands, not I. All I have in my hands is the control of the order. If they cause disorder, they then must take the blame for any abrupt ending of the debate, and then I will be absolutely impartial and innocent in the matter. Hon. members, there you have it; do as you care to do.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I always like to be obedient to the Chair, and I have the greatest respect for you and your authority; therefore I will desist from any further personal comment although I have some more to make.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to find out three things from the hon. member; things which he did not cover in his introductory speech nor has he laid them out here as a basis for this inquiry.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have to rise again on a point of order. This is about the seventh or eighth time that the hon. junior member for St. Philip has said that I gave no facts in my speech in support of this Resolution. That is not true. If I make a speech in here and it is beyond people to understand, or they do not care to understand, that is their business, not mine; but I am not going to have them make mis-statements about anything I did here.

In the speech which I made in support of this Resolution, I gave all the relevant facts why this inquiry should be conducted. If he cannot read or has not read them, it is a matter for him. I am not going to sit here and let him say I did not make them because they are in the Hansard of the House.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, it would have been a good thing if he had said that there was a wage dispute between the workers and the sugar industry and what part the Union is playing. It would have been a good thing to have told us, which he didn't, if he is dissatisfied that the peasants are not getting an equitable price for their canes, or if there are conditions of work in the sugar industry with which he disagrees, and if he feels that because the Union is not representing these people fully he has stepped to fill the breach. I went further and said that the person whom he recommended to this Government for carrying out this inquiry has visited Jamaica, and since leaving Jamaica, the sugar industry there has been in a pitiable plight. I said too, Sir, that the factory owners have taken to complete mechanisation of the industry.

I am sure, Sir, that Barbadians would have read not so long ago how twelve hundred acres of canes were lost because of fire. I take it that the workers were not satisfied with the result of Mr. Goldenberg's inquiry or recommendations. As I said before, it might have been that they got wind of his advice to pay them a little more or advising the owners of plantations to mechanise in their own interest; I do not know; but a lot of mechanisation has been carried out since he made his inquiry and recommendations which leaves one to judge and come to any conclusion. I am submitting, Sir, that while we in Barbados want to get the maximum pay for agricultural workers, yet we are not going to be a party to any introduction of further mechanisation and putting people out of work. Whatever profits there are in the sugar industry, the industry must have some and the workers must have their share. That is our policy and we do not want any high-pressure economist with his, perhaps, ultra-modern ideas to come here and tell us that if we are having trouble with our labourers, the only thing to do would be to pay some of them a little more money and mechanise.

Mr. Speaker, I saw some of this mechanisation in St. Kitts, and I have been telling quite a few farmers who count in Barbados that they had better go easy and slow with the entire mechanisation of the sugar industry in Barbados. If they want to continue in their position in this colony, they have got to abide by the principle of 'live-and-let-live'. This is a very delicate question at the moment, Mr. Speaker, and I am saying that we have got to be very careful how we negotiate and what we are asking for. I do not know this gentleman; I can only speak of what has happened since he went to Jamaica and made his inquiry, and anyone is entitled to come to his conclusions after seeing the results. The thing that struck me most is the fact which would not only be a headache for the Government but for all people of goodwill in Barbados: that is, to have our sugar industry disintegrated and to have further trouble when we can negotiate amicably. The Union is there for that work, and what the Union cannot do, of course the Government can do. The Union not long ago negotiated and succeeded in getting higher out of crop wages. I think the men who got $2.76 cents or something like that now get $3 and the women who got $1.84 now get $2.08.

I am not here to defend the plantocracy at all. I, like some of the other peasants, want the most we can get for our produce, because I am in the same boat as the peasants. I have a crop to sell every year; so I could have no part with the plantocracy. I do not manufacture sugar, I sell the primary product; therefore I have to represent them and see that justice is done; but at the same time it does not behove any of us to use it politically so that we will cause untold suffering to innocent people. We cannot use them as pawns in our hands in getting ourselves pivoted into certain positions.
4.15 p.m.

As I have said before, we should not be majoring in minor. That is not good enough. I think I know a little of the sugar industry of Barbados. I have studied it and I have come into contact with the people who deal with it. I am saying that the Union and the Government — I do not care what kind of Government it is — will always have to see to it that the conditions of service and the rates of pay for the sugar workers are the best than can be had for the workers in order that the sugar industry should survive. We who go to the other islands have seen that because sugar has been abandoned, or the land abandoned in the planting of sugar cane, there has been stark poverty. When they come here and see what we have done with it, they have nothing but words of praise for us for having done so much and for doing so much with our one-crop industry. That is because of the sanity we have given to this line of business. We have not taken the industry and made a play toy of it. We have always thought of it as the life blood of our nation. That is the reason why people ask the questions: How is it that Barbados can maintain so big a population on so small an area of land and with such a comparatively high standard of living when compared with the other islands?" You do not have to go far to see the reason. We have got the method, the management and the ability to do it and we are trying to hold on to that all the time.

Sir, I consider if there was any grave anxiety in the industry that the very first person who should alarm us would be the General Secretary of the Union. But this does not come from him. Quite recently he negotiated for workers in the industry and I take it that he must have been satisfied as a result of the negotiations. I think he asked for 10% increase for those workers. I do not know what it is; I do not know if the hon. senior member for St. Philip

that he should have got 12% or 17%. I do not know, but my argument is that the people who are organised to deal with these matters should deal with them and you should not lead them to a political scrap heap where they can create disunity, sorrow and regret.

I have some figures here with me and they are very recent. If the hon. member wants to claim that the peasants are not getting sufficient money for their canes, I think we can still answer that to his satisfaction at the moment. It is true to say that all of us want more money for our canes. Some of the cane farmers who have no shares in the factory would want more money because they do not share in the production of sugar; they only sell their canes to the factory. I do not make any boast because I, like the peasant, sell my canes to the factory; therefore, whatever we can get for our canes we want and we want the most. But when you compare the figures which we get for our canes with what peasants in some of the other West Indian islands are getting, you will see that we are making a good job, so far as we know. That is why I said sometime ago that this Government has the right to get an agricultural economist because we do not want to lose anything in the industry. We want a man who knows what he is talking about when he talks. We do not want to be guided by the Sugar Producers Association. We feel that the Government should have its own agricultural economist and that is what we are working towards.

I will quote you a few figures to show that the Barbados Government and the Union are not leaving the workers in the lurch. I will quote the prices paid for peasant canes in the various colonies and these are figures for 1959. In British Guiana they paid $9.01 per ton; British Honduras paid $9.51; Grenada paid $9.91; St. Kitts paid $8.86; St. Lucia paid $12.20. The cane farmer in Barbados during the same year was paid $16.10. Antigua paid $13.52, so you can see that Barbados is above the others when it comes to what the peasant farmer receives for his canes. I do not make any boast about that because I would like to hear that they get $20 per ton. That is why I say that the Government will be well advised to get its own agricultural economist. Those are the most recent figures which I have seen. The letter with the figures which came from Grenada is dated 20th March, 1961. That from St. Kitts is dated 25th March, 1961. Jamaica is hoping to send us theirs but they have not yet arrived.

Sir, I can go on reading quite a lot to show that much attention is being paid in Barbados to these things and to show that we are not unmindful of the people. When you think that all of these West Indian islands sell sugar to the same source and they all get the same price, you can see that the peasant farmer is well taken care of here. We in Barbados must always see to it that a return to the old days is never allowed and that planters and factory owners of Barbados must realise that the economy of this country depends upon a successful sugar crop and a proper distribution of the wealth. They must not take upon themselves the opportunity to hoard the wealth and leave the country poverty stricken because the Government will not be able to do any social work if they cannot get the money circulated. We are a partner in this business.

Mr. Speaker, you know just as well as I do that when one flies over this country all that one can see are fields of canes. There are very few light industries which we have in Barbados, and up to now, their presence cannot be felt financially. They are young and they are now springing up, it is true that you have a couple of old industries but the new ones must be protected. They want many things which the old ones have. We have not reached the stage of industrialisation where we can say that we are going to cease with the sugar industry or where we can let people take it into their hands and do as they like with it.
4.25 p.m.

Any Government which is coming into power should keep the sugar industry and the Department of Agriculture in a proper state. I want to say that the Ministry of Agriculture has to provide a lot of services. They have to see what are the best breed of canes commercially and otherwise and they have to provide information as to moth borer pests and as to all sorts of diseases. It is a service for which people do not pay and it is because the Government realises the importance of this Department that we have to keep a watchful eye on things.

At this stage, it now being 4.30 p.m. of the clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 p.m. of the clock and the House will revert to the consideration of Government Business.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: When Government Business was last under consideration, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958.

Mr. WALCOTT: On the adjournment, I was making the point and I drew it to the Premier's attention, that this tax is a mathematical deduction which he should examine very carefully. If you want $20 million and you take away $2 million, then you have only $18 million. But you have to spend $20 million and therefore you have to get the other $2 million from some other source. The purpose of this Bill it to levy a uniform rate of trade tax in the three Local Government areas, but the Premier knows what the position is. I am quoting from what he himself said in Queen's Park. He said that the rates were exorbitant and that the rate of the City Council should be 14%. Today, however, he is introducing a Bill and in that Bill there is the proposal that the Trade Tax should be levied on a uniform basis and that basis should be 17.5%. That is the complete antithesis of local taxation and fiscal policy. In Local Government you do not lay the rate first; you have to know what you are going to spend. That is why you have all the safeguards of going to the Governor-in-Executive Committee. A Local Government Council is not to make money; you have to provide services and you have to lay a rate to provide those services. Local Government is not like the Central Government which can budget for a surplus; the theory is that, as the taxpayer cannot get back a rebate, you carry forward the amount for his own use. The theory of laying rates for a municipality or county is that you do not levy rates for a surplus; you only borrow money for what is required for carrying out your services and you do not call upon people in any one year to repay money. On what basis can the Premier say that there should be a rate of 17.5%? And to receive what? Trade is something which fluctuates. If you say that 17.5% is the rate for trade, what are you putting for property which should remain static for the next ten years? If you say that the trade rate is 17.5% you must remember that trade fluctuates. If you have a recession in the United States of America tomorrow, that will affect all the trade rates you make. When you lay that rate, you are working on the hypothesis that you know what is the amount of money you require. What is the amount which you require?

This Bill, the Government would have to agree, is an admission of inefficiency. You should not have to bring down a Bill like this where the Session for Local Government has not yet passed. You did not have to do this for one hundred years as a means of financing the Vestries. I am not speaking for the hon. senior member for the City because he is capable of speaking for himself. Look at the requirements of the City; what the City requires you will not require in a country area. You do not have to provide baths or sanitary services for canes; you do not have to provide for canes the amenities which you have to provide for human beings. In the rural areas the population is not as congested as it is in the City of Bridgetown; nowhere in the City of Bridgetown is there a square mile which is not populated. The density of population in St. Michael and in Bridgetown is like that of Manhattan with its skyscrapers; in St. Michael in 15 square miles you have about 100,000 people. You have something in the vicinity of 6 1/2 thousand people to the square mile in the City.
4.35 p.m.

The services for the City will always be greater owing to its density, and like all cities all over the world, you have to provide more expensive services. Let us take the postal arrangements in the City; there are more deliveries in the City than in the rural areas because that is where

the business is, and people come from the country to town. When you say that the City Council will not be allowed to use all the money collected but that it will be put in a pool, we should like to know how much you are getting from the other places. We should like to know what is the trade potential if you say the rate should be 17.5%. Is it a number which you have pulled out of a bag or is it a figure arrived at on some scientific basis?

Mr. Speaker, why are you now for the first time legislating in advance for Local Government arrangements in taxation? It has never happened before. Local Government must pay what is required at the time; if you do not need any money, then you do not tax. Local Government taxation, Mr. Speaker, is a "must"; it is based on what you do. That is to say, for the things you provide you do not make a man pay a local tax, because he lives in the community and pays other taxes. If you own a house, it is not to say that you do not pay taxes because there are rates on the house; you pay income tax, you buy food and contribute to the community. The very house you build makes a contribution to the community through labour. The reason why Local Government has sprung up was because it was always impossible for the Central Government to know the needs of local areas and therefore the Local Government Councils would go into this. There are three Councils in Barbados, but the three Councils still mean eleven parishes. When you have decided that these eleven parishes need 17.5% in trade tax, how much trade tax is coming from the parishes other than St. Michael and Christ Church?

Why should the rate be 17.5% and not 10% or 20%, Mr. Speaker? Why must you put a tax on trade before you know what you require? Why not a tax on land? If you say there should be a uniform tax on trade, what are the barriers to putting one on land? What is the fundamental difference between trade and land? Why should land be rated on the acreage and not on its value? If a man is paying $12 an acre and he owns 100 acres, who says that that is the best method of calculating what he should pay when the 100 acres he has are more valuable and worth so much that what he pays is not equitable and you could get more from it? Why should there not be a re-assessment of the whole structural arrangement? Why come to dabble with something that does not answer the question? When you fix the rate at 17.5% in advance, the money which you earmark is going to be used as part of the total expenditure for running the Council.

A trade tax is not used only for people who run businesses; the money collected is to be used for putting down sanitation and meeting some of the other requirements of Local Government; so when you have a situation like that you are stipulating a certain tax to put in a fund not to be used for a special purpose, but for the general purpose of running the Council. What justification can there be for saying that because you collected more money, there should be a 17.5% tax? Because St. Michael or the City Council collects 17.5% you are working on that percentage, which means that you are striking at the amount of money they have. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has asked you what you are asking such people to tell the community they represent. Are you asking them to reduce the standards they now have by saying they do not need $2 million they only require $1 1/2 million?

I will say quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, that if the economic position in Barbados goes on the way it is going, the City Council will have more people pressing on the social services than they have now, because there is a general tendency that people leave the rural areas and come to the urban areas whenever there is a little depression in the hope of finding employment especially in an agricultural community. In an agricultural community where the land cannot hold anymore people, the people normally huddle to town and that is the reason why there are so many slums in the city. People leave the country and come to town and sleep anywhere because town at least has more of the amenities around it, and there are the prospects of snatching a job, snatching a feed or snatching something even if it is snatching in its true sense. In the country, life is more settled and everybody knows everybody else.

I do not see any justification, Mr. Speaker, for the Hon. Premier introducing a Bill of this nature, nor do I see any logic in it, because a uniform rate in one aspect of fundamental taxation is just as if we come in here and in our fiscal policy decided to have one rate for income tax and not income tax on a graduated scale in order that those who can pay will pay. You come here and say that trade should be uniform; but land should not be uniform nor should property be uniform. Why should a man in St. Thomas have a house with rental value of $2,000 and a man in St. Michael have one of $2,000 and yet they must pay two different rates? What uniformity is there is that?

There are three sources from which you get money, and these are land, property and trade. If you have a house in St. Thomas with a rental value of $50 a month and I have one in St. Michael with a rental value of $50 a month, although you are talking about uniform rate, yet I must pay one rate and he must pay another. Now I could quite see if the hon. member had come here and said that the whole policy of Local Government taxation was that there was going to be a uniform rate on land, property and trade, because we could then investigate it and everybody in Barbados would see that there would be no real difference.

4.45 p.m.

You can then pool the money and say to the people in Christ Church that you cannot raise the taxes any more than this, no matter what you pay as a rate. The City is the richest part; therefore, like the U.S.A., this is what they do centrally. Whenever the Federal Government of the U.S.A. provides all of the State Governments with subsidies for specific things, for example, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it is done as a vote. They have it that as long as a State Government passes a law dealing with certain welfare projects but does not have enough money to carry out the projects, the Federal Government out of Federal Government Funds will make up the funds to carry out such projects for that State, and you will find that each State sends financial advisers to Washington in order to put their case. Of course, in a big State like New York you do not ask for any help; therefore, I say that if you want to have a purchase tax and you want to utilise it for the purpose of giving the Local Government a subsidy, or you want to lay a rate on houses or some rate on property or land you should lay the nominal rate which would produce the amount of money which you need. If the people with plantations say that they are worth the amount of money when they are selling it for more, well then, they are worthy of giving a little more to the State. As I have said, a plantation was just sold for £75,000 or $360,000 and for the most part it was rab land. They have it here in the Act that you do not pay any tax for rab land but that is part of the price for which they sold that plantation. When you go to buy a plantation you see what they have set up is something like this: it consists of 100 acres of arable land, so much of pasture land and so much of rab land.

When you talk of rab land, look how many of the agricultural labourers are living on rab land. The Government has just bought some rab land at Forde's which is swampy land on top of that. They have just bought Bagatelle rab land and turned it into a quarry and you know that when you are finished with a quarry you can do nothing with it but fill it in with stuff. When you hear them talking of rab land, they talk of it as if it is bad food. If you go up in Delamere Land, you will find that it is rab land and it has good valuation in so far as your putting a house on it. As I have just said, a plantation was just sold out for $360,000. Are you thinking of the economic problems which beset us; are you thinking of this stark economic situation before us? With this stark economic situation facing us, you should make a complete study of the problem so as to say that if rab land can bring this sort of price, therefore, it means that if a reasonable taxation is imposed on such land it would not be burdensome. The money for that plantation has to be paid in Barbados even if an Englishman bought it. I know that there are local owners: but even if the capital comes from outside to purchase something, it means that something inside must earn it.

Speaking about the sugar industry, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture said not long ago that the people in the indus-

try know their business. If that is so, do not think that they will pay $360,000 for a plantation which they believe is a white elephant. If these prices can prevail, then your taxation value must bear some relation to them. You are taking an antediluvian step and you are protecting the land, forgetting that you are in the minority when it comes to land holding. The economic power of this country is entrenched in the hands of fewer people today than it was 100 years ago. Today we are a bunch of wage-earners and the minority has the wealth of this country in their hands and, on top of that, they do not share the views of this Government.

The Hon. Premier comes in and says that he is laying a general rate of 17 1/2% on trade and is leaving the rate on land to catch-as-catch-can. You are leaving that to fluctuate from year to year. When the house rate goes up next year as a result of this, then you will come with some bogus argument to tell the man who owns a house that you are going to see it next year. You did not see it this way. When you do it this way, up goes your house rate and you know that if there is anybody who can embarrass you and make it difficult for you, it is the hon. senior member for the City. He has been doing it successfully over the last few years. He is around your neck choking you and you are begging everybody to take him off you. You have come down today with this Bill and the next thing which is going to happen is that your house rates are going up and when you hear of it, you are going to say: "Oh, you know who has done it, it is Mr. Mottley who has carried them up." He is your Frankinstein. How can you reasonably fix a rate in advance for trade and put it in a Bill? You say that you know what is the volume of trade and where that trade lies. You also know the area of land. You know where the land is and what it is. It is not going to move. How many arable acres of land are there? that is the sort of thing which you should know. The Hon. Premier has been a member of Local Government for many years. He knows that you cannot budget before hand. The whole theory of Local Government is to lay a rate after you know what the various Councils are going to spend in 1962. What I think the Hon. Premier should be quite prepared to do is to pass a Bill which would say that there should be uniform rates in every phase of Local Government taxation.
4.55 p.m.

What I think the Premier should be quite clear to say is this: "Yes, pass a Bill saying that all rates in the island should be uniform, but the rates to be laid will be laid in consultation with the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Councils concerned." The rates are sent to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, anyhow. If you say that the rate should be 17.5% for trade, 10% for houses and 5% for land before you know what you are going to spend, you are saying what money you are going to receive, which is false. This is what is inserted in the Bill Section 4:- "Section one hundred and seventy three of the principal Act is hereby amended as follows:" You have paragraph (a), paragraph (b) and then paragraph (c) states "by deleting from subsection (2) the words 'a uniform amount' and substituting therefor the words 'the rate of seventeen and one half cents' ".

You have put in what the amount shall be. What I am saying is this: the theory of Local Government financing is that a Local Government Council collects money on the basis of its expenditure. Local Government Councils do not tax people and then spend money like the Central Government; Local Government Councils say that they are spending say, $10,000 this year, and they will lay a rate in order to collect that money. You do not want any hocus-pocus. The whole idea is that the ratepayers are only asked to pay for what you are going to provide for them, and nothing more. As soon as you want more than that, then you go to the Central Government. You did not allow a Vestry to lay a rate for five years; you allowed the Vestries to lay rates for a year, and that theory has been going on for many centuries.

I do not see how the Premier could agree to this proposal. He was a member of the Vestry for many years and I think that there was once a case where people objected to the laying of the rates, and the case was upheld because the rates were not right. Moreover, I do not know what was in the Premier's mind in Queen's Park when he said that the rates should have been 14%. That means that, from the value which was before them, the rates should have been 14% in the City and the money would be realised because there is a lot of property there.

There must be a complete re-assessment of valuations. If the market value is moving up and up, well, the relative value of taxation must have a change because taxation is related to that. I hope that what I have said will set, in its true perspective, this Measure. That is fundamental; it is important that the Premier should know this because to introduce a Bill of this nature is to create confusion and hardship for the people in the territory.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous lot which I can say on this Bill, but I do not propose to work myself up on it. I do not propose to arm my opponents with any electioneering speech. Let them be kept guessing. I do not blame either the Northern Council or the Southern Council. When I read that both of these Councils had agreed, not only with the principle of the Bill but with the entire Bill, I felt myself that if I represented an area or constituency and something was.....

At this stage Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying Sir, that if I represented an area or constituency and something was given free to my constituents and it was anything which would relieve them, I would have to accept it. Here I speak as a member of the House and also as a representative of the Local Government Municipality. When I combine my two duties, I have come to the conclusion, after having given very careful and mature consideration to the matter, that, in principle, I agree that if the services of the two district areas, which I would like to see come up to the standard of the services of the City of Bridgetown, are to come up to that standard, a subsidy should be given to the North and to the South. That is why I encouraged the City Council, during the life of the Local Government, to appeal for a subsidy similar to the one which was given to the Northern and Southern District Councils. My stand is that I believe that all of us, of whatever brand of politics we are, would like to see the services of the North and the South brought up to the service of the Municipal area.
5.05 p.m.

I am fully conscious myself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the under current underlying a lot of these amendments, but I am not worried in the least because my conscience is absolutely clear. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, as soon as you succeed in life there is the type of mentality which will accuse you of stealing and being dishonest. That is perfectly all right; I never worry about that. The Minister of Agriculture laughs, but he knows that that accusation has also been thrown at him. If on the other hand you become bankrupt, people say: "There goes a bankrupt." If you succeed, they say: "There goes a criminal and a crook;" but if you remain stagnant and pretend to be poor as some members of the Government would like people to believe they are, they feel you are honest.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no objection in principle to this Bill. The City Council had the opportunity to discuss it, but nothing we say can make the Government change. I would like to draw something to their attention. Facts are stubborn things. You can do this, but including children, there are nearly 100,000 people in the municipality to whom you have to answer. The argument which has been used by the Government for fooling us is that they want to have a uniform rate; therefore they are not going to do it themselves by letting everybody in the island pay for it; they are going to ask only the people of the municipal area to pay for it. I am going to address a few questions to their minds and see if they are going to hold their heads upright as Socialists. One of the arguments adduced has been that this will prevent all of the businesses from coming within the municipal area and encourage them to go outside. How does that interest or concern the Government?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, I never said it would encourage all of the businesses from coming within the municipal area. On that point, we were thinking of industries that may come to the island.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg your pardon. Let us deal with industries. All new industries are given a tax-free holiday. With my twenty odd years in Local Government administration, despite what anybody may think, I think the Hon. Premier knows that I have always been ready to offer what knowledge I have at my disposal; and because I have a love for Local Government, I have read a lot of its administration both in America and England. When the Government says that new industries would not only settle within the municipal area but would settle in the other areas, what difference does it make from a Central Government point of view? If from a Local Government point of view you put the rate at 17.5% and I opened an industry some place, and the cost of transporting, delivering and selling my goods is going to be high - you are only going to have one Bridgetown, no matter what you do - what difference does it make? Though you put the rate at 17.5%, every business is still going to get nearest to the place where the cost of output will be less.

On the other hand, Sir, what the Government has not raised is this: in any country in the world where there is Local Government, the Central Government must have a voice in its administration in a way because from the Central Exchequer they make their contribution. You are just passing legislation to say you must control and you must do this and that, but you must stand clear and not make any contribution at all; hence you come with an amendment saying that the municipal area must give up some of its trade earnings to the North and South so that they would be able to have their rates equalised in the island at 17.5%.

At least there is one thing I am glad to see, Sir, and it is that despite the tremendous criticism thrown at my head, the only reason I can find up to now for their arriving at 17.5% is because the Bridgetown City Council fixed their rate at 17.5% when other people thought it could and should be less. Those were only the usual political remarks, but at least you have had the Bridgetown City Council to guide you in laying the rate at 17.5%. As I said, Sir, I am not going to generate any heat in this; the sweetness in this Bill will be left for the villages, for the Park, for the Lower Green, and for the by-ways and alleys where people live; because, say what you like on this Bill, to take away $200,000 now is to deny the people in the City Council from performing services which are so absolutely necessary. The Government is shirking its responsibility by not subsidising.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at no point can the Premier and members of the Government say that members of my Party who are in the City Council have ever expressed one single view against Government subsidising the two areas, because we felt and have always said that if you do not want to give an equalisation grant, knowing how much your sanitary services and your public assistance would cost, you would give a grant stipulating how it should be spent. I believe myself that the way Government did it last year was the wrong way; they are suffering from confusion. I do not believe that Government members are all *au fait* with this form of Government, and somebody has been confusing them. Last year they decided they would give a subsidy to people whose properties were valued at $300 so that they could take off 15% before sending the Bills out. I could find no precedent for that except in Barbados.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even when the laws were amended in England and the means of doing it changed to a Deficiency and Efficiency grant, they never talked about taking off taxes.

5.15 p.m.

What they always maintained was that you have to do these things and they would watch and see if you did those things: and if you did those things, they would vote you this money. That is what was done in 1958.

At any rate, we do not have to go over that; I will leave it for another place. Let me speak now as a member of this House; I am not speaking now as a City Councillor. What is the position with the North? You have so much surplus and what have they done with that? Have they made any attempt to bring salaries up to the level of Government salaries? What are you suggesting giving them this money to do? Is it merely to equalise the rate or is it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the purpose of allowing them to carry out certain social services? If this equalisation of the rate is for the purpose of carrying out certain social services, then I say it is Government's responsibility to give them as a grant and I do not think anyone would deny that.

Now, Sir, I will deal with the Bill: but before I get to it I am going to show you something. I am at a loss to understand the attitude of this Socialist Government. I pay great respect to the hon. junior member for St. James for his knowledge in Local Government and I think he has got to agree with me in this. The change which was made in the method of arriving at the laying of rates was something which those of us who have some experience upheld because we knew that the new method was working a hardship.

Now, Sir, if you are equalising this rate, are you equalising it so that the taxes of those people who pay in respect of property and land might be lowered? In other words, are you saying that if you give the Northern District Council, let us say, $87,000, that you are doing it to keep the taxes on house and property down? Or are you saying, if we take a place like White Hall where the house tax on one side of the road is one thing and that on the other side is something else that you are doing it to make them uniform? Do you realise that by what you are doing you are leaving the position in the same way as it was? We realise that the change in boundary areas causes them to spend money, and, of course, I know why you have to do it that way. However, I argued then and I continue to argue now that your method of taxation will only relieve the big planter who can afford to pay taxation. It will give relief to nobody else. It may not be your feeling; it is something of which you are ignorant; but it is a fact.

Let us take the traders within the municipal area. One of the greatest combines which was once in the municipal area is the British American Tobacco Company. That combine before the new form of Local Government paid trade tax at a rate of 17.5%. That meant that that money which they paid in trade tax was an expense: so it was taken out of their income tax; and as you know, a limited liability company pays income tax of 40% on their net profits. As the Hon. Premier has said, I can do nothing more but to multiply, divide, substract and add. As soon as Local Government came into being, the British American Tobacco Company, found itself in the Southern area and as a result they found that their trade tax went up from 17.5% to 21.2 cents with your subsidy. All that meant was that the 21 cents in every dollar which they paid to the Local Government came out of their returns which they made to you.

Now, you come to places like Lower Estate Factory, Warrens Factory and the Belle Plantation and the British American Tobacco Factory who can pay 21.2% and say to them that they will now pay 17 1/2%; therefore, you ease them with 3 1/2%. The reason why you ease them is because although they have to pay you 40% on the rest, you are still putting something back into their pockets. That means that in your reducing your rate on trade, the taxes in St. Michael on the 20,000 odd people with hereditaments must now be increased. The hon. member who just sat down thinks that I do not understand him when he said that it is a means of preventing any expansion of any social services in St. Michael, which might be a challenge to the Government. All I will say is that I like to be in Local Government and I do what my conscience tells me. I will say that there were very many accusations levelled at the old system. I suppose officers of the Government go around and see the things which we do now. They were not always done. New blood came into the Vestry and there are those of us who when we won a seat said: "You must do this or else we will build a row."

I thought members of the Government would have taken a cue from the hon. junior member for St. James. Under the old system you laid a rate on land. You get these slanderous remarks made about my having friends in the Income Tax Office like Mr. John Maynard. It was a very slanderous and depraved thing to have said that I was using him to put the rates up high. Sometimes I shudder at those sayings. I shudder when people would get up in public life and say things like that and then have the courage and brass to say to others that they must not say things about Civil Servants. Because that man was my friend, they said that I was encouraging him to put the rate on my house and their houses high. Why then, if that was so, did they not send him to prison?
5.25 p.m.

Naturally you had a revaluation. That is why I never got up and said anything. A house which was rented for $5 a month is now rented at $30 a month and you can take account of the service which the Government gives to the country now as against what was given 13 or 18 years ago. You could not expect things to be the same; there must be a revaluation. However, when people find themselves in a corner, they make dirty remarks and say that I was responsible for anything because I had friends in the office. The friends of my Party do not like the speech I am making, but I do not ask them for any favours. The method adopted before was that you have five hundred acres of land at $24 an acre and the only exemption was that in respect of land which was under trees. There was a hue and cry that you only paid for arable land. You have cut up land at Dunscombe, Vaucluse, Walkers, Sturges, Greenland, Bawdens and Haggatts. When a plantation brought ten thousand or fifteen thousand pounds today, do you think that the planters have not kept on their heads? Have you seen anyone of them go bankrupt yet? The old system was that you owed a contribution to the plantation; a planter was allowed to make a greater profit than a shopkeeper because he had to provide against bad years. If you had 200 arable acres of land you must pay for that. When you say that you pay $1,800 for land which did not bring in one cent, that is true; but what about that which brought you in money?

Speaking as a real estate agent, I can say that I sold land at Greenland, Bawdens, Haggatts and St. Simons and all that was rab land. What do you think I sold that land for? Rab price or buttons? Mr. Julian Mahon came out in public and made it quite clear that what I said was right. Do you think that anybody would pay £75,000 for a plantation just so? All along the straight road as you look you can see the grass. What did Mr. Herbert get for his land at Dover? What did you pay for the rab land at Bagatelle? You are making fun. I cannot blame the North or the South; I know about what I am speaking.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier knows that the only exemption you had before was the exemption on your land on which you cultivated trees. There was a reason for cultivating forestry in the island. I speak with experience on this matter. I offered, when Mr. Lightburn was here, to discuss matters with him and advise him, but they wanted to keep me out of everything. I went to Ashton Hall and sold some land. It was all rab land but the person who bought it had to pay for it; the owner had to pay what it was rated on. You have thrown away a lot of income and you have put it on other people who cannot bear taxation. I go to the Valley, St. George, I go to St. Philip and I say you have done this thing unwittingly. You have not changed the method but this is what is happening. I am not really generating any heat on this matter; I know when to generate heat.
5.35 p.m.

It may appear to you that you have 1,800 traders in the municipal area, and according to you these 1,800 traders by the assessment of the Income Tax Commissioner will yield a revenue of $9 million. Their dislike for me is so great that whatever I tell them must be told to them by K. R. Hunte or Sir Archibald Cuke before they can hear what I say. I should still like to know how they arrived at the 17.5% when they themselves said it should be 14%. There are old Vestrymen here like my friend the hon. junior member for St. James who will criticise and say you are not doing this and that; but they will not use this rate for land because they do not make them pay for land. I would like you to show me any spot of rab land on which an agriculturist lives for which he is not paying, even if it is one penny a day. It is the rab land today that is working for money; the land on the hill with the rocks and grass is the one that is bringing money because of the houses being built on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am amazed to find that in the parish of St. James where people build houses on this kind of land not one cent is collected for taxes. This land is sold at 36¢ a square foot, but they say no taxes should be collected on it; and it is the only land the Government will allow to be sold, because they do not want to sell agricultural land. The Income Tax Commissioner has said that the 1,700 or 1,800 traders in the municipality can yield $9 million, but you can only get $1 million from the other Districts; yet you come along and say that there should be a uniform tax of 17.5%.

All I want to ask is this: do you realise the injustice you are doing to the people in the municipal area? I will tell you something now; even the hon. senior member for St. Peter made this mistake: the method of rating the houses within the municipal area is somewhat higher than in St. Philip or St. Andrew, and it is correctly so too. If you have some three-room bungalow.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I said that you now have a uniform rate for trade and not for the other things, and asked why should a man pay a different rate in St. Michael from one in the rural areas.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am saying is this: a man comes along and rates a house within the municipality depending upon its area, but you are not going to rate a house in Chalky Mount at the same where there is less likelihood of getting a tenant. It is therefore put at a different annual rental value, and that seems correct to me. I realise what a trap it would be to fall in if I said that the rate in the North and South should be the same, because they could not afford it. In all countries of the world Government offers a subsidy in some form or other to those Councils which cannot carry out their social services.

When you say that the 1,800 traders in the municipality can yield $9 million, you are forgetting that you have no uniform rate on property nor on land, but you are asking the 20,000 people who own hereditaments such as chattel houses and pieces of land within the municipality to contribute to the North and South. Every person in the municipal area who owns an eighth of an acre of land and every old age pensioner who is paying 60¢ or 70¢ is now contributing to the North and South when they refuse to call upon Government to allow them to tax non-arable land. If you ask me how, the answer is simple; if you are taking away $200,000 from the municipal area and giving it away, is it not normal therefore that if that $200,000 were applied back in the municipality that the rate on houses would go down? I wonder if you can tell me that it is not true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you say that the rate must remain at 17.5% and you take that money and give it away, as long as you have to carry on your social services, everybody knows that the necessity for certain social services within the municipality must be greater than in the North. When you talk about social services, you do not want lights in Bawdens because you cannot afford it; nor do you want street cleaning equipment in agricultural areas. You cannot convert the whole of Barbados into a municipality; therefore your social services in the City are absolutely necessary. It was drawn to the public's attention a few nights ago that whatever you do in Barbados you will never prevent an influx of people coming into the municipality. People go to America and come back and tell you they have been to America, but America for them is Manhattan, New York or Brooklyn; it does not include going to Long Island. It is just that people want to live in the City.

There are a lot of people, Sir, who would not want to live in the City, but you cannot stop people from migrating to the City. When you say, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this would encourage industries in going out of the City, that is a very flimsy argument. At present you have a five-year tax holiday. If I recall rightly, the Minister of Trade – he will pardon me if I quote him wrongly – suggested that

they will go as far as any of the other West Indian islands in giving a tax holiday as a means of encouraging industries.
5.45 p.m.

Therefore, Sir, if it is five years or seven and a half years now, where does that come in? What I put to you tonight is hard, stubborn fact. You are telling the British American Tobacco Company tonight, a company which would normally go and pay 21% of their profits for trade tax to the Southern District Company, "Oh no, do not pay that, pay only 17 1/2%." You are saying the same thing to Lower Estate, the Belle and Warrens Factory. You are saying the same thing to Porters and to Haymans Factory. You are a Socialist Government. That is what you say to Searles Factory and to Porters Factory also. Then you say to the little householder next door, the little fellow who put you in here, that is the porter and the carpenter and people like that.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I see the hon. member is falling into the same trap as the hon. senior member for St. Peter. This Bill has nothing to do with land. This is really a trade tax; therefore, why bring in all this talk on land? You do not pay trade tax on land. I thought you would have observed that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This amendment deals with a taxation policy. We did not say it dealt with land; we dealt with that to show what it would reveal on land taxes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, you have got three ways of raising taxes to run the municipal area. One is a tax upon property, one is a tax upon land and the other is a tax upon trade. I am saying to you now that you have gone to the North and said to the people who own Sandy Lane, Haymans and Springhall who normally would pay 21 cents in the dollar as trade tax that they must only pay 17 1/2% now. We say that when those people pay that 21 cents, it would have been taken out of their income tax returns. In other words, it was an expense. You are now saying "Oh no, boys, you can pay 17 1/2%". Therefore, they will only take out 17 1/2% out of their profits.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: When you take out 17 1/2% you have got to pay income tax of 40% on the balance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Let us suppose that they were paying in $21 to the Local Government. They will be now paying 17.50 and holding $3.50. As it was before, they would be paying $21 and you would be taking 40% out of the remaining $79. You are now telling them that they can pay $17 out of the $100 and you will be getting 40% out of the $83 remaining. What I am trying to prove to you is that what you are really saying is that of the balance of which you are relieving them you are only getting 40%.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am following the hon. member's argument. Twenty-one dollars from $100 leaves $79 and you will be getting 40% of $79.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That 40% of $79 is what Local Government is not getting.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: What I want to draw to the hon. member's attention is that $21 from $100 leaves $79 and the Central Government will get 40% of $79. That is $31.60 and it will leave that company with $47.40. When you take out $17.50 it will leave them with $82.50. Which is the greater?

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. What the hon. member is pointing out is that it means that the Government is getting a higher rate of income tax of which they are not paying a subsidy to the Local Government Councils: which means that those who pay on land and house will have to pay for the deficit which you have taken away as a result of a lower trade tax.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You are collecting the money now. I am saying that you are not passing it on, although you are collecting it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe after I am finished that I would convince the hon. member on the other side and he will see what I am talking about. You are giving up to them by this new taxation 3 1/2%. Under the circumstances, they will have to pay 40% of that elsewhere. Do you not agree that when you make it 17 1/2% as against 21% that everyone of those businesses stand to show a greater profit? Answer that. That is for the Hon. Minister of Education to tell them. They are only going to pay you 40% on that 3 1/2% now; so they stand to show a greater profit.

Mr. SPEAKER: It appears as if you are addressing your remarks to the Hon. Minister of Education. You are not to pay any regard to him. He is not in charge of this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Why I am posing the question to the Minister of Education is because he is expected to deal with figures. I believe the Hon. Premier who introduced this Bill deals with medicine. What I am drawing to the Hon. Premier's attention is this. Accept these figures or do not accept them. I am saying that these people are bound to show a greater profit. They know that that is correct. The only person who does not know that would be the Financial Secretary.
5.55 p.m.

You are giving up something to the big traders who are presently carrying on business; in other words, they will pay 40% out of the 3 1/2%. I wonder why the Chairman did not get up and tell them that. I do not believe that the Hon. Premier is resisting what I am saying for no reason; I believe that if the Premier sees it, he will say that he sees it. You are saying that you are going to make the rate equal throughout the island, but what you are doing is saying to the big trader that out of the 3 1/2% you are only paying 40%. I could do that in second standard. If the Minister of Education tells me that I am wrong then I will go out of the House.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation. The hon. senior member for the City is saying that when you pay 21% out of $100, $79 will be left and then when you take 40% of $79, there is $31.60 which the Government will get. The proprietor would have paid $21 and $31.60 goes to the Government which would make a total of $52.60. And $52.60 from $100 will leave $47.40. When you pay at 21% the proprietor gets $47 for himself and when you pay at 17.5% he gets $49 for himself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Am I right or wrong? I thank the hon. member for being honest; I always thought him to be honest. You have three means of collecting taxation. I am going to press it home again. I feel that the proper way in which to do this thing is to give the Northern and Southern District Councils their subsidy; you must continue to do it. That is done in every country in the world. If you must have services, then you must have money. If you go the other way, then you are going wrong. I want the Premier to listen to this. You have trade, land and houses from which to collect taxation; therefore, when you relieve traders to this extent in these two areas, you fail to see that rab land is properly taxed.

This is an observation which I am making and if you value democracy you will see what I am saying. When you fail to see that all land is valuable you are calling upon the other side to pay by way of houses. When a man buys his little house, he has to pay because you are relieving the big trader by putting more money into his pocket. You do not ask the landowner to pay for all the land along the main road. Colleton in the parish of St. Lucy was sold. All that land is under grass. It cannot bear anything, but they will not sell me for any £500 an acre. What the hon. member has said is true; of the three methods which you have for raising taxation, in raising money for local Government you can only raise the money you need by two sources. The other

source will be affected because you have not directed what your land should be.
6.05 p.m.

Secondly, let us come back to the City. Despite the fact that people say you have no right giving this and that, down in their conscience they know that with the high standard of illegitimacy and standard of unemployment, with the people coming to the City you have got to do these things. You either do these things or none of us are happy. You have to keep children in school; therefore you must have these social services in the municipality, while they are not necessary for other areas. The Chairman of the Northern District mentioned to me that he would naturally like to be able to give children clothing to keep them in school, but he could not do it because he has not got the money. He said I can do this because I have been doing it before and nothing can stop me. I would like to see him doing it in the Northern area. How is he going to do it? Are you going to say he must do that by taking money from us and giving it to him? Do you realise that you cannot afford to give the number we are giving now; and we are getting more and more?

The Minister of Education has told you to get wise. You are giving away money to sources that can afford to pay, and Julian Mahon told you so in a letter to the Press; and you are taking that money from this source. I know that God will give me the energy to put this over in this country. You are taking money away from the lighterman and the longshoreman who buys a house, and giving it to the North. If social services must be carried out in the municipal area and you take this money away, where must we get money from? You have rated a man's small house and have refused to rate the people who can pay. I do not know who is advising you.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, the hon. member is trying to make this House believe that when this thing has been done, somebody in St. Michael is going to suffer. (Mr. MOTTLEY: We know so.) I intended to say this in my reply, but I will say it at this point. The figures show that after this has been done - and these figures are up to February, and will be higher at the end of this month - the City Council will still have at its disposal $237,343. So it is not true to say that in our calculation small houses will have to pay more.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I believe the Premier means well, Sir, but he is dealing with the wrong figures. What we are dealing with in this Bill is 1961-62.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: These figures are for this year 1960-61.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do not give the impression that the City Council did not lay its rates properly and has a surplus which we did not anticipate. There is a surplus of $237,000. The method of laying trade tax comes down from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. He tells us to lay the tax on trade at $7 1/2 million and the tax on property at so many million dollars. During the year however, he finds, as with the Government that the crop was better than was anticipated, and he sends down more. We could only have budgeted and sent the figures to the Governor-in-Executive Committee by the end of March. He sent down for $237,000 which would net us $237,000 more. The Hon. Premier is absolutely correct about that; but let me tell him something: he must not make these statements as he is not on the City Council. How does he know what the expenses for this year will be? You say that when all this is done we will have $237,000. Are you suggesting that this Bill is a means of freezing the Bridgetown City Council from doing any social work?

The Hon. Premier says that at the end of the financial year, which is tomorrow, we will have this amount of money. You are not springing any surprises on me, because I am a man who takes my duties seriously, and before I begin to talk about estimates I have to get my facts and figures so that I can guide my Council where they should go and what they should do. The hon. member is absolutely correct when he says that we have $237,000 as a surplus from last year. That being the surplus from last year, you are now dealing with 1961-62. (Hon. M. E. COX: That will be carried forward.) Are you suggesting that it is your intention to bring this Bill to freeze our expenses on social services? How do you know that 17.5% is the amount we will want for all time?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The position is this: the estimated taxable income of the City area appreciates rapidly every year as has happened this year; so it is no question of freezing your expenditure. Whatever the income may be, this is 17.5%.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member says we have $1/4 million to carry forward, but I do not think he understands what he is saying. When you say that we have a surplus of $237,000, with the greatest respect to the North and South, you are dealing with a place which spends over $2 million, a place that employs over 800 people on an incremental basis; so without making one improvement at all automatically our expenditure increases. Without putting up one additional light, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the expenditure for the next year must be greater than that for the last year, because there are increments to be paid. There is no question therefore of carrying forward, and the Minister of Education will tell you that it is simple 'rule-of-three.' If therefore we have $237,000 which was a surplus and which we are glad for, we have also the incremental basis and system of paying people and improving conditions, and our expansion of the City and scanvenging must be carried out, so that money must be taken out and spent.
6.15 p.m.

That is bound to be brought forward into next year. therefore, it would be brought forward into 1961-62 Estimates. You have to spend it. Let us say that the bringing forward of that would balance it out and it would remain as it was. Do you see what would happen if we do not have to give away this $200,000? If you agree that our system of giving increments and our methods of doing things are such that we have to spend this $237,000 which we are going to bring forward.....

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I rise on a point of order. What I was going to tell the hon. member was that last year the rate which he sent to Government was 17%. That would mean that he would collect much less than what he actually collected then because he collected 5% more. Presumably, he would not have this additional amount.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think the hon. member is a bit confused about that. You cannot have less. The only way is if the estimated revenue was less. Let us forget all of that. The actual money which you will hope to collect is $237,000. That money is to be carried forward this year. I happen to know what the estimated expenditure for this year would be. That estimated expenditure is going to swallow up this $237,000. It is going to be expended. You are going to expend that and you will have to give away $200,000. Do you not see if you have to give away this $200,000, if you have to make up for this reduction, where it would lay? It would bound to lay upon property. However, it is a matter for you.

Let me say here and now that the Bridgetown City Council of which I have the honour to be leader of the majority Party objects to the idea of your taking their money and contributing to the other Councils, but in principle they agree that the Government should subsidise the other two Councils. When you work it out with your Minister of Education, you will see that you are throwing the burden here and relieving some people there. But you are relieving them at the others' expense. Do you know how much money you are putting back in the pockets of those who own factories? I can tell you how many thousand dollars you are putting back in their pockets. There are no two ways about it. Let me put it this way. The British American Tobacco Company is one of the biggest combines in the world. If they like they can drop the price of cigarettes here if someone comes to compete with them and raise it in another country to make up for the loss until they run that other business out. You are putting money back into their pockets. Answer that question. Is it true or not?

I am not supporting the Bill on the face of what is going to happen, because I know that it is bound to hamper the 20,000 householders which we have in the municipality. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you this. You have a lot of women going to England and leaving their children here. The Nightengale Home is bursting at the seams. We asked them for money to extend it but because of the position of your humble servant, they would do nothing about it. But here I am and here I will be. That has to be extended. We have got to do these things; therefore you are going to absorb that amount and we are very glad that there is that surplus.

I can tell you how much a cent would mean in the difference of revenue you collect. The burden of this Bill which the Legislature will pass today making equality of trade rates throughout the island will be borne by the 20,000 householders and people who own property in the municipal area. You have all these additional expenses such as additional street lighting, additional scavenging and the tremendous burden which we have as a result of people going to England. While I am on that, some people seem to misunderstand me. Never have I said at any time that I was in opposition to any Deep Water Harbour. I said that Government must be offered the maximum of co-operation to make this harbour a success. But you get people twisting things.

Mr. SPEAKER: Where are we now?

Mr. MOTTLEY: We are not in Queen's Park, Sir. Never did I say that it was the intention of the City Council to lay any rate to give displaced workers assistance. What I did say - and any intelligent person would realise - is this:

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get away from the Deep Water Harbour.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I said is that if a thousand people were displaced.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Displaced where?

Mr. MOTTLEY: As a result of the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, we are back to the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, we are at the City Council. With the number of people who will leave and with the additional expenditure, I saw it immediately when Costain started to lay off people. At no time did I offer any opposition because I would be a most crazy man to offer opposition in a matter of this sort. I am conscious of my position in this community and I would not like to see people tracked down. Mr. Speaker, I will now come to the Bill. I am opposing this Bill. Are you going to pool $9 million from the municipality with a million from the other two districts and then say, in addition to this, that you will give 11% to the South and 9% to the North? But you say that for the Municipality to get 80% of this pool it must collect 90%. Do you realise that I do not want a showdown yet? I do not know who is really making them put in these things; we must collect 90% and we will get 80%. If you do not collect the 90% you can only get that proportion which you collect. How could I be such a traitor to the people down here? They have never asked me anything about this; I can assure you that trade tax will be collected from a lot of people who have no visible assets on which to levy. You say that we must collect our proportion; we can only assume that the amount is what we need. You have the case of an insurance company doing business in Barbados. There is an amount of $2,000 to be collected and when the time comes for collecting it, they are out of the island. You also have the case of a club run by Mr. "A" and he is rated on $9,000. He shuts down business and goes to Trinidad; how are you going to collect the money? Why must we collect 90% in order to get 80%? I just do not understand it. You go on to say that, in this pool, unless we collect our proportion, we cannot get that amount to spend. You may have the best intention about that, but do you think you could prevent me from thinking that this is something which is calculated to curb my activities? You cannot curb me; nobody can curb me. Well, you go on and stop me; there is one sure thing that if you can get a hearing I can get three hearings. (Hon. M. E. COX: You have got the thing with which to do it.) The hon. member is always inferring a lot of improper motives. (Hon. M. E. COX: I am making a statement of fact. You have a lot of money to dish out. The people say that they come to you and get a lot of money.) I heard a lot of things about you too. I heard the people say that you do not like white people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Where are we now?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was making my speech and I was going on all right; how could I draw a lot of money and dish it out? I am avoiding being nasty, offensive and personal in this matter. I have been trying to convince hon. members as to whether I am right or wrong. I am trying to keep on a high level. You have $22 million to spend.
6.35 p.m.

There is this idea that I have money there to spend. After 16 years you are still worrying. I am arguing this along principle and without personality. The hon. member said that I have money to give away. I will tell you what I have to do; I have children to support and educate. That is a great privilege because there are a lot of people who do not have children, and that is why I respect the Hon. Premier.

What I am saying, Sir, is that you tell us you are going to give us 80% but we must collect 90%, and I am trying to point out the difficulty in this. You say that we have to pay this money to the Local Government Commissioner who will put it in a pool, and we can only get back a proportion of that. In other words, we have to collect 10% for the other places. If we do not collect 80% we will get 70% and they will get 10%; but he will ask us to collect it.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are the restrictions restricted to the City Council Area?

Mr. MOTTLEY: It only talks about the City area collecting 90%. What I am trying to show to the Premier is that if we do not collect it, we cannot get the money for spending, and as I have said, the traders in this area do not only comprise big traders who make returns to the Income Tax Office. The big traders are in the minority; the majority of traders are those who pay small amounts; but you would be surprised to know that there are a number of those from whom you will not be able to collect between the beginning and the end of the financial year. What will happen then with the running of the parish? Let the Hon. Premier answer that. I am dealing with principle and not with men. I do not care how they abuse me.

Mr. Speaker, when we fail to collect the amount of money which they say we should collect, how are we to run the municipal area? The bulk of our revenue comes from trade, and if the bulk comes from trade and we are not putting by any, what will we have as a reserve? Last year we put by $40,000 as reserve, but now we will have no reserve. Out of the number of people trading in the City area, there is the woman who brings fruit from Dominica, and there are also the Indians and Jews, and by the time you are ready to send out your tax Bill, out they go. The hon. member has made a most facetious remark when he said that the figures show that we have more, but he does not know that figures can prove anything. The figures which the Premier has will show $237,000, but for his information we do not estimate for more than $200,000 out of that. It shows that 17.5% on the money they send down would yield $237,000 but it does not mean that we will collect that amount. I want the Premier to get to this point, because when he gets to the Bill which I believe he will deal with, despite the fact that I am not going to vote for it. (Mr. STRAUGHN: You are not voting for this?) Voting for this? You like you are making fun, boy; you are getting stupid. Would I vote for a Bill which in my opinion is a betrayal, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, of the people of the municipality? This is a change of principle on taxation from when I was elected.

I hear the Government talking about having a mandate, but when I got the seat in here from the municipal area,

nobody elected me on the grounds that I would agree to pool taxation and they would carry the burden of the North and South; so this would be a betrayal of my trust. (Mr. WALCOTT: You all are dishonest people.) (Hon. R. G. MAPP: This is done all over the world.)

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. member that this is not done all over the world. There is no part of the world where this is done; Barbados is the only place where this is done. In every country throughout the West Indies where there is Local Government, the Government makes a contribution every year and that is why they must have a certain amount of control. Up to when we had the Vestry system, the people in Trinidad were surprised to hear that there was no control because there was no contribution made by Government. When this is passed Government will not be making a contribution; so those members who sit and feel proud that they are taking money out of the pockets of the people in the municipality and in St. Michael will penalise the householders. What we say should be done is that the Government of Barbados should in its general expenditure provide an amount to carry these two areas. I am not now saying something which I did not say before. At no time did we object to Government giving subsidies, and at no time did we ask for money for the City; but what we do say now is that you have reached the stage where you realise that you have bungled certain things in certain areas, and it is our opinion that you should give these two areas grants.

Mr. Speaker, I should like them to tell us why they must take $200,000 from the municipal area to give to the North and South.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have to rise again, but the hon. member is again trying to make this House believe that somebody is taking $200,000 from the City Council. What we have said in principle is that people from all over the island come and spend their money in the City. (Mr. WALCOTT: That is a joke.) That is no joke. In their way they are contributing to trade in the City, and that is the idea behind the Bill. The hon. member would appreciate that a man from St. Lucy comes to town to buy his hat and goods and everything else; so he contributes to the collection of trade tax in the City. That is the principle behind the whole thing.
6.45 p.m.

I hope the hon. member will not continue to impress the House that somebody is robbing the City Council. People from all over the parishes come to Bridgetown. There is only one town; there is only one place where you do trade and that is in Bridgetown.

Mr. WALCOTT: Can anybody say that this is a matter of principle? What principle is there involved? The hon. member said that I made that point. He is making a point of order out of something which has been said.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose on a point of order in reply to something which the hon. member said.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that could not be a matter of principle.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the Hon. Premier said that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes; he said that the money is being used because of this idea of people from all over the parishes coming to Bridgetown.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier said that he wanted to erase the impression that there was any intention to deprive the City Council of $200,000.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: That is what I said.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rose on a point of order to say that it is not a matter of principle but that it was a matter of expediency.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is now arguing. I want this debate to go straight.

The Hon. Premier rose on a point of order to make an explanation regarding a point made by the hon. senior member for the City. The hon. senior member for the City has stated that $200,000 had been taken from the City Council. The Hon. Premier rose to say that that was not so or the intention was not so. I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Peter had a point of order. He said that that is not a matter of principle but that it was a matter of expediency. He has not got to rise to say that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am still saying even if according to the Hon. Premier's argument, we are not being deprived of $200,000 - that is to say the ratepayers in the municipal area - that I must be convinced that they are not. I still say that they are, and for the simple reason that the services which we provide in the municipality applies to everybody. We provide services for the entire island and I think that the Hon. Premier appreciates that. The Hon. Premier would like me to believe that it is not the Government's intention to deprive the burgesses of the municipality of $200,000. The Hon. Premier from his own figures said that St. Michael will be contributing $200,000 and that is according to the figure from the appointed authority, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue. I contend that not only is it unscientific but it is also unbusinesslike in the manner in which they are doing it. They are relieving persons within the Northern and Southern District of trade when those persons are able to pay. The Government is putting back into their pockets and the Hon. Premier and his best financial advisers cannot deny that. This is giving them 3 1/2% because this is calling on them to pay 17 1/2% when they paid 21% and on that remainder which they are given back, they are only paying 40%. On top of that, you have not made an effort to create a proper method in the rating of these people's land. Under these circumstances, I can come to no other conclusion than that you are so inefficient as not to be able to see that you are making these blunders in giving away to those who can best pay the amount of their taxation and you are so blind as not to be able to see it when drawn to you by a member of your own Party. I refer to the hon. junior member for St. James. Unless you were to come into this House and show us actually that this is the amount of money which those areas would gain if there were a different method of taxation on land, then I can come to no other conclusion that the people of the municipal area are being taxed to the extent of $200,000. I must tell you that I do not appreciate it and I do not see it your way. It is absolutely taking from the people of this area $200,000. By so doing, you are going to make the people of this area, more especially the householders and the property owners, pay higher taxes than they would have done if normally they did not have this $200,000 more to get. You know that the argument used in 1959 was that Mottley has too much money in the City to play with and it should be curtailed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us confine ourselves to arguments used in the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The argument outside was that Mottley has too much money to play with. Curtail his activity. If you curtail him there, he will have no opportunity to have any power. Hence, you have brought down this Bill.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to deny that. No such argument entered into the bringing forward of this Bill. The hon. member always from time to time makes these remarks: "how about the poor country shopkeeper; why not help him?" This Bill is to relieve the small man.

Mr. MOTTLEY' The Hon. Premier speaks as if he did not have any experience in Local Government.
6.55 p.m.

If you have 17,000, only 100 pay three quarters of the taxes; we do not worry about these small people. That is why I am stressing the point; when you give up the tax, to whom are you giving it? *(ASIDES)*

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member does not need to pay any attention to the asides.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Asides never worry me; but if they become personal, then I will become personal too. Anyway,

I accept that at least the hon. member was not motivated to curtail the activities of the hon. senior member for the City in bringing forward this Bill. Why did the Hon. Premier not tell this House why the Government refused to make this contribution and only called upon the municipality to make it?

At this stage, it now being 7 p.m. of the clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. of the clock, this sitting stands suspended until 7.30 p.m. of the clock.
7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum present and I ask that the Bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension of the sitting, the hon. senior member for the City was addressing the House on the Second reading of a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1958. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place. Does any other hon. member desire to address the House?

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I must at the outset congratulate the two hon. members who have spoken last on this Bill, the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Peter, in that they have stated a case for the City Council and a very sound defence, in so far as the effect of this Bill is concerned. Speaking for myself, I can with certainty say that I agree with the general principle of the Bill which seeks to establish a uniform rate of trade tax for the entire island at the rate of 17.5%. I say that for many reasons. Trade tax is an essential tax for the purpose of administering Local Government, and it would be really unfair if we were to allow the present state of affairs to continue whereby the present rate of tax varied from district to district.

At the present time, the rate of tax in the Southern area is 21.2%; that in the Northern area is 26.62%; and in the City area, it is 17.5%. I think that these figures as quoted by the Premier are correct. The Premier also quoted the total taxable income as $10,395,929. For the City, $9,426,462; for the Southern area, $592,147; and for the Northern area, $377,320. My argument is that by the introduction of this Bill an equitable system of trade tax would be established island wide; but in a small island like this, there is no reason why you should victimise trade in the Northern and Southern areas at the expense of trade in the City, which, in truth and fact, as the Premier suggested, receives more patronage than that in the Northern and Southern areas, in that all roads lead to the City and the volume of business conducted in the City is therefore very much greater than that conducted in either the Northern or the Southern Area. I would like to emphasize to some extent that, as hon. members will remember on the introduction of the Local Government Bill which took place in this Chamber on several occasions from 1954 and onwards, my colleagues and I were at pains to point out that if the more wealthy portion of Christ Church, which forms a part of the Southern area, were taken off and tacked on to the City area, the revenue received by the Local Government Council in the Southern area would be proportionately less.
7.50 p.m.

Of course that argument fell on deaf ears at the time with the result that we have the Government coming back with the intention of trying to remedy an undoubted wrong. Of course it could have been done by way of subvention as has been done before, and that may probably be the proper way to do it; but we see no harm in establishing a uniform rate of trade tax in a small island of this sort whereby the trade in the Northern and Sourthern District areas would not be called upon to pay a higher rate of tax than the trade in the City area. Although that may be so, Sir, I consider this a novel Bill; it is a departure from the normal type of Bill we encounter. It is a means of taking away certain powers which were vested in the old Vestries, and a means whereby this new power will be vested in the Government's Commissioner who will be the representative of the Central Government.

Now, Sir, this is merely a step by way of centralisation, and it is not a very healthy way of conducting Local Government business. The argument adduced by the hon. member for the City that $200,000 will be handed back by the City Council for the Northern and Southern District Councils can be answered as far as the Southern area is concerned in that a wealthy part of the Christ Church ward has been lopped off and tacked on to the City area, and I am certain that as a result of that lopping off from the Worthing View, Rendezvous and back to the Garrison where most of the hotels are established, and where the greater part of the business as far as hotels and other business of that nature is conducted, that will yield a great proportion of that $200,000 to which the hon. senior member for the City referred. It is for that reason that I see no harm whatever in having a uniform rate of trade tax; but there is no reason why a plantation owner - although I do not represent vested interest - should be called on to bear a rate of 21.2% in the Southern District and 26.62% in the Northern District where as in the City area he bears not more than 17.5% as in the past and in some cases even less.

Although the trade tax is being made uniform, yet I feel that Government will still be called upon to make subventions and grants to the District Councils, because if the Northern and Southern District Councils are expected to give reasonable services at least up to a certain standard, a higher standard than at present, this method of creating a uniform trade tax will still not cover the deficit which at present exists. I am hoping, Sir, that although the Government is now attempting to remedy an undoubted wrong in the actual division of the areas, they will see fit to hand out the necessary subventions as arise from time to time.

Now the Bill, Mr. Speaker, provides many new incursions as have been ably explained by the hon. senior member for the City who pointed out that the big trader, that is the factory owner, will still stand to benefit as a result of this Bill; so it would seem as though on a final analysis less taxes will be collected by the Southern and Northern District Councils than at present, because the decrease from 26.62% in the Northern Area to 17.5% and from 21.2% in the Southern District to 17.5% will create a difference which will hardly be made up by this extra $200,000 which will be handed over by the municipality to the Northern and Southern Districts respectively on a *pro rata* basis.

Although this Bill may appear to be the salvation for the Northern and Southern areas, yet in truth and in fact it will merely be relieving to some extent the ones who bear the burden of trade tax, the small percentage of businessmen, and it may prove to be at the expense of the owners of chattel houses and hereditaments as explained in the Local Government Bill, because hereditaments include chattel houses of a rateable value of $120 per annum. I sympathise to some extent with the present Government in that they find themselves in a sort of dilemma in the actual working of the Local Government Bill, and this is an attempt to try and regularise the position in order to create an equitable rate of trade tax for the entire island, and at the same time to relieve the Central Government of the subventions which they have to hand out within recent years since the inception of the Local Government system.
8.00 p.m.

It may be said that no one knows how these Bills will operate until after a few years of actual practice and that may be regarded as a means to regularise the position. I think that is Government's intention. While this may be Government's intention to regularise and to do what is regular and fair to taxpayers, that is, that there be uniformity in trade tax island-wide, yet it may in the end bring a certain amount of burden on owners of small chattel

houses and owners of property and of land, say, in another year or two. The members who are here then will perperhaps see another Bill coming down to regularise the rate of tax to be paid on hereditaments and land. When that time comes, it may be time to abolish Local Government altogether. I say that this Bill absolutely takes away certain powers and rights which are inherently vested in Local Government in that the Council of Local Government will no longer have the power to lay a rate so far as trade tax is concerned because that is embodied in the Bill. That means that Local Government in the Northern, Southern and City areas are controlled by this Bill so far as trade tax is concerned. This is a step towards centralisation. If it is proved after another two or three years that what this Bill sets out to do is not achieved, you may find a Bill, resembling this Bill, being sent back to remedy something else or to impose some fixed rate of taxation, or to lay rates on land or hereditaments.

Sir, there are many flaws in the working of the Local Government which are detected from time to time. I am not opposing the principle of the Bill in general which, as I see it, seeks to establish an equitable rate of tax on an islandwide basis. There is no reason why a big shopkeeper who pays trade tax in say, Belleplaine, in Oistins or wherever he may be, should be called upon to pay a higher rate than the shopkeeper in Bridgetown. There is no reason why he should pay a rate of 21.2% whereas his brother shopkeeper on similar footing in the City area where the volume of business may be three times greater, pays a lower rate of 17.5%. I am not a member of Local Government but I can see a certain amount of equity in this Bill apart from the factory or a plantation owner who may stand to benefit as explained by the Hon. Premier and the hon. senior member for St. Peter who ably stated a case on behalf of the City Council mainly. I see no reason why the factory owner in the Southern or the Northern area or any form of business should pay more trade tax that his brother businessman who may even carry a bigger form of business in the City. It is all right to argue that you are taking $200,000 from the City and handing out to the Northern and Southern Districts, but that state of affairs should never exist. It is not a question of doing a good service to the factory owner or big businessmen in the Northern and Southern area. It is more that they have been done a disservice in the past because there is no reason why their rate should be 21.2% in the North, 26.6% in the South when the rate for those in the City is only 17.50%. To argue that they are taking money from the municipality and relieving the big businessmen in the Northern and Southern areas is not a sound argument on the basis of it because, in the first instance, if the island was divided on a more equitable basis - and I speak mainly of the Southern area, the wealthier part of which is attached to the City area - you would not have to give subvention to the Southern area. When you give Christ Church $100,000, you are not really giving the Southern area any gift, you are really giving that area what it is entitled to and what they collected prior to when they were attached to the municipal area. You are putting them in a position which they formerly enjoyed. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not here to hear this.

Sir, I agree that the final effect of this Bill would be to relieve the factory owner and the big taxpayer in that he would merely be called upon to pay 17 1/2% as compared with the 21.2% or the 26.62% which he is called upon to pay in the Northern and Southern Districts respectively. By calling on him now to pay 17 1/2%, he will be paying 40% of the balance to the Central Government by way of company tax and that means that he is left with 60% out of the difference. You can very well see that he would be better off to that extent. The question is whether this $200,000 will cover the difference which would arise as a result of the reduction in the trade tax of 26.62% in the South and 21.2% in the North to 17.5% which is the present rate of tax in the City area.
8.10 p.m.

I would expect that the Government would still have to make subvention and grants in the Northern and Southern District Councils, if these Councils are to provide the services at a reasonable standard and more in line with some of the services given by the Municipality. I am doubtful whether the 11% for the Southern District and the 9% for the Northern District of the total amount of taxes collected will cover the expenditure for the installation of proper street lighting in the Southern and Northern Districts. Already we have seen some of the work done by the City Council in establishing a better and brighter system of lighting in the City area for which we are all grateful; but when we consider the lighting system in the Northern and Southern areas, to take one simple example, there is a lot to be desired. In that one item and in the administration of poor relief we can see that the 11% for the Southern District and the 9% for the Northern District will hardly prove to be adequate. As to the City Council having to collect 90% in order to be granted their 80%, I think that the matter has been very ably dealt with by the hon. senior member for the City; I am in agreement with his remarks on that particular point. I think that that proviso should be removed. If you are going to pool the trade tax into one common fund, there should not be a proviso of that nature. You try to collect as much trade tax as possible and then you make the final allocations. You say that in the pool 80% will go to the City Council, 11% to the Southern District Council and 9% to the Northern District Council. There is no necessity for pinning down the City Council and putting in a proviso that the City Council has to collect 90% in order to get 80%.

I am not opposed to the passing of this Bill in that I am in agreement with the principle generally, although in so far as derogating all powers from the Councils to the Local Government Commissioner is concerned, that is hardly a step in the right direction. The Commissioner will be performing in future certain of the functions of the City Council and the respective District Councils. That will be a move whereby a new principle is created and an innovation is being made into the running of the Local Government Councils. it may be the only way of doing it but it is a very clumsy way, in that you set up District Councils and then you start to amend the Local Government Act in the most vital respects possible. If this is the first step in abrogating the powers of the City Council and the District Council, then the time cannot be too far distant when another Bill of a similar nature dealing with tax hereditaments will be introduced. Chattel houses of a rateable value of $10 a month are exempt from taxation at present and I am hoping that through the introduction of this Bill by way of reducing the trade tax for the Northern and Southern Districts Councils, the impact will not be felt by the small householder, the small owner of a hereditament and the small shopkeeper or taxi owner who may be operating one car at a loss but who may still be called upon to pay trade tax.

In relieving the factory owner, the businessman and the plantation owner, I hope that the burden will not be superimposed on owners who may be small shopkeepers or small taxi owners. I hope that that burden will not be shifted on the shoulders of these small people. As the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. senior member for St. Peter have pointed out, such taxation will be collected and a big benefit will be derived by the big taxpayer and the difference will be made up in some way or other.

The Government speaks about some $300,000 to be handed back. Let me tell the Hon. Premier that the volume of service should be extended in districts such as St. Peter, St. James, many parts of St. George and certain parts of St. Philip and St. John. When you think of the various areas which are being developed in St James, St. Peter Christ Church, St. George and St. Philip you can see that services will have to be extended and therefore the cost will grow proportionally.
8.20 p.m.

When you fix 17.5% as the standard rate of trade tax, you will probably have to come with amendments fairly often unless the Government will give the assurance that they will continue to make the subventions and grants that they have made in the past to the Northern and Southern District Councils. We in the Christ Church Ward, Mr. Speaker, are not thoroughly satisfied with our lighting system and we are hoping that the Southern District area will follow the example which has been set by extending the lighting system and improving on the type of street lights which are provided.

In as far as sanitation is concerned, we feel that something more could be done, and we want to see certain open

parks and spaces provided in certain districts as well as playing fields and communal baths. We have not got the money to do these things; so unless Government comes with substantial grants to assist, I can see that fixing the rate at 17.5% will not serve the purpose which we have in mind.

This Bill is not one of the expiring laws which come into force each year; it is something which is going on the Statute Book once and for all; and when once it is there, there is little hope that it will be amended in the near future. It is for that reason that I look at this figure of 17.5% and feel that the rate of trade tax will necessarily vary from time to time, and in the not too distant future the rate may have to be amended in keeping with the volume of expenditure involved in granting the necessary amenities and facilities to the residents and taxpayers in the Northern and Southern District areas respectively.

The yield at present in the City is $1,649,630, in the South $125,535 and in the North $100,442; I think those were the figures given by the Hon. Minister when he introduced the Bill; but to expect that $125,535 can prove adequate for the numerous things which we in the Southern area are yet to do is impossible. What I say of the Southern area applies equally to the Northern area. When you think of the provision of suitable accesses to the sea, the necessity of establishing proper bathing facilities and the necessity of setting up bathing cubicles on certain beaches and things of that sort, how could $125,535 which is at present collected by way of trade tax in the Southern area and $100,442 in the Northern area together with whatever tax thay collect prove sufficient to improve conditions in these two respective areas? Government will definitely have still to come to the assistance of these two areas. It may seem that this Bill on the face of it sets out to remedy what may be termed an undoubted wrong and an old grievance which had been outlined by my colleague and myself when this Bill was first introduced, but it will merely give back some money to the Southern which we once enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, I have more or less covered the points which I intended making, and I do not believe in wasting time; so I would like to say in most emphatic terms.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 8.30 p.m. o'clock, this is the Moment of Interruption. Is the matter now under discussion regarded as controversial? If it is, it will not be proceeded with further tonight.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter is regarded as being controversial.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 4th April at 12 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.

8.34 p.m.