

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th May, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. J.B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

Messrs. N. W. BOXILL, L. A. LYNCH and Hon. G. G. FERGUSON entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing net Customs and Excise receipts for one month ended 30th April, 1963.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay a Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st December, 1962.

Messrs. E. D. MOTTLEY and S. E. SEALEY entered the House and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill further to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS many people in this island are unable to own their own homes and have to depend to a large extent on renting;

AND WHEREAS many landlords are exacting unreasonable rents from people unable to pay;

BE IT RESOLVED that Government set up immediately a Rent Restriction Board with a view to protecting such people who are forced to rent houses through no fault of their own.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the parish of St. Thomas has been without a dispensary for a very long time;

AND WHEREAS that such a dispensary would be of great benefit to the said parish;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government make representation to the Northern District Council to find out the feasibility of erecting such a service to the community.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the Government is called upon to subsidise the tourist industry to the sum of \$500,000 for the benefit of the Island;

AND WHEREAS the proposed entry of Britain into the European Common Market will have some effect on the economy of the Island;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Government make representation to the American and Canadian Governments with a view of asking them to allow more of their Naval ships to visit this Island in order that the many crews may spend their short leave in the Island.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the composition of the membership of the Boundaries Commission is drawn from the House of Assembly;

AND WHEREAS the announcement of the appointment of the Boundaries Commission does not truly reflect the present membership of the House of Assembly;

BE IT RESOLVED that the House of Assembly deplore the composition of the Boundaries Commission which does not reflect the membership of the House of Assembly. 12.20 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Resolution stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael re Lodge Road in St. Michael.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS the district known as Lodge Hill in the parish of Saint Michael leading from Green Hill near the

British-American Tobacco Factory to Cave Hill has recently become a heavily populated area;

AND WHEREAS there is at present no bus service available to the inhabitants of the said district;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to issue a directive to the concessionaire concerned to provide the said district with an extension of the Cave Hill bus service at such times and within such hours as Government shall deem necessary.

QUESTIONS

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works & Housing:

Will Government with all convenient despatch cause a postbox to be placed at the top of St. Stephen's Hill in the parish of St. Michael for the use of the inhabitants of Cave Hill, Lodge Hill and the several Housing Schemes nearby?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill further to amend the Casual Employees Pensions Act, 1961 was read a first time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; to move the second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1963, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of the Hon. Premier, I am asking leave to take charge of Orders Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 8, all standing in the name of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of Orders Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 8 under Government Business for today, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

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

THE RATES OF INCOME TAX ACT, 1963.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Order No. 1 is a Bill to settle the rates on which income tax are to be levied and assessed for the year 1963. As members are aware, it is necessary every year to legislate for the income tax rates to be fixed for the ensuing year, and this Bill seeks to impose the same rates of taxation for the year 1963 as obtained during the assessment year, 1962. In view of the fact that there is no change and the rates presumably will be as satisfactory as they were last year, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to exercise my right in this Chamber, and in this matter of dealing with income tax, I propose to touch on some of the matters that were referred to last week in the Budget by the Hon. Premier.

I want to begin by saying, Sir, that the time has come when some members of Parliament at least, if not all, have to exercise their right in the preservation of all the tenets of democracy. I am a disappointed man in the Party in power when I read their manifesto, and I am going to make many references to it today to show why I am a disappointed man, because the Party seems to be challenging.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion before the House is a motion

for the second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act. The hon. member said he proposes to refer to points raised during the Budget Statement of the Premier last week. As the hon. member is aware.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not a point of order. There cannot be any point of order about an ordinary statement I have made when I am going to make a speech, and what I propose to do in my speech; there cannot be any point of order about that. There is nothing in that for any person to begin to have a point of order on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just let me hear the Hon. Minister's point of order, if he will make it precisely.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I appreciate Your Honour's admonition. The position is that the motion before the House is a motion for the second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, and I need hardly point out for Your Honour's consideration the provisions of the Rules of the House with regard to matters of this sort before the House. I merely want to add, Sir, that also on the Order Paper is a motion to approve the Budget Statement of the Premier, and this matter will come up today, we hope, as the first item under Private Members' Business. I was expecting, therefore, that hon. members who wanted or who desired to comment on the Budget Statement would utilise the opportunity when this motion came up later in today's sitting for discussion. It is Your Honour's prerogative to control.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, you cannot allow this. The hon. member is making a speech and not a point of order. I have not made a statement yet on which a point of order can be taken. A point of order is when a member has said something that offends the House or when he has misquoted somebody.
12.30 p.m.

I am making my first speech and the hon. member is making this long dissertation on the Rules of the House of Assembly saying that is a point of order. This is something which I have to comment on later.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is not aware that he was making a statement. His very first expression...

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot question that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If both hon. members would give way. I take it that when the Hon. Leader of the House rose on a point of order, he was stating that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was out of order when he said that he is going to discuss or make reference to the Budget Speech. That is what I thought.

The principle which I have in mind in dealing with these Bills is that a member is at liberty to make reference to the Budget Speech. I am making this ruling now. Inasmuch as these three Bills emanate from the Hon. Premier's Budget Speech, it would seem to me that hon. members are at liberty to make reference to it. As the Hon. Leader of the House has said — and I believe he might have been asking them to exercise their discretion not to debate it at this time, but to wait until the particular motion comes up for discussion.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, if you refer to the Statutory Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, you will see that a discussion on the second reading of a Bill is clearly defined.

Standing Order No. 40, on page 39, paragraph 2, reads as follows:-

"On the order for the second reading of a Bill being called, a motion may be made 'That the Bill be now read a second time', and a debate may arise covering the principle and general merits of the Bill."

Am I to understand from Your Honour's ruling that you propose unilaterally to suspend the Standing Orders and to permit debate on a motion before the House which the Standing Orders most clearly do not allow?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will repeat what I said. I am not making any proposals. I have just said, dealing with the Bills under Government Business, I cannot reasonably or logically preclude a member from making reference to the Hon. Premier's Budget Speech. That is all I have said.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, all that the Hon. Leader of the House has said is a perfect indication of the substance of my submission to this House, that is, his speech is a designed attempt to preclude hon. members of this House from debating what should have been the first debate on this matter by hon. members.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object most strongly to the remarks of the hon. member. So far as I am aware, there is no design or no attempt to stifle debate on this matter. I began by saying that the Standing Orders set out that a debate may arise on the motion being made covering the principle and general merits of the Bill. Secondly, I also said that set down for debate under today's business during Private Members' time is a motion on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance; therefore it is completely wrong and incorrect for the hon. senior member for St. Peter or any other hon. member to say that I am trying to preclude or to stifle debate on this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House is going to rise about a hundred times because my speech has not started yet. I said that it was designedly an attempt to preclude a debate on the matter which should have taken place in the first instance. Now, Sir, we listened to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals by the Hon. Premier last Tuesday, and under paragraph 2, it carries the details of revenue collected during 1962 which are as follows: Customs Duties, \$11,144,000; Excise Duties \$2,210,000; Income Tax, \$8,997,000; and other Receipts, \$5,985,000.

You have that; and the Hon. Leader of the House has the effrontery and brass to get up here today and suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that no reference should be made under the Income Tax Bill, which is the first Order of Government Business, to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals, and he is reading some emasculated Rules of this House and imputing that it is wrong for a member to make reference to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals in dealing with this Bill. He is asking us here today not to discuss this matter or make any reference to the Budgetary Proposals. You had this circuitous route, and some hon. member giving notice of some damp squib Resolution at the eleventh hour to preclude us from discussing this matter today; and on top of that so that you could discuss these Bills first, you move that we adjourn to meet at 12.00 o'clock today while all the other times you were meeting at 2.30 o'clock. You did not even have the courtesy of letting us know that you were coming down with the Budgetary Proposals in a week's time. We had to get an introduction of knowing about one of the most important statements to be made by any Government in any country in any department by way of Rediffusion. You are reducing the dignity of this House to a position where it no longer happens to be the supreme body. The same hon. gentleman went to the electorate of this country and asked them to send him here, and as the people's representative, he is giving notice over Rediffusion to the other representatives of the people that one of the most important items of Parliament is going to be discussed. That is a most positive discourtesy meted out to members of Parliament. The Hon. Premier came in and brought in with him paraphernalia to speak on it. He brought in equipment to broadcast his speech. Let me tell him that the question of broadcasting your speech is not a question which is in the province of the Government. It is not the business of the Government to say whether your speech should be broadcast by microphone, loudspeaker or by juke box. The next thing you are going to get is some little juke box playing in here just because some Minister may like to do "The Twist". The business of bringing things into the House of Assembly resides with Parliament.

The Hon. Minister of Education is one of those members who have written part of the Government's Manifesto and I can see the part which he has written.
12.40 p.m.

The House met at 2.30 p.m. for the last six weeks even when the Government's Budget Speech was to be made. Then at the eleventh hour the same Hon. Leader of the House was the person who proposed that we meet at 12 o'clock today after a Resolution was pushed into the hands of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas asking him to move that we approve of the Budgetary Proposals. They knew that we could not discuss them until 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon and therefore they moved the adjournment until 12 o'clock noon today.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time fixed for the meeting of the House is conditioned entirely by the extent of Government Business. That is all. When there are only a few items on the Order Paper, we meet at 2.30 o'clock; but today when the Government has no fewer than 13 different items on the Order Paper and it was not expected that we could get through the majority of them.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not a point of order. That is a reply to the speech which I am making. I have not said anything which is not a fact; so what the hon. member is saying could not be a point of order.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member has said that it is a matter of design that we are meeting today at 12 o'clock in order to begin Government Business. That is his interpretation which he can make if he likes to do so, but I object to the statement that this is a matter of design, and, furthermore, that the meeting of the House at 12 o'clock noon today is part and parcel of that design.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the hon. senior member for St. Peter resumes his remarks, I should like to say this: I have given a ruling on the matter as to whether hon. members are entitled to make reference to the Budget Proposals in dealing with these Bills. I would therefore be grateful now if the hon. member would proceed to deal with the matter which is Order No. 1 on the Order Paper today.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, all that I am saying is a part of this Income Tax Bill because it is wrapped up in the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. My contention is that in view of the fact that this is a Government Measure introduced into the House of Assembly for the first time since the Budget Proposals were introduced, we should have been given the opportunity of discussing these Budget Proposals which contained these Bills prior to the introduction of the Bills to be discussed, in order to preclude reference to the Budget Proposals; and in that connection I have said that that was done by design. It is a fact that these Bills are part of the Budget Proposals and we should not be discussing these Bills before we discuss the Budget Proposals; that is why I said that this was not by accident. The Hon. Leader of the House could have moved the adjournment of the House until 12 o'clock noon today, but he could have made arrangements for the Budget Proposals to be discussed as the first Order of the Day; we could have suspended the Rules so as to deal with the matter. The Rules could have been suspended so that we could have the opportunity of discussing the Budget Proposal because our Rules are not the laws of the Medes and Persians.

The Budget Speech preceded the Financial Proposals; why could not the debate on the Budget Proposals follow consistently? Why is it that we could not discuss the Budget Proposals and then deal with the Bills? The idea was to have this paraphernalia brought in here and broadcast to the world and then make it appear as if we are the menials of the Government. I will say a lot in here so as to demonstrate the fundamental rights of any democracy which I hold dearly. I do not want anybody to be under any misapprehension of my attitude. I do not regard Parliament as any place where I have to be sentimental about any one or to be emotional about anyone; our friends in public life happen to be our consciences; and when we discharge our consciences then we do not have to care.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, against the background of these Financial Proposals are the Estimates for 1963-64. We

cannot discuss income tax in isolation from the Estimates. The Estimates bear a close relationship to the Budgetary Proposals. We are not now passing a Bill for the first time in our lives to have the question of Income tax put on the Statute Book. The Hon. Leader of the House introduced this matter in relation to a Bill as if we are passing a Bill for the first time putting income tax on the Statute Book, and he told us not to make any reference to anything else. I quite agree with the hon. member in this respect because you would not expect me to make any reference to the tax on cigarettes or sweet drinks now. I will do that in another Bill; but you cannot prevent me from making reference to the Budget Proposals because the Budget Proposals presented by the Hon. Premier was to make up for a deficit of \$1,228,072. The Government did not treat us with the courtesy of allowing us to know that these Budget Proposals would have been made last Tuesday, but the Premier can do that and leave the little children in the House and he goes away from this island! He does not know that Parliament comes supreme before any visit can be made out of the island. Imagine the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain making Budget Proposals and then going away leaving those Budget Proposals to be discussed! The Hon. Premier has taken full responsibility for these proposals and now he has left them to the Hon. Leader of the House to answer. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember that it is only a few weeks ago that the Hon. Leader of the House said that he could not speak for the Hon. Premier in relation to the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund.

12.50 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order; the hon. member is quite within his right to make any statement and draw any conclusion he likes, but they should be fair and reasonable. It is not fair to the Hon. Premier to consider his departure from the Island immediately after the presentation of the Budget as any sign of disrespect or irresponsibility. The position is that this was the only week which the Hon. Premier would have had free to attend to the urgent business he is attending with the Canadian Government, and the hon. member is fully aware that next Monday begins in this Island a meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers to discuss the Federation proposals. The Ministers are converging here; some are already here and the others are coming this week. Mr. Nigel Fisher himself.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what are you allowing? The hon. member introduced this Bill and it is his right to reply; it is not his right to interrupt when I am making a speech. If he says I am entitled to a statement, I am entitled to it, and he is entitled to reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me make this clear to both hon. members. When the Hon. Leader rose on a point of order, I took it he was replying to the hon. member when he said it was not fair for the Hon. Premier to have left this Budget and that he could have done better, and I thought the Hon. Leader was explaining that it was force of circumstances that caused the Premier to leave. I think that matter has been decided. The Hon. Leader has rejected the statement, and I will ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter to continue.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not in any way whatsoever challenge Your Honour's ruling, but I am sure you will agree with me that the Hon. Leader has the right to reply, and therefore each time I make a statement that is a matter of my own judgment, he cannot rise on a point of order. It is a fact that the Hon. Premier left the Island after introducing the Budget Proposals, and I regard that as a positive act of discourtesy. It is for the hon. member to reply in making his speech, but not to get up on a point of order, because my judgment is that the House of Assembly in this country is supreme to Canada, the United States of America, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Kennedy or anybody else. When these people have their business to arrange, we have to take second place to their business arrangements. We are not second place to the Regional Council of Ministers. This is the Barbados Parliament to which we were elected, and you only become a Regional Minister if the people elect you to one of these posts. You are not elected from the country to be a Regional Minister. You are a Regional Minister when you are a Minister in a region.

What I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, — and none of the interruptions will prevent me from saying it — is that the Leader of the House should be the last person to defend this, because when he was asked a simple question on the Widows and Orphans Resolution, a little thing like that had to be postponed in this House three times so that the Hon. Premier could deal with it; but the country's whole finances rest in the hands of the Minister of Finance, and he cannot disregard this Chamber with the sort of contempt with which we find this Chamber is being disregarded by coming on Tuesdays and bringing all the paraphernalia, and then when we have to debate it, it is being pushed into a secondary position. This is an intrusion on our fundamental democratic rights which I feel we as Parliamentarians have a right to preserve, more so in these days when there is so much intrusion on the rights of democracy all over the world, and we cannot allow it to slip up here.

I want to remind the hon. member — and I will remind him when I get more in these proposals to show what I mean — that in their manifesto the Party said that it is irrevocably committed to foster, develop and sustain the principles of Parliamentary democracy. If you believe in Parliamentary democracy, why not treat us with the courtesy that Parliament deserves and not reduce Parliament to a tamarind tree tea meeting, or like a meeting turn where you tell a person that it does not matter if he gets a turn last, because next time he will get the first turn? No matter who are your friends or enemies, there are certain basic principles you have to follow.

The Hon. Premier introduced a Budget in which he said he wanted to make up a gap of \$1,200,000 in the Estimates. Now I want to explode the myth which the Hon. Leader has just produced about the Premier being in Canada and this is the only week he could go. The Premier himself made all these arrangements knowing he was going to make his Budget Speech at this time. The last Budget came in June, but there is nothing sacrosanct about introducing the Budget. Not only is there no date for laying the Budget, but there is even no method of telling us when it is going to be dealt with; so when the hon. member said that the Premier had this commitment in Canada, do you believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be so stupid a man.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, today happens to be the 14th May and the Hon. Premier will soon be arriving, and the debate is only now commencing; so each and every one of us has a right to place our case and make any relevant point, and the Hon. Premier shall be back and shall make the replies at the right time and in the manner in which I know he will do it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister very much. I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who is an old Parliamentarian will agree that even if you are in a Government and it does something that infringes some of the basic principles of Parliamentary democracy, even if they can be defended, he must admit that it is an infringement. What I am saying is that the Premier, being Minister of Finance and being the Premier of Barbados, in making any overseas arrangements must take into consideration his own local commitments; so that if he is committed to introduce the Budget on 7th May, he would have to make arrangements so that he would not be out of the Island until he deals with it because it is a matter dear to him as Minister of Finance; and if the Premier has undertaken to be away, he should make alternative arrangements. Mr. Pearson is in the United States, but there is no Budget debate going on in Canada. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has to meet other people, but they have to wait until the Budget is over. It is true that members who are not members of Government, for the sake of not wanting to create disharmony or appear to be making opposition for the sake of opposition, sometimes allow some of their basic rights to go by the Board, but it does not mean that forever they are going to do it. This is a serious matter and I have given serious thought and consideration to it, because I am one of those people who know that in running a country you only have to slip up once or twice before you find that the iron hand of dictatorship seems to embrace you so tightly that you cannot get out of it. I will have something more to say on that.

1.00 p.m.

That is a deficit which has been created under the Table of expenditure..

Now, the Government budgeted for a revenue of less than \$29 million, part of which they were going to collect by way of income tax. They have also budgeted for an expenditure of \$30 million. The Premier knows that he has made proposals to redress this matter, but the Government has come forward with this new political attempt and is saying that it is not discussing the Budget Proposals as we formerly did, but that we will have the time to discuss them during Private Members' Business. This Government is using other ways of stifling debate on important issues and they have taken a circuitous route of dealing with this matter by coming in here with a Statement knowing very well that you cannot debate a Statement. You have tried to circumvent all of the channels of appropriate debate by pushing this matter in a motion which you can only debate during the second part of the day. You bring in the main proposals affecting the Budget to be dealt with during the first part of the day and you object to members dealing with the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement while dealing with these proposals.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these proposals for increased taxation are to make way for the deficit of \$1 million. You say that you are not asking the income tax payer for any more money. In your Estimates of Revenue you have proposals for getting in \$8,400,000 from income tax, and as I have said, I have read in these Budgetary Proposals that you are making up for a deficit of \$1 million; yet in this Income Tax Bill which we are now asked to pass we have seen that you have not increased the rates to get in any more money. You are collecting income tax according to the old rates.

Now, Sir, this is not a Bill which you are bringing in for the first time. This is not a Bill which we are passing for the first time. Money has been taken out of my salary up to last week to pay income tax. Do not let us confuse ourselves and think that you are coming to do something new for the first time. This Rates of Income Tax Bill was passed in the first instance saying what are the rates and you are asked to do this each year. The Hon. Premier told you that you have a deficit of \$1,200,000; but he did not tell you that there are people who owe the Government more than \$2 million for income tax. You are calling upon the people of this country to make up this deficit and you say that you are not calling upon income tax payers to pay more. Through this same Income Tax Bill which you have brought here, you have income tax payers who owe the Government an amount to the tune of over \$2 million. I have my income tax bill in my pocket and I paid my last bill on the 3rd April, 1963. As I have said, you have a deficit of \$1,200,000 and you have outstanding over \$2 million by people who pay income tax. Now, you come today and tell me not to make any reference to the Premier's Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals while dealing with any of these three Bills.

I am sorry that the Hon. Premier is not present. I would have like the Hon. Premier to hear what I am going to say. I want the man who claims to be the financial genius to be here. Now, the average run of people who pay income tax, pay it according to the P.A.Y.E. system, and sometimes they have to go to the Income Tax Commissioner and get remittances because they have paid income tax over and above the amount which they should have paid. You have people owing this country over \$2 million in income tax and they are not poor people either: the people who owe this \$2 million are not the half-cent people whom you are taking \$5.00 as income tax from. You have passed a Bill which has as its objects means whereby you are encouraged to pay your income tax. I do not owe one cent as income tax and I am not a rich man. In fact, poverty is my profession. I never had a lot of money; but what little I have earned, I have contributed to the state fully without any question or form of conscience because I feel that a country must have finance to run its business, particularly if the people are asking for those things.

Are you going to tell the people of this country that your income tax proposals are such as to produce a situa-

tion like this? I am a Socialist; but you have to learn to implement a way to narrow the gap.

Now, for the last ten years you have said that this was the position. In 1952-53 your Customs and Excise duties amounted to \$5,965,974, taxation, \$6,056,197; in 1953-54, Customs and Excise duties, \$6,659,818, taxation \$6,303,418; in 1954-55, Customs and Excise Duties, \$7,232,614, taxation, \$6,340,771; in 1955-56, Customs and Excise Duties, \$7,668,853, taxation, \$7,052,767; in 1956-57, Customs and Excise Duties, \$8,288,348, taxation, \$7,593,522; in 1957-58, Customs and Excise Duties amounted to \$9,617,945 and taxation \$7,951,710; in 1958-59, Customs and Excise Duties, \$9,666,848 and taxation \$10,739,504; in 1959-60, Customs and Excise Duties brought in \$10,798,902 and taxation \$9,104,100, in 1960-61, Customs and Excise Duties brought in \$12,154,673 and taxation \$9,861,313. In 1961-62, Customs and Excise Duties, \$11,530,975 and taxation \$9,953,294.

Turning to the Budget proposals, what has the Hon. Premier told us since he came into power? Customs and Excise comes to nearly \$14 million — which is nearly one-half of the total revenue which you get coming from out of the people who buy food. Income tax comes to \$8.9 million. Those of us who have a Socialist philosophy always believe that you should begin to narrow the gap between things which people eat and which come through Customs, and what people pay by way of income tax.

1.10 p.m.

When you buy through the Customs, you tax every poor man. They are the poor people who have to eat food and buy clothes and they are the poor people who have to live in rented houses; but the gap is widened and we have to pay for food the sum of \$14 million out of a total budget of \$28 million. The amount of 50% of the total budget comes from Customs duties and excise. You are imposing fresh consumption taxes in a situation where you have 50% of the total revenue coming from Customs and Excise and you have not told us what you are doing about this \$2 million. Now you are coming in with Budget Proposals against a background of your own income tax situation and the gap is widening on the other side. You are telling people: "I am not going to tax you any more." Let us agree that the income is high. I am not talking about income tax as somebody who does not pay. I have to pay my income tax; I only work for a salary and I have to pay my income tax. I do not get any fees; my salary is known. I get a few cents from this House of Assembly and my salary from the Barbados Worker's Union is known. I cannot get any reduction of income tax more than what the law allows. If the amount of \$2 million is outstanding, it is not from those people who pay \$14 million for food; it is in other sectors, and your Budget Proposals today include further taxation on these people. Nobody can say that I am a person who is not paying my income tax and I am talking like this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to deal with the Premier's Financial Statement and Budget Proposals in detail when we come to discuss the matter, but I will deal with the proposals as they relate to income tax. The Hon. Premier has made a general survey of the economy of Barbados and he starts off by saying this: "The purpose of this economic survey of the Barbados economy in 1962 is to provide a background picture of general trends in the economy of the island against which the Budget proposals for the year 1963-64 can be more clearly viewed and appreciated." One of the important things in relation to our fiscal policy is income tax and in these proposals, these two items represent the largest portion of our revenue — Customs and Excise Duties and Taxation. As regards our revenue for 1963-64, of the \$29 million which is expected to be derived from revenue, you will note that the Import duties and package tax account for \$9 million and \$15 million is from Customs and Excise. Even in the Approved Estimates you have a summary of the income and you will find that in the year 1953, ten years ago, the total revenue was what we are getting today from Customs duties, that is, over \$14.9 million. You cannot say that the masses are getting a freeness when it comes to taxation. With the Socialist principle when the Conservative Government was in power, our sounding-board was that we would close the gap or we

wanted to close the gap between Customs Duties and Income Tax because the burden fell more heavily on the poor man who has to buy his shoes and his clothing; the poor man is being taxed and the rich is not called upon to pay. A man cannot trust income tax when he goes to buy a pint of rice or a pound of flour. Those people who owe any of this \$2 million are not those who are working for \$20 a week or who are going to sleep without a meal, or those who are waiting to buy cheap flying fish; those who owe any of this \$2 million are not those who have to go sleep with an oil lamp or those who live on the barest level of subsistence; but it is those people who enjoy a better standard of living than other people in this community.

Why is it that we are making it more burdensome for people in this community without stating the facts clearly? In stating the reasons for making these proposals, the Premier said that it was for the purpose of lessening the gap of the deficit which we have. If you did not have this deficit of \$1,228,000, the necessity for imposing this taxation at this time would not have arisen. I am not one of those persons who will get on a platform and tell people that they can increase or improve their standard of living at the same price. I am a believer in having good social conditions, but I do not believe in having these conditions at the same price.

1.20 p.m.

A man who wants to live in a better house than the one in which he is at present living must realise that it is going to cost him more money. If a country wants a better standard of living, it is going to cost the country more. It may not cost the people more in the sense that the money can be re-distributed in a way in which you get a better way of life, but you have to bring in more money as such, and the Government itself will re-distribute the earnings through its fiscal policy, so that the level of taxation falls evenly on the people who pay. If you see that the gap is getting wider and that Customs Duties are going up and up, you have to review your income tax. This will bring a measure of consolation and relief to the Leader of the Opposition and his group, because normally they are the more affluent members of this society, and any income tax increase would fall heavier on those persons they represent. I would expect them to support the proposal not to increase income tax, and I believe in a general way that very few people like any increases except increases in which they are at the receiving end. Everybody seems innately to possess the feeling of wanting to hold on to as much as he can and only giving as little as he is forced to; but I am sure that even they would have to admit that if the gap gets too wide between income tax and Customs Duty in a community like this, you would have to review the situation and attempt to narrow that gap, because you are going on on a consumption basis; and if you have more people to consume something, therefore you will be passing on a heavier burden on the people who have to consume some of the things you provide.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel that if it is the intention of Government to review the income tax position in Barbados, by all means they should set up a Committee and review it and not let us come to the House each year. The Government that is in power came into office in December 1961 and this is their second Budget Proposals. Each Budget Proposal included a heavier burden on the consumption of things in this country. In two years' time your consumption tax has increased, and you get the situation in this island where your Customs and Excise duties are rising faster than your income tax, and the gap is getting very wide indeed. I would be quite prepared to agree with a gap even as wide as that if I knew you did not have all these defaulters existing in Barbados. It is not fair in a community to claim you are having a budget of \$8 million from taxation and you have 25% of that in arrears. Let the hon. member say this is not their fault but something they inherited from the last Government. I am the last person to resurrect the last political Party. Everybody in Barbados will know that so far as I am concerned they could have been dead ten years ago. So far as I am concerned, they are dead and I do not believe in re-incarnation; I would have to come back here 89 times for purification, and if that is so, they would have to come back 899 times for purification. This is no time to

apologise for the last Government, because they were members of a Party of destructers; so why should I want to resurrect somebody who wants to destroy? Even my closest friend I am not going to defend on the guise that he is giving me poison to suck and saying it is a sweet. Sometimes you have to be more watchful of your friends than your enemies, because your enemies do not get close to you, but your friends can get right into your bosom.

Here you get a situation in which the Ministers are not going to speak for this. The Premier said he is responsible for finance and not the members of the Cabinet. He came here with the first Budget and made the most brazen and outrageous statement that in consulting them he did it about five minutes before he came up with the Budget proposals. They must be a bunch of idiots of the biggest class that they have collective responsibility, that if the Premier falls all of them will fall, and he can come with gigantic Budget Proposals without consulting them though they went around the country asking people to vote for them. Are they such minions that he can put proposals to them five minutes before they come here, and can go back and tell the people that the Premier decided they had to do it? No constitution dictates that nonsense in any Cabinet. That happens when you get inflated about your own importance and feel that even those around you are not capable of advising you. When you reach that stage, you are ready to die, because nobody comes in the grave to advise a dead man; but if you are alive, you are in need of legal advice. These are matters which do not affect you as a person, but the community. Nobody can run a country and say he does not need somebody to advise him. It is not like a puzzling tin where if you run short you can put in a knife to get out some money, and even there somebody has to advise you if you have the knife too straight, that you should put it at a slant. When the hon. member came here and made that outrageous statement at the time, I wonder on whose behalf it was made. Some of the members sat with a certain amount of patience and tolerance and underwent that sort of public statement being made which is a positive infringement on their own sense of character. When I examine this and I see what the Premier has said in these Budget Proposals, as against the background of reality, how can you ask me today when I vote for this Bill on income tax not to make any reference to these things?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to ask the Hon. Leader of the House when he replies if he would regard that as an improper statement for me to make against the background of the total arrears in income tax and against what is budgeted for, if in the circumstances had he not been a member of this Government but was sitting over there in the Opposition and the Government had brought down Budget Proposals which ostensibly were to make up a deficit in the total amount they had in income tax arrears, what would be his answer. I know the hon. member very well, but life is a funny thing. The Hon. Minister is now administering things with which he did not agree. You did not agree with everything in the Five Year Development Plan, but let us admit that we all agreed that there should be a Deep Water Harbour and a Cold Storage. The other Government started them, but you are running them for the benefit of the colony. I want to ask the hon. member to say when he replies what would have been his attitude to the arrears of \$2 million which represents about 25% of the total amount you budget for, and whether he does not feel it more incumbent on the Government to garner unto itself its arrears before it comes with fresh taxation. Tell people in Barbados that you cannot spend more money on them, and do what the law permits you to do. If you pass a law that gives you \$10 million and the people in the community give you \$8 million, do not spend \$11 million; make them wait.

I do not have to challenge the Government on its proposals for expenditure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the Hon. Leader of the House would have to admit that within the same Estimates for which the Premier wants to make up the gap — this \$8 million is part of it; and I want to tell the Leader that the Government cannot do everything that is in its manifesto in one year, two years or even three years, and it would be stupid to give the public the impression that because you wrote a manifesto, you are going to carry out everything in it.

1.30 p.m.

Karl Marx wrote a manifesto in the 1880's and it is the same manifesto of today; but do you realise that there are certain parts of the Marx manifesto which are inapplicable in Soviet Russia today through the march of time? Do you think that whatever you have in your manifesto you can do in three years? If you think so, you do not know the meaning of the word "manifesto". A manifesto is only a document containing certain particular principles which you have in mind.

The Hon. Minister of Education within this same Budget has a proposal which increases the expenditure of this country. I do not go in for making any vain statements. I say this. If you cannot feed all the children by giving them all a hot meal, you had better not continue with your hot meal programme; you had better feed all with milk and biscuits as you were doing and wait until the time you can do it for all. I can bring in a Resolution today asking the Government to give everybody who is walking about barefooted a pair of shoes. Now, if the Government were to agree to that, up would go your taxation for giving a pair of shoes to everybody who is walking barefooted.

The question is if you are satisfied about doing a thing and you feel it is essential. If you are satisfied, well, do it. I like the courage of the Hon. Premier. Even if he is doing something wrong he has the courage to say what he is doing. However, courage is not the only attribute in running a country. You have to run a country and take into consideration every aspect of it. I know what I am saying, and I am satisfied in my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people of this country are not satisfied to know that you have outstanding arrears in income tax of \$2 million while you have a deficit of \$1 million, and you are calling on those people who have already made up the large gap in your deficit to continue to make up that large gap.

Now, this \$2 million deficit is not a recurrent estimate. Next year, it does not mean that your expenditure is going to be \$30 million. I think you have a recurrent bill of expenditure of something in the vicinity of \$16 million or \$17 million; that is to say, no matter what happens, we have to look for a recurrent expenditure of a certain amount in the vicinity of what I have just said. I think the correct figures are set out in the Estimates.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I promised that I would make reference to the manifesto of the Government Party. I propose to do so now. I have read a part and I believe the Hon. Minister of Trade wrote it. Now, there are conflicting things in that manifesto and that is why I say it was written by different people. When the Hon. Minister of Labour wrote his part, he said that this country was in a prosperous condition. When the Hon. Premier wrote his part, he said that the present state of the island's finances is a matter of grave concern. The Minister of Labour was saying that the country was in a prosperous condition and the Hon. Premier was saying that the finances of the country was a matter of grave concern. There is no money and the island's savings are now simply depleted.

Now, Sir, if according to the Premier the island's savings are now depleted, I say this. If I start off a business and I find that things are not so good, I would look to see who owed me money and I would start collecting from the people who owed me. This is ordinary shopkeeping business. It does not need any Euclid to solve anything. Before I start spending money I would collect from those who owed me. You, yourself, said that the island's finances are depleted; therefore, the first thing you should have done was to go to the people who owed you. The Premier said that the island's savings are now depleted. There is no money in the General Revenue Balance and the Revenue Equalisation Fund was recently committed by the Government to provide advances pending the raising of loans which may never be realised.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think it is quite true for the hon. member to say that we have made no attempt. A supplement of the (*Official Gazette*) dated 4th June, 1962, sets out a Bill to look after that matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government set out in a Bill last year how people would pay their income tax in dribble terms. However, if you had collected the \$2 million it would bound to reflect in your current Budgetary Proposals.

What I was pointing out was that they stated in their manifesto that the island's savings are now depleted and there is no money in the General Revenue Balance and the Revenue Equalisation Fund was recently committed by the Government to provide advances pending the raising of loans which may never be realised. I would say that that is a political statement. This Government has benefited by the fact that the last Government raised money out of its own resources pending the raising of loans because when this Government came into power, if the last Government had borrowed money at the time when they could have borrowed money, the interest rates would have been so high that we would be paying a higher Sinking Fund. You have therefore benefitted by those fellows utilising what we had in the kitty and their not borrowing at the time.
1.40 p.m.

But now you come to govern, down went the rate of interest. If the finances of this colony were so bad, you could not have come into power in 1961 and get anybody in 1962 to lend you money. The reputation of this island would have to be a good one in order that you could get a loan in 18 months and raise the money so quickly. I do not like to make these uncharitable statements against my vilest opponent. You were in a better position to borrow money at the time when the interest rate went down; you had the luck of the draw. I want to say that if Jamaica went on the London Money Market they would get the same one and a quarter million dollars. The lawyers have a way of making people believe that when you go on the London Money Market it is like when you go to the Fairchild Street Market and people are waiting with money in their pockets to say "Let us have two shillings worth of potatoes". But the money market does not work just like a woman who is waiting to sell potatoes. It means that when your credit is good people will buy things from you.

I think that the Hon. Premier worked a clever one in showing how narrow he could get the difference in money down, that it is only a difference of so much. You get Government Departments which spend money and it will make you realise how neat the Budget is; but they can inflate the cost of overtime so as to spend the money. I throw that out as a hint to the Minister; the money would be utilised because some of the Departmental Heads want to get it spent as quickly as possible realising that the 31st March is coming.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the year 1956 the value of our exports was \$32,875,000. This is dealing with sugar and molasses. You will find that in 1957-58 the taxation was \$7.9 million. In 1957, the value of the domestic produce was \$45,011,000. The price of sugar went up and the export of sugar was \$35,995,000, the export of molasses was \$4,833,000, making a total of \$40,828,000 and the domestic produce was \$45,011,000. In 1957-58 you collected \$7.9 million in taxation. The highest collection was in 1958-59 and that reflected a windfall which we got from the Suez Canal. The taxation collected that year, 1958-59, was \$10,739,504. In the next year, the amount went down to \$9,104,100 and correspondingly in the next year the amount was \$9,861,313. In 1959 the value of the domestic produce was \$39,821,000 and it may be that in one year the rum trade may have affected the gross domestic produce, because they had a drop while the amount of sugar did not drop by any considerable amount. In 1961 the total amount for sugar and molasses was \$31,603,000, but it is likely that we will get a windfall even from the Estimates which we now have, because with the price for sugar the national income would increase as a result of the distribution of more profits and more earnings, and therefore a higher reflection in income tax.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that all of us should know that the Government is satisfied with the estimate it has made in the Budget Proposals for 1963-64 and that is what

the hon. Deputy Premier has come to us with. They have estimated that they will get \$8,400,000. In 1961-62, you had \$9.3 million and in 1960 the domestic produce was something like \$35,016,000. On sugar alone in 1961, the amount was \$28,039,000. What I want to know is this: what has happened that the amount of income tax has been put down at \$8 million? We do not want to budget lower for this item than what we are going to get. I do not want anybody to come along and say that a windfall has taken place and it looks like higher prosperity. Do you not have your own people coming into the income tax bracket from year to year on the P.A.Y.E. basis? If you said that the employment situation has improved, then you should bring more people into the income tax bracket. You cannot have a bigger employment or labour market and a lower income tax. I am sure that today an analysis of any of the business houses in this City will tell you that if we are employing more people in a general way, then our income tax collection will rise on the basis of the P.A.Y.E. system, unless you are putting everybody below the income tax level.

1.50 p.m.

Now when you look at that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and see that the income tax we are going to get is \$8,400,000, that is where I want the hon. Leader of the House to tell us quite frankly whether this \$8,400,000 is your realistic budgetary figure or a figure you have put in here based on last year's crop. What was the value of last year's crop? The Premier had some figures here and I am going to quote his own figures. There is a figure of the 1962 domestic product. I was looking to quote from the figures so that the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Leader of the House would be able to tell me if these income tax figures relate to these things, but I can guess the amount. The amount is about \$33 million so far as sugar is concerned, but I think the total domestic product is \$44 million. What I do not understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is how it is that from these taxation proposals we are likely to get less money than what was reflected some time ago, and I would like to know something about that.

The point I made at the beginning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will repeat here in closing. How can we adequately deal with this general survey which includes these taxes for which the deficit was made up, if we have to deal with it in this disjointed manner? That is why I said you have not given us an opportunity to deal with it in relation to the things that are to come. When we deal with the proposals for which we have another two hour's debate, it is going to teach the Government a lesson. Some time ago their predecessors were taught a lesson in here. They wanted to turn back somebody in here, but we kept them here until 7 o'clock, and it never happened again. This is a lesson to show the Leader of the House that he has to be careful with his tricks. You cannot come in this House and think you can risk any political gimmick by coming to us and telling us these are the Budget Proposals one day, putting them before us today and then saying next week that we cannot discuss the proposals because you are going to bring down the Bills. It is now five minutes to 2 o'clock, and you have not passed a Bill yet, and that is only one. You are going to say that it was not your intention to stay.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member is addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sorry. 2 o'clock will come, but what you wanted to do was to pass the Income Tax Bill and all the other Bills and then make the Budget Proposals one of those stupid debates that has nothing attached to it, so that we would be discussing a proposal long after it had no effectiveness, because you had passed the things already. The Budget debate must be an intelligent debate, and no Government should be afraid of its Budget Proposals being debated in the same way it is being introduced. My colleagues over there were rampant. We have had sessions together against the last Government for this attitude, and we warned them over there that their attitude does not pay, that they would not always be there to get on with that, and they laughed. I remember on one occasion the Minister of Education telling them "when we get over there," and they looked over and said "Over where? Over here?" I do not associate the Minister of Education wholly with this attitude,

but as part of the Government, I have to associate him partially with that sort of conduct which is not in keeping with the tenets of Parliamentary democracy and what has been enunciated in your manifesto. If we do not agree with the Budget Proposals, we will say so, but you will pass them because you have the numbers and if we do not like them, we will criticise them; but it is your duty to bring them down and let us debate them. We would discuss the proposals and say we do not agree with all the Budget Proposals or that we agree with them, after which the vote is taken and the Bills will follow.

What we do not like, Mr. Deputy Speaker — and I hinted this — is that you cannot come to the House with this and then meet at 12 o'clock in order to circumvent the debate on this, then introduce things that form part of it, and then by innuendo and by rising on a point of order, try to get the Deputy Speaker to tell us not to make any reference at all to it, because we will deal with the Budget Proposals later, although the taxation proposals form part of this Financial Statement. That is why I said that the Leader of the House must give us in this House the same sort of privilege that brought them into power, because it was the general dislike for the last Government's parliamentary attitude in believing that because they had numbers they could do as they pleased that caused them to be outside of the Chamber. People became disgusted with that conduct. I am asking the members of this Government, if they are tempted, like any new boy would be tempted, sometimes to be a little bit rash, to remember that we are part and parcel of a democracy in which we all believe and which we want to preserve; and therefore when they are in power, they should treat all of us in Parliament in the same way that they would have us treat them had they been in our place, because power is nothing that is given to them alone. Anyone can be in power today and out of power tomorrow.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It now being 2 o'clock p.m., this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 o'clock p.m. 2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is Question Time.

Question No. 95/1963 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Philip. I observe that the hon. member is not now in his place.

There being no other questions today, we move on to Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RESOLUTION re FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. BATSON: The Resolution reads as follows:-

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance for the fiscal year, 1963."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members present are well aware of the procedure that has been instituted by this Government since last year by the introduction of these Financial Statements and Budgetary Proposals by the Hon. Minister of Finance; therefore, the procedure this year is nothing new to this Chamber.

I feel that hon. members during the course of the Statement by the Hon. Premier were very attentive and listened to all that had been said. Since then, I have been in contact with many people in the community in connection with the Statement and Budgetary Proposals, and I can say

on behalf of this Government that in the majority of cases the people are very much sympathetic towards the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance. It is true that some individuals may have been subjected to some inconvenience by the proposals, but in any evolution or transition, some individuals must feel some shock. However, I feel that the shock, if it might be termed a shock, is not a serious one.

Now, Sir, when we look at a few of the commodities which have been increased starting first with gasoline which has been increased by five cents per gallon, I feel that increase is permissible. I feel that many individuals who own vehicles, though at the outset they might have denounced the increase, yet in a serious vein must realise that the actual cost of 70 cents a gallon or 78 cents a gallon for the dearer one, is really not an exorbitant amount to pay for gasoline. It is true that human nature being what it is, most individuals like everything for nothing; therefore, when this increase of five cents per gallon was put on, there would be a shout, no doubt, by those who would have to pay the increased price. I personally feel that five cents per gallon is really not a serious increase, and I know that a lot of hon. members are in wholehearted agreement with this increase which was long overdue. As a matter of fact, I feel that it should have been done since last year, and I think it was the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who was loud in his suggestion to the Government last year that the price of gasoline should be increased. Therefore, I am sure that he would not be saying anything today in connection with this increase because he had given the Government the advice last year to do so and no doubt his suggestion has served a good purpose.

Sir, you may find some hon. members on the other side criticising the cent increase on the price of rice. It is really not an increase, but the subsidy which was in the vicinity of \$450,000 on it has been reduced by 50%. I think this should have been implemented since last year. Other islands in the Caribbean are paying much more for a pound of rice than we are paying for a pint. People in some of the other islands are paying to the tune of 19 cents a pint for rice; therefore, I feel the average Barbadian would not condemn the Government for instituting this slender rise of one cent increase. In truth and in fact, we are not paying more than this one cent increase because when the Government is subsidising it to the tune of \$450,000, the people themselves are paying this subsidy though they themselves did not realise it.

Some hon. members may think that the increase on soft drinks is unjustifiable; but when you realise that there are approximately 50 million bottles of soft drinks which are manufactured annually and the Minister of Finance suggested that there should be an increase of one cent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that is unjustifiable either. 2.40 p.m.

During the last few days, many of the shopkeepers have made increases in the vicinity of four cents a bottle, and people have been purchasing it; although it has been to their disadvantage, yet they have been buying these soft drinks at 14 cents a bottle which is an increase of four cents. I do not believe that hon. members on the other side are serious when they criticise the Minister of Finance in his increase of one cent a bottle. Since the Hon. Minister made his Statement, some of the manufacturers have had meetings and they have decided on an increase. Some of them have taken into consideration the increase on gasoline; they have included that in their overall expenditure, and they have claimed that it is impracticable for them to produce the same type of drink at the increase of only one cent. However, I have been told that one cent has been placed on the small bottles and one penny on the larger bottles. The consumer has been apparently paying the amount very easily, and it would be rather late now for hon. members to criticise it because it has been accepted by the consumer. I do not think that an increase of one cent is beyond the capacity of those who consume the commodity.

Moreover, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund which has been in operation for a long time, the Hon. Minister of Finance has seen fit to make

a reduction of 50 per cent which, in my opinion, is a gift because the members of the Civil Service have lost \$4 a month on every hundred dollars, and now they are called upon to pay \$2 a month, that in itself is a saving for them. When we criticise the Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance we have to weigh the advantages and the disadvantages and things which have been instituted in the interest of the vast majority of the people; we have to be very careful in making our criticisms.

As to the Government Pensioners, we find that there are 1,400 of them in this island and they will have a handout of \$10 a month. That is an increase on their pension. If there are one thousand four hundred of these pensioners and they have been given an increase of \$10 a month that is approximately \$144,000 which will have to be utilised in that direction. One must realise that if natural increases have been made, they will have to be met in order to recoup the amount of money which will be required to fulfil other commitments. The foreign pool betting duty has been increased from 20% to 50%. It is not that the average Barbadian is a gambler, but Barbadians are much concerned about these pools because if they wait on their monthly savings they will have to wait for a very long time before they can accumulate any appreciable amount of such savings. Therefore, they risk much of their savings in that direction in order to try and solve their financial difficulties. However, Sir, this foreign pool betting duty has been increased from 20% to 50% but the local duty on pool betting remains the same. These pools which have been operating locally have not suffered any disadvantage and they have been allowed to remain at a duty of 20%. I feel that when hon. members look through the Financial Statement — it is true that no individual is perfect and all individuals are subject to criticism; yet if we peruse this document carefully, we will find that it is very comprehensive and it covers many aspects of our own endeavour. I feel that the Opposition is going to have a very difficult task in making their observations; I am expecting, for example, that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will say that a further tax should be imposed on bicycles.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is anticipating what the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is going to say, but I think that he should carry on with his speech and leave me out.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot refrain from mentioning the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has referred to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has replied, and the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution should not worry to comment on that.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot refrain from mentioning the hon. junior member for St. Joseph; I feel it is appropriate that the comments should be made because the hon. member will make a very good contribution to this debate in complimenting the Hon. Minister of Finance on his Statement; that is why I have referred to the hon. member.

Anyhow, Sir, some individuals are saying that the tax on bicycles should be increased. I have heard it stated that items which actually bear the brunt of revenue should be the ones to be taxed. This method of taxation should not be haphazard or spasmodic, but it should be placed on items on which you can guarantee revenue, and not make any charge against owners of bicycles; on the other hand, there are several bicycles in this island which are unlicensed. The system of bicycle licensing is a very trivial one; you pay 64 cents and you get a piece of tin with numbers painted on it. Anybody can do that. I do not believe that the revenue would be increased substantially by increasing the tax on bicycles. I am expecting it to be said that the tax on bicycles could be made \$1. I believe, however, that the Hon. Minister of Finance has carefully perused all of these things and his decisions must have been arrived at after very serious thought. 2.50 p.m.

I feel that the criticism which the opposition might launch on these Financial Statement and Budgetary Propos-

als will undoubtedly give them some sort of headache. I do not think it is necessary for me to go on much longer; so I will sit and listen to the remarks of hon. members on the other side to see whether they have been doing their arithmetic very well and whether they have been perusing the Financial Statements as I have been, and then I will be able to weigh the pros and cons to see whether they have made out a proper case against this Resolution.

With those few remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in rising to second this Resolution, I must say that I have heard several comments concerning the Minister of Finance, and I must say that on any good deed you can look for criticism. Now, Sir, I have heard suggestions about raising the tax on bicycles, taxing rice and other things, but I must repeat that the position of a Minister of Finance is a very difficult one and he will be criticised even when he does good. But we have to forgive those who make the criticisms, for they know not what they do. The Minister of Finance has to know where the money is to come from and how to get it, because he has the country in his hands to run and he has to know what he is doing. It is not for us to tell him what he has to raise on, because if it were so, he would never raise a penny; no one likes to pay taxes. He has to put before his Cabinet what he wants to run the country. As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance does not know whom to please. I remember some time ago a woman had six children who were working, but they were not all working for one salary, though each was contributing to the mother. One would come in and say he wanted bacon, while another wanted ham, and yet another wanted beef-steak, and her brain was going around like a clock in trying to please everybody, because if she gave "John" bacon, "Johnny" would ask for ham and eggs. She had to try to stretch the money, because if she ran out for one day, they would say that she wasted the money which they brought in. The Minister of Finance is just like that woman who has so much to control. He tries his best and we have to help him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some people who suggested that there should be a tax of \$5.00 on bicycles. The average man in Barbados purchases a bicycle because he is unable to purchase a motor car to get to work, and the majority of school children ride to school; if we tax bicycles heavily, school children will be affected. We try to get away from taxing bicycles so that the under-privileged can ride to work. How much damage does a bicycle do to the roads? If we create an additional burden on those who use bicycles, it would also affect school children who have to ride to school. Sometimes the bus fare is so great that a poor man or woman has to go and credit a bicycle to get away from such heavy costs. If this argument was used for vote-catching, Mr. Deputy Speaker, look how many votes the Government would be losing. I am glad therefore that the Minister of Finance has not taxed bicycles.

I heard the Minister of Finance say that there will be one cent increase on sweet drinks. If that is so, I never thought that the shopkeepers would have to put on a penny. The manufacturers say they must get some benefit from the cent increase, the shopkeepers must get a benefit; so they have increased it by one penny instead of one cent and it is coming from the consumer.

On the question of rice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one cent increase also on a pint. The rice brought to this Island is subsidised, and if the Minister of Finance imposes an additional cent on a pint of rice, what can we do? He is looking for ways and means to run the country, and if he does not do that, then the country will run him, and we do not want him to run so soon because we want to exist, and we can only exist properly if we co-operate with him and help him out of his difficulties instead of resisting him at all times. We want more water facilities, more electricity, more housing and other services; all these things call for money, and the Minister of Finance has to look to see where he is going to get the money from to run this country. 3.00 p.m.

We cannot do that. I am a backbencher. I sit and listen; and if anything comes to this House and it is reason-

able, I, John Wesley Corbin or "Homey", will vote for it; and if I feel it is dangerous, I will vote against it. I have told the Premier that I am on the bow of the ship and I am watching him sailing it, and I will warn him if I see him heading for an iceberg; but if I warn him and he still keeps heading on the iceberg I, "Homey", am going to get off; I am not going down on the ship. If I see him heading in the right direction, I will sail with him; but the day he sails in the wrong direction, goodbye, "Homey" is gone. The ship is sailing in a very pleasant atmosphere today. I am sure the Hon. Premier is going in the right latitude this time. I know the grievances of the people more than any other hon. member. I drive sometimes in a motor car, sometimes on the bus and I walk and I do everything. It is our duty to find out the grievances of the people and take them before the Ministers.

Sir, I have great joy in seconding this Resolution. I feel this Government is making a great success. Salaries of people have gone up all over the island and for all categories of workers. Every man is receiving an increase of salary today. We must tax something or other and if it is not there, it has to be here. This island can only be run by taxation.

Taxation was introduced from years B. C. when Augustus Caesar brought in the first taxation, and from that time until now every man has to pay taxes. Taxes will increase. They will increase because the population is growing larger and larger and the people are demanding more things. There are greater services; therefore taxes will increase.

The Financial Minister has to look at the overall plans. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that after a while the same tongue which once cursed will speak in a good manner towards our Financial Minister. I have nothing against him. The only thing which would make me get up against him is if he does not work in the right direction. As long as he proceeds in the right direction, "Homey" Corbin will be always with him.

Sir, I second this Resolution and agree with it wholeheartedly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, having embarked upon an approved Estimates of Expenditure of \$30,508,515, and an Estimated Revenue of \$29,280,443, we find that there is a deficit of \$1,228,072. To meet this, the Hon. Minister of Finance in his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals has suggested ways and means by which this deficit should be absorbed. It is for the Government in power to find ways and means by which they should plan their budget. The collective responsibility of the Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, cannot be shirked, whether it is the Minister of Finance or the Leader of the House. It is the collective responsibility of the Government although it might be said that the Minister of Finance who is trained in economics might have been the person who has put on the proposals. On the other hand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will not expect from the Opposition the same basis as you might get from the Minister of Finance or from the Government because the Opposition has not got at its disposal the departments and the various figures which a Minister of Government has.

Sir, before I deal with any of the items which Government has increased - and you will know why I prefer to say Government than to mention any particular individual I should like to make my own position clear. Although I have made it clear so often to this House, it seems as if there are some people who feel because I have been named Leader of the Opposition, it is my duty to rant and abuse, tear and the like in this House. It is true that it is part of the duty of the Opposition to criticise and discourage, to brake and warn, to try to improve and indeed even to harass and if necessary try to win the Government. However, all this must be done in a constructive manner; and all this must be done in a way which in my opinion would help to form a democratic Government.

Now, Sir, as far as I am concerned, and as regards my experience in this House, I have never crossed the floor of

this House. I came to this House as one thing and I will remain as one thing. I hope when the time comes for me to be here no longer that I shall be out still remaining a Conservative member of the Parliament of Barbados. I have no desire to change that because that is how I feel in my conscience. Of course, I do not want to push that label on everybody although most of us are Conservatives because that is what Barbadians are by nature. However, Sir, I do feel, having made my position so clear in this manner so often, that it is like throwing water on a duck's back when I see in the newspapers scribes who want to create a jealousy within my own Party, and who seem as though they would like on every occasion I come in here, whether a Bill is good or whether a Resolution is good or whether Questions are in order, that because I am named Leader of the Opposition, I should get up and waste the time of the House and offer opposition.

On the other hand, Sir, let me say that I agree with the attitude of the Government last week; but I must say, had the Government insisted in proceeding with this Bill without our being able to make reference to the Budgetary proposals, I intended to join forces with the hon. senior member for St. Peter and delay not only the passing of this Bill, but every one of these Bills which come under the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement by the Hon. Premier, just to show that they had no right to do what they intended to do last week.

3.10 p.m.

I must say that I agree with him that proposals which are put up by the Government must be subjected to criticism, and if they are to be subjected to criticism, then opportunity should be given for making that criticism. I think it has been demonstrated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter today that there is no point in denying members that opportunity. I would not go so far as to say that there was this attempt made by design, but I do say that it was stupidly done for the simple reason that the members on this side of the House should be given an opportunity, after such a Budget Speech or Statement, to make our criticisms of it. No one can reply to that Speech or Statement; no one could reply to the Financial and Budget Proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance immediately as the Minister had finished those proposals, but only after we could go through the Speech with our colleagues. I said that I intended to talk right through on every possible Bill which came out of this Financial Statement. I do not believe that the Hon. Leader of the House realised the position when I said last Tuesday that it was my intention to speak on all of these Bills, and I am so happy that Your Honour did rule that it would be in order for any hon. member of this House to discuss any of the Bills which arose out of the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals. Nevertheless, that has been passed and I shall now propose to make my observations and criticisms on the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals by the Minister of Finance and his Government.

As I have already said, if you look at the Draft Estimates, you will see that the Government must look for the sum of \$1,228,072 so as to balance their budget. Those of us who have had to do with any form of Government or of business know well enough that there must be ways and means of finding money either by direct or indirect taxation. Let me deal with what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said about the rates of Income Tax Bill. The hon. member referred to the fact that as to the Leader of the Opposition and the members of his Party the non-increase of income tax will obviously meet with their approval. I am not denying that; I would say that it meets with our approval because if you go through this Financial Statement you will see that attempts are made to increase industries in this island; and if you follow the income tax rates in the other islands like Jamaica and Trinidad, you will observe that if we were not to agree in a matter of this sort, we would not be agreeing to what we had put forward many years ago, that is to say, that we should encourage industries and give opportunities for industries to be developed. It is not that we are happy about these rates for personal reasons at all. It might sound strange to hon. members this afternoon to hear that it is not the majority of the people who contribute

the bulk of the income tax through the P. A. Y. E. system, but it is the businesses and the corporations which make this big contribution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in passing there is one point which I would like to answer about income tax. It is that the hon. member said that there is the necessity for raising one million two hundred thousand odd dollars, but there is something like \$2 million outstanding by way of income tax. As far as I am concerned, I am not answering or attempting to answer anything, but I am wondering if the Government has been caught in any trap. You will take into consideration your \$2 million less what the Commissioner of Inland Revenue will consider as being not collectible and the remainder would be given out for collection. I would like to hear the Government on the other question. If you say that you want to encourage industries and create jobs in the country, you have to do something about the matter and I do not see what else could be done in this respect. Do not let the Government sit back and feel that, because I agree with them in something that they have done, I will agree with them in everything that they have done or that I will agree with all of their proposals. To the contrary, I do not agree with all of their proposals.

There is one point which I would like to make before I go on to my criticisms. What would anybody think of me if I came into the House and disagreed with the following statements which I read in these proposals? I am quoting now from page 3 of the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals laid by the Hon. Premier, and I say that this is something which my Party had been advocating for years and years. This is what the Hon. Minister of Finance has said in this Financial Statement and Budget Proposals:

"At this juncture I do not propose to deal with the statutory undertakings which were owned by us. There is a strong committee examining the working of the Transport Board; a world famed expert has examined problems regarding housing and his report is awaited; I may add that I have received his first interim report this morning. The Natural Gas Corporation is consolidating its position. I would repeat, however, that there is no reason why the general taxpayer, and this includes very poor people, should subsidize a service which would pay for itself and make a profit if it were operated by private persons.

The last sentence of that passage is very important. Mr. Deputy Speaker, would I not be considered as a most dishonest person if I disagreed with that passage? That is my philosophy and it is the philosophy of my Party; it is what we have always said.

3.20 p.m.

Let me put it this way; to those of you listening to me and to those of you in this Chamber, we do not advocate that all public utility services, because we are of a Conservative Party, should be run by private enterprise. It is impossible, and I do not want anyone to remind me of that. Just as the Minister of Finance has made the statement that he does not see why any private enterprise should not pay its way, we say that there are certain public utilities - and we say it strongly - that should be and must be run by the State; and I believe that just as the Socialists of Great Britain have seen that the actual tenets of Socialism as laid down in book form cannot work, the Conservatives of today realise that Conservatism today must be so far removed from the Conservatism of yesterday that the two actually meet halfway.

Naturally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are items which the general public must think of. Let us face facts. \$1 million must be raised. I have already said that we agree that if you are to have and encourage industries in this country, you cannot frighten people away; but I go further and say that you cannot give further tax holidays. What are the things we have to talk about today? It is the question of gasoline, rice, cigarettes, imported beer and sweet drinks. You may say that an extreme Left Wing form of Socialist might find ways and means of doing things which would prick the Conservatives; in a Right wing form of Government, a Conservative Government, they might find ways and means of raising money that would annoy Socialists; but there

comes a time when you have got to face facts generally. On this question of gasoline, my own Party might have looked at it from a different angle, worked out the figures and decided taking into consideration the delivery of goods and the like, that gasoline could not bear five cents increase on a gallon, but a little less; but as I have said, we have not got the figures at our disposal. My own Party might have said that to increase gasoline by five cents might very well cause an increase in transport services, unless some other means could be found to give assistance. On the other hand, Sir, there is no point in coming here and saying the Government should put on three cents, although five cents show us what we can raise from that.

As I listened to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, and the mover of this Resolution of acceptance who stated that they have been moving among people and that shopkeepers are charging more than one cent on a sweet drink, I felt that if it is just one cent on a sweet drink, nobody would worry; but we on this side caution Government to do everything that is possible to see that the commodity does not cost the consumer more than one cent as given in the assurance to the public of Barbados by the Minister of Finance. I am absolutely certain that ways and means can be found to work that out, although we do not believe in this continuing of control. We believe that competition will make these things come right, and we do feel that under the circumstances everything will be done. I understand from the senior member for St. Thomas that since this Statement has been made, some of these drinks - I think he must mean cokes - are being sold at four cents more. I personally can hardly believe that. I can hardly believe anybody pays ten cents for a small coke. If that is so, it is about time that we offered severe criticism to that, and it is about time that the Minister of Trade, who is the Leader of the House, should take steps to see that that is not done. I am sure that the addition of one penny on a large coke and one cent on a small coke is what was meant by the Government at the time. If four cents is being charged, we strongly object and we will harass the Minister until he does something to bring that down.

On the question of the tax on imported beer and ale and other drinks, that gives an opportunity to people, as has been stated in the Premier's Statement, to support local industry, and there is no point in fooling ourselves. You are not going to get people to come to Barbados and invest hard-earned money in any industry at all if protection is not given to them. I was rather careful and particularly reluctant in offering undue criticism when the beer tax was interfered with, because I felt then that young as the Government was, you should give them an opportunity to see the error of its ways. I do not think any of you on the other side would consider me all of an idiot not to see that the suggestion here on the preferential tariff of beer, ale and so on would give every opportunity to local industry in this category to regain its position in this country, and I think that is a step in the right direction.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the question of cigarettes, how many of us who sit around this Table feel that the proposals for cigarettes are unreasonable? I must confess, however, when I hear members on the other side say that the one cent increase on a pint of rice will not be felt by people, I do not agree with that. Even when I heard the Premier say that to those who eat a lot of rice, it is starch anyhow, let them eat potatoes and yams, I would like to assure him that he cannot change people from their habits, and Barbados is a tremendous rice-eating country; but what you have done is to withdraw the subsidy, which would carry it to one cent more.

3.30 p.m.

To the people of Barbados I say that he mentioned that in Montserrat it is 17 cents a pound and in St. Kitts it is 19 cents per pound; this was to counter what is going to happen.

Before you pass this, I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Trade will tell me in view of the fact of what I have seen in the Press, that is to say, a notice with respect to the shortage of rice - and I hope in his reply he will give an answer this afternoon - what steps are taken to ensure that we do not run out of this commodity. I do not think any-

one can be angry with the Trade Union Leader, if what I have read is correct, that they have decided to back the Trade Union of British Guiana by not handling any cargo from British Guiana. I hope the Hon. Minister of Trade will not wait until the horse is out of the stable to act. The interview which I have read in the *Advocate* by the number of persons who have to deal with it leaves me with doubts of the plight of the unfortunate people of this Island who eat rice as their main diet.

Sir, I feel that the Budget on a whole is presented with a view of raising this \$1 million deficit. The sources from which you must raise your money must be either from direct or indirect taxation. This country with its population problem and its doors closed to emigrants to the U. S. A. to Canada and now to England, makes it now more difficult than ever; therefore, what we must do is to try to encourage industrialisation. I, like the hon. member for St. Peter, repeat that it is regrettable that the Hon. Premier after making his Budget Speech had to go off to Canada because I agree that no one would be more fitting to answer and to give us the details which we would like to know than the Hon. Premier himself. May be, some of us would accept what the Hon. Leader of the House has said that arrangements had been made for this trip which the Hon. Premier is making long before today. I do agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that this matter with which we are dealing is of paramount importance and this should come first; therefore, if the Hon. Premier knew that he had to go away at this time, this should have come earlier so that we could have discussed it before he left and so that we could know what the entire position would be from him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not let modesty prevent me from saying this. What we have seen from the Budget proposals is that Barbados has had such a good name in England and in the financial market that within one minute they could raise a loan of \$10 million. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that we inherited this good name from the last Government; so I will ask from whom did the last Government inherit this good name? I will only say that the Conservatives ran it before the last Government and they ran it with a good name so that when the Socialist Government took over, our debt was practically nil. Unlike what has happened in some of the other Islands, throughout the years no bank can tell you that any businessman of this country has ever been found owing any large sum of money to the bank. When people come to this country - inspectors of banks - to talk about development of industries, they do not necessarily come to members of this House because they have been elected to this Chamber; they might hear something from members of the Government as to the policy of Government; but as regards the Island's stability, they get what they want to know about that from the banks. Therefore, when the hon. member says that it is a trick of the way of a lawyer when he says that we are so good that we can raise a loan within one minute and that the last Government said the same thing, let me ask; if Barbados had a Government which had been reckless in its expenditure and in its government before the first Socialist Government took up the reins of government, what would have been the position when attempts were made to raise money in London? Modesty would not prevent me from taking that share of the credit for the way in which my Party ran the Government. Although our members are few now in this House, we have lived to see a number of our suggestions adopted and put into operation by other Governments. We do not grudge you. Far from that, we encourage you. On many occasions, I have had to criticise you. You also know that there were many individuals of the last Government who said that there was no love lost between us.

3.40 p.m.

It is not that I am afraid of any member of the Government, but I do think that people should be given an opportunity. This Government might take the credit for the Deep Water Harbour; the last Government might take the credit for it also; but I have stood up in public and I have heard the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself get tremendous abuse for the Deep Water Harbour. Since the Deep Water Harbour has been constructed it is paying for itself; it is paying for its services. It is paying for the

interest on the \$12 million loan and everybody is taking the credit for that. However, as I have said, I have stood up and heard references to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself and we were being criticised. Some of the people who had interest in lighters refused to press for the Deep Water Harbour which, at one time, would have cost about \$5 million instead of \$30 million. We are indeed happy to think that this Deep Water Harbour with its bunkering services should be so profitable. I want to say that it is part of the duty of the Opposition to press home things. We said: "Yes, we should have the Deep Water Harbour." That is why I have never been a hypocrite to say that the construction of the Deep Water Harbour has displaced workers and we should never have had it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you take up your Estimates and you will see what the Deep Water Harbour is doing for this island. Although it may be said that when the present Government took over from the last Government there was not much in the kitty, yet it may be said that the value of money is not always when you have it in your pocket, but when you have a name. Let us take it in this way. I am willing to bet anything today that there are places around this island which could not raise a million dollars in England within the next two months, never mind raising that money in one month, or at any kind of interest rate, not even at the usury rate. That speaks well for this country. Our Party is small in numbers, but we are not ashamed of anything. I render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things which are God's. Whether there are men in the Cabinet with an economic background and the ability to correlate and bring together these facts and figures and have them presented in this way, I do not know; but I say this. During my time in here we have been treated to speeches and addresses on constitutional development, possibly year after year; and during that period, with our limited experience — because there are persons who like to tell the members of my Party that we are not University graduates. As to that, I say you hang these things up on a wall and you will see how much they will bring in every month. Some of the people who were insulted did not know that the insults were meant for them. I am still a Conservative, no matter what you may offer me. As I have said, I render to Caesar the things which are Caesar's and to God the things which are God's. Possibly we would not have put on five cents on the gasoline or a cent on the rice as it is now; we would have looked at the matter in a different light.

On the question of Tariffs, we might have done likewise. With \$2 million outstanding, did you take into account that you had this money outstanding when you took into consideration that you had \$2 million left and that you took off 20%, or that the Commissioner of Inland Revenue decided how much was to be taken off? I do hope that the Hon. Minister is listening to what I am saying because this is a very important question. Let us remember that, as to the gap between direct taxation and indirect taxation, if it becomes wider and wider, even an arch-Conservative must be worried in a community because he could not be happy. If you throw the entire burden on the consumer, if he can spot that direct taxation is not bearing its burden then nobody with anything in this island is safe. I hope that the Hon. Minister will be in a position to answer this matter. It must be remembered and borne in mind that what has been coming in for 1963-64 is the tax for last year. I have had to deal with figures with the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and I know that the amount of money which has been coming in the Estimates for this year is coming in from the earnings of last year or from business.

I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that hon. members will want to talk on this matter, but I do hope that in future whether it be by accident or by design, no attempt will be made to do a thing like this. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has come forward with this Resolution and the Hon. Leader of the House has wisely seen fit to let it go as the first Order on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business. However, I do not think that the attitude which had been adopted by the Government should be the attitude to be adopted. When the other Government was in power, similar things were done and we all know what happened. I do feel that the opportunity should be given to hon. mem-

bers to offer our criticisms, and I am saying that where there is room for criticism we will offer that criticism.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is just one last point which I would like to make as to the Hilton Hotel. I suppose that that matter will be dealt with at a time not so far from now, and I will reserve my comments on that; but it is about time that if the Government has been talking about a crash programme, they should let their crash programme be something of a lasting nature. I remember that Franklin Roosevelt came forward as a Democrat and he was bitterly opposed. He was opposed for two years and in the third year a Conservative paper backed that Democratic candidate for crash programme. They worked upon something which was of a lasting nature, something on which people could see that money was being spent. I counsel this Government that in relation to their Public Works Programme and in their Highways and Transport Department, they should see that the work is carried on expeditiously and that the money will be spent correctly. I caution the Government to take greater care with their works programme; and if they get a proper day's work for the money which they are spending, it will mean a lot to these people on whom we are now imposing this taxation.

3.50 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those few remarks, I think I have made my contribution, but I want it to be clearly understood that to be Leader of the Opposition does not necessarily mean as has been said — and I think the Minister of Education will correct me if I am wrong — in a book by Randolph Churchill himself that you must of necessity oppose everything that comes up or it is your duty to oppose everything that comes up. As a matter of fact, that would have to be viewed with great qualifications today, because those of us who have been following the Conservative Government together with the Socialist Party realise that they are meeting in the way rather than letting another political philosophy like Communism creep into these parts.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to demonstrate to you what I was saying earlier about this Budget. Now we have the spectacle right here that we are going to deal with the Budget on the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, but all the things that follow in Government Business are items stemming from this survey in which you have this disjointed exercise. I am going to be very harsh today. I excuse the hon. senior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

When it comes to these Budgetary Proposals and what is involved, God help us that at this time of our history that is not all the thinking we have to rely on, because you would pass on this country to a dictatorship pure and simple. They do not understand the implications. Some of them went skirting around with their facetious remarks about bicycle taxes, and about going around the country to see whether people are charging a cent or a penny on sweet drinks. It looks as if we are reaching the stage of parliamentary morass in which members of the House are incapable of interpreting the very legislation that they sit down and pass. We are coming to a very unhappy state of affairs because the consumption tax on these beverages was not only based on a bottle; it was based on so many cents per gallon; so it is a quantum tax. Yet you get this type of political ignoramus chat coming forth from people who do not know what to go and tell the people they represent. On the other hand, I find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they have brought in some gimmick and put one on the Government side and one on the Opposition side, and they are carrying on some little treaty of speaking to people on Rediffusion tonight. So far as I am concerned, I speak to the people every day.

So far as this is concerned, I will start off with what the Minister said in the survey. It states: "As it is necessary, in a developing country like Barbados where Government's fiscal policy is aimed at providing the infrastructure and pre-conditions for take-off from a period of stagnation, that the members of the general public as well as the members of the Legislature and more politically sophisticated should be kept fully informed, the survey

has been presented without an abundance of statistical tables and with the minimum use of technical terms." I should like to say that if the Premier made the statement "providing the infra-structure and pre-conditions for take-off from a period of stagnation", that is not true. Mr. Deputy Speaker, to talk about Barbados' infra-structure being in a state of stagnation is to speak about Barbados' education. We boast that Barbados' education is second to none in all of the West Indian territories. That is part of your infra-structure, as well as your schools, your hospitals and your public services. What is wrong with your infra-structure? Your infra-structure has always to be improved upon, and I would say that there is no territory in the whole Caribbean including the French, the Dutch and the British where you will find as good a road system as exists in Barbados. For 166 square miles you have a higher density of good roads than in any part of the world. There is no part of the world with a density like this where you have nearly 800 miles of road in 166 square miles.

I will say quite frankly that this is something we have inherited from our village and plantation system. Under that system, you had to have little by-ways and roads, but that has created a problem for us; and I think the amount of roads we have takes a great deal to maintain, because you are maintaining 800 miles of road in 166 square miles which provide a higher road density and higher road expenses than the density of the population even justify with 240,000 people; and if you went to the United Kingdom or the United States, you can very well see what the road bill would run into. This is a relic of the past, and some of our politicians still want more roads to be built right down to the last person's house, and there is resistance from those people who live in remote villages and in gullies, who, instead of coming to the front, want to remain to keep their pigs, goats and cows, and therefore you have to go in for the actual structure of more roads and putting in water and light in an area where the total cost of the houses cannot justify the capital expenditure to carry these services there. We need a complete re-orientation in our thinking and a re-orientation of the members in our House. I therefore do not subscribe to the view that the infra-structure has reached a state of stagnation.

I would like to know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who has decided that on this Budget debate the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition should be accorded facilities outside of the House and no other member. I say that quite seriously, because if your office, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is going to be a sinecure and people are going to come in here like that, it is going to expense Rediffusion, because I would take the microphone and break it up and nobody can charge me because it has no right being in here. It is not the property of the House and the Government would have to pay for it. What I want to say is that there cannot be any collusion between the Government and the Leader of the Opposition by according them special facilities in here that are not extended to other members. They would have to go on a platform to have these facilities.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I do not know why the hon. member said that there can be no collusion between the Government and the Leader of the Opposition. I should like to assure him that there is absolutely none. I know nothing about Rediffusion, and he knows that if I knew anything, I would tell him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it is good that the hon. senior member has raised that point, because other members have wondered about it; but I have been informed by the Clerk of the House that the Rediffusion authorities wrote asking permission to have a record of the speech by the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, this whole business is coming to a very unhappy pass, because if Rediffusion is now having direct communication with Parliament, I say these are intrusions into our basic right. Can you imagine a debate is going to take place in the House of Commons on the European Common Market or the new Skybolt missile and the Director of the B.B.C. is going to write one of the Clerks telling him that they want to set something up in the House

of Commons and it is put there like that? I have reached the stage where I wonder what is happening to this Chamber. What are we coming to? This is only an indication, as I said earlier, where the Government initiates peculiar practices, and private sources now feel they can follow.
4.00 p.m.

Now, Sir, I am going to move a Resolution, maybe subsequently, deploring the imposition of any of these transmission systems, and they have the brass and effrontery to get an outside source to come to the House and broadcast their speeches whenever they want themselves heard. If they want that, let them get it done by some other means. Let them go to the studios of Rediffusion and make their broadcast. I repeat, they should get the permission of the House before they do it.

Sir, if I may describe my view as regards the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals of the Minister of Finance as I see here in this paper, I would regard it as making a hurricane out of a drizzle. The deficit of \$1,200,000, is a comparative drizzle in the whole economy of Barbados; therefore, you were making a hurricane of it last week. If we had reached the end of our taxation policy, I would say, all right. We know that in taxing a country, there is no finality in your policy. We know that it does not mean that you have come to the end of your road and that this is your last taxation policy.

The Hon. Introducer of these Budget Proposals spoke as if this was the end of his taxation policy. As I have said earlier, you have raised your Customs and Excise Duties up to almost \$15 million; therefore, when you have your Customs and Excise bringing in \$15 million out of your total revenue of \$30 million, you will have to admit that the taxation on the people of your whole community is 50%.

Sir, I am not running the Government; therefore the Government must take its lashes. Who advised the Government to undertake the school meals programme before they were ready to incur the recurrent expenditure? They knew that our economy could not meet that without another \$5 million added to it. Who told them that the children were starving? As it is now, all are not eligible for it; so you are asking the children of St. Peter whom I represent to swallow while those in St. Lucy drink soup. As a matter of fact, some will go to school for the next five years and will never get a hot meal. It does not mean that because you had put this in your programme that you should start on it when you found out that you could not start on it yet. You had the Premier saying that by the end of September 1962, if the Minister of Education did not get the hot meal programme in operation he must resign. That bogus talk does not appeal to me. It does not sound sensible. What is the urgency of having a school meals programme? Were people dying from starvation or suffering from rickets? When you give a child a hot meal at school, what have you done? The Hon. Premier talked about rice having a lot of starch in it. I would say that a hot meal has in starch too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to take this at random because I want to finish by 4.30 p.m. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade to enlighten me on this matter. I do not know whom the Hon. Premier was referring to but in his speech he said: "I have heard one eminent Trade Unionist claim that we are subsidising low wages when we do that, the theory being that if you have to subsidise a commodity like rice, then the people are not paid subsistence wages because they cannot be paid out of their own pockets. This is a theory with which I entirely agree and I think this learned gentleman and I are agreed on many other things although not on all."

I have always been a believer in the theory that if you subsidise an article, you can only subsidise the article based on certain fundamental things that are lacking, and I have always said that if the price of an article is sold at free market price and a reasonable price is paid for it, the only justification of subsidising that article is if the wages paid by the people residing in the community are too low or if it is being prepared in the territory for which it is produced at reasonable cost; if the producer cannot produce

it without a loss, then you can give a subsidy. This is not on the basis that you are subsidising low wages in British Guiana when you are subsidising rice. What I would like to say here is that this connotes that you are subsidising this article because the wages here are so low that the people cannot pay a reasonable price for rice; therefore, you are subsidising an article to depressed people. If British Guiana is selling its rice on a free market basis, and Barbados and everybody admits that the price they pay is a fair price for the rice received, therefore the question of subsidising it can only be agreed to on the basis on which you did it in the war time, and you subsidised other food items along with it so as to keep your food prices down. You did that then because you did not want your food prices to rise as high as they could rise.

I agree that there is no justification for the subsidising of rice now, but this is where I say that the Hon. Premier is like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. He, too, is afraid of taking off the whole subsidy because he is afraid of the people.

Sir, I do not subscribe to the view that you cannot pay this or you cannot pay that; I only subscribe to that view if you are not in need of the money. You can utilise the money being spent on subsidising rice on some other thing because I am satisfied, if Barbadians can go up on the Garrison Savannah on race days and gamble away money and they can go and pay money into pools, that they can take some of their money and buy it in rice. There is no chance which you are taking in your buying a pint of rice.
4.10 p.m.

Whenever you buy a pint of rice you will get something to eat. If you have people spending money in something else — I may say that my criticism of the Budget is that if you take the subsidy off an item because it is no longer justified, I ask what are you going to utilise your money on? On the amount of income tax? I would like the Hon. Leader of the House to tell me if it is a fact, because I do not know, if you have increased the duty on tooth paste? In a community in which you are saying that you want to give the school children free food, these are the same people to whom you are giving free education. Tooth paste is one of the health products which you use. When I make an analysis of this matter, I want to know what is wrong with some of the members of the Cabinet. You are putting a tax on tooth paste and you are allowing a vacuum cleaner and a carpet cleaner to come in free of duty. You have a little tube of tooth paste for 12 cents and you are putting an *Ad Valorem* duty on tooth paste to raise what? I believe that you want to bring in these vacuum cleaners and carpet cleaners for the hotels, but you take the *Ad Valorem* duty off everybody and say that they must have carpet cleaners. I am just making this rough analysis. Can any Minister tell me why they want to increase the duty on tooth paste in respect of children for whom we want to promote health habits?

The hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution said that he read the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals; well, if that is so, if I went to St. Thomas and said that the hon. member preferred to see vacuum cleaners come in without duty and that they put more duty on tooth paste, would that be an unfair criticism? If these things were to become publicized and they were to become current, what sort of thing would happen? We want to give a little dental service here, and before you encourage the community in carrying out some of the health habits, you are increasing the duty on tooth paste! I am saying that where a person can encourage people to preserve their teeth, that is a good thing. I want to say that toothache is one of the worst things which you can have. In that way you lose manpower and you have a high degree of absenteeism; if a man has toothache, he cannot come out to work.

The proposals dealing with the consumption tax are not proposals with which we can deal at all because they come in Orders. We cannot just say that we do not approve of something in the Order; however, it is a question of reviewing these Budget Proposals in the light in which they are given to us. I ask the members of the Government this: how are we going to justify this? The Hon. Leader of the

Opposition has said that he was very pleased that the Government wanted to encourage people in Barbados to buy more Barbadian goods. I may say that this is the first Budget during the discussion of which I have been fortunate to be present. Things seem to have conspired against me; I left the Island at the wrong time. I was not here when the first Budget with the beer was being debated and I came in at the tail end. I said to the Hon. Premier that he was either a madman or a fool to do what he did with the beer. You always encourage a country to supply its own goods and you encourage the people to buy them. If you are going to get drunk, well, you may as well get drunk. I know that this statement about Banks Brewery discouraged it to the extent that some of the shopkeepers have got the stupid habit that if you ask for beer they will ask you: "What beer? If you were to say "Banks Beer" they would say: "No, not Banks but Amstel."
4.20 p.m.

When you land in Holland, they put Amstel or Heinekens before you, and if you do not drink either of them, they ask you if you would have a little German beer. If you say "yes", they would say: "We had some last week but all has gone." If the Premier has done anything against buying Barbados goods, he has done it himself. When the senior member for St. Andrew says these things, he has to remember that if the Premier makes rash statements, he must pay for his mistakes. I am not going to be like the Leader of the Opposition and talk about giving him a chance; you do that in romance. He must take the blame for creating the atmosphere against buying Barbados goods. He started a campaign against Banks Beer and collected less money in consumption tax; so he had to take it off in order to get money. Now he has seen the sense in creating an atmosphere for buying Banks beer, but he came in here at the time with the economic conundrum that it was better to import beer than to allow Banks to develop, with the idea that they only employed 68 people. That number of 68 people is going to grow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this morning, I tied up an agreement on the Port at the Deep Water Harbour on behalf of the workers there. No man could get \$9.00 a day on the old Port, because there was not that income from which they could get such a wage. You are now getting a total income of \$5 million from bunkering where you did not get one penny before; so therefore you analyse these things in the light of what it produces. Those of us who sat on the Deep Water Harbour Board, recommended that there should be a Deep Water Harbour; but because people did not plan for the consequences that would take place after its erection, they looked for scapegoats. I have been in politics long enough to be a scapegoat but God has blessed me with thick shoulders. The position now is that this country's national income will go up as a result of increasing these wages, and our position will go up as a result of the Deep Water Harbour because of the number of ships that come here for bunkering, and the invisible income we are going to get from the reclamation of land, and by offering investors an opportunity to put things right there in the Harbour mouth, which are going to create investment income which you cannot calculate in terms of dollars and cents. The whole country's face is going to be changed, because it is going to give a face lift and a frontage to the community which it deserves. The infrastructure has been built up, and if the Premier has now come around to the point when we have been thinking seriously about these things, we must accept.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, some people suffer from fright and fear. They feel that if you say something first and they have not said it, they should not do it because it is likely to reflect more credit for you. You will never be able to stop ideas coming into a person's brain. As a matter of fact, the person himself is not responsible, because he does not know how it occurs, but it happens. This is a small community; and from the money you spend in industrial development, some will have to go in diversification, because we are still an agricultural community and it is necessary for us to have these things; and when I analyse this against what he said earlier, I can say "I told you so!" It is not therefore a question of taxing these people and saying you have only put a cent on this and a cent on that. What I will say to the

Premier is that the incidence of taxation on the consumption basis was too heavy for the community to absorb at one time. Do not think that in three years you can do all that you want to do, because after all we do not draw our salaries at the beginning of the year; we draw our salary for the year at the end of December; so do not come with inflated taxation proposals, because they would jar the people on whom they fall heavily.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you analyse the position in 1961, you were getting \$11 million in Customs and Excise, but now you are getting \$15 million in two years' time. You have to be careful that you do not let the gap between direct and indirect taxation fall heavily on the spending power, and if you continue to reduce the spending power of the man in the street or the masses of people, you are only shrinking their income and making it more difficult for them to exist. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Thomas make a statement. My office is by the market, and I can tell him that there are people in Barbados who go to the shop every day to buy food. There are people who do not belong to the class of persons who buy goods by the week. There are some persons who not only buy food every day, but each meal means a trip to the shop; therefore any increase at any point is something they are going to feel.

Now we do not say even for those reasons that your fiscal policy can remain static or that there should be no increase in consumption tax here or there. I would like to emphasise what the Leader of the House has said. There is too much emphasis being placed on one sector of workers in Barbados for laziness. There are examples of laziness at the top, and I find that there is not much charge based on people higher up on slow productivity in the Government Service. There are some Government Officers high up who are not giving the public what they should get, because they are not giving enough. There are also some in the middle; so the whole structure of your Government work force should be re-organised in order that people could be trained. As I told the Civil Servants, if a man does not like meeting the public, do not put him in the Post Office to sell stamps; put him somewhere where he would not meet the public. I am a believer that the man in the road should be trained, and the supervisor should be made to understand why people work. All the politicians sitting around this Table will make a speech here and there on this, but when it comes to the year of election, they would find it quite easy to say that Frank Walcott said they did not work hard enough and you should not return him to the House of Assembly. They would not say to the men that they cannot get more roads or more houses if they make the building of roads more expensive than they should have been and therefore it is better for them to get on and do some work. These are some of the problems we have to face, and the Government should not be afraid to face them.

I consider that there are other aspects which I am going to deal with in greater detail. When it comes to the proposal of putting a further tax on beverage, you have to analyse this in the light of commonsense. That is why I say that you need money; but if you do it in the light that travel cost is going to be increased.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, just before the hon. member sits, I should like to point out that there has been no reduction in the taxation on vacuum cleaners and what not.

HOUSE REVERTS TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 4.30 o'clock p.m., and that brings Private Members' Business to an end. We will now revert to Government Business, and before the Sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking on the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act.

THE RATES OF INCOME TAX ACT, 1963

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose to conclude my speech on the Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, since I think I have dealt with the matter fully. I have indicated and I would like to re-emphasise that there is no

opposition from my point of view on the basis of the tax remaining as it stands today, because there are many good reasons for so doing. I think I was at pains to point out that there should be an examination into the whole matter of our income tax revenue so that we can get an up-to-date position of the situation. I also made the point about the arrears which are apparently high and against the deficit we were thinking about of \$1,122,000. We have to watch that very carefully.
4.30 p.m.

Now I would also like to say that in any of these matters with which we are dealing, there is no attempt on my part to misrepresent any of these things; but human frailties being what they are, if there is any misrepresentation, that is some of the occupational hazards of our own profession in public life. Sometimes, we are misrepresented — and sometimes on purpose; and there is no doubt whatever in my mind that some people do that without any cause. It is not my intention to misrepresent; it is my intention that any fiscal policy which you make may bear some relation to the community and the circumstances under which the people live in the community.

If you have to do something to attract people to come here, do it. The House approved of something like 12 1/2% because it was a means of inviting people to come here and spend money. At the same time, if your taxation proposals are lagging very much behind your indirect taxation, it is time that you have a re-examination in this matter. Are you collecting the money? There is no point in coming to the House and giving us a short estimate of the taxable amount of money available to us. Somebody goes and steals \$10 and you impose a fine of \$75 on them or the alternative is imprisonment. If they are not paying their taxes, lock up somebody and put them in prison. I saw in the newspapers the other day, somebody had to pay a fine of \$75 for stealing a fowl. Some time ago, I heard that people owed the Hospital a lot of money and that they were people who could pay. There is a class of people walking around in this community who think that they can do as they please. I am not going to condone a man who is not doing his work well. Do not tell me that the burden of taxation should fall on the man below. You do not mind putting a cent on sweet drinks or on a coke. You let that pass; but you let a small proportion of the people in the community owe you \$2 million.

If the Income Tax Department is not staffed sufficiently well enough, staff it. I agree that you need a proper office for the Income Tax Department just as you need one for your Post Office. The Income Tax Office should be so geared and staffed that you can get in this money. You had an Acting Income Tax Commissioner for the last — I do not know how many years. The substantive holder was acting as Assistant Financial Secretary for a very long time. You had an acting Income Tax Commissioner who died recently and you have just appointed another acting Income Tax Commissioner. You can see that the staff at that Department has weakened as a result and, may be, that is your problem. I remember one year that they sent me two income tax bills for two assessment years, and that meant that I had to pay income tax for two years, which was rather burdensome. That is a clear indication that staffing is one of your problems. I would like the Government to bring the staff of this Department up to measure, because if we are not getting in the full amount from income tax which we are entitled to, it means that our budgeting will be faulty. You cannot owe the Customs Department because you have to pay duty before you get out the goods.

As regards income tax, there are those of us who have to pay it under the system of P.A.Y.E., and it is not fair to us that we do not have the privilege of owing the Government large sums of money, as other people who are in a position to pay. If certain people are defaulters, that is going to sour our community life. You talk of corruption; but there is as much corruption in withholding information on that as somebody putting their hands in the Treasury and taking out money. There is too much of this hide-and-seek about these matters and nobody wants to name these people when they find out who they are. If it were somebody whom you wanted to discredit, you would name the person. If I

get more worries, I am going to make a big exposure of certain things. There are certain things which are happening in this community which have got to stop and this non-collection of income tax is one. I know there are certain people who owe income tax and some people are afraid to expose them.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have defended the lot of the poor people. Newspapers do not refuse anything which is sent to them for publication, and somebody the other day wrote in the newspaper that I am the sole opposition in the House. There are lots of workers outside this House whose interest I have to protect. If any hon. member is in doubt of that, he can see it when there is a public demonstration. It is not their main concern to examine people as how I have to examine them. I consider any slackness about the collection of income tax is inimical to the interest of the broad masses of working people in this Island because the broad masses of people are contributing in no small way to the revenue of this country when you examine the Budget Proposals and what you get from Customs and Excise. Therefore, there is no excuse that the Government should not see to it that every penny of income tax is collected, and those people who fail to pay theirs should be made a public example because they are not making the contribution to the public which they should make.

Sir, I have more criticisms to make, but these criticisms which I have made are made from the point of view of how I see things and how I feel about them. There is the proverbial saying that it is the last straw which breaks the camel's back.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like, first of all, to begin by replying to some of the personal accusations made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter against the Minister of Finance.
4.40 p.m.

He began by accusing him of irresponsibility, of not attending this debate after having made the Financial Statement and Budget Proposals last week. As I said to the hon. member earlier, the time schedule with which the Hon. Premier had to make his activities correspond was so tight that it was not possible for him to have done otherwise. Next week there begins in this Island a meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers for which some of the Ministers have already gathered and others are coming in later during the week. The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Nigel Fisher, is arriving early next week for talks, then at the beginning of the month talks are projected for Trinidad which are imperative and should emerge before the talks on Federation in June; and in order to fit all of this into a picture, a rigid schedule had to be fixed and adhered to and the absence from this Chamber of the Hon. Premier today is an answer to the allegation which has been made of dictatorship, infallibility and what not. If the Hon. Premier decided that he was so infallible and indispensable, naturally he would have had to be here today and his absence from here, I think, can in itself be construed as an answer to the charges which have been made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, while it is fresh in my mind, I should like at this stage to reply very emphatically and categorically to deny the last part of the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter with regard to the new Customs Tariffs. As a matter of fact, I should like to confess that I was very much disappointed today at the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Normally, I regard the hon. member as a very wide-awake politician and, more important still, one who does his homework. Invariably when the hon. member comes in here and talks, he knows what he is talking about; but today he was completely off beat. It may be that he did not have a good sleep last night, but he was guilty of trying to mislead the House and the public and of making statements which have been monstrously incorrect. To begin with, he said just now that we have increased the tariff on tooth paste, and we should be encouraging the extension of the use of toothpaste by children. We have not increased the duty on tooth paste not even by one fraction of a cent.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I made that statement, I asked if it is a fact that

the duty on tooth paste had been increased. When I looked at the Speech of the Hon. Premier as distinct from what the Minister said, I had that underlined. The relevant part of that speech is as follows: air conditioning and refrigerating equipment (excluding mechanical refrigerators (classified 899-08) (that is standard international); Free and 10%; portable electric tools and appliances (domestic appliances) — vacuum cleaners, carpet sweepers, polishing brooms, electric saws, drills, planes, soldering irons etc., Free and 10% Travel goods (e.g. shopping bags, haversack bags and similar articles, 20% and 20%; pocket books and similar articles of all materials, 20% and 20%; watches, watch movements, cases and other parts of watches (including marine chronometers and instrument panel clocks), 20% and 30%; pipes, cigar holders and cigarette holders 20% and 30%.

And he ended that part of the Speech by saying: "These are the figures". That indicated that there were some of these items at a freeness unless the hon. member did not have the tariff structure, but spoke of these items as free and 10%. As it now stands, these items are subject to *Ad Valorem* tax. On the matter of tooth paste, we saw here that even an Order sets out this matter, and it may be that the Hon. Minister will explain what is meant by this long customs tariff list when it mentions tooth paste and powder (including denture powder and dental soaps) 10% preference and 20% general. You have toothpaste 10% and 20%, and when I asked about it I got an approval "Yes" that that was so.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. member had posed that question, that would have been a different matter; but he dilated on this matter and went on to say that children in a community should be encouraged in the use of tooth paste and that you had a high degree of absenteeism because of toothache.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I said that toothache could be the cause of a high degree of absenteeism.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: In other words, if you put tooth paste beyond the reach of the people, you will have more absenteeism from toothache. That is a dilation that his theory would give rise to all of these evils in the country eventually, and that is why I said that he was off beat. There has not been any increase in respect of toothpaste or of tooth powder. It is true that in the new Schedule for inclusion in Section 4 of the Customs Tariff Act, tooth paste and tooth powder do occur. You have one classification here, Item 552 — 01.6. Tooth paste and powder (including denture powder and dental soaps) 10% preference 20% general.
4.50 p.m.

When I refer to the old Customs Tariff Schedule, I find, Sir, that the only reason for including this item here is in order to give it a new classification. Originally, Sir, you had 552 — 01.5 Cosmetics: Toilet Preparations except Soaps (e.g. powder, rouge, lipstick, hair dyes, bath salts, deodorants, etc.) and you also had Tooth paste and powder (including denture powder and dental soaps). All this Schedule means to do is to create a new Schedule. You will see from the Schedule here that tooth paste and powder is 01.6 under its own independent Schedule; so there is not one single cent increase in the price of tooth paste, and the entire fifteen minutes which were spent by the hon. member dilating on these imaginary evils which will ensue are purely a figment of his imagination, and merely demonstrates that at least last night he did not do his homework. Furthermore while I am on this point, let me say this:.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the hon. member did not read the Premier's speech. If he looks at page 4 of the Premier's speech, he will see that he starts off by saying "Stout and Porter in bottles \$1.50 and \$1.56; Stout and Porter in Wood, \$1.50 and \$1.56; Cork, raw and waste (including natural Cork in blocks and sheets) Free and 10%; Coir fibre, Free and 10%; Other Textiles fibres n.e.s. and wastes of such fibres, Free and 10%; Paints and Enamels 15% and 16% — again to maintain the GATT differential; Other toilet waters (e.g. eau-de-cologne, lavender water, Florida water, etc.); Other perfumes with or without alcohol; then he says "Cosmetics: Toilet preparations except Soaps (e.g. powder, rouge, lipstick, hair dyes, bath salts,

deodorants, etc.) 20% and 30% - unless some ladies in the community consider it beyond the call of duty to pay this price."

Now the hon. member tells me I did not read these things. The Premier then goes on to say "Tooth paste and powder (including denture powder and dental soaps) 20% and 30%." When the Premier made the statement "unless some ladies in the community consider it beyond the call of duty to pay this price" in that context, would he be making a speech like that by talking about paying that price if the price was the same? Would you conclude in that context that he was talking about the same price?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The position is this: before the House today are the Premier's speech and the actual context of all the Bills to provide legislation for the imposition of these new tariffs. If you were to read the Report of the Premier's Speech and compare it with the actual text of the Bills before the House today, you will see that the Reporters quite understandably seem to have got a lot of figures mixed up - not only one or two, but a lot of them, because the hon. member just quoted for instance tooth paste and powder, 20% and 30%. That is what the Reporter has and I agree with that; but look at the Bill we have introduced today.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member accused me of not doing my homework, and I said I read the Premier's speech. That is the one I was dealing with when he said I was dilating. I was dilating on the Budget proposals; I did not go to the Bill. I dealt with the question of tooth paste and these other budget proposals after the Leader of the Opposition spoke. Now the hon. member is asking me to read the document which has come to me as an official document on these proposals, because he cannot ask me now to deal with the Bill. When it comes to dealing with the Bill, I will have to hear what explanation is made. If this is what the Premier has said, how can he accuse me of not doing my homework? If you want to say it is wrongly reported, say so; but if I read from the printed Report, you cannot get up and say I have not done my homework.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: My reason for saying that is this: nobody in this community, and least of all somebody with the experience of the hon. member who himself was a customs clerk, would concede that the preferential duty on tooth paste is 20% and non-preferential 30%; therefore if he had done his homework

Mr. WALCOTT: 30% is 50% over 20.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like hon. members to understand that I am not going to listen to this exchange about homework anymore. Everyone must speak; but we must make some progress on this Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, if the hon. member is making a categorical denial to what the Hon. Premier has said, you would not expect me to sit down on that. Now that I have pointed out what I said in the Budget Speech, the hon. member is not willing - and that is one of his failings - to admit, but is proceeding now to enter into discussion on a proposed Bill which is before us as if I were discussing the Bill; but I was only discussing the Budget Speech made by the Premier from which I concluded that tooth paste was increased.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I propose to explain the Government's position as fully as possible so that there can be no misunderstanding on any matter beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt, and I repeat that any member of this House seeing for the first time that the duty on tooth paste is as high as 30% must know there is a mistake somewhere, and since every hon. member is provided with a copy of the Laws of the Island and every time we pass an amendment every member gets a copy of the amendments, all he has to do is to check the amendments to see wherein the mistake has been made. That is what I did. When I heard him say these things today and checked the speech, the report of the Speech could not be right. I checked the relevant legislation and found that in a number of cases in this Report the new

rates of customs duty are completely wrong. Reference to the actual proposals for legislation before the House as embodied in the Order will have the correct rates in all cases, and there is no increase in the duty on tooth paste and tooth powder. Moreover, the Government has gone further; in cases, Sir, where the duty has been increased, it has been increased either on luxury items or on items which purely fortuitously are manufactured here, and as the Premier explained last Tuesday, this was done purely

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I would like to know if the Hon. Minister is replying to the Budget proposals or to the particular Bill which is before us.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I was saying, Sir, that in so far as the actual increase are concerned, the increases are either on luxury items or items already manufactured here. 5.00 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The increases are on the Budget Proposals, not on the Income Tax Bill which the Hon. Minister is replying on. He is trying to be clever. He must reply to remarks on the Income Tax Bill and not on the remarks on the Budget Proposals. He is replying to statements made on the Resolution which was brought in under Private Members' Business.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also rise on a point of order. I think it was the Hon. Minister himself who reminded you very strenuously that you should guard against members utilising the Income Tax Bill to refer to matters in the Budget. It is he who said that we were not dealing with these things. What the Hon. Minister is now replying to are the speeches which we made on the Budget Proposals; but we did not make those speeches when we were debating the Income Tax Bill.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, before I pass on from this, I can show on this question that the Government actually removed the duty entirely. Now, to get back to the hon. senior member for the City -

Mr. HUSBANDS: On what?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is not your business.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is my business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both members sit? By chance, I heard the hon. junior member for St. Peter asking, I do not know whom and why, and the Hon. Leader of the House made the mistake by answering, I do not know whom. Now, that matter is closed. I would be glad if the Hon. Leader of the House would proceed now.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am making a point of order now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not entertaining that point of order now.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I rose on a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have ruled, I say, let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed now.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Is Your Honour ruling that I am not to be heard on a point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not at this stage.

Mr. HUSBANDS: At what stage?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would hear the Hon. Leader of the House now if he would continue.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Your Honour, I am afraid if that is your attitude to deny me a hearing when I rose on a point of order before you actually listened to the point of order. I know my rules.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have said that I would hear the Hon. Leader of the House now.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I said that the hon. senior member for St. Peter appeared today to be completely off beat. He has propounded so many economic heresies that I do not know where to begin. On this question of arrears of income tax, the total arrears now are about \$1 3/4 million. It is true to say that when we came into office we found arrears of \$1 1/2 million and the difference accumulated last year. The arrears represent an accumulation of tax over a period of years. Where the hon. senior member for St. Peter was wrong is to suggest that because we have \$2 million in arrears, the entire basis of our budget should be different.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister has said what the Government's attitude is and has linked up the present debate with the Budgetary Proposals by criticising the hon. senior member for St. Peter as to where he is wrong. The Hon. Minister is out of order because we are now dealing with the Income Tax Bill. He is criticising the hon. senior member for St. Peter for his attitude towards the Budgetary Proposals and said it is there where he went wrong. The Hon. Minister is entirely out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It might be very difficult and even impossible in replying to this Bill not even to make the slightest reference to what has been said during the debate on the motion with regard to the Budgetary Proposals. I take it that the Hon. Leader of the House is experienced in his responsibility and would confine his remarks as closely as possible to the Bill before the House.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is not only the point. I am replying to points actually raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter during his remarks on the Income Tax Bill. The hon. junior member for St. Peter has not been in the House for the entire day. He comes in here like Nicodemus at night.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Minister has said that I was not in the House for the entire day. He is making himself an imposter and a stranger to the truth because I have been in my seat before now, and I was in my seat when the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke on two subjects before the House today. Therefore, when the Hon. Minister or whatever he is styled or self-styled said that I have not been in the House today, he is stranger to the truth; and when he refers to the statement that I am in here like Nicodemus at night, let me not say what a learned judge said of him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On no account do I want that. I want hon. members to refrain absolutely from making the slightest personal attack, however innocent it may be, on other hon. members.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Peter has been absent from today's sitting for a long time; therefore, he could not have heard all the remarks made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. He could not because he was not in his seat all the time.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never claimed that I heard all the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Peter; therefore, what the Hon. Minister is saying is useless. It suits him to say so.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I was saying, Sir, for the purpose of the budget that we estimated a certain amount of expenditure, and then we estimated a certain amount of revenue, and we estimated in that revenue for a certain amount to be collected from income tax. 5. 10 p.m.

That approximately includes the total amount of income tax which we expect to collect this year. We did not allow for any defaulting; defaulting occurs in Government as in business. You have bad debts; you have people who do not pay their debts properly and you carry forward to the next year bad debts or recoverable debts which will go on to the next year. I do not know on what basis the hon. member thinks that we could afford to budget for a deficit and make

no attempt at all to bridge the gap between expenditure and revenue merely because we have \$1 3/4 million of arrears from income tax. So long as there is a deficit of \$1 1/4 million between estimated revenue and expenditure, we are in duty bound to take measures so as to bridge that gap. I am sure that the hon. member himself must understand that it would be impossible for any Government to proceed on a different basis.

Again, when the hon. member talked about the marked increase in revenue from indirect taxation in comparison with the revenue from direct taxation, I should like to say that there are many factors which he failed to take into account. For instance, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that in 1952-53 the revenue was \$14 million, that we are now collecting from Customs duties over \$14 million and, naturally, the Customs duty fell heavily on the masses and the masses are making more than their contribution to the revenue. I am surprised that a Parliamentarian, a Trade Union Leader, a student of public affairs with the experience of the hon. senior member for St. Peter should make such an oversimplification of a matter like this. The amount which you collect from Customs duty must bear some relation to the revenue, and in ten years there must be a marked increase in the revenue.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The analogy I made was to show what had taken place, but the gap was a gradual one. The hon. member was not listening to me. I was showing the gap between Customs duty which had taken place from 1953 when the Customs duty was \$5 million and direct taxation was \$6 million. Direct taxation was greater than indirect taxation, and now the gap has gone on so that indirect taxation is \$15 million as compared with \$9 million. I say that, as Socialists, we believe in closing the gap between direct taxation and indirect taxation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: What the hon. member must understand is this: as the standard in the community rises his Union becomes more effective in its demands and the value of imports must rise. In 1952 the total value of c.i.f. imports was only \$55 million; today it is \$88 million and therefore this differential must be reflected in the amount collected from Customs duty. If you double your imports in ten years, then you must also double your revenue. If you want a higher standard of living for the people, your direct taxation must always keep pace with your indirect taxation. Naturally, it may be necessary to investigate the possibility, in the nearest possible time, of getting more revenue from direct taxation; but, as the hon. member himself has said, at the moment the rates of direct taxation seem to allow very little margin for an increase if you want to expand the economy further and provide more employment. The rates of taxation in this Colony correspond fairly with those in Trinidad and in Jamaica and, for that matter, with a highly industrialised country like Great Britain; therefore, in levying taxation, one has to bear in mind the capital for industrial development for expanding the economy of the country, and therefore the Government had to be very careful, at a time when it is trying to develop more industries about scaring capital away by any abnormal increase in the taxation rate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one other point to which I should like to reply and that is with regard to the castigation impliedly of the Government in allowing this appreciably high amount of income tax to be in default. Apparently, the hon. member forgot that only this year we introduced a Bill in this House, and it was passed by this Chamber and the Other Place, increasing the penalty for the non-payment of income tax. One of the Sections of the Bill provided that if income tax is not paid within a prescribed time, an additional rate of 5% on the amount of the unpaid income tax shall be added thereto. Furthermore, the Bill also provides for the accretion of interest of 6% in certain circumstances to be calculated at the expiration of every month from the date due. Therefore, it is not quite fair or correct to say that we are unmindful of the position with regard to these high arrears of income tax, because we have taken steps against it, and the penalties imposed in the Bill which we brought down to this House during this year are of such a critical nature as we feel convinced will assist in obliterating these arrears within a short time.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. When I raised that point, I said precisely that the question of arrears was not the sole responsibility of this Government and the hon. member should remember that. I said that if you take over a Government and you find arrears, you will have to tell the people that you cannot do things for them with these outstanding arrears which are there. I said that it is not fair to ask other people to be imposed with further arrears because that would create a problem for the Government. 5.20 p.m.

The fact that the Government is \$1 million or \$2 million short of its revenue means it is short of that much money to utilise, and before imposing new taxation, they should garner what is owing.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the Government is short of \$1 1/2 million, that amount for income tax was not owed for last year at all, and would not be owed for this year either; therefore the fact that it is owed does not permit us to bridge the gap between estimated expenditure for the current year and estimated revenue. You cannot, as the member wants to say, take any steps to bridge the gap. I do not think I need say anything more at this stage with regard to the actual comments on the Income Tax Bill, but I want to assure the House finally that nobody in this community realises more than the Government itself the necessity for obtaining every possible penny that it can from direct taxation, and the moment we see the time opportune and the circumstances warrant it for obtaining more money from this form of taxation, we will leave no stone unturned to get it.

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:—

2: (1) Subject to the provisions of sections 9, 10 and 11 of the Income Tax Act, 1921, and of any other enactment with respect to the rates of tax on companies and on persons who subscribe any policy of insurance (other than life) in and for the year one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three the graduated rates of tax set forth in the Schedule to this Act shall be the rates at which income tax shall be charged, levied, collected and paid to Her Majesty for the use of this Island.

(2) On every complete dollar of taxable income in each of the grades to which the different portions of any income are respectively assignable there shall be levied and paid a sum of money equal to the rate appropriate to such grade;

Provided that no tax shall be charged to any taxpayer whose taxable income is less than five dollars.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I should like to answer that point made by the Hon. Leader of the House when he was dealing with the matter. When he raised the point that he could not take into consideration budgeting for the arrears, I do not subscribe to that. Your budget is an annual budget; it is not a Five Year Development Plan that you cannot take every item of revenue.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the hon. member would give way, I should like to say that I did not mean we would ig-

nore it completely. In your estimation, you would naturally estimate for some portion of the \$2 million to be paid. What I really meant was that you could not say because we were owed \$2 million, we need not budget to recover the \$1 1/2 million deficit.

Mr. WALCOTT: We will be on all fours on that, because I wanted to say to the hon. member that it will be difficult for the Government in one year to collect its arrears; therefore they could not budget for the collectible arrears. But I was at pains to point out that if your fiscal policy means that you have these outstanding debts that are greater than your deficit, it means that it imposes further taxation on people to bear the burden of defaulters, and you will have to tell the community that it cannot have these standards if the defaulters are not willing to pay their debts, because you cannot carry out a further imposition on people. I believe that sooner or later the Government will have to come to that, I think the hon. senior member for Bridgetown will find this difficulty in a small sector. If you have any Local Government authority in which half the people decide they would not pay the rates, you cannot then set out to increase the expenditure which would increase the rates further on those who are willing to pay as a means of providing services. You have to say to the people that they cannot get these services if people are unwilling to pay. From income tax we provide school meals, pay Police and do all these things, and people cannot have advanced services if 25% of the taxpayers are going to default each year in the bills you have to pay.

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

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE PETROLEUM (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1963

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Order of the day under Government Business is a Bill to move the second reading of a Bill further to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882. This Bill, Sir, seeks to amend the rate of taxation on petroleum distillates with the exception of kerosine. I want to make it clear that none of the provisions of this Bill refer to kerosine, and therefore the price of kerosine must remain unchanged through the Island; but the price of other petroleum distillates will be increased proportionately to the increase in the taxation, which is from one shilling one penny and one farthing per gallon to thirty-one point five cents per gallon for all petroleum taken from the petroleum warehouse or other authorised storehouse. It also seeks to make the necessary consequential amendments to section 26 of the Petroleum Act, 1882.

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

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is another matter, which as I said, we will have to deal with in a disjointed fashion in so far as the Budget is concerned. Now the five cents a gallon on gasolene in my view, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is going to affect travel cost. The Hon. Leader of the House said I have been producing economic heresies, and it is not the first time I have heard a Government Minister say so. 5.30 p.m.

I remember on that side, some hon. member asking what kind of economist I am. That is the normal tendency

of members on the Government's side when you raise anything like this. I am not afraid of taxation and I have indicated in this line what the taxation should be. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas and everybody would give their view. We are entitled to that as long as we are members of the House. As long as a matter comes here, it is our business, and it is our business to express our views on it. That is where I join issue with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he quoted the Hon. Premier in dealing with this matter of gasoline. He said that there is no reason why general taxpayers should subsidise a service which can pay for itself if it were operated by private enterprise.

Turning to the bus service and travel costs, I do not know what is the opinion of the Hon. Premier. One of the hypothetical statements which he made is that if it were operated by private people it would make a profit. We know when private people were running the buses, they said that they were not making a profit and they wanted an increase in bus fares.

I am satisfied in my mind that this 5-cent increase on gasoline is not going to be absorbed by people in industrial business. If you take the people who are running the buses, I cannot see your increasing the price of gasoline by five cents a gallon and your saying that it is not going to affect travelling cost. Let us take domestic servants. The days are over for domestic servants travelling to work on foot. That is what you have to bear in mind. Now, let us take a person who travels to Bridgetown to work from my constituency. If bus fares go up by five cents for a person travelling from Speightstown to Bridgetown, it means ten cents more per day, sixty cents more per week and \$2.50 more per month. Let us take, for instance, that this is the case of people who work in stores. If you have at present a minimum wage of \$18 a week for such a person, that is not a wage which can bear any further cost. There are hundreds of persons who are working for a wage which cannot bear an increase of this magnitude. It is true that their rate of pay has gone up from \$16 to \$18 a week recently. If their increased travel costs go up by 60 cents per week, you can very well see what it would mean. It seems to be the general view that travel costs would go up. A Committee is sitting at present to enquire into the Transport system and, maybe we shall soon hear what its report is.

Sir, as I have said earlier, the roads in Barbados are more or less in good condition and I feel the people who use the roads predominantly must make a contribution to their upkeep.

The hon. member spoke about drink. There is no law which says that a coke has to be sold for eight cents or five cents. The price fixed for a coke at present is the industrial price. Now, what has the Government done? For all the years there was no consumption tax on sweet drinks, but as the Government has seen the people drinking a lot of sweet drinks they have dashed on a tax on it. There is no royal road for governments to get in money. Government's policy is theirs, so they can argue their point; I am going to argue mine. It is a question as to how you distribute your taxation.

I heard some hon. members talking about a bicycle. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew was on the wrong latitude when speaking on this question, he said that a bicycle did not take up too much of the road. If it were a question of how much space you took up on the road, then the owners of some jackass carts should pay more than the owners of some motor cars because a jackass cart is fitted with hard wheels while a motor car is fitted with rubber wheels. You can run a motor car on the road for the next hundred years and that road is not going to be in the state of condition as if you were running a jackass cart on it. You do not base taxation on the minimum damage which a vehicle can do to your roads; you deal with the value of the vehicle. If someone can buy a motor car for \$5,000, well, you can get \$5,000 advantage out of a motor car; but you cannot get that advantage out of a jackass cart.

Sir, the road system in Barbados being what it is, it seems to me logical that you should be able to get in more

parochial taxes from that source. The point which I am making is that the Government collects all of the taxes which you pay on a motor car. The rate of parochial tax for a motor car has been a rate which has been in existence for many years. It is an annual rate.

5.40 p.m.

That is a natural thing. That is the sort of revenue that would not affect the traffic costs and the number of vehicles you have operating on the street; you have private cars and other vehicles and that is where you can get some revenue. There are some people who pay \$20 to \$25 a year, and, it may be, \$3 a month. Very few of us have problems with our motor cars now. I have a motor car which has done about 30,000 miles and I have not yet had a broken spring; so that the car owners can make a contribution to the revenue. If you could put a penny on gasoline in one way and a tax somewhere else, you distribute the cost to a section which does not feel it. If there are 10,000 motor car users absorbing the cost, then it would not be reflected in a community where it makes an inflationary trend. The domestic servant will ask the housewife for more money and there you will find that the spiral begins to swing. In Barbados it is difficult to arrive at any system of comparative costs, but taxi fares will go up and a request will come from Government Officers, because gasoline has gone up in cost and travelling allowance will have to go up too. A Minister may bear it for a little time, but eventually the Ministers will say.....

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: On a point of order. The hon. member must bear in mind that in January, 1962, the Transport Board and all persons interested in transport stood an increase of over 25% in wages. A year has elapsed and no increase in transport cost has taken place. The Transport Board has lost a revenue of \$144,000 for the year; we have had this amount of \$144,000 to bear for over a year alone.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was not dealing with the travel costs or the other operational costs because, as the Hon. Minister has intimated, the wages at the Transport Board have been deplorably low. A bus driver gets between \$32 and \$34 a week and a conductor gets \$24 a week. A bus driver is receiving less than \$1 an hour and that is not a princely sum for that type of job. I should like to say that Barbados has some of the best transport services. If Barbadians want to travel in comparatively luxurious buses in a comparably poor community, then they will have to pay something more for that. In St. Vincent or in Grenada you will find that you are getting in juke boxes for buses because when you get in the buses you hear the music coming from them. There is no designing such as what we have here. I would like some hon. members to go on a Parliamentary delegation to Montserrat, St. Kitts or Dominica, and when they come back here they will then be able to talk about the sort of standards which obtain in those parts. I would like to take about 500 Barbadians and land them in Antigua. I think you will agree that our standards here are higher and better than those in the other areas and we have to pay for them. I am not advocating that you should not pay for what you want and for what is good; but I am pointing out that this 5 cents increase in the cost of gasoline can lead to an increase in travel costs and there the spiral will start to snowball. I was only thinking in terms of splitting your increase between the cost that can be absorbed at one point and at another point, and so relieve the community of some of these costs.

Mr. HUSBANDS: My colleague has spoken at length on what he envisages is the likely consequence which will follow from the enactment of this Bill, especially as affecting transportation and even possible claims from the Civil Servants who now enjoy travelling allowance. I say that this Bill has further consequences; this Bill is going to affect the people's food. As far as the country retailer is concerned, his food moves from Roebuck Street on wheels; and in the long run, the retail country shopkeeper who exists on credit largely so — you may number those who pay cash at the stores from which they buy — that country shopkeeper will be put further into the hands of the Roebuck Street merchant, and he will be at a greater disadvantage than that at which he is today. In my view, the tax on petroleum should

be put on very gradually if it is to go on, and even more progressively; but a rise in taxation of 5 cents a gallon on gasoline is a tremendous rise to go on at once. If a tax of one cent had been put on gasoline last year, then the Government would be in a better position this year to increase it by another cent; but this five cents tax goes on instantly and, as I have already said, the poor people's food is transported by wheels to the country districts. Then the retail shopkeeper, who exists very largely on credit, has to find himself in a very embarrassing position to sell his goods at the same rate. Therefore, you are going to have serious repercussions because whilst we understand that there is the proposed addition of one cent on a pint of rice, that is a very gradual tax.

Sir, there is a motion before this House relative to the Premier's Financial Statement and Budget Proposals and I hope to have the opportunity of adding my contribution to the debate next week. I will not go into that now; indeed I cannot go back to that now.

5.50 p.m.

Right now, apart from transportation costs having to rise or being forced to rise, the food as retailed by the country shopkeeper will have to rise too, and there is no getting away from that. One man gets the squeeze and passes it on to another man. The poor shopkeeper in St. Thomas, St. Peter, St. Lucy and the other rural parishes does his small trade with the Roebuck Street merchant, and the merchants send out small vans in the country. I live in the parish of St. Peter, which is a rural area. Speightstown is, relatively speaking, a small town and shops cater not only to the residents in Speightstown, but to the residents in the rural part of St. Peter. The shopkeepers there have to impose small increases to their clients in the country, and there is a great exodus of people from the country which goes to town on Fridays and shops in Baxters Road, Tudor Street and other grocery stores in Bridgetown, thereby reducing the trade in the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we who live in the rural areas will be feeling this tax, because due to the imposition of this tax, bus transportation being as cheap as it is, people will leave St. James and St. Peter and shop for better bargains in Tudor Street and Baxters Road. That is an old pattern already, but when now the addition of five cents per gallon of petrol is put on, what is going to be the result? The country shopkeeper will be hit hard by that tax because he is actually paying more for his goods and is bound to put more on, and whether it is legal or otherwise, he is going to charge more. He carries on his business largely by giving credit, and the people who live every day from hand to mouth will have to pay these surreptitious additions to the food items, and there we all have it. It is therefore going further than hon. members may think, and much further than my colleague has expressed. My colleague dealt with transportation and the possible claims of those who enjoy travelling allowance, but now it comes right down to the food of the poorest man in the hinterland of this country, because he largely has to go to the nearest shopkeeper and do his credit by the week, and he has got to accept the new additions which will be imposed on his food items, and a hardship will be created. Bus transportation being so cheap, people will journey into town and by doing that the trend of trade in the country is going to be worse.

It is obvious, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what I am saying is reasonable. Any hon. member who has the privilege and honour of representing a rural constituency and knows how the people of his constituency buy their goods, will substantiate what I am saying, unless he has lived and moved about with his eyes and ears in the air. There are other far-reaching consequences that hang from this proposed piece of legislation; therefore in my view I consider the rise of five cents on one gallon of petrol is too steep, and must mean that a hardship is going to accrue to the poorest people of this Island by having to pay more for their daily food.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have much to say on this Bill, because there is more to come next week, but dealing with the remarks by the hon. senior member for

St. Thomas about the rise in gasoline, he was at pains to point out to this House that 70 cents for a gallon of gasoline is not too much. He knows that because he has to buy it, and he knows how easy it is for him to get 70 cents; but I know how hard it is for me and others to get it. I would never say that 70 cents is not too much. The hon. member anticipated me and said that he felt sure that I was going to speak in favour of the increase, because I said last year that an increase should be made in the price of gasoline. I said so, but had I thought the Hon. Premier would have inflicted a five cents increase, I would have played dumb because five cents per gallon as an increase is too much. I said at that time that rather than cripple Banksbeer, one cent more on gasoline would have done the trick; and I am sure that if he had put on one cent last year, he would not have to put on five cents this year.

6.00 p.m.

As you know, by crippling Banks Brewery, he saw plainly that he was going to lose more than he gained; so he came back inside here a few days afterwards, comparatively speaking, and said that he was going to give the people cheap beer for Christmas and he took the increased tax off and by taking it off he did not receive as much taxation as he expected.

I am sure he would not have to put on so much this year. It is all well and good for the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to say that the five cents increase is not too much. I am wondering to know if he was thinking seriously at the time when he was making this speech because he did not stay there and deliver his speech; he must have studied it overnight. He must have prepared that speech; therefore, he had time to think even as regards what it would mean to the children who attend his school. I am wondering if any of them owe him school fees. The increase in the price of gasoline, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, is going further than what most of us think. There are people today, masons, carpenters, drivers, conductors, engineers, clerks, harbour workers, hawkers and speculators who now have to get a little piece of car to take them around. You have people speculating who are using pickups. The people who eke out a living by way of speculating have to drive from one corner of the country to another, and I am sure that some times they go out and do not get one thing to buy; but when they go out they have to buy gasoline. If they drive 50 miles or 60 miles a day, they have to put in gasoline, and sometimes they do not get a thing to cover that expense. The next day, they will have to go out again and see what they can raise. You have some hawkers who drive from St. Joseph to St. Philip and even down to St. Lucy for coconuts. They are not using a horse and cart any more. When you had the horse and cart, you only had to buy a bundle or two of meat for the horse and that was your greatest expense. But today, they use a pickup or own a motor car and it means buying gasoline. Imagine, Sir, these people driving all over the country. This increase of five cents a gallon on gasoline will surely hit them hard.

I am not such a fool as to think that the Government does not have to budget for bringing in revenue, but you have to be very careful in levying your tax. You have to look and see what you are going to do. You have Indians and other people who drive all over the country and who are a help to the poor working class people of the country by bringing to their doors cloth for them to buy. I am sure this increase in the price of gasoline will mean an increase on their travelling expenses and the people who buy the cloth from them will have to pay it. The people who go around in these pickups and old motor cars also have to budget for parts, and that means more money which they have to spend although it would not cost more if they bring their car to the Fix-It Right Garage, because that garage is prepared to keep the price down on the cost of parts. (Laughter) However, Sir, you can clearly see what is going to happen by this big increase of five cents a gallon on gasoline.

If I may refer to people like conductors and drivers, there are some of them who have to get to their work at a certain hour. They work in St. Michael and they live in St. Joseph. The buses do not move off to suit the time they have to get to work; so they have to buy a piece of motor

car to get them to their work and so that they may be able to get a job. Some of them have to bring a bus up to the country by five o'clock in the morning; therefore, they have to get to the Transport Board in time so that they can get the bus in the country by five o'clock. In such a case, they have to buy a piece of car to get them on the job. When I say a piece of car, I mean an old car, and that is a mistake which those people make; but it is through poverty that they buy a piece of car. There are some people who do not keep a motor car longer than three years. There are some people who as soon as the tyres on their cars begin to wear, they get rid of the car and get a new one. The people who have to get an old one for their purpose are not going to do that and it is the people who have to keep an old car who are saddled with more expense. They have to keep an old one because they cannot raise the amount of money to provide a new one. You will find some people who own the same old motor car for the last fifteen years, because they are not able to get a new one and they are bound to keep it because they must have something to get them on the job. A conductor who works for \$20 or \$25 a week and who has a family, you will find him very often spending more on the upkeep of his car than on his family. In other words, they have to cut short the money which they give to their wives in order to keep the old motor car going, and they are bound to do that because without the car they cannot work at all.

You have engineers working at factories. You may ask what has become of bicycles? Cannot they ride to work? 6.10 p.m.

After you have got to a certain age, especially if you live in an area like St. John, St. Andrew St. Joseph or St. Thomas, a bicycle is of very little use to you. A bicycle is of very little use to a mason or a carpenter. You may have a mason living in the parish of St. George and a job is opened in St. James; you will find that these workers will join together and contribute something to the owner of a motor car so that they can get to the job; but if a person has to pay five cents more for a gallon of gasoline, then he will charge these people something more for taking them to their jobs. Sir, it is a serious thing to hit the gasoline so hard at this moment. I understand — as a matter of fact, I know that there are other ways and means whereby you could get along and you would not have to hit this particular item so hard. When you look around — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to go outside the scope of this Bill because your attention will be called to the fact that I am straying. However, I will say that you will have to raise bus fares. I have been told that bus fares have already been increased in some cases. When I made my investigation I discovered that there was a particular concessionaire — I will not call his name — who never charged the full fare per stage; he was so sympathetic to his area or field that he did not charge the full fare per stage, but now that the cost of gasoline has gone up, he will have to do something about the fare. So long as you got out of the bus between two stages, this particular concessionaire did not charge anything more. This concessionaire is not doing anything wrong now if he asks for an increased fare because he should have done it long ago.

As regards the school children, you can easily see what is going to happen with them; you can quite see what is going to happen with the parents. This increase in the cost of gasoline is going to cause a great hardship. As the hon. senior member for the City has said, it was not the last Government but the Conservative Government before who was doing things so as to get ends to meet; but although that was so, that Government never inflicted such a hardship on the community. The cost of items never went so high and that was a Conservative Government. Now you have had a Socialist Government in power; you look around and see the money which they have spent; you look at the improvements which have been made; and yet the people of this country were not hit so hard by the taxation imposed by the last Government. I do not have to call any names, but I do say that the last Government never had to do such things so as to make ends meet. Regardless of what is said of the last Government, they have done a good job because the people were not so hard hit.

The tax on gasoline is more than what we ever had. For instance, in the parish of St. Michael there was a time when there were only 2,000 vehicles and today there are over 7,000. The consumption therefore is greater. If you are using more gasoline, then I am submitting that the tax should be less; that is my contention. A parish like St. Joseph never had any more than 50 vehicles before; the parish of St. George or St. James would have about 800 (Mr. MOTTLEY: What about St. Michael?) The parish of St. Michael has about 7,000 now. The last Government had to spend very much in improving conditions in this Island and the consumption of gasoline was not so great. Speaking under correction, I am saying that they did not increase the tax by more than three cents. Sir, I would like to know what has gone wrong now that this Government has to impose an increase of five cents. Something is wrong if we have seen the necessity for doing that. I know that the Government will have to get the money which they want to spend but, as I say there are other ways and means of getting that money. However he turns, the little man has got a blow; everybody is getting it but the small man is getting it more so. If I live next Tuesday, however, and do not die and go to Heaven (Laughter), I will let this House know where the small man is getting a blow all round. Good dear! You say that the small drink is water; you lash the small man on that and you also lash him on the water itself; I know that everybody has to buy these things. I am representing some of the very poorest people in this country and I know what their needs are. I know what they are suffering from and I am saying that this taxation is going to inflict a very great hardship on these people, especially those who are living in the country areas.

6.20 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that five cents on one gallon of gasoline this year of grace, 1963, is too much to put on at one time when the consumption is greater. Something is wrong and this Government had better check up.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the whole day we have heard much talk about the poor whenever a member opens his mouth. Here we have this increase of five cents on a gallon of gasoline. Members have talked about everything, but they have not talked about an undertaker, because nobody fixes his price. He knows that the dead must be buried; so whatever he charges has to be paid. The hon. junior member talked all around and has not mentioned an undertaker's name yet.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has not mentioned anything about an undertaker, but I am telling him that an undertaker can take care of himself, drunk or sober.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, nobody knows what the undertakers charge because they talk in secret. You will see all prices set up on notice boards except the undertaker's fee; so no man can stop him from raising or lowering his charge. On the increase of five cents per gallon on gasoline, we have heard discussion about the shopkeepers in the country, about buses and about everything else and members have referred to the poor. It seems to me that there are certain politicians in this Island who preach politics wherever they go, but anyone you see going around whispering to the poor is absolutely blaspheming the name of the poor, because he has never contributed a cent of his to the poor.

I remember reading from the scriptures that when Jesus was on the earth, he called a rich young man and asked him if he would like to go to Heaven. Jesus asked him whether he loved his neighbour as he loved himself and he said "yes". The man said he had done everything, but Jesus told him that if he loved the poor as he loved himself, to distribute what he had to the poor and come and follow Him. The man said that would not do. Jesus then told him that it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Wherever you turn in the world today, anyone who wants to get into power goes around talking about the poor;

he represents the poor with his mouth, but he never does anything for them.

As I said today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance has to find ways and means to run this Government, and I remember hearing the hon. junior member for St. Joseph say during the last budget speech that there should be an increase on gasoline, and that too much money was put on beer, and rum was too dear. Now that the Premier has raised the price, the hon. member is grumbling. If you put a cent on any commodity, the people are going to cry because they do not like to pay taxes. Even car owners in the Island do not mind paying more for gasoline, and they burn more gasoline for pleasure than for work. When you hear people talking about the five cent increase on gasoline, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am certain that the only persons it might affect would be the bus owners. There are motor cars today which give twenty miles to the gallon, and to a man living in St. Andrew it is one gallon to come to town and one gallon to go back. Ten cents more a day for a man to run a motor car is not too much and I am sure that people are going to pay. Would the hon. member want the Premier to put five cents more on flour?

I hope, Sir, that in time the Government will see fit to increase bus fares by one cent or a penny because the buses consume more gasoline. Heavy duty vehicles like a bus or a truck will consume more gasoline, and I hope that the Government will see fit to increase bus fares at least by a cent or a penny. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot criticise this Bill, as I said before, because I know the Government has to get money to run the country; therefore I support it wholeheartedly.
6.30 p.m.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before this Bill is passed, I feel it is my duty to make a few observations. I very well remember last June when certain commodities were increased that the Hon. Minister of Finance met with very grave criticisms for not increasing the price of gasoline. Many of those critics have not, up to now, bought one gill of gasoline, but they have criticised the attitude of the Hon. Premier for increasing certain commodities and not increasing the price on gasoline.

I know the Hon. Minister of Transport knows the plight of the Transport Board and the plight of all persons who have to use gasoline from day to day during the course of their business. I am a motor omnibus concessionaire and I am not at all exaggerating when I say that more than one-third of the takings on any bus goes in buying gasoline.

I regret very much that the price of gasoline has been increased, because I am sure that concessionaires today must feel it harder with the small bus fares on which they are operating. They have all made application to the Government for an increase in bus fares since last April when they had to pay backpay to their employees. From time to time, employees will be coming for more wages and we have to live up to expectations. We are looking forward to an increase in bus fares, and I am sorry there is an increase on the price of gasoline because as it stands today we transport school children at a 40% reduction of fares and it takes up not less than 40% of our units to deal with that part of the transport system. Therefore, you will see that if a small increase in bus fare is even put on, that concessionaires would get very little more profit out of it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I will say now that the Government is not at all conceding that this increase in the price of gasoline must of necessity be followed by an increase in bus fares. I am surprised to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter imply that in his speech because last year, as he will rightly recall, the Transport Board under Government's control, was forced to pay in its wage bill an increase of 25%. It meant an increase of \$144,000 a year and this 25%-increase in its wage bill was absorbed without any increase in bus fares. The Workers Union felt that the wages of the operational staff of the buses were insufficient and they called for an increase in wages and we had to meet it. There was no increase in bus fares then and I see no reason why with an 8% increase of the price of gasoline the leader of the Workers Union who originated the 25% increase in the wage structure with no increase in bus fares

should think that this 8% increase in the price of gasoline should be followed by an increase in bus fares.

Hon. members are fully aware of the fact that there is today a lot of vehicular traffic on the road. Only today the hon. senior member for St. Peter pointed out that in an Island of 166 square miles we have over 800 miles of road. These roads have to be kept in order. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph who found himself in favour of these proposals came in here and asked us to increase the mileage of the roads in the Island. He wanted the Government to cut more roads between cane fields so as to assist peasants in getting out their canes. It was a proposal which the Government had already embarked upon. It must result in additional mileage of roads in this country. You have to spend money on the upkeep of these roads and there are almost double the number of vehicles using the roads today as they were ten years ago; so it must mean more wear and tear. As a matter of fact, I am more than surprised to hear the hon. junior member for St. Joseph criticising this increase in the price of gasoline today because last June, he said in the most emphatic terms that we should put on an increase in the price of gasoline.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did say that an increase should be put on the price of gasoline, but I did not say that it should be five cents on a gallon. I said one cent. Therefore, what is the Minister getting up now and saying?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, on the last occasion, when the price of gasoline was increased by the Party to which the hon. member belongs, he sat on the floor of the House and agreed to the increase and it was five cents on the gallon then. He never said a word. (Laughter)

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If it were five cents then, look at that time to now. The consumption of gasoline now is greater. At that time you did not have half as many vehicles on the roads. If the Party to which I belong even did it then, look and see what they did with the money. What has this Government done? It has done nothing yet to compare with the taxation they have imposed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: At the time when they did that, did they need it with all the surplus funds which they had in the Treasury? When the hon. member talks of his Party's record, today this Government has achieved more than what was ever done by his Party when they were in power. We have the largest record of employment in the Public Works Department, and our school building programme is far more than anything they imagined. There are 2,100 persons whom we have employed. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph sat there when his Party increased the price of gasoline by five cents and never said one word in opposition, and he now comes in here telling us it should be increased by one cent more instead. You have all these vehicles using the roads and deteriorating them so rapidly. They are almost double what they were ten years ago. Along with that, there is an increase in the tenantry roads and arterial roads. With the amount of vehicular traffic, deterioration of the roads must be more rapid than it was before, and it must take more money to maintain them. The greater the number of vehicles on the road, the more rapid the deterioration of the road and the more money needed to repair them.

The position, Sir, is that if we were to collect more money from this source, which was a source recommended to us by the Opposition last year and which was recommended most strongly by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph — and he not only talked about gasoline but even of shoes.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I have not said anything about shoes. It was his boss who talked about shoes, not I. (Laughter)

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know who the hon. member means when he speaks about my boss. If he means the electorate of St. Philip, well, that is the only boss I have. (Mr. SMITH: You have another one too.) All other hon. members here heard the hon. member mention shoes. If we had to increase the price of gasoline,

the increase should not be less than five cents a gallon, and I may say that a lot of arguments which have been used here today are completely untenable. I regret that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is not now in his place, but he began his remarks by saying that this tax on gasoline would result in the increase of the price of food in the rural areas because, according to him, the lorries brought the food from the Roebuck Street merchants and the people in the country areas would be charged more for transport; but in the next breath the hon. member said that the people in the country areas leave their homes and go to town to the shops. Therefore, I do not know what the hon. member means. I began buying gasoline at 27 cents a gallon; now it has gone to 65 cents and 70 cents, and it has been raised to a great extent by the Party dominated by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. If in the light of our commitments and in the face of all we have to meet, we ask for an increase of five cents in the price of gasoline, I am submitting that that is not beyond our resources.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

POOL BETTING DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Pool Betting Duty Act, 1960.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is a very short one and the provisions of it are also very short. These provisions merely seek to increase the rate of duty between pools promoted in the island — those promoted from inside and those promoted from outside.

The rate of duty will be 20% on the amount of stake money paid if the pools are promoted in the island and 50% of the stake money paid if they are promoted outside the island. Section 2 sets out, or rather the various Sub-sections of Section 2 of the Bill, set out the effects of the Bill. The Government feels that you cannot entirely prohibit — or you do not want entirely to prohibit — this form of gambling, and the least you can do would be to get the maximum amount of money you can from it. I do not think that anybody could regard a tax on pools as being unjust, since it does not constitute a burden on anybody. If you are lucky enough to win a sum of money in a game of chance like this, then there is no reason why the Government should not earmark a reasonable portion of that money for community services. With those remarks, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to throw out the suggestion to the Government that with the extra money which would be realised from the increased tax on these pools, a percentage of this money be allocated to the provision of suitable equipment for the promotion of sport in this Colony generally. It must be very obvious to everybody that the Government's policy towards promoting sport in this island is practically non-existent. I believe that Dr. Fidel Castro might be more accused of promoting Roman Catholicism in his country than the Government would be accused of promoting sport in this Island. I am suggesting that here is an excellent opportunity for the people of this Colony to know what proper athletic equipment looks like, because many a generation has passed on without knowing. The hurdles in use at the premier school in this Colony were erected, I believe, since 1896, and they form an excellent method of breaking a leg for our youngsters. It is only those pupils who have been fortunate enough to have been taken abroad by their parents who have ever seen real athletic equipment. You will only have to travel as far as British Guiana and you will find that Dr. Jagan has seen the necessity for providing sporting equipment for that Colony.

6.50 p.m.

This is an excellent opportunity for allocating a percentage of the takings from these pools — out of evil might well come good — so that when we invite coaches to come here through the courtesy of the U.S.I.S. or some other generous body of that nature, there would at least be some equipment on the Island which they might use in teaching the boys of this Island, who are hoping to represent the Island at international contests, how they might perfect their techniques. I hope that the Minister responsible will take the remarks I am making in good heart. If he does not, that is his affair, and I make no apology for it, because I am very sensible of the needs and aspirations of these young people in so far as sport is concerned. It is not being neglected in Jamaica, in British Guiana or in Trinidad, and I see no reason whatever why it should be neglected here and people be fogged off with pious promises.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose to ask for the suspension of the Sitting at 7.30 p.m. for a slight break, and then return in order to go on. Until then there is no point in suspending the Sitting before, and I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not quite follow the hon. member. If he had suggested it to me, I would be perfectly willing to move the suspension of the Standing Orders, but if he gets up to speak on this Bill, he will lose his right.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: If the motion is carried, I can speak, and the Deputy Speaker should rule.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the hon. member suggests that I should move the Suspension of the Standing Orders while I am speaking, I am willing to accommodate him, but coming in between like that is not right. I am not going to embarrass him; and will move the suspension of the Standing Orders as soon as it reaches 7 o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for Bridgetown carry on until the appropriate time before 7 o'clock. It is now about 6.50 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I just want to ask the hon. member a few questions on this matter. In the absence of the legal luminaries on that side of the Table, Sir, maybe the hon. member would consult you on this matter. As I understand it from my limited knowledge, the only Bill which legalises gambling is the one for the Turf Club. We are now passing a Bill to take money from something which is not legal, so to speak.

Lest it be thought, Sir, that my colleague was singing a solo, I am joining him in his appeal to the Hon. Minister. This is a wonderful opportunity to earmark a certain amount of money for the field of sport where youngsters were denied quite recently a grant from Government.

As far as I am concerned, what I am worried about is this 50% in the Bill. It is all well and good to say nobody should be annoyed if you are taking away 20% from the pools which are played locally and 50% from overseas pools. I believe you are coming in line with other countries, but am I to understand that these companies must also pay a trade tax? Any pool company running this business is trading. I wonder if the Minister would tell me that at this stage.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Before the hon. member replies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

THE POOL BETTING DUTY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1961

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like the Minister to answer the questions I raised.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I see the hon. member is still on his feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I suggest to the Hon. Minister to give me the answers to the questions I posed, and also tell us something about what my colleague has suggested.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Hon. Minister replies, I should like to ask Your Honour to let the people in the Gallery know that they are in here to listen to the debates, and not to make a lot of uncouth and uncalled for remarks. Some person behind me is sucking his teeth.

What I would like to ask the Minister is whether I am to understand that 20% will be taken from a person who won a pool in Barbados and 50% from a person who won an overseas pool.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has thrown out a suggestion which I am sure will be considered according to its merits by the Government. He has, however, accused the Government of not being interested in the promotion of sports. 7.00 p.m.

He has said that the Government's policy on the promotion of sports is non-existent. I would like to deny such an allegation emphatically. This whole business emanated from the fact that not long ago representation was made by the Olympic Association of Barbados for a grant for sending athletes abroad. Quite a lot was said, and Government was criticised quite unjustifiably by certain people, and I feel it is my duty to clear up the issue.

Now, in refuting the statements made by the hon. junior member for the City, I would just like to point out that for the first time in the history of Barbados a separate vote was placed in the Estimates for the promotion of minor sports in Barbados. It is in the present Estimates, and it has been done during the regime of this Government. Since this Government was in power, it has also established the post of Cricket Coach and the Ministry is now considering the pros and cons of having an Athletic Coach.

We have recently taken over the Savannah Tennis Courts for the purpose of promoting lawn tennis in schools. Quite recently the Government has allocated a sum of money for the establishment of a children's corner at Trents Playing Field. I take it that the hon. junior member for the City does not look over his wall, or else he would have seen that facilities for the promotion of netball and basketball have been provided at Weymouth.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I happen to be the President of the Basketball Association.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: To speak quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for the City was not getting on as if he was aware of the fact that Government was doing something for the promotion of sport. He did not act in the responsible manner of President of the Association and as a person who knows that Government is doing something for the promotion of sports in Barbados. That is why I said so.

It was only last year that Government also gave a grant of \$3,600 to the Olympic Association. Taking these things into consideration, I do not see how it is fair for the hon. member to say that Government's policy towards the promotion of sport is non-existent.

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

On motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

2. Section 3 of the Pool Betting Duty Act, 1960, is amended as follows:-

(a) by substituting the following subsections for subsections (1) and (2) thereof:-

"(1) Subject as hereinafter provided, there shall be raised, levied and collected on all bets made by way of pool betting a duty to be known as the pool betting duty.

(2) Where the bets are made by means of a totalisator set up in the Island, the pool betting duty shall be equal to twenty per centum of the amount of the stake money paid and such pool betting duty shall be paid by the person in the Island who is in charge of the totalisator.

(3) Where the bets are made by way of pool betting but not by means of a totalisator set up in the Island, and where the promoter is in the Island, the pool betting duty shall be equal to twenty per centum of the amount of the stake money paid and such pool betting duty shall be paid by the said promoter.

(4) Where the bets are made by way of pool betting and where the promoter is outside the Island, the pool betting duty shall be equal to fifty per centum of the amount of the stake money paid and such pool betting duty shall be paid by any person in the Island who as servant, agent or other representative of the said promoter takes, receives or collects any bets in connection with the betting; and any bets so taken, received or collected shall be treated for the purposes of the Act as stake money paid to the said promoter and shall be liable to duty accordingly."

(b) by renumbering subsection (3) of the section as subsection (5) thereof.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is for the Hon. Minister to tell me what is "stake". We are not talking about an iron stake. I am sure that half of those hon. members over on the other side really do not understand what it is. Let any one of them get up and tell me what you mean by "stake".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I would have thought in this context the hon. member would have known what it means.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not finished yet. I want to know what is the meaning of "stake" in this clause. Is it the actual money which you bet or the money which you win? We have no definition of what you mean.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am sorry the hon. member does not understand. "Stake" means in this context what is put down; in other words, "a bet".

Mr. MOTTLEY: If "stake" means the money which you put down, it means if I pay \$5.00, the Government is entitled to \$2.50 out of that. I thought you meant if I won a pool of \$5,000, you were entitled to \$2,500 out of it. In fact, that is what it should mean. If it means that when I pay down \$5.00, the Government is getting \$2.50 out of it, that is not correct. As a matter of fact, it cannot mean that. You say here:

"(4) Where the bets are made by way of pool betting and where the promoter is outside the Island, the pool betting duty shall be equal to fifty per centum of the amount of the stake money paid....."

If a man pays down \$1.00 it means that the Government is entitled to 50 cents. We are not talking of an iron stake.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it means the total value of the stakes -- what you pay in the pools.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You say that it means the stake money paid. I cannot see how it means that. If you win a Derby in the United States, you have to pay into the Government 50% of what you won. That is obviously what it means in this Bill.
7.10 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out what it means. If I stake the sum of \$5 and I lose, I do not think you could draw any money from a man who has lost; you can only draw from a man who has won.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, hon. members on the opposite side of the Chamber, are, I think, making unnecessary difficulties for themselves. In any betting system, there is prize money and there is stake money. Prize money is what you win on stake money and stake money is what you put down so as to win prize money.

Mr. SMITH: What is this?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: This is stake money. This is what the subsection says:-

"Where the bets are made by way of pool betting and where the promoter is outside the Island, the pool betting duty shall be equal to fifty per centum of the amount of the stake money paid and such pool betting duty shall be paid by any person in the Island who as servant, agent or other representative of the said promoter takes, receives or collects any bets in connection with the betting; and any bets so taken, received or collected shall be treated for the purposes of the Act as stake money paid to the said promoter and shall be liable to duty accordingly."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Then if one hundred people put up this money, they will have to make an arrangement to pay this 50% here. (ASIDES).

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, the difference between prize money and stake money has at last been defined. This will be a sum large enough so that a percentage of it should be allocated by the Government in prosecuting their interest in sport. I have been hearing about the appointment of Coaches and I happen to know that there was a Barbadian who had three years of tuition at a New York University; he offered his services to this Government and they told him that when they are ready they will call for him.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that we cannot now have any

discussion on the general principle of the Bill; we cannot have that at this stage. All that is before the Chamber now is the relative Section of the Bill; we cannot have these details now.

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the relevant Section of the Bill and that is in relation to stake money. I was simply suggesting how this money might best be spent, that rather than having this *ad hoc* decision about sporting matters, they should at least formulate a policy, having some money to spend.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN reported, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION re LEASE OF LAND TO THE BARBADOS DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House; To move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the lease of 143,189 square feet of land at the Bridgetown Harbour to the Barbados Development Board.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is a Resolution which seeks to vest an area of land, which is now vested in the Executive Committee, to the Development Board. The area comprises 143,189 square feet at the Bridgetown Harbour, and it is proposed that the House approve of the lease of this land by the Executive Committee to the Development Board. As is set out in the Second Schedule to the Resolution, the land is to be leased for 15 years at a peppercorn rent; it is to be used for the purposes of a tourist oriented, handicrafts industrial centre and the Board is to be subject in the development, control and administration of the area to the policy of the Government as directed by the Minister who is responsible for the subject of industry. From the Addendum to the Resolution hon. members will see that the Board itself proposes to provide accommodation in this area for small handicraft purposes such as pottery, candle making, woodwork, silver-smith work, fabric printing and similar handwork industries. Space will also be made available to sellers of local handicrafts. In other words, the entire area, comprising roughly three acres, will be earmarked exclusively for a tourist oriented handicrafts industrial centre, and the Development Board will represent the Government Handicraft Section as well as have facilities to offer their wares for sale and provide for the purchase of articles of this sort in the Port area.
7.20 p.m.

I think, Sir, that hon. members will agree that this is a most appropriate place for a promotion of this kind, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there can be no objection to this because we all agree that this area should be reserved for the purpose of development, but I should like to draw something to the Hon. Minister's attention. However well intentioned and however anxious we might be to develop this area, I certainly deprecate — and I do so after consultation with people with some taste — some of the architecture I see there. There is a building which has not been put up for any length of time which has been built out of concrete blocks, and it has been put together without any symmetry, leaning to one side and looking in a way which I consider not to be conducive to the proper development of the area. I am sure the Minister of Trade and the Minister of Communications and Works must be fully acquainted with what I am talking about. This place is really not a good advertisement to tourists coming along that road, and there seems a little difference between that building and some of the dilapidated buildings in Cats Castle, except for some paint which has been put on it. Some people have peculiar taste, and I counsel the Minister not to allow people to do that sort of thing. I do not want to go very far into this, but the Minister will agree with me that something proper should be put up if the people are going to lease this land. Just as people live and have the ideas which they have, they want to put these things up the same way.

I have heard so many foreign people ask if this is the type of building we allow to go up on the approach road to the Harbour. From the Second Schedule to the Resolution, the land is to be leased for 15 years at a peppercorn rent, and is to be used for the purposes of a tourist oriented handicrafts industrial centre. I feel that if people are putting up something small, they should put up something with taste. The Board is to be subject in its development, control and administration of the area, to such policy directions as the Minister responsible for the subject of Industry may issue; so not only the Town and Country Planning Officer must say that the building should be so many feet back from the road. As far as I am concerned, I think it should be known that those of us who have to contribute taxes deprecate the Government allowing people to put up these stupid things with a sign saying "Visit the Potteries", when in truth and in fact that building should be dragged down. I have nothing against passing the Resolution, and I myself feel I should like to see more buildings go up there through the Government giving these leases to people who would be willing to put up proper buildings. As a matter of fact, in a lease of this nature, the person should submit a plan of the type of building. It need not be elaborate but should have some taste. I am absolutely certain that none of our "C" class masons had anything to do with this. The owner probably got some concrete blocks from somewhere, put some mortar on them, and as a result the building is leaning to one side. I think the Minister should control the type of building that goes up there. Imagine a ship landing at the Deep Water Harbour and the passengers therefrom travelling along this road to Bridgetown and, the first thing they see is a building similar to some in Bulls Alley or Cats Castle.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that by this agreement the Government is leasing about three acres of land. The Minister has not told us the amount of land to be used for the purposes of this tourist oriented, handicrafts industrial centre, nor has he explained what this is so that we would have some idea. Moreover I am coming to the stage in my thinking where I feel that the land at the Deep Water Harbour owned by the Government is pretty well being given away. This is land that cost us a lot of money; you want to amortize this debt; and what I do not like about the bookkeeping of this organisation is that we have to be very careful that they do not land us in a situation. As I said, earlier today we concluded an agreement for the dockers of Bridgetown. What I do not like about this situation is that when you take land that has a valuation and begin to parcel it out in gifts and lease it at peppercorn rent, it should be evaluated with the other invisible returns you are getting, because the land there — the Deep Water Harbour cost \$30 million — is reflected in the Port expenses. I am a member of the Port Advisory Board and I had to make a little criticism of that. It is definitely unfair, if you take the Port and the cost of this land, and you say it costs

\$X million — and you have to amortize the debt through direct charges and the receipts you get from the Port — to take this land and give it away, because you are not giving the Port any credit for the value of the land which they have to amortize, and you are making the Port carry the heavy amortization charges for something you are giving away to somebody at a peppercorn rent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Government is leasing this land at a peppercorn rent, then the Government cannot come here and say, as I have heard the Premier say, that the Port itself is showing a deficit. I am not going to agree to your increasing Port charges for the community to pay for the Port when you are giving away part of the Port's valuation in land, since we have to pay for the whole thing. I hope the time will come when an expert examination will be made into the clear-cut evaluation of this. Now I am not against the Government leasing land for industrial development, but three acres is a lot of land in Barbados, and I want to know what sort of centre this is that needs three acres of land.

Now I want to say to the Leader of the House that at this Port which we have built, nothing has been done to positively demonstrate to the public that you are giving us a little area for the workers. You have got a tennis court at the Garrison; we do not need a tennis court, but some place where people can have a little recreation. I know we will be approaching the Minister for a canteen, and he will be able to tell us what he proposes to do with regard to canteen facilities for the workers, because I do not feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it would be fair for this community to have all these other advantages, while the people directly concerned at the Port and the people who have to pay the social costs get none. I am not clear in my mind what this tourist oriented handicraft centre is, for which you want three acres of land. What are they putting up? Is it a market?

7.30 p.m.

I want to know what you are giving three acres of land for. The average habit is that as soon as you start parceling out land and you are not selling it, somebody would be begging you for another piece. The land at the Deep Water Harbour is not land which you can give away, and for anyone to take and put any sort of nonsense on. It is expensive land. It is there to do something which you must have near to your Port. I want to know if this three acres of land is for the purpose of putting some half-cent business on. Do not start off siting little half-cent businesses on the Deep Water Harbour.

I have no objection, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to your creating a little tourist area down there for people who come through the Harbour, but I would like it to be examined because the Port should offer you facilities for the type of industrial concerns where you want easy shipping facilities. Where shipping is going to be an essential element in your business, you want that business sited near the Port so that you can reduce your shipping expenses. I take it that you want to give such businesses facilities as near to the Port as you possibly can. While the tourist trade has some part to play, I want to know why it should take up three acres of land.

The Hon. Minister must tell me if you are going to have a car park there. If you are going to have one, have it properly laid out and have a proper pavement there. I hope that you have an idea of planting trees there. Of course, that may be part of the duties of the Advisory Committee.

Now I am on this, I would like to say this to the Hon. Minister of Communications. You must inform the Police Department that they must have some sort of marked-out path for parking on the approach road to the Port. I think it is a dangerous thing to have all of those motor cars parking on the Northern Access Road. When a policeman is not there, people have the idea that once they park their car on the left side, it is parked in accordance with the law. The average Barbadian feels that once he gets as close as he can to the side of the road he is safe; but when one fellow parks his car on one side and the other fellow parks on the other side, although it is a wide road if it is done near the

corner he narrows the angle; therefore, if two cars come along in opposite directions, the whole road is blocked. The traffic people should be there to see how you park — and more so during the crop time. As a matter of fact, that road should not be used as a parking strip then; and if it should be used as a parking strip, people should be only allowed to park on one side, and only at certain hours.

Sir, I would like some check to be made of the value of the land which we are giving out at peppercorn rent. If we start too early with this nonsense, then the income which we expect to get from this land would not be forthcoming. I do not think it would be fair to the Port Authorities to land them with all these charges.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to correct a few misconceptions as regards utilisation of this area. To begin with, the building occupied by the Christopher Russell's Pottery has not been erected by the present owner. It was an old building lying there left by the Costain people and the pottery people came along and rented it. I agree with the hon. member that it has little or no aesthetic appeal, and to be quite frank, the Government had scheduled it for demolition. It should have come down long time ago. However, the pottery people moved in, and after a time they erected a kiln and began operating from there. The industry was then getting on its feet and the pottery people asked us to allow them to stay there a little longer, and permission was granted them to stay a little longer. The building is a ramshackled one, and it is true to say that the occupiers have tried their best more by camouflage than by anything else to beautify it. It should have been taken down.

Hon. members seem to think that because we are leasing this land out at a peppercorn rent, it means that people who occupy it will also pay a peppercorn rent. At the moment, the ownership of this land is vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee. All we are doing in this Resolution is for the Legislature to authorise the transferring of power from the Executive Committee to the Development Board for leasing the land at the Deep Water Harbour. The rental of the land there has been fixed at ten cents per square foot per annum and this is so calculated with due deference to the cost of the entire Deep Water Harbour in mind, and with due deference to the specified period in which the cost of the harbour should be amortised. I think the time is fifteen or twenty years.
7.40 p.m.

I want to assure the hon. senior member for St. Peter that his proposal coincides precisely in every detail with the Government's policy with regard to the utilisation of the area. We have had several proposals or applications for areas at the Bridgetown Harbour, which we have refused except for two purposes. The area is to be utilised for any industry or industries manufactured solely for re-export. You bring in the raw materials, process them here and re-export them and you will know that they are to be on the Harbour site. It is proposed to have a plant for the processing of shrimps and a plant for the evisceration of poultry. It is proposed to have these two types of industries down there, which would require the facilities which are offered, and it is likely that the two of them could be sited in close proximity to the cold storage plant.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I would like to see the plan. (ASIDES) I cannot speak again, therefore I have risen on a point of order. You will remember, Sir, that at one time we asked for a plan and the then Minister in charge of the particular portfolio felt in his pocket for it; but it was a big Waterworks Plan in relation to the erection of a stand-pipe. (Laughter).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I want to say that hon. members can rest assured, especially the hon. senior member for St. Peter, that the Government had the same apprehension as to the value of this land as they have, and we were very careful in our decision not to make any of this land available for any and every purpose. As a matter of fact, with regard to this area which we are now going to vest in the Development Board for sub-leasing at the fixed rental

of 10 cents a year, it is felt that this is precisely an area where you should have a tourist oriented handicrafts industrial section. We will move some of the handicraft sections at the Garrison down there. We will open the area to local merchants or local manufacturers of handicraft items to rent spots there and make their ware available to the tourists. The development will be entirely controlled; it will be the front door of the island, and the Government is conscious of the necessity for seeing that it is developed in some conformity to the demands of modern development and appealing to the aesthetic sense of beauty and things like that. It will not be developed in any helter-skelter fashion; as to the old somewhat ramshackled buildings which now house certain things, they are merely temporary and they will come down for the erection of buildings in conformity with our plans for the erection of buildings.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in making this land available to anybody at all, proper attention will be paid to what it costs the Government. The Executive Committee does not want to be burdened unduly. Somebody wants, say, 500 or 600 square feet of land for the sale of handiwork or embroidery and therefore we are giving the Development Board all the power to make these sub-leases; we are transferring the power which now lies in the hands of the Executive Committee to the Development Board only in respect of this 144 thousand odd square feet which has been delineated in the Resolution.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:—To move the second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the thirty-first day of March, one thousand, nine hundred and sixty-three.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the ordinary supplementary Appropriation Bill which we pass from time to time. This is a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the 31st day of March, 1963. I do not think, Sir, that this Bill will require any further remarks on my part. It is merely a question of providing the appropriation for the Resolutions which were passed during the year ended on the 31st March, 1963, so long as these sums are deemed expedient for the public service. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON the Preamble was postponed. Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed, 7.50 p.m.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the Resolution in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of Order No. 7, unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

RESOLUTION *re* TRANSFER OF LANDS BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO THE HOUSING AUTHORITY

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to approve the transfer by way of the parcels of land described in the Schedule appended, Nos 1 to 10. They are being transferred from the Executive Committee to the Housing Authority, and approval of the Legislature is hereby sought. The Addendum points out that according to the provisions of the Executive Committee (Amendment) Act, 1951, the approval of the Legislature to the transfer of land to the Housing Authority has to be sought. Housing estates have been established on lands bought in the name of the Executive Committee. These lands are now under the control of the Housing Authority, and it is necessary for them to be vested in the Housing Authority to enable the Authority to have the power to lease or rent any of the portions of the land.

The portions are set out in the Schedules. In the First Schedule there is land formerly part of Maxwells Plantation; in the Second Schedule there is land at Canevale; in the Third Schedule there is some land originally part of Thorpes Plantation; in the Fourth Schedule there is some land formerly part of the lands of Bagatelle Plantation; in the Fifth Schedule there is some land formerly part of the lands of Grazettes Plantation; in the Sixth Schedule there is a certain piece of land at Black Rock; in the Seventh Schedule there is some land at Chelsea Cot in the district known as Black Rock; in the Eighth Schedule there is some land formerly part of the lands owned by the Barbados Government Railway; in the Ninth Schedule there is land at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip and in the Tenth Schedule there is land at Belleplaine in the parish of Saint Andrew.

This Resolution, Sir, is a formal matter and merely carries out the provisions of the Act which compel legislative sanction to be sought for any transfer of authority over lands vested in the Executive Committee to any Statutory Authority.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as this seems to be dealing with quite a number of lots of land bought within

recent years by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, I was wondering whether the Minister could say if the Bay Land, the Pine and Emmerton have already been vested in the Housing Authority. I remember that during my twelve years on the Housing Board before it became the Housing Authority, we merely acted as agents. I cannot remember any Resolutions being passed here to the effect, and I am wondering if these other places have been passed into the hands of the Housing Authority.

What I rose primarily to say is this: I am sorry the Premier is not in his place, because he is Minister of Local Government, so to speak. If hon. members sitting around this Table were to look at the Schedules carefully, they would see that they actually affect not only the municipal area, but both the Northern and Southern Districts. That is to say, land which originally paid taxes to these areas have been bought by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and therefore are exempt from taxation. They are now being turned over to the Housing Authority in the great majority of cases for the building of houses and for carrying out certain social services — and I hope the members from the Northern and Southern Districts who are members of this House are listening to me — and the Housing Authority by a special Act of legislation is also exempt from taxation. At this juncture I think I should draw to the Government's attention that it seems quite unfair, and the criticisms I used against the last Government I will use against this Government. The Local Government bodies must provide social services which are absolutely necessary in these areas, and according to the recommendations of Sir John Maude and Mr. Lightburn Government should make some grant to the local authorities in lieu of the taxes they would have got if the land had still been in the hands of private people, as Government is exempt from taxation, and by a special Act the Housing Authority is exempt from taxation. Each time you do this, you lessen the area the particular Local Government Council would have to tax; therefore the higher the taxation will go upon the householders and property owners in the area, because they have not got the amount of land to tax.

While I support this Resolution, I hope the Ministers who are on the other side listening will make a note of this, although I see the Minister in charge of this is not paying me any mind. This is an important matter, and I am as serious as death about it. (Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I have heard everything you are saying.) I did not think you were hearing. I forgot you were a journalist and can do five things at the same time. 8.00 p.m.

I hope your colleague from the Southern District Council would support this because this is Canevale land on which you are going to carry out certain social amenities. In order to collect money, we must impose taxes on people, and what we are asking is that the Government give this very serious consideration. This would mean a reduction in the taxes which we collect. You should give us back something and that is the recommendation of the expert whom you brought here. This is where we part company. As far as Local Government is concerned, if you are going to pursue the same stubborn and spiteful policy of the last Government, then I will have to get up in arms against you. If you do not want to penalise and create a hardship on the people in this area, you must give us something. You have taken away thousands of acres of land from us and giving something in return is what is done in every country of the world. You should give us back something. This is where I part company with anybody. It is just not fair. I have raised this question on several occasions.

As a matter of fact, I go further. I have gone further than Sir John Maude because I do not believe that property used for social services should pay taxes; but it is a question, where you have revenue-earning property, that you should give us something. You must bear in mind that some of these areas were once land from which we collected revenue. When you buy Canevale and when you buy Parks and develop them into housing areas, you are taking away a part of the Local Government area from which it used to get taxes and Local Government still has to carry out services in that area. The last Government did it spitefully,

and maliciously, and it was partly due to their wanting to get at me. I do not expect it of you. Whether you do it or you do not do it, I will come back in here. We are not saying that you should pay on property which you are using purely for social services. But why on earth should a doctor be given a house without paying anything?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member knows that the Government has come to the assistance of Local Government Councils with a direct grant in order to compensate for the taxes through the adoption of a method which the hon. member is criticising. I know the City Council has not benefitted to such an extent. The Hon. Minister of Social Services has just reminded me that tomorrow himself and the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing will be in attendance at a meeting to finalise plans for the transfer of these individual units under the housing estates to the occupiers. They will be entitled to buy them. When they buy the house it also means that they will be owning the land on which it stands.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am glad to hear that because that is a sensible thing to do. All Barbadians like to own a house and land.

What I am saying is this. If I were to tell you what a stupid letter came to me from one of the Ministries, you will be surprised. Can you imagine the City Council saying we asked to give us something in lieu of your revenue-earning property and someone writing you a note asking you to name the revenue-earning property which we are thinking of? Only a convulsed idiot would send something like that to you. How can you know? How on earth can we know? Only the Public Works Department and the people who draw the money would know. If we asked you to give us something in lieu of revenue-earning property, is it for you to ask us where is your revenue-earning property? Only an ass will do that. How can you ask me? If we were to ask you where are Government revenue-earning properties, right away the Minister can say those properties in the Garrison and the like. You will know that places like the Law Courts, the hospitals and the schools are not revenue-earning properties. The people to know are the people who collect the money and the Public Works Department.

The Hon. Minister said that the previous Government gave a grant, but I say categorically that they did not give a grant. They gave a grant for spite and to see if they could lower the taxes in the area to which they gave the grant so that they could belittle the people in the City Council. This does not only affect the City. Now, you are passing this on to an Authority who has no authority to pay.

I am happy to hear that the Minister of Social Services and the Minister of Communications will be meeting shortly for the purpose of final arrangements for the transfer of these houses to the people who rent them. It is a wise thing to do. If you take the background of the people in Barbados and the outlook which they have, you will realise that if you really want to get your money in, it is a wise thing to do. Your rates are very cheap now. Sometimes I get very annoyed when they come in and tell me that they owe a year's rent. I get annoyed because the rents could not be cheaper than what they are. If you want to get these people to pay you your rent, let them know that they have the opportunity of leaving the house to their children. Give these people the chance of owning the house. If you do that, instead of their paying the rent only, they would pay you three or four times the amount.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I agree with the Resolution, I feel that the Hon. Minister would not let what I said fall on deaf ears.
8.10 p.m.

You can swear that in all of these areas you collect taxes. If you had to lose \$200, \$300, or \$500 in taxation by way of the Government owning land, well, you must have money to run your social services and must you not put it on houses when the actual legislation fixed the amount on trade? How else must you do it? I do not skylark when it comes to Local Government, and I do say it is time that the Government show that they do not perpetuate dislike for

individuals or that they do not come to the conclusion that a grant should be given.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am parting company with the hon. member on this occasion. Both he and the Government seem to be playing a game in this matter. This Government cannot afford to build houses for a number of people and then make them believe that you can sell them a house. You have to provide facilities for people to borrow money to build houses. This business started because each political party believed that it could put a fast one on the other, and you are now paying dearly for this state of affairs. Your Party has given the image to people that they need not pay for housing.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is guilty of making the most incorrect and irrational statement; never, at any time, have I heard any member who is associated with this Party tell people that they should not pay the rent for the houses which they occupy.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not talking about the last election at all; I am talking about the image which the hon. member's party created in the minds of people who occupy these houses, that the houses belong to the Government and they were to live in these houses (*ASIDES*). Is the hon. member saying 'No'? I will say now that it started even from 1947 when we first had the Labour Welfare Fund and we started to build houses. People were told: "This is Government money" and this idea of people not paying rent for houses was started.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I must insist that the hon. member should not accuse members of this Party of doing that. I have heard that from a man who is associated with another Party.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am saying that it is your Party which has given the image that the money which was coming out of the Sugar Industry Rehabilitation Fund was not being paid back to the plantation owners and therefore why is it that the workers had to pay this money for their houses.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. It has been said that the money paid out from the Sugar Rehabilitation Fund was not repaid, but that has been said in the context of reducing the amount of money to be allocated to the Sugar Rehabilitation Fund or, on the other hand, stopping it for a certain time. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have said over and over again that at some time or other the rehabilitation of the factories must reach saturation point and you should stop this Fund and increase the Labour Welfare Fund.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have said that this image was created by the hon. member's Party. This has been said in St. Lucy. Do you want me to call names? I have been in politics for a long time and I know that I have to meet these things. I know what my opponents go before me and say, and then they have to go back and explain what they meant. I have asked that the 10% cost be removed but there is still a charge there. I said that I parted company with the hon. senior member for the City and in spite of what Sir John Maude and Mr. Lightburn have said, I, as a Socialist, believe that the things which the Government would have to do in constructing houses for people in the community, may be a part of the price which you may have to surrender now. In a municipality where the Government undertakes to carry out a housing project, you must lose income from the point of view that it creates a shortage of capital for you, but it might provide something else.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the Hon. Leader of the House has said that the Minister of Social Services was discussing the possibility of allowing people to own these houses.

Mr. WALCOTT: What I am saying is that the Government in putting money towards property, that property would normally be taxable if the Government did not own these things. I was pointing out to the hon. member that

sometimes you have to view these things in the light of the whole social cost.

8.20 p.m.

In some instances you may find that the Government comes along and acquires land, and builds houses which it has to service, and provides other things in the community and in the municipality which the municipality itself could not have undertaken. I agree that if the municipality can show that its income falls so short that it could not now maintain this, you might be able to consider that in another light; but on the basis of providing houses, you may say that is something that is already constructed and erected. But what are you going to do for the future? Can you have a policy in which you continue to build houses on the basis of having them occupied and owned, and have you tested the community and discovered what are its needs? For example, in my own constituency I do not know what have been the delays in finding appropriate land for housing, but in thinking of Barbados now and not merely of St. Peter, one of the difficulties you are having in Barbados is that you are building houses on the periphery — as in Cave Hill and the Pine and other places — and leaving a vacuum in the City. What you do not realise is taking place is that you are creating a congestion all the time at a most dangerous point, because you are building houses here; and all the people who come from the country, and all the drifters go to the periphery or drift to the City, and the slum areas in the City become more congested than they were ten years ago because of the influx. You have to take the bull by the horns. There is Emmerton and Chapman Lane that we can beautify because it is valuable land.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, right here in the City, in Nelson Street, you should start a programme in which you erect a different type of building for which you would not have to talk about giving a man a house. You have to get a policy to suit your needs. There are 240,000 people and a little bit of land. While the Leader of the House said that freehold is very good, we must reach the stage of thinking that freehold is not good, in the sense that where a man owns a little bit of land but wants all the amenities, you will get no housing. If you do not have housing residing on a leasehold basis in the State itself, you may have the danger — owing to dilapidation and people not keeping the houses in proper condition — of your houses going back to slum conditions, because unfortunately where people have been living at low standards of life and have no money to invest in a house, if the place is wall or stone, they feel it will remain as wall or stone forever and they do not have to do anything with it. We have to watch the American system. The American people have just built a lot of co-operative flats in New York, and they will sell a man a flat, though the freehold is vested in the people who built that flat, in perpetuity; he can own it in perpetuity but he cannot join with others and sell them out to other people. He can only sell it with the owner's authority, and he has to make a contribution monthly to the upkeep of the place.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if you are building State houses, you have to be careful not to allow the image of State houses to be so damaging and become so disreputable by handing over power to leasehold without any of these maintenances, that it would be a shocking thing the next twenty or twenty-five years to see the State houses which are only a shamble through people not taking care of them. I would therefore warn the Government to be very careful in these new projections they have.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: For the information of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I should like to draw to his attention that we would have been further ahead with this policy, but I thought it best to have in Mr. George Abrahams, an expert on housing and an authority on leasehold housing, and a lot is included in his statements for our guidance in the turning over of these houses. At present we are setting up in Grazeettes 46 houses on one area, and they are all single unit houses. Although it would take more land actually in the building per person, yet the system has not yet developed in Barbados of four or five people living in one larger house, and I think that in years to come Barbadians will have to be gradually weaned into the idea of

living in apartment houses rather than single unit houses. We are however, starting immediately on single unit houses with each man having his own plot and house, and in view of the small amount of land in Barbados, we will have to resort to apartment houses for the poorer classes in the housing areas.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am very glad to hear the Minister say that, because that is one of the projections I think Barbadians must come to. I also agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the time has come too when you have to be frank with people. I visit the housing areas, and I am very pleased to say that the housing areas have meant a lot to the improvement of the standard of housing of people living in Barbados. I have absolutely no sympathy for those persons who do not pay the rents which have been charged, because there are other people living in other sectors of our community who pay twice as much for the services they are getting, and it is shocking and shameful to find when people talk about a subsidy that they do not know these people are being subsidised in a home to the tune which some of them pay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was amazed when I was told some evenings ago what some of the houses in Grazeettes cost. Nobody living in a housing area has to take off his shoes at the top of the gap and do a hop-scotch to his home. There is electric light in them and you can drive anybody to his door in any of the housing area. For practical purposes any person living in a housing area vis-a-vis the United States of America is living just as good. I know the salary structure in a general way in Barbados. For a man who is unemployed, it is difficult in any circumstance; but any man working for what can be regarded as an average wage in Barbados can pay that rent, because the amount is very low. I think the Government has just increased the qualifying amount to a higher figure per week, but there are some people living in the housing areas, who, if they were in New York, would have to move, because in the United States of America, you only live in a project if your salary is below a certain amount. I have a friend who was living in the project, but he was only allowed to live there because he had three children, and after his salary reached a certain point, he had to leave. We know it is difficult to do that here in Barbados, because houses are difficult to acquire.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to see the Government go through with a policy of making people pay their rents. Before I sit, I should like to say also that I would like to see a more vigorous policy of Housing. I hope the Minister has a plan afoot for having housing development. I saw it mentioned in the Budget Speech on a more general basis, and I believe in this community either by a Loan Society or by assistance, other middle income group people should be assisted in building houses, because I regard that as a policy of saving money. The Premier spoke about a National Savings Committee. This is where I will join forces with the Hon. Leader of the House in saying that the best way to make people have savings in any community is to create the responsibility of ownership by paying back for something, and let them expend some of their savings in the community on something that becomes worthwhile. I feel that if a man knows he has the responsibility of paying for a house and you can assist him in the beginning, you will stop him from spending money badly. That is why I say you should make loans available for building houses, and you will find that many of the middle income group and lower income group people will have a boon in Barbados which will help this community.

8.30 p.m.

It is very essential for this community to have small savings. We will never have steel or those big industries, but we can have things wherein the small man can invest his money.

I would admonish the Government to start soon, and I think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition can see in his own area that it is really bursting at the seams. I know that he is waiting; but if he goes on waiting, he will have a very explosive situation on his hands.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That brings Government Business to an end today.

In fixing the Order Paper, the matters remaining from this week will come first.

I now beg to move.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the question is put, I am asking permission that the Resolution which I brought in today be made Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business.

Mr. BOXILL: I am also asking leave that the Resolution which I gave notice of today be moved to the third or fourth position.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: If I remember correctly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the last meeting of this House a Resolution was tabled by my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, in relation to a statement which I made on the Gillette Report. At that time, he asked that it be made

Order No. 2 under Private Members' Business. The only reason why he did not ask for it to be No. 1 is because he thought the Resolution on the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals should take priority. On his behalf, I am asking that it remain Order No. 2 and the others mentioned be made 3, 4, and 5 respectively.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to discharge the following Standing Committees:-

The Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to amend the Trade Union Act, 1939; and the Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the Young Women's Christian Association of Barbados.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 21st May, 1963, at 12.00 o'clock (noon).

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

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

8.40 p.m.