

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday, 30th June, 1967

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C. F.Z.S., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries*); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance*); Sir G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., D.C.L. (Hon.), (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour G. E. SARGEANT, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; and Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPRINGER entered the House and took his seat.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before you begin today's meeting —

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I was about to mention that I regret to inform the House that no Minutes of the last meeting of the House has yet been received.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE OF HOUSE

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I wish to say that the House has to give permission for Rediffusion to broadcast any proceedings of this House and on no occasion should anything be broadcast of proceedings of this House without the permission of members.

The first time that I heard the Budget Speech was to be broadcast over the radio was this morning. Certainly it is a matter which is not in the knowledge of all members of the House and it is a breach of privilege of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say that there is precedence for the giving by the Speaker of permission on certain occasions for the installations of broadcast-

ing apparatus in this Chamber in respect of the broadcasting of the Budget Speech which is the reason, as I understand it, for this evening's sitting. A written request was made to me on this occasion as was made on other occasions in the past and as was made last year when the Deputy Speaker was then presiding, and application had been granted for the presence of this equipment in this House as well as the person to operate this equipment.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: May I ask Your Honour on what terms this apparatus was brought in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no specific terms. The request is merely made now, as it was done in the past for the equipment to be installed on the occasion of the Budget debate and such permission is granted. This House has no authority as to the operation of this equipment but permission is granted for it to be on the premises and to be used.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I must ask Your Honour for permission to speak again. Am I to understand that this apparatus is to be operated throughout the debate today or subsequently?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that in the past, according to my recollection, it has been installed for the broadcast of the Budget Speech and for the speech in reply by the Leader of the Opposition. That is to my certain recollection but I observe that the Hon. Leader of the House desires to rise and I will allow him to say something.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, my regret is as to the fact that I did not have previous consultations on this matter with the other side. The hon. member would recall that I said on the last occasion that the Budget Speech would take place in the House this evening and I observed the procedure as is normally taken, that is after the Budget Speech by the Hon. Prime Minister, the Opposition will move their own motion to introduce a debate on the Budget Speech.

When they table a motion to me, then I will provide an early occasion for the debate and it is on that occasion that they will be making their reply and we

will be making preparations for it to be broadcasted, that is, the main Opposition Speech and the Minister's reply. There will be three speeches which will be broadcasted, one this evening when the Hon. Minister of Finance makes his speech on the Budgetary Proposal; when they reply to their own motion; and the Government's reply. I think that is favourable.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry it was not brought to the notice of the Opposition. I merely was following the precedent taken by the House of Commons and recently by the now defunct, Parliament of the West Indian Federation which caused a complete debate in that Parliament.

The Hon. Leader of the Government explained that the Hon. Prime Minister would be making his Budget Speech today and the Opposition would have to give notice of a substantive motion but I did not know the speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance would be broadcast over the radio. He went on to say that what they would proceed further with is what he referred to arising out of the Budget Speech by the Hon. Minister of Finance.

Does the Hon. Leader of the House merely give notice of these things to Your Honour? All these things should be told that we are listening to one speech, two speeches or the whole debate over the broadcasting system. We should be allowed to say which way we are following. We are now following our way.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I do not think we are following our way. The Budget Speech is made by the Hon. Prime Minister who is also Minister of Finance. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition well knows, no debate can come from a ministerial statement, therefore it will be for the hon. member, if he likes, to give notice of his motion. It will then rest on me to implement an early time for the debate in which case there will be no hiatus. They will have all the time they need for speaking on the Budget Proposals.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am longing for the day when there will be some consultation between the two sides of this House outside of this Chamber as to these things.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: We have made every attempt to have consultation with the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am pleased to know that there have been attempts made to have consultations.

Mr. SPEAKER: As to the question of party whips, that is purely a party matter.
3.55 p.m.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: We have appointed a party whip.

Mr. YEAWOOD entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of

Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I am commanded to lay Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of the Barbados Savings Bank for the year ended 31st December, 1965.

Also, the Report on the Training Scheme Fund for 1966-67.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Minister of External Affairs, I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Provisional Collection of Duties and Tax Act, 1963, and to make other provision in place thereof.

I should like to say in connection with this Bill, that we are going to circulate copies of it, and it is proposed to ask the House to deal with this Bill in all of its stages today. When hon. members see the terms of the Bill, they will understand why it is necessary to deal with this Bill in all of its stages today.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to repeal the Provisional collection of Duties and Tax Act, 1963, and to make other provision in place thereof, was read a first time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now time for Private Members' Business. The first Order of the Day under this Head stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, who I do not observe to be in his place.

The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown who also I do not observe to be in his place. Accordingly, as the time for Questions has expired and the two hon. members in whose names alone there is Private Members' Business, are not present, nothing remains on the Order Paper for today other than Government Business.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

4.05 p.m.

BARBADOS UNION OIL COMPANY REFINERY
(LEVY ON PETROLEUM PRODUCTS)
(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1967

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the Day under Government Business, and I am asking leave of the House for the Hon. Minister of Trade to take charge of it.

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

The question that Item No. 2 be taken was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is now the first Order of the day. The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave for this matter to be taken by the Hon. Minister of Trade and unless there be any objection, that leave will be granted.

(A Pause)

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister of Trade to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Union Oil Company Refinery (Levy on Petroleum Products) Act, 1965.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to amend the Barbados Union Oil Company Refinery (Levy on Petroleum Products) Act, 1965, so as to exempt from the duties payable under that Act petroleum products manufactured locally and sold to companies which are in receipt of benefits under the Pioneer Industries Act, 1958 and the Industrial Incentives Act, 1963 for use as raw materials in the manufacture of products approved under those Acts. At present duty free entry of improved petroleum products used as raw materials by such companies is permitted.

Opportunity has been taken to exempt from duty petroleum products manufactured locally and used as raw materials in the manufacture of other products produced by the Company.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly set out that if petroleum products are imported into this country for use as raw materials in the manufacture of other products, they have a right to exemption of duty. The law lays it down that the Barbados Union Oil Company be granted exemption of duty for bringing in these products.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to find out from the Hon. Minister whether these products which we are asked to exempt from duties payable because they are to be used in the making of raw materials by this same company, whether it will include the movement of these goods

by motor transport. It is a possibility that what this company is importing for the use of making gasoline, paint and such things will have to be transported by motor transport. I take it that these motor lorries are all owned by the company because they have their own lorries. I am asking if they are exempted too.

The Minister has said if the materials imported are used locally for raw materials in the manufacture of products they will be exempted from duty. The Hon. Minister may tell us that the lorries which belong to the company may fall under that too, but suppose there are other lorries used in the transport of these raw materials other than those owned by the company, would they fall under this too?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The Bill simply states products.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member replies, I just want to satisfy myself that there is no other hon. member who wants to speak. *(After a pause)*. The Hon. Minister may now proceed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The Bill simply states products and I do not see anything about transport of products. I do not think that comes under the Bill. The Bill simply states products. Certain companies manufacture paint for local manufacture by importing petroleum products and this Bill is to allow those petroleum products which are imported for such use to come into this Island free of duty.

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

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

4.15 p.m.

Clauses 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Suspension of this Sitting for fifteen minutes.

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

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

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting of this House was suspended for fifteen minutes exactly and we are now on Government Business.

PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF DUTIES AND TAX BILL

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that when I was giving notice of this Bill, I intimated that it was our desire to deal with it in all its stages today, and I think it was circulated to hon. members. I therefore beg to move that the next item of Government Business be this Bill to repeal the Provisional Collection of Duties and Tax Act, 1963 and to make other provision in place thereof.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister of Finance:- To move the Second Reading of a Bill to repeal the Provisional Collection of Duties and Tax Act, 1963, and to make other provision in place thereof.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in 1963 the Legislature passed an Act entitled the Provisional Collection of Duties and Tax Act for that year, and under the provisions of that Act which we are now seeking to repeal, any import duties or increase in import duties levied as a result of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals which are laid by the Minister of Finance, became operative either immediately or at some time as might have been specified by the Minister in his speech. The purpose of this Bill is similar to the purpose of the Provisional Collection of Duties and Tax Act, 1963, except that this Bill now makes it possible for import duties and any other taxation proposals to come into effect either at the time of making the Statement or at such date as might be specified by the Minister.

The obvious purpose of this Bill is that the Minister follows the procedure which did not exist in any part of the Caribbean other than Barbados until we introduced this Bill and brought our legislation into line with the more progressive countries. The Minister introduces the taxation proposals and it will be possible for a protracted debate to take place, so that the effect of the taxation would be nullified by those who would not be interested in seeing it passed, or, alternatively, who would be interested in making some kind of unjust gain at the expense of the Treasury of this Island. That is a state of affairs which no hon. member of this Chamber, speaking subject to correction on the Other side, would want to see perpetuated. The purpose of this Bill is merely an extension from import duties to other import duties by the provisions which are already enshrined in legislation. I therefore beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we, on this side, share the Prime Minister's horror of anyone doing anything to delay the coming into force of new taxation either of the sort envisaged in 1963 or introduced by the Bill which is now before the House. Such queries as we will have on this Bill will be related solely to what we do view as the somewhat vague definition of "budgetary proposals" in Clause 2 of the Bill. It is my intention to speak again in Committee on this point of "budgetary proposals" as defined merely by referring once more to the word "proposals". This certainly seems to us to be a departure from the normal language which is used in legislation of this kind, because there is no definition of what the word "proposals" mean when the licence fees, driving licences and conductors' licences were increased? Would you have them or were they before the House because some Minister argued that we needed more revenue to be spent on the roads? 4.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, for example, what the proposals meant when licence fees were introduced on motor cars, taxis and for drivers and conductors, would they be budgetary proposals merely because some member said that we need more revenue for the increased expenditure on our roads. Sir, you would remember one of those Ministers said that the fees were increased by the Minister of Finance. Other than that, we have no objection to this Bill.

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA; Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

(1) For the purpose of this Act —

"budgetary proposals" means any proposals made by or on behalf of the Minister responsible for finance for the purpose of raising revenue to meet public expenditure;

"existing tax" means all taxes of any kind imposed by or under any enactment whether made or passed before or after the commencement of this Act;

"tax" includes all assessments, charges, duties, fees, rates, impositions and other levies (however called) the proceeds of which are payable into the Consolidated Fund as part of the revenue of the Island.

(2) For the purpose of this Act expressions referring to the imposition of a tax shall be read as referring to the imposition of a new tax.

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

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, this is the Clause to which I referred. Mr. Chairman, it is known that the words "budgetary proposals" wherever they occur in the section referred to in that Act is related to the provisional collection of taxes by way of excise duties and import duties and they would be effective from the date specified by the Minister in such proposals or from the date specified in the Bill or from the date on which the Bill was introduced into the House of Assembly. In other words, the taxes which are subject to provisional collection will only exist after the bill for their introduction is given notice in the House of Assembly. Therefore, the phrase "budgetary proposals" is used.

Clause 2 says: for the purpose of this Act "budgetary proposals" means any proposals made to the House of Assembly by and on behalf of the Minister responsible for finance for the purpose of raising revenue to meet public expenditure.

Lawyers can argue that a particular tax was not proposed and lawyers can argue that a particular tax was proposed. These words would mean that every time the Prime Minister fails to come to the House and some other Minister who seeks leave of the House to act for the Minister of Finance introduces some Bill which seeks to raise revenue for the purpose of public expenditure that Bill would be a budgetary proposal. I do not think that was intended.

If I refer to an example which I mentioned already. We have a situation to which a Minister was responsible for amendments. You have had amendments just a few weeks ago to increase some licensing fees and the Minister in charge said he was not doing it for the Minister of Finance and another saying said it was necessary to raise revenue for the purpose of meeting expenditure on roads.

Is the proposal not more than a proposal to defend circumstances in which a set of circumstances for collecting provisional taxes was being derived? It is not as when the case was in Barbados that the Budget was always introduced at a fixed time and we could look forward to it being introduced in March every year. The last budget was introduced in September and this Budget has been introduced in June. There is no assistance to what a budgetary proposal is by referring to the standard procedure as the standard time for the introduction of the budget has changed from time to time.

Mr. Chairman, speaking as a lawyer, I do not like it because I foresee a different taxation method between taxation authorities, who may differ from time to time. However, speaking as a parliamentarian I think this definition is very vague. This is a very vital function of parliament and we are asked to allow more than the Minister of Finance to raise revenue to meet public expenditure when we are asked to pass this interpretation of "budgetary proposals."

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

Clauses 3, 4 and 5 were called and passed.

4.50 p.m.

Clauses 6 and 7 were called and passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Clause 8, hon. members will see that it reads - "and shall be deemed to come into operation on June" - the date is 30th. I beg to move that Clause 8, as amended, stand part.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported to me the passage in Committee of one Bill.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I trust that you will observe that the Bill has been passed in Committee without a reply to the point which was raised by the Opposition. While I appreciate that the Prime Minister has not come here today to make too many speeches, yet I would draw hon. members' attention to the fact that this Bill will put the collecting authorities in a very strange position indeed, because there is no provision in the Interpretation Act of our island or any other legislation as to what day a proposal is introduced in the House of Assembly. If we may judge by the speed at which official debates are printed, in any case, the Bill itself is likely to pass before the result of the official debates are out, but there is nothing in the legislation of this island for introducing a matter, like on what day the budgetary proposals should be given. I challenge the Government to suggest how anybody can refuse to pay increased tax as a result of the budgetary proposals and be convicted in a court.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly I declare this Bill duly to have been passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the next item under Government Business will be the financial statement and budgetary proposals for 1967 by the hon. and learned Minister of Finance.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. and learned Minister of Finance proceed to lay his Statement.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, five years ago on the 26th June, 1962, I presented to the Legislature the first financial statement and budget proposals ever made by a Minister of Government in this Island. We can with candour declare that this heralded the first real break with our colonial past and set this House firmly on the road to independence from financial management by officials and colonial administrators.

Indeed Mr. Speaker when I first entered these precincts as a representative just over fifteen and a half years ago the Governor of the country and the Financial Secretary regarded themselves as the chief planners for the Government and the architects of its financial strategy.

The role of a Government in financial matters was indeed a passive one, and in those days not so long past, the annual estimates of revenue and expenditure were passed after a cursory introduction by the member irresponsible, punctuated with references to sugar production and population and interlarded with clichés like 'good housekeeping' and 'putting by something for a rainy day'; 'buoyancy of economy' and 'steady as you go'. All of these phrases, Mr. Speaker, I have extracted from speeches printed in the *Official Gazette* which I also heard with my own unbelieving ears. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, when I demonstrated that the state of equilibrium so anxiously pursued in the management of the island's economy by the former Government could more readily be overtaken and discovered in chill solitude of the grave I was greeted with derision exceeded only by the abuse heaped upon my dauntless head in the columns of the official organ of the then Government party when I ventured the opinion that what this island needed was not a state of rest but one of dynamic disequilibrium under which we would always be moving forward.

In 1960-61 there was not only a state of rest in the economy it had actually begun to move backward and the national income of Barbados had receded to a figure well under \$100 million and below what it had been the previous year.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker the placid, unquestionably harmless and financially innocent predecessor in my office as Premier had the candour to confess on the floor of this House that Government's reserves had been depleted and that by the end of March, 1962, there would be no, repeat, no money in the Treasury.

This was the situation which this Party inherited when it was called to office. Moreover, the costly experiment in Federal association of which we on this side were no part had collapsed. Whoever unperturbed history may decide was the author of its destruction at least this Government can say that although as a party we had been excluded from the Federal exercise, that Government was never hooted down with carping and malicious criticisms by us. Indeed, from the national point of view we supported all measures which had reference back to this Legislature whether in the form of mandatory levy for its support or a matter of constitutional reform.

You, Mr. Speaker, even accompanied a Government delegation to inter-governmental conferences and far from trying to denigrate the characters of the Government delegations and exposing their incompetence, you as a matter of natural pride from their own reports rendered them every assistance and advice.

No situation, Mr. Speaker, I hope will ever arise again in the affairs of these countries more chaotic than that which I inherited in 1962.

To those who would accuse me of wishing to posture on a larger stage and losing interest in a smaller grouping because, they allege, the other leaders were unlikely to select me as a head of a federal government I should like to quote Professor Arthur Lewis who was an impartial observer and who indeed was selected by the Federal Prime Minister in 1961 as his special representative:—

"In recent months people have been saying that Barbados wanted to get the other islands into a federation so that it could dictate to them and exploit their markets. Nobody could say this who took part in these discussions in 1962 and 1963.

Mr. Barrow was dragged into the federation of the eight. The problem arose within six weeks of his becoming Premier, when his mind was preoccupied with getting hold of Barbados affairs."

Mr. Speaker, to place the economy of Barbados on a sound footing is what I set out to do and place it on a sound footing is what I have done with the help of my Ministers, the co-operation of a handful of dedicated public officers and with the unstinting support of the masses. We have achieved all this in spite of the unrelenting efforts of the men of ill will in this community to debase its standards, deny us our freedom and pull the country down for the sake of personal gain and in the hope of peculiar glory.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for reviving the memory of what we have passed through. In a country where freedom of the press means only freedom to destroy our moral standards and to engineer the destruction of the legally appointed Government of the people, it is necessary to uncover what has remained covered; to open up what has been closed; to let the fresh breezes blow in the nasty corridors of corruption, and let the light shine in the dark corners of conspiracy.

I owe it to my colleagues and to our supporters, to those thousands of people who in the face of threats and bribes kept the faith in the struggle, all those who without social ambition and with little economic security braved victimisation at the hands of employers. We owe it to all those unemployed turned away morning after morning by the hard bitten relics of a former regime from the gates of the works departments, and who for over ten years were haunted and taunted with the words "go and let this person and that person give you a job let Barrow or Boxill, Tudor or Talma give you a job, there is no job here for you". They kept the faith, they kept singing "we shall overcome, we shall overcome some day, some day deep in my heart I do believe we shall overcome some day."

Go tell it on the mountain I say, Mr. Speaker, tell the conservative back benchers in the Parliament of Westminster who were canvassed and harassed by our opponents to block our independence, go tell it to the officials in Great Smith Street who saw their foolish plans and visions of grandeur being frustrated by our claim to nationhood. Go tell those private companies and individuals who lavished their money and propaganda on our opponents. Go tell it on the mountain to those who claimed we could not afford to be free, who claimed we could not afford the luxury of independence that we have overcome.

We have been moving upward and onward during these past five years, Mr. Speaker. Total Government Revenue in 1962-63 was just over \$26 million whilst the amount of revenue needed this year to meet our approved estimated expenditure is \$52 million or a 100% increase in Government spending in the same five year period. Gross domestic product has risen between 1961 and 1966 from \$553½ to \$654.2 per head of population. These are phenomenal rates of growth by any international standard and illustrates the dynamic nature of the island's economy.

In 1962 I instituted the practice of printing and circulating the economic survey as soon as possible after the close of the annual accounts at the end of March and before presentation of my financial statement and budgetary proposals. As I have explained on more than one occasion, I like to have the out turn figures before making any proposals for taxation since estimates are sometimes on the modest side and one does not like to make new demands on the taxpayers unless they are well justified.

In accordance with the unbroken practice followed since 1962, honourable members were presented with copies of this year's economic survey at the last meeting of the House on Tuesday. The final accounts have not all been gathered in but the figures given are in my opinion reasonably accurate.

I also try to avoid a recitation of figures which members may and should digest for themselves. Such figures as may be quoted by me are given purely for the sake of analysis and comparison. I also strenuously try to avoid the employment of technical terms and economic jargon since the purpose of a budget speech is not to impress the academics but to inform the taxpayer and the voter, whoever he may be, how we are managing his affairs and what more, if any, we require from him to keep the country open for business.

The salient feature of this year's approved estimates is the gap which exists between the revenue and expenditure items of some \$6½ million. Last year we made a modest surplus of \$400 thousand but spent approximately \$11½ million on capital projects. Nearly \$6 million of this amount was transferred to the Development Board from my office to satisfy their requirements for the completion of building and furnishing of the Barbados Hilton which opened for business before Independence last year.

The capital expenditure was financed as follows:—

Loans	\$ 2850
Commonwealth Development and Welfare Grants ..	.221
Consolidated Fund ..	8.422
	\$ 11.493

With the attainment of independence on the 30th November, 1966, a Consolidated Fund was established in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution into which is paid all revenues of the Island including the proceeds of all loans raised. I remain unconvinced that this confusion of our current accounts with our reserves and loan capital is in the best interest of proper accounting or financial control. The public accounts were however adjusted to reflect the position as if the Consolidated Fund had existed throughout the whole of the financial year.

At the 1st April, 1966, the Public Debt stood at \$46.5 million and Treasury Bills outstanding \$.8 million. The nominal value of Sinking Funds at the same date was \$4.5 million. During the year no external loans were raised but local loans were raised to the extent of \$2,974 million and loans amounting to \$740,832 redeemed. At the commencement of the financial year the Public Debt stood at \$48,745 million and Treasury Bills outstanding amounted to \$813,548.

I should like to say something about the public debt especially because from time to time we hear a lot of ill informed comment about the size of the public debt and alarming statements about the island becoming bankrupt on this account.

In the first place all monies borrowed both locally and abroad receive the prior approval of the Legislature. There has never been in this House during the past fifteen years a single dissenting vote cast against the raising of loans for any of the purposes for which the approval of the Legislature has been sought.

Secondly the reason why Governments borrow for capital development is that the generations who come after and who will be sharing in benefits of the development should also be asked to contribute towards the cost.

We do not borrow money therefore for independence celebrations or for paying the salaries of teachers or public officers or for promotion of the island's attractions at EXPO 67.

We do however borrow for the construction of the new harbour or for permanent improvements to the runway and taxiway at Seawell International Airport and we borrow for new schools and other projects of a lasting nature which will continue to exist long after this generation of taxpayers has paid its last debts.

Thirdly, in a society such as ours where the ability to accumulate capital is concentrated in the hands of a few who do not necessarily nourish a propensity to invest their savings in the land of their birth, it is imperative that the Government formulate plans for social development and productive capital projects in order to maintain, not only the quality of citizens educationally and otherwise,

but also to generate gainful employment and purchasing power in the hands of the masses.

By embarking on a capital works programme evidence of which can be seen all over this country from the parapet of Paragon to the panorama of Pico Teneriffe, this Government has been able to keep hanging from buildings and bridges, from quarries to conference rooms the notice to all and sundry "Men at work".

In 1961 the Government was responsible for the wages and salaries of eight thousand persons with a total bill of 12.6 million dollars. At the 31st March, 1967, direct government employment had risen to nine thousand five hundred souls with a salary and wage bill of twenty-four million eight hundred thousand dollars. This represents an 18% increase in the number of Government workers alone accompanied by a 98% increase in the Government wage bill.

The increase in employment has been largely amongst the ranks of unskilled and semi-skilled workers who today would be unemployed if the public debt had not been increased to underwrite the cost of the development programmes. It should also be pointed out that in March 1961 the public debt stood at \$27.243 million and although it has been increased by \$21 million since that date, over six million dollars was raised by me to pay off the outstanding debt on the harbour in 1962, leaving a matter of 15 million dollars for financing the completion of the Hospital to the tune of \$5 million, and the Government's newly initiated developments.

In the final analysis or as we would say when everything boils down, the size of the public debt must be controlled by the country's ability to service and pay that debt when the time of reckoning comes. The best judges of the nation's ability to pay and of the soundness of its financial policies are the investors and these at least have displayed unbounded confidence in our financial health by their over-subscriptions of this Government's two major fund raising efforts on the London market during its relatively short term of office.

Any time a member of this House honestly believes that the country should not incur further debt he should have the courage to stand up and be counted amongst those opposed to development rather than to take advantage of the financial innocence of uniformed bystanders when he has slunk away from these legislative buildings.

1967-68 Revenue and Expenditure

The Approved Estimates for 1967-68 call for expenditure on the current and capital services of Government to the extent of \$63.85 as follows:-

Current Expenditure	\$52.094
Capital Expenditure	11.756

Current revenue is estimated at \$45.515 million and capital receipts at \$2.736 million excluding receipts from loans to be raised. The deficit on current account is of the order of \$6.5 million and it

will be necessary to raise some \$9 million from loans if the capital programme is to be carried out in full.

In my 1966 Budget Speech I made reference to the Tripartite Commission's Report and Taxation Report.

Tripartite Commission

Early November, 1966, a Conference was held in Antigua at which this Government was represented to consider the regional aspects of the Report and out of the Conference came proposals for the establishment of a Regional Development Agency to co-ordinate the development of regional projects and of a Regional Development Bank. At a recent meeting of Barbados and the West Indies Associated States in St. Lucia the structure of the proposed Regional Development Agency was agreed and the Regional Development Bank Team which is sponsored by the United Nations Development Programme visited Barbados about the middle of May. An early Report is expected.

Taxation Report

In February last this Government was able to secure under Canadian External Aid the services of a Canadian draughtsman to carry out a revision of the Income Tax Act.

The Government has also secured the services of a Land Valuation Expert under the United Nations Development Programme to carry out a complete overhaul of the present system of valuation, train local staff in principles and practice of valuation and to assist in the preparation of new legislation.

By these measures the Government hopes to carry out a complete overhaul of direct tax legislation, to rationalise our tax system and to re-organise the antiquated system of rating and valuation.

Proposals

I now come to the fiscal measures which the Government needs to take to meet its commitments. I have considered various methods of raising the large amount of revenue required to meet approved expenditure. The amount required is some \$6.5 million and this is not a situation where half measures can be taken.

Income Tax

I do not propose any change in the rates of personal income tax and of company tax. On the one hand individuals may be disappointed that they have not been reduced and on the other businessmen have no reason to be discouraged from formulating plans for new investment. I regret that the general economic and financial position does not justify a reduction in the rates of personal tax. A new Income Tax Act is being drafted and in the course of this exercise a re-appraisal of the rate structure will be made. From time to time there has been pressure in some quarters for separate assessment of working wives. While the general financial situation does not justify this, some increase in the marriage allowance is justified. I propose that the allowance which was increased

from \$300 to \$420 in 1965 should be further increased to \$540. This increase will cost approximately \$40,000.

The medical expense claim is at present limited to \$25 per child not exceeding two children. It is felt that this may be the cause of hardship in some cases and it is proposed to remove the limit on the number of children and to grant the allowance in respect of any child who qualifies for the child allowance. A married man with two children could claim \$150 for medical expenses incurred on behalf of any member or members of his family. If he has four children he will now be eligible for a deduction of \$250 if he has incurred medical expenses of this magnitude or greater whereas under the old arrangements the maximum allowance was \$150. It is also proposed to extend the scope of allowance and admit claims where the taxpayer is referred for medical attention overseas or incurs medical expenses while overseas.

If money is borrowed from a foreign source which is not liable to pay tax in Barbados the borrower could not claim the interest paid as a deduction.

In order to give a further stimulus to investment and an inflow of capital, I propose to remove the proviso to Section 18(1) of the Income Tax Act which prohibits a deduction in respect of interest unless the recipient is exempt from tax or that tax is chargeable on the interest.

As an incentive to industry and in order that manufacturing industry may keep abreast of the times and other established industries may take new initiatives, I propose to make an allowance in respect of scientific research. This allowance will permit qualifying expenditure on plant and equipment to be written off over a period of five years and buildings used for scientific research to qualify for the industrial buildings allowance. This allowance will be granted in respect of expenditure incurred on or after 1st January, 1967, but the removal of the proviso to Section 18 will apply to assessments for the year 1967 and subsequently.

The arrears of income tax at 31st March, 1967, stood at \$2,863 million. Five years ago the amount was \$1,285. In five years some \$1,578 million have been added to the amount of arrears. This is a situation which calls for strong action. As I have already stated I do not propose to change the rates of income tax this year, but I propose to take all necessary steps to ensure that those who are assessed do in fact pay what is due from them and those who are outside the tax net are brought within it. The steps taken in 1962 to increase the penalties for failure to pay within the prescribed time do not seem to have produced the results expected. I propose to review these penalties and to increase them. The increased penalties will be included in the revision of the Act. This gives defaulters a period of grace within which to settle their accounts with the Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

The Government is experiencing some difficulty in staffing the various Departments, and the Department of Inland Revenue like other Government Departments has suffered from staff shortages. I propose to strengthen the Collection Section of the office to enable it to deal more effectively with the problem of tax collection. I also hope that very shortly the services of a tax expert in investigation and evasion cases will be available to the Department and those who are now successfully evading and avoiding income tax will be brought to account. It is, Mr.

Speaker, in these circumstances that I find myself unable to make any change upwards or downwards in the rate structure of income tax.

Customs and Excise

The import duty on petroleum products and lubricating oils is a specific duty and has remained unchanged since 1921. I think there is room for some increase here and I propose that the duties on these goods should be increased as follows:—

S. I. T. C. (Revised)		PRESENT		PROPOSED	
		Preferential	General	Preferential	General
332.11	Aviation spirit of 100 octane and over (gal.)	2¢	4¢	3½¢	5¼¢
332.12	Aviation spirit of other grades (gal.)	2¢	4¢	3½¢	5¼¢
332.13	Motor gasoline (petrol) (gal.)	2¢	4¢	3½¢	5¼¢
332.14	Other motor spirits including petroleum oil distillates generally for use as fuel for road vehicles (gal.)	2¢	4¢	3½¢	5¼¢
332.211	Jet fuel (gal.)	4¢	8¢	5½¢	9½¢
332.12	Other power kerosene (gal.)	4¢	8¢	5½¢	9½¢
332.22	Illuminating kerosene (gal.)	4¢	8¢	5½¢	9½¢
332.31	Gas oil (automotive diesel) (ton)	60¢	\$1.20	90¢	\$1.50
332.32	Diesel oil (Heavy/Marine) (ton)	60¢	\$1.20	90¢	\$1.50
332.33	Other distillate fuel oils (ton)	60¢	\$1.20	90¢	\$1.50
332.41	Bunker "C" Grade fuel oil (ton)	60¢	\$1.20	90¢	\$1.50
332.42	Other residual fuel oils (ton)	60¢	\$1.20	90¢	\$1.50
332.511	Lubricating oils (gal.)	6¢	12¢	20¢	26¢

I should like to make it clear that the above increases are on import duty and not an increase in road tax which is a substantial source of revenue at 31½ cents per gallon. The effect of this increased duty from the consumers point of view will be a rise in the price of motor spirit to 72 cents and 80 cents per gallon and 42 cents in the case of kerosene. The additional revenue is estimated at \$600,000.

It has been brought to my attention that large quantities of shirts other than knitted of a C.I.F. value of less than \$12.00 per dozen are being imported in the Island. In order to afford local shirt manufacturers greater protection in this range and also to give protection to manufacturers of hats and toothpaste who have made representations, I propose the following increases in the rates of duty:—

S. I. T. C. (Revised)		PRESENT		PROPOSED	
		Preferential	General	Preferential	General
841.431	Shirts, knitted of a C.I.F. value not exceeding \$12.00 per dozen	10%	20%	17%	27%
841.51	Headgear of felt	10%	20%	20%	30%
841.52	Headgear, plaited	10%	20%	20%	30%
841.53	Headgear knitted, crocheted or of textile fabric other than felt	10%	20%	20%	30%
841.54	Headbands, linings, covers, foundations and the like ..	10%	20%	20%	30%
841.59	Other headgear	10%	20%	20%	30%
553.032	Toothpaste and powder ..	10%	20%	20%	30%

Yachts

In order to encourage the use of Barbados as a base for yachting cruises and charters and to encourage tourism, I intend to remove the duty on yachts with motors and without motors, and on motor boat hulls. Duty will continue to be paid on motors and outboard engines.

Similarly it is hoped to expand our locally based aircraft operations and maintenance by the registration of new companies which will provide air services of a chartered, scheduled and non-scheduled nature. In order to facilitate this welcome development which should provide skilled training for many young persons I propose to remove the duty on aircraft, airships and balloons and parts thereof under S.I.T.C. 734.9.

Consumption Tax

In 1963 a consumption tax was imposed on cigarettes. I think that I can ask the smokers to pay a little more for their cigarettes. The increase proposed is not burdensome. It is in fact quite small. I propose that the rate of consumption tax on cigarettes should be increased from 1 cent to 2 cents per five or an additional 2 cents on a package of 10 cigarettes and four cents on a package of 20 cigarettes. I feel sure that this will cause no hardship to smokers. The estimated additional revenue of \$300,000.

Package Tax

The Package Tax Act provides that a tax of 25 cents shall be levied upon every package of goods imported or brought into the Island or taken out of bond for consumption in the Island. In recent years the yield from this tax has been eroded by the practice of bundling or placing several packages in one large container which counts as a single package for the purposes of tax. It is proposed that in addition to the charge of 25 cents imposed on each package, in the case of goods which do not fall under the First Schedule to the Act where the package exceeds 56 lbs. in weight, a further 25¢ shall be chargeable in respect of each 56 lbs.

Fees of Office

Under various Acts certain fees are payable to the Registrar. In most cases these fees have never been revised and some have been in existence for more than 60 years. The time is appropriate for bringing these fees up to date and the process of revision will continue.

Certificates of Births, Baptisms, Marriages

The fees payable to the Registrar and District Registrars for certificates of births, baptisms, marriages, burials and for searches is 25 cents and it is proposed that such fees should be increased to 50 cents for each certificate.

Patents

The fees set out in the Second Schedule to the Act have been in force since 1903. These are wholly unrealistic. Firstly, I propose that the fee of \$25.20 for the registration of patents granted in other countries should be increased to \$125.00. Secondly that the scale of fees in the Second Schedule to the Act should be revised to a level which would make the charges meaningful.

Trade Marks

The existing scale of fees of trade marks was brought into force by the Merchandise Marks Rules of 1950. The new scale of fees which I propose will have the effect of doubling the amount of the fees.

Companies

No one would more readily admit than I the need for a new Companies Act. For good and sufficient reason it has not yet been possible to put the revision in hand. This will be done as soon as possible. There is a very limited number of draughtsmen at the disposal of the Attorney General and it is even difficult for them to keep up with current work. A week ago a Resolution passed this House providing for an increase in staff in the Legal Department but of course we still have to find the men.

I do not regard our inability at this time to produce a new Companies Act any reason why the Table of Fees which has been in existence since 1910 should not be revised.

I therefore propose to introduce a new Table B which will reflect current money values and remove the low limit of \$240 as total registration fee that may be paid in the formation of a Company. The details are contained in the bill amending Table B of the 1910 Companies Act which Honourable Members will have before them shortly.

Airport Tax

In my Budget Speech on 1st July, 1965, I stated that I proposed to introduce a specific airport charge of \$2.00 on all outgoing passengers other than intransit passengers and specially exempted persons. In 1965-66 there was considerable increase in revenue receipts, the out-turn being an excess of approximately \$5½ million. Accordingly I refrained

from imposing this charge as it was not absolutely necessary for revenue purposes. This charge which was estimated to yield \$150,000 two years ago, because of the increase in traffic is now expected to yield \$180,000 in a full year.

Landing Fees

The scale of landing fees for aircraft was last revised in 1965. Since the imposition of these charges further improvements have been made in the services provided especially in respect of heavy aircraft, and it is proposed that in the case of aircraft of over 105,000 lbs. in weight the charge should be increased from 86 cents per 1,000 lbs. or part thereof to \$1.00 per 1,000 lbs. or part thereof. The estimated yield from this increase is \$100,000.

In accordance with recognised international procedures I notified the international Air Transport Association of my intention to impose these charges. I have held meetings this week with four International Airlines Transport Association experts from Montreal and whereas the Association is in full agreement with the Airport service charge they quite naturally resist the idea of increases in landing fees. As members are aware the Government is spending over \$1 million annually at Seawell and these increased charges are still lower than those imposed in Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica and not even adequate to meet the new recurrent expenditures.

Cable and Wireless

By virtue of the Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited Act of 1939, Cable and Wireless enjoys complete exemption from all import duties, and taxation whether imposed by Local Government or Central Government. In discussions with Sir John Macpherson, the Chairman of this Company, I gave notice of my intention to repeal this provision which is accepted. The gain to the revenue cannot at this stage be estimated with any accuracy, but the total taxes payable by the Company should be significant in amount.

Bingo Duty

In my Budget of September, 1966, a tax at the rate of 5 cents was imposed in respect of every Bingo ticket or card the price of which was twenty cents or less, and where the price of the ticket or card exceeded twenty cents then the tax was levied at the rate of twenty cents in the dollar. The main organisers of the Bingo Games – the Jaycees and the Lions Club – have represented that the games have had to be reorganised in order to carry the tax burden. The re-organisation included a reduction in the prize money and there has been a decrease in the amount of the sales. In consequence there has been a reduction in the amount available for charitable donations. In order to bolster the support to charity, it is proposed that the tax on each ticket should be reduced to 3 cents where the price of the Bingo ticket or card does not exceed 25 cents and at the rate of 12 cents in the dollar where the price exceeds 25 cents.

Driving and Motor Vehicles Licences

The higher rates of driving and motor vehicles licences imposed from 1st June will add about \$260,000 to the revenue.

Summary

I shall now summarise the main features of this Budget.

It is proposed –

- (1) to increase the wife's earned income allowance.
- (2) To allow a deduction in respect of interest employed in acquiring income upon which tax is payable whether or not such interest is liable to tax.
- (3) To allow a medical expense claim in respect of all dependent children and to extend the claim to cover medical expenses incurred overseas.
- (4) To make an allowance in respect of expenditure incurred in scientific research.
- (5) To revise the penalties in respect of late payment of income tax.
- (6) To increase the import duties on –
 - (a) aviation spirit, gasoline and other motor spirits, and petroleum distillates for use as fuel for road vehicles.
 - (b) Jet fuel, other power kerosene and illuminating kerosene.
 - (c) Gas oil, diesel oil and other distillate fuel oils.
 - (d) Lubricating oils.
- (7) To increase the import duty on shirts of C.I.F. value less than \$12 a dozen, headgear and toothpaste.
- (8) To increase the consumption tax on cigarettes
- (9) To amend the Package Tax Act.
- (10) To increase the fees payable in respect of Patents and Trade Marks.
- (11) To increase the fees payable on registration of Companies.
- (12) To introduce an airport service charge.
- (13) To increase landing fees in respect of certain aircraft.
- (14) To revise certain tax exemptions for Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited.
- (15) To reduce the Bingo Duty.

Conclusion

The Budget for 1967–68 calls for expenditure of \$63.85 million – \$52.094 million current expenditure and \$11.756 million capital expenditure. The current expenditure is \$8.657 million more than the actual expenditure for 1966–67, while capital expenditure is just approximately \$300,000 more than the previous year.

With the revenue measures I have outlined, with the higher prospects of revenue from our expanding economy and with the institution of

a vigorous programme of collection of arrears of income tax the funds in sight for financing current expenditure are \$50.5 million. This leaves a gap of \$1.5 million which I have no doubt will be closed as we succeeded in doing last financial year by practising strict economy and by tightening our financial controls.

In my 1966 Budget I faced a deficit of \$6.332 million on current account which it was proposed to make good from the General Revenue Balance. The out-turn of the year as I have stated was a small surplus and reinforces my faith in the ability of this country to pay its way.

The deficit in the approved estimates for 1967-68 is \$6.5 million. As it happened in 1962 no new taxation would have been necessary if recurrent expenditure on personal emoluments had not been increased by over \$6½ million as a result of salaries revision implemented last year.

I therefore call upon all sections of the Public Service to pull their weight and give the general public courteous, efficient and productive service. The rest of us taxpayers cannot afford to support people who wish to continue to behave like an army of occupation. This behaviour is a hangover from the colonial system and has no relevance in our forward looking society.

It is also my pious hope that those who would wish to see this country progress should refrain from indulging in propaganda outside of the island calculated to damage the credit of the country in the eyes of would-be investors.

I call upon the citizens of Barbados to use all their resources to stamp out these evil practices either by boycotting the goods of those who indulge in them or by isolating from respectable law abiding society the perpetrators of acts calculated to bring discredit upon the country which maintains and sustains us in and out of season.

I call upon the mercantile community to adhere to proper business ethics and to discourage the use of improper invoicing. We shall take stern action against any one who attempts to throw an unfair burden on the honest taxpayer by his own malpractice.

This Budget, Mr. Speaker, our first as a new nation, is not a "freeness" budget. It is a "freedom" budget. It is designed to demonstrate in no uncertain way to the outside world and to our own doubting Thomases within our shores our intention and ability to run our own affairs and to pay our own way.

It is not an apologetic budget, Mr. Speaker, neither is it tailored to fit a cringing nation of insecure mendicants or neurotic scandal mongers willing to rush back to the shelter of the torn and tattered colonial coattail at the first sign of stormy weather. This is a budget designed for the inspired, the exulting and the free; a budget fashioned for the young and pure at heart who intend to write their names on history's page with expectations great,

Strict guardians of their heritage,
Firm craftsmen of their fate.

Documents

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay the following documents:-

The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967.

The Consumption Tax Order, 1967.

The Merchandise Marks (Amendment) Rules, 1967.

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

Resolution to sanction the Merchandise Marks (Amendment) Rules, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I also beg your leave to give notice of the following Bills:-

A Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941.

A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910.

A Bill to amend the Patents Act, 1903.

A Bill to amend the Bingo Duty Act, 1966.

A Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1967, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941 be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1910 be now read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Patents Act, 1903 be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Bingo Duty Act, 1966 be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1967, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said Tax be read a first time.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn till Tuesday next at 12.00 noon.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly I declare this House now stands adjourned until Tuesday of next week at 12.00 o'clock noon.
6.00 p.m.

