

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd July, 1968

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 o'clock p.m. 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., (*Leader of the House*); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P.
Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, J.P. (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance*); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L. S. CRAIG;
Mr. J. B. SPRINGER and Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. HINDS and Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to inform hon. members that once again there are no minutes available for confirmation.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the month of June, 1967, as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the twelfth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1967.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

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 Resolution to place the sum of \$16,600 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1968-69, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1968-69 No. 9 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions are ready. I have already given notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 42, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is ready. I am now giving notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 135, standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James, is now ready.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 73, 74 and 123, asked by the hon. junior member for St. Peter, are now ready. I also beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 109, asked by the hon. junior member for St. James is ready. This has already been given notice of.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

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

WHEREAS the system of garbage disposal in this Island leaves much to be desired;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government to purchase an incinerator and erect same at a suitable point so as to dispose of garbage in the centrally-sited parishes of the Island.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. I am advised that the Reply has been laid to Question No. 73,

standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter.

DEVELOPMENT IN BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware of the development taking place in the building and construction industry in this Island?

2. Would Government investigate with a view to finding out whether, or to what extent, the labour market of carpenters and masons, attendant labourers and clerks engaged in such building and construction is being exploited?

3. Is Government satisfied that overseas and other firms enjoying Government contracts in the said building and construction industry in this Island, are paying adequate wages to workers employed and making conditions of work for these people such as to reflect the existence of human standards?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

(1) Yes, Sir.

(2) The Government is not aware of any exploitation of workers engaged on construction projects. Wage rates in the construction industry are subject to free collective and individual bargaining.

(3) The Labour Clause (Public Contracts) Act 1952, stipulates that Government contractors shall pay wages and observe hours and conditions of labour not less favourable than those established in the trade or industry. In the absence of established rates and conditions, the Chief Labour Officer shall draw up fair and reasonable rates and conditions to be observed in the execution of contracts. Powers of inspection are vested in the Chief Labour Officer.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire of the Minister if these Contractors are paying the wages that they should pay, which he refers to in his Reply to No. 3. In other words, he tells us what they should do and I am asking him if they are doing it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: My information is that this is being done in respect of contracts.

EMPLOYMENT OF FEMALE WORKERS AT GRAZETTES AND OTHER SITES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Question to which the Reply has been laid is Question No. 74, standing in the name of the same hon. member. That is on page 3, right column.

Mr. HINDS: To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

1. Is Government aware that a number of industrial firms established at Grazettes Estate and

other sites with the financial assistance of the Barbados Development Board, are employing large numbers of female workers in the manufacture of their products both for the export market and for local consumption?

2. Is Government aware that the bulk of these firms employ a system of work-apportioning and price-calculating, which could constitute a whole-sale robbery of the majority of these female workers?

3. Is Government satisfied to have industries established under Barbados Development Board auspices which insist on paying 90% and more of their female staff, a weekly wage of as low as \$5 and hardly more than \$10 for a five-day week?

4. Would Government see to it that the Barbados Development Board establish as a policy that no industry enjoying the Board's assistance should have a minimum basic weekly wage less than the present weekly wage of a female Shop Attendant?

5. Is Government aware that a number of the industries established under auspices of the Barbados Development Board are apt to employ tactics which would make employees fear becoming members of a trade union?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's Question is as follows:-

(1) Yes, Sir.

(2) No, Sir. Some firms operate a system of payment on a piece-rate basis which places emphasis on speed but a minimum weekly wage is observed. Wage agreements with the Barbados Workers' Union exist in some of these undertakings and, in others, earnings range from \$15.00 per week to \$30.00 per week except in the case of probationers who are paid a minimum of \$2.00 a day.

In one case workers are paid on a piece-rate basis with a fixed minimum of \$2.00 a day. No complaints have been made to the Ministry.

(3) No, Sir.

(4) Active consideration is being given to this matter.

(5) No, Sir."

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, at No. 2, I would like to enquire of the Minister what is the minimum weekly wage which is observed. His reply is that a weekly minimum wage is observed. What is that minimum weekly wage? And when the hon. member rises, he might also reply in the case of probationers employed at the rate of \$2.00 per day. Can he tell us whether these probationers are told in advance that they are probationers and that they will be paid at the rate of \$2.00 a day?
2.55 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, in reply to the hon. member's first question, the minimum weekly wage is determined by negotiations between the employers

and the Barbados Workers' Union. In reply to the second question, the information which I have on my file is that they are told that as probationers they are expected to receive a minimum of \$2.00 per day plus what money they raise from the piece-rate production. I do not know if that satisfies the hon. member.....

Mr. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, is the Minister saying that the workers at the Garment Industry in Grazettes are unionised? If he is saying that, will he tell us the date of the last agreement between the Workers' Union and the employers?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I have had my officers investigate this matter, and the information I have given is information which I have received from my officers. I am advised that there are a number of wage agreements between the B.W.U. and the employers of workers in this industry. There are a number of such undertakings at Grazettes, and these are investigated by Labour Officers, and it was ascertained that in the case of female workers there were only nine female workers employed at the rate which the hon. member spoke of.

It was found that there were three garment factories with agreements with the B.W.U., and in these agreements there was a minimum wage of \$2.00 per day for probationers up to the first three months, and thereafter the minimum was \$2.40 per day.

This was information I got from the Officers. As far as I am aware, there are three of these industries which have agreements with the B.W.U. in Grazettes, and the employees are paid on a piece work basis.

Mr. HINDS: Just to get one point clear from the Minister. Am I to understand the Minister to say that these Officers discovered that there were nine workers who were being paid at rates from \$5.00 to \$10.00 a week?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that only nine of these concerns employed female workers, and there are three that have agreements with the Union, and the rate which is fixed is the rate which I gave. There are five other undertakings and the earnings range between \$15.00 and \$35.00 per week. It is stated that one business pays salaries of \$120.00 to \$200.00 a month.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister understands me quite clearly or if it is a case of where I do not understand the Minister. I think that I can say that I understand the Minister to say that there are nine firms employing female workers. Is that right? I want to know if his Officers have discovered at any of these firms that wages as low as \$5.00 to \$10.00 are paid weekly to the workers.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the reason why this question took so long to be answered is that I was sending Officers to and fro for information, because I myself heard that this obtained in some of

the industries. The information was that the people who received it, the people who got this \$5.00 or less received it on a piece work basis. They did not necessarily receive it for a whole week.

Mr. HINDS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister made any inquiries as to the conditions under which these workers work. I wonder if the Minister became aware during his investigations that when there is a cut in the electricity at a factory, which may be for two or four hours during the day, the workers have to remain on the premises, but they are not paid. I wonder if the Minister is aware of all that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I must say, Mr. Speaker that I tried to equip myself with the answers to the Questions asked by the hon. member. I would say that the question now asked by the hon. member could be asked as a substantive question, and I will investigate it. It is completely different from what he asked about wages. He did not ask about general conditions of service. If the hon. member would like to ask a substantive question, I will investigate it and give him a reply.

Mr. HINDS: The Minister is just trying to seek a way of escape. In answering my supplementary he made mention of the fact that some of the workers received \$5.00 at the end of the week; but he made out a case where they were not in such cases employed a whole week. I asked a supplementary arising out of this question. What I want to ask the Minister now is this: in any case is the Government satisfied that industries being established under the auspices of the Development Board are paying workers as little as \$5.00 a week? Is the Minister admitting that workers have been receiving as little as \$5.00 a week. Is the Government satisfied that this is fair and just in the year 1968?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I explained that the question of \$5.00 a week was not for a week's pay, but for piece work where workers do not work for a week, but for a day or a day-and-a-half. Until legislation is brought in whereby a minimum week's pay is guaranteed for workers in the industry, I do not see how the position can change.

The question which the hon. member asked about conditions of service will have to be investigated; but the Government is not aware that any worker in the industry, after having worked for a whole week, only receives \$5.00 a week. I want to make that clear. People who may have received \$5.00 at the end of a week received it for working part of a week, for a day or a day-and-a-half, as the case may be.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the Minister investigated the system of work apportioning and price calculation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister has given a reply to Question No. 2 and I would like, Mr.

Speaker, if you will permit the Minister - what I am saying is that in respect of Question No. 2, inasmuch as the Minister has admitted that he did not inquire about the subject matter of the question, if Your Honour will be willing to have this question remain on the Order Paper until the Minister can really investigate and report factually on the matter.

3.05 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I think I misunderstood the question asked by the hon. member. I really gave him the reply to Question No. 2 when I said the answer to that was no. That is, after further investigation, we were satisfied that there was no discrimination in the question of work proportion. I completely misunderstood the penultimate question. I think he understands now.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister, in carrying out his investigation, discovered that workers leave their homes on mornings, turn out at these respective factories, wait around the premises, maybe for two or three hours, and are then told that there is no work today, or there will be no work until a later hour during that day?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 123 standing in the name of the same hon. member at page 5, right hand column.

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC LIMITED

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the presence in this Island of a business firm operating under the name of International Scientific Limited?

2. How many Barbadian workers under 40 years of age have been employed by this firm in its first year of operations here threading memory cores, or doing similar work?

3. Is Government aware of the highly scientific nature of the work these workers perform?

4. Are they adequately compensated for the type of work they do?

5. Is Government aware that the long hours these workers perform and the meticulousness and exactness of the tasks involved, impose a considerable strain on the eyesight of these workers?

6. With a view to ensuring whether or not there is impairment to the health of these workers, particularly the eyesight, would Government undertake to have checks made on the eyes of a number of these workers by the Department of Ophthalmology of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

7. If tests reveal the presence of myosis resulting from the nature of the said work would Government stipulate that -

(a) regular tests of the eyes of these workers be carried out;

(b) all workers employed by this firm be specially insured against loss of eyesight, impairment thereof, and particularly, contraction of the pupil of the eye?

8. How many workers employed by this firm have been medically advised to wear spectacles since being employed there?

9. How many workers have not been financially able to meet the requirements of the advice given at 8 above?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

1. Yes, Sir.

2. 203 persons were hired during the year 1967 for training in the stringing of memory cores.

3. The Government is aware that the work requires training for its satisfactory performance.

4. This is a matter for bargaining between employers and employees.

5. The Government is not aware that considerable strain is imposed on the eyesight of the employees but if it is, then it is a matter which employers and employees should take into account in setting conditions of work for employees.

6.) The provisions of the Labour Department
7.) Act, 1943, prohibit the collection and release
8.) of the information requested on these
9.) points.

Mr. HINDS: If the provisions of the Labour Department Act prohibit the collection and release of the information requested on these points, then we will proceed with other points with Your Honour's permission. Is the Minister aware that International Scientific Limited offered Cod Liver Oil as something extra to some of its workers?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The Minister is not aware of that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand from the Minister that it is not possible, in Barbados, to find out from a worker if he is financially able to carry out his doctor's advice when he is employed by a firm established under the Barbados Development Board's auspices?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not understand the question. If the hon. member would repeat it, I should be glad.

Mr. HINDS: I am enquiring from the Minister if he wants this House to understand that it is impossible for the Labour Department to find out from a worker employed at International Scientific Limited, or in any other industry in this Island, if that worker

has been able, during the course of his employment, to carry out instructions received from a doctor?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not trying to tell the House so. What I am trying to tell the House is that the provisions of the Labour Department Act, 1943, prohibit the Chief Labour Officer, or any officer in the industry of labour, from obtaining and releasing any information in connection with the points raised by the hon. member. I would invite the hon. member to have a look at the Labour Department Act, 1943, and he would not ask those questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is after 3.15 o'clock p.m., when Question Time expires.

Mr. HINDS: May I ask that these questions remain on the Order Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my understanding that the supplementaries have not been completed.

We revert now to Private Members' Business. When this was adjourned at the previous meeting, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chamber on Item No. 1, Private Members' Business. That hon. member may now proceed with his Address, if he wishes.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, this is a business afternoon and more important business has to be discussed this afternoon than ever for the year.

Now I have noticed that there is more equipment in here than we are accustomed to having, and before I go any further I would like to know by whose permission it is here and for what purpose...

Mr. SPEAKER: My permission was sought and given for equipment to be installed in accordance with precedent for the purpose of the Budget. As to the actual amount or type of equipment, I am not in a position to say whether there is more or less, or whether it is different from any previous occasions, except in respect of this rather imposing or threatening looking apparatus in front of me which I understand is designed so that if the Chair has to interpolate or intervene, that that intervention would also be audible.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, may I remind Your Honour that the actual procedure has not yet been agreed on. The Leader of the House proclaimed rather emphatically, if not dogmatically that he intended to exercise the right of reply although the matter before the House would be under Private Members' Business, while later the Prime Minister indicated that there would be no such reply, and that it is purely Private Members' Business. I rise merely on a point of order to draw to Your Honour's attention that the matter is not yet concluded, if the matter is before the House with two contrary expressions of opinion as to what the procedure is to be, I suggest to Your Honour with great respect that the House should decide on how far the debate is to go and how much is to be broadcast.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the equipment, as I understand, is for the purpose of the speech of the Prime Minister relative to the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. Sir, this one with which I am dealing now is the Budget Speech, and I am entitled to have the equipment switched on. It is installed for the purpose of the Budget Speech, and in the same way that permission was sought and given to allow it to come in here, I feel that we should give the green light and have it turned on. You have the authority and the power to instruct the operator to have it turned on, because this is the Budget Speech also from an elected member, and an elected member of this Country is speaking on the Budget with respect to which I am in order; otherwise you would not have called on me to speak. In the same way that permission was sought for the purpose of the Budget Speech, I feel that you can give instructions to have it turned on and let us start the ball rolling from here. If you are not going to give such instructions, I want to know under what conditions these speeches will be broadcast, because there is a possibility that the Prime Minister as usual will broadcast his speech, leave the Chamber and the apparatus follow him; but it is my intention today to create history in this House, and if I am not allowed to use the same equipment this afternoon, nobody at all will use it - P.M. or M.P. I do not want to embarrass you or any other member in here, but some embarrassment will take place this evening, because I am not allowing it to happen. I am not allowing the Prime Minister to come here at 4.30 p.m. and broadcast his speech and leave, and the apparatus leave also. The apparatus will have to leave before he starts to talk and then he can follow after.

Do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I am threatening you. I have come with my ammunition to work, and I am going to work if something is not done. I intend to do it, and after it is done anything can happen with me. You can send me to Glendairy, to the Mental Hospital or anywhere at all: I am representing my people. I am not going to allow any speech to be broadcast this afternoon in here unless I get the assurance that the Opposition will have the same privilege to use it. I am asking you to have it switched on now, because it is here for the purpose of the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement, and I intend to carry on with this. You will recall that I have not gone into this speech yet, and it is my prerogative - not the one in St. George - to have this thing switched on, and if it is not switched on, I am going to switch it off for good.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I really think the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is generating more anger than the circumstances really warrant. In the first place, the hon. member is supposed to be addressing the House in respect of the last Budget and not yet in respect of the one which is to come. I do not want to tell the House, but I just want to make two short points to show why the hon. member, I think, is out of order. In the first place, the other side, so far as I know, has already made its official reply broadcast to the last Budget. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is true that

in the course of his own speech he has made a request for broadcast time, and I understand, because I was not present when the request was made, that the Prime Minister was very favourably disposed towards the request of the hon. member, but that it was pointed out to him.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order, Your Honour must rule at some time or other. What is the point of order? What is the hon. member doing wrong on which a point of order can arise?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am allowing a certain amount of latitude for the purpose of clarifying this matter which I had thought and hoped might have been discussed and decided by the Whips on both sides before now.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is the Chief Whip on our side, but that is not my point. My point is that I am on a point of order, and I am asking Your Honour to rule that the hon. member is not allowed to make another speech under the guise of making a point of order. Where is the point of order? What is the point of order? What has gone wrong? Where is the breach of a rule? Your Honour has just attended a meeting of the Caribbean area and that is one of the things that was pointed out: the duty of the Chair to stop this sort of accident disorder. The hon. member is not entitled to make another speech, and I would be glad to know that the Speaker of Barbados set the example for the rest of the Caribbean.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not made a point of order.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I raised the point of order that the hon. member is making a speech, and not a point of order. That is a point of order. This is showing that there is disorder on the part of the Hon. Leader of the House. He is breaking all the Rules; he is making a speech, and he cannot make a speech under the guise of a point of order. One of the chief things that Your Honour has just finished discussing was the fraudulent - the word 'fraudulent' has been used in the House of Commons, and I notice that the West Indian speakers use it too - use of the term "point of order" in order to make a speech. Your Honour must rule.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am drawing to Your Honour's attention that here is a case where Your Honour has been allowing two hon. members to be on their feet at the same time. One hon. member is addressing the Chair, and the other hon. member is on his feet, as is happening in this case now.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that two hon. members are on their feet now.

Mr. HINDS: That is right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House rose on a point of order, and he was proceeding to

make his point of order or points of order when another hon. member rose - the Hon. Leader of the Opposition - and he also said: "On a point of order". The Hon. Leader of the House should have been allowed to complete his point and then the Hon. Leader of the Opposition could make his. It is not a question of a point of order arising out of a point of order. That is my point. (ASIDES) Right now there are three hon. members on their feet.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, that is what I was enquiring of Your Honour. If two hon. members are on their feet, are we respecting you any longer? (ASIDES) It seems to me, Sir, that the equipment has been turned off. (A MEMBER: That is his friend.)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, I see two hon. members on their feet.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. HINDS: I was speaking on a point of order and it was observed that more than one hon. member was on his feet. Are we going to have this kind of racketeering (ASIDES)

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. HINDS: It seems to me that the volume has now been turned on. I am to ask Your Honour to rule in these things. The Opposition has had to complain time and time again and too often about the equipment not working when the members of the Opposition are speaking. (A MEMBER: He is the Speaker's friend.) I do not mind whose friend this youngster happens to be. He is drawing the taxpayers' money which has got to be voted by this Honourable House. I do not want to offend Mr. Speaker or any other friend of whom he may happen to be. Let him do his job to the Opposition as he is doing it to any other hon. member in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I see that two hon. members are on their feet. The Hon. Leader of the House was making his point of order and he may proceed and complete his point of order, and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph may resume his address.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I was making was that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I think, was wrongly imputing.....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, how can that be a point of order?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I take it that Your Honour is still in the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Very much so.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I was saying that, in my opinion, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph mistakenly imputed to the Prime Minister the respon-

stibility for the arrangement which Your Honour has just mentioned. I went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that on the last occasion the other side replied to the Budget through their official spokesman, but that in the course of the hon. member's.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I must interrupt the hon. member now. He is speaking on the occasion of the last Budget, but I am speaking now on the occasion of this Budget. I am nothing to do with the last Budget. I want this House to understand my intention with this Budget which is to come. I ask you to ask the operator to turn on the switch. If you do not do it, I cannot make you do it, but you have given permission to bring the equipment in here, and the same permission applies to have it working. If it does not work, I have already allowed this House to know what is going to happen. If it does not work now, it will never work again in here as long as I am an hon. member in here. If it is not going to work now, it will never be allowed to work as long as I am in this Chamber. It is the people of St. Joseph who are responsible for my being in this Chamber and they alone, nobody else. I am sure that if I create history this afternoon with this loud-speaking equipment, the people in St. Joseph will create history with me too at the next election; that is to say, that anyone else who ever wants to come in St. Joseph will never be able to enter. I intend to create this history. Do you know why, Sir? I am on my feet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am entitled to intervene. I will say this to the hon. member. I spoke of having given permission in respect of the apparatus being brought here this afternoon. It was in respect of a request for the purpose of broadcasting the Budget, which is, I understand, to be made in the course of Government Business this afternoon. It was in respect of that Budget and not in respect of the Budget which is still proceeding from last year. That is what I gave permission in respect of. So far as I am concerned, I have no authority in respect of the switching on or the turning off.
3.35 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not now rise on a point of order, because the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has clarified what I took to be a misconception of his. He says that his remarks are now in respect of the Budget which is to come. I wish now therefore to speak in explanation of the arrangement which Your Honour has announced.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that while it is true that the Hon. Leader of the House has not yet spoken - so I am advised - on this matter, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is on his feet and the Hon. Leader of the House has not proposed that he is rising on a point of order or a point of explanation or a point of clarification. I am afraid that he will have to await the conclusion of the hon. member for St. Joseph's speech and then rise, if he catches my eye first.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. I really do not think that I am being fairly treated. I am sorry.

I have, for many years, only once in my life had to say this to the Chair. (Aside: - take up the Mace)

Your Honour knows the circumstances in which this request was made, and Your Honour also knows that this request did not originate with me. If it had originated with me, I would not have to explain. I have the ultimate responsibility of seeing that Government's policy in this House is carried out, and I would not like Government's policy to go by default.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Am I to understand that the Leader of the House is being badly treated in that he has not spoken on the matter that is before the House - the last Budgetary Proposals? In other words, will he be allowed to speak on this matter again?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member has not yet spoken, he is perfectly entitled to speak on it.

Mr. HINDS: Has he not spoken today?

Mr. SPEAKER: He rose and said: "On a point of order."

Mr. HINDS: The Leader of the House said that he was not rising on a point of order. He said definitely that it was not on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: He said that he was not speaking on a point of order, but that he was speaking on a point of explanation.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: On a point of order. I am asking Your Honour to rule if it is in order for a member to speak on a point of explanation on something that has not arisen. How do we know that he will not rise on a point of complaint? He said that he was treated badly. Obviously no one could treat him badly but the Chair. I do not understand how anybody but the Chair could treat the hon. member badly. He could only have meant the Chair, and we on this side sympathise with Your Honour.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear too clearly; but it sounds to me as if he said or wants to say that asking for permission for this apparatus did not originate through him. Now, Sir, I will have to agree that the Hon. Leader of the House was treated unfairly or badly, because who else should it come from? I feel that way too.

If it came from an outsider, and Your Honour agreed to give the green light to an outsider to have it brought in here, you can give the green light for it to be switched on or off. So, you will make me feel that you care more for an outsider than for any member of the House. I was thinking all the time that permission was asked by the Leader of the House; but it is not so. If you have opened your hands to an outsider that strengthens my argument for having it thrown outside at once because it did not come through the right channels. I am finished, Sir, because you are listening to the Clerk.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of explanation because if I had been allowed to speak, the whole matter would have been resolved to everybody's satisfaction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the House make his point?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Is the Leader of the House on a point of order or what?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to await his point before I can rule on it.

Mr. HINDS: He should first intimate to Your Honour what is the point which he is making. Each time he gets up he makes a speech, and before this matter is finished he will have made five or six speeches. Members of this side can only address Your Honour once.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the hon. junior member for St. Peter has risen as often as the Leader of the House on points of order.

Mr. HINDS: On each occasion it was a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was prefaced "on a point of order".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I was saying, on a point of explanation

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I draw Your Honour's attention to Rule 26 (15) which says that "no member shall speak more than once on any proposition except -

- (a) in Committee;
- (b) in explanation as provided in paragraph 16 of this Order;
- (c) to a point of order; or
- (d) in the case of the mover of a substantive motion in the House, in reply:

Provided that any Member may second a motion or amendment to a Bill by rising in his place and stating that it is his intention to second the motion or amendment, without prejudice to his right to speak at a later period of the debate."

No. 17 says that "a member who has spoken may speak again when a new question has been proposed by the Speaker, such as a proposed amendment, or a motion for the adjournment of the debate or a dilatory motion".

I have noticed - I do not want to cause any embarrassment to Your Honour or to anyone else - that from time to time a member very often gets up and says "on a point of order", and makes a point of explanation on some matter that he has already spoken on. There is by members on the other side this vio-

lation and I repeat the word, this violation of the term "point of order". Only last month Your Honour was in conference with other Speakers who came here, and one of the objects of the discussions was to join together and put an end to this violation of the term "point of order", and Your Honour is allowing it!

I draw Your Honour's attention again to the Standing Order I have just read. The hon. member has not spoken in substance on this matter and therefore, he cannot be giving an explanation of anything that he said, and it is for Your Honour to say, according to the Standing Order, if he can rise on a point of order.
3.45 p.m.

I am rising to show there is disorder. An Order has been broken, but the hon. member wants to talk on a point of explanation, point of order, and all sorts of things. I repeat the word "fraudulent". Very often members deliberately do that in order that they may get in something that they had not said before.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition can complain about any hon. member making a speech after prefacing it with a point of order, because he has certainly made a speech. If the Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the indulgence of the House to make a personal explanation....

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is seeking the indulgence of the House and not of the Chair; we have to agree as well.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Am I to understand that Your Honour is giving the Leader of the House permission to make the speech referred to, or the explanation referred to, in the middle of the speech of the hon. member for St. Joseph who is addressing the House on the substantive matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter is not to understand that I am giving him leave. If the House agrees, and in an effort to clarify this situation, the hon. member will be permitted to make his personal explanation. I think it will facilitate matters a great deal in respect of what seems to be very highly controversial.

Mr. HINDS: So the hon. senior member for St. Joseph will continue his speech.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking indulgence of the House to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the House is seeking the indulgence of the House to make a personal explanation. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. (Mr. HINDS: "Objection".)

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Objection. On a point of order. I notice Your Honour invites the informa-

tion of the Clerk. It is not the Clerk's duty to instruct the Chair unless he is asked for an opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not remember, when he spoke a moment ago, that in this Parliament we are not supplied with Parliamentary Counsel; so one, on occasion, refers to the Clerks-at-the-Table. Sir Harry Foster, a former Solicitor General and one of Her Majesty's Counsel, has Parliamentary Counsel just as any other Speaker has.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, am I in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: As I said, this is a matter in which the hon. member might make a personal explanation by the indulgence of the House. Now hon. members who are in favour of granting such indulgence will please indicate. I am obtaining the feeling of the House. (Hon. Members: Aye.) Hon. Members who are not in favour of granting this indulgence? I think the "Ayes" have it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is the duty on every member to respect the Chair. I am asking Your Honour what is the Order by which Your Honour puts to a vote a motion of this sort? We cannot respect the Chair if, with this matter so clear that we on this side object, Your Honour says: "The Ayes have it". We would call for a division, and no division could possibly be in order where you ask for the indulgence of House. A single dissentient voice shows the House is not in agreement. Your Honour knows that; Your Honour has been a Speaker for many years. We have been trying our best to respect the Chair, and to make people abroad feel that the House of Assembly can live up to the traditions of any House of Assembly, or any House of Commons, in any part of the world, and then Your Honour does that!

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House may make his personal explanation.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that, in the face of the objection by the Opposition, he will be allowed to speak? We oppose any such suggestion. There was objection from this side of the House. Are you not going to protect the minority? Are you not going to protect the Opposition against these outrages, or are you going to contribute to them? (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Name him.) We are willing to respect the Chair, and we are begging you to rule in a manner which compels us to respect the Chair. We are willing to respect Your Honour, but undoubtedly something is wrong. I am sure Your Honour could not mean that the Hon. Leader of the House is entitled to make his speech.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of making a speech. It is a question of making a personal explanation.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. (ASIDES)

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the grave disorder, this sitting is suspended for 15 minutes.
3.55 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to make it quite clear to hon. members that what I have given permission for in respect of this afternoon's proceedings is - and only - permission for the Prime Minister's Speech to be broadcast live. That is all that I have given permission for, and it is that alone which will be done, I take it, this afternoon, in accordance with custom. Then when a motion is made in accordance with custom to deal with the Budgetary Proposals, I would suggest that the amount of broadcasting time available for both sides of the House should be a matter for arrangements between them before that discussion starts; but all that I have given permission for is for the equipment to be brought in this Chamber, and there is ample precedent for the Chair giving such permission. It has been given year after year, but all that I have given permission for is for the equipment to be brought in here for the Prime Minister's speech to be broadcast live; that and nothing else as for now. Then in respect of the debate initiated to discuss the Budgetary Proposals which obviously could not start today, that would be a matter between now and the next meeting of this House for a request or arrangements to be made for the equipment if it is wanted for the discussion of the budget. That is a matter for both sides to arrange between themselves, how many hours they want it for and how many speakers. (ASIDES) There can be no question of not having control if an agreement is arrived at between both sides. (ASIDES) That applies only in respect of this afternoon to broadcast the Budget Proposals live. There is no permission for anyone else or any other afternoon.

Mr. St. JOHN: Speaking on a point of privilege, Your Honour is the guardian of the privileges of this House, and Your Honour has given permission to an outside person over whom Your Honour has no control, and Your Honour has not consulted the Leader of the House nor the Leader of the Opposition, nor the Chief Whip on this side, so that we find ourselves in this position that permission has been granted, without the House knowing, in respect of the broadcast of a speech of a member of this House with no power or authority in Your Honour to ensure that equality can take place in the future. That in my submission is acting against the interest of the privileges of this House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, time is running out on me. Now, Sir, you have the authority and the power, I believe, to give the permission. I feel so; I may be wrong. Would you let me know who asked for the permission and to whom it was given before I start? I intend firing off the gun; but before I pull the trigger, would you let me know who sought the permission?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Government Information Officer.

Mr. SMITH: Thank you, Sir. It is no wonder that the Leader of the House is not feeling too happy on this matter. I want the Leader of the House to see quite clearly, if he cannot, that as far as he is con-

cerned, somebody does not care anymore about him in here as Leader of the House as they care about me. I believe this is the first time that the Information Officer had to seek permission to bring apparatus in here. Why is it? Who is the Information Officer? Is he an elected representative of this country? That is the reason why I am not going to let it work this afternoon - promises or no promises. The Hon. Leader of the House said he was not treated fairly, and I am saying that I have not been treated fairly either. The Information Officer is a servant; so somebody instructed him to do it. He did not do it off his own bat. Some Quartermaster shirt-tail man asked or gave permission and by-passed the Leader of the House, and it serves him right.

Mr. SPEAKER: For the information of hon. members, I will say that from 1962 so far as records before me now reveal, the request has been made by the same official.

Mr. SMITH: If from 1962 the Information Officer was seeking permission, then the request was granted without the knowledge of the Leader of the House. If that was so, I cannot understand why the Leader should feel so unhappy this afternoon. If permission was being sought, I feel that the Leader of the House should negotiate it; but in this case the Leader did not have any say in it, and to make matters worse, the Minister in charge of these things or of C.B.C. does not care anything about the Leader of the House. He should have consulted the Leader of the House in this matter; yet the Leader of the House comes in here and pilots the same shirt-tail Minister's work. If the Leader of the House is doing that, then he should be getting half the money, because the qualification to be a Minister is that you come in here and pilot your own Bills. That is part and parcel of the Ministry. This chap does not do that, and although the Leader of the House is working for him and he is drawing money he does not earn, he still by-passed him and sent to the Speaker without the knowledge of the Leader. They can do as they like; they belong to one pen, and I belong to another.

Mr. Speaker, I am an elected member and I have the same rights and privileges inside here as the Prime Minister or anybody else. The Government cannot or should not dictate to Parliament by telling us that the Leader of the Opposition will have half an hour, two hours or twenty hours. This equipment belongs to the people and we are doing the people's business. Why do you want to limit us? Why do you want to muzzle us? Why don't you want the people of this country to hear what we have to say? Something is wrong. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order....) I am not agreeing to any half an hour, two hours or anything at all. It is here for all of us or nobody at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has risen and said "on a point of order".

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I think the hon. member is wrong to suggest that somebody from this side is trying to limit or inhibit the freedom of speech of hon. members.
4.20 p.m.

It is impossible for me at this stage to say what I wish to say, but I give the hon. member the assurance that I will consult with the other side after the Prime Minister has spoken, when they have given notice of the motion which they traditionally give notice of, and when they indicate to me what time they wish to initiate the debate, the proper arrangement will be made. I can guarantee that it will be to the satisfaction of the whole House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Any arrangement or negotiation should be entered into before the apparatus is used by any member of this House. In other words, we cannot negotiate with the equipment on the premises. That is the first thing. In other words, we must have uninhibited territory. (Laughter) That is what we must have. We must have the equipment removed and then let us begin to negotiate. You must bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this House is comprised of Government members and Opposition members, and when Your Honour proceeded to give permission for the equipment to be brought in - I appreciate the fact that Your Honour followed the custom from 1962, but it means that we have only discovered in 1968 that Your Honour has not been discharging your duties in ample fairness. You do not at all times take into consideration the rights and privileges of the minority group, the Opposition members, in the House of Assembly. We find that in 1968....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order and time is running out. (Laughter) I am not standing for it. That is not a point of order; that is a gallon. Sir, the Hon. Leader of the House has just said that after the Prime Minister has spoken, we can come together and make the necessary arrangements. Now, Sir, I am drawing this to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House now, and I said that this would pass my way some time again. Last year I was promised that I would have a say over the air; in fact, that was the year before last. The Hon. Minister at that time had given me that assurance, but he quickly left the Island before the day of the next meeting. At the next meeting the apparatus was not brought in. At that time he was a Minister; he was Quarter Master, General, Foreman and everything then. This time he is only a boy as far as that is concerned, because he is not the Minister. He was the Minister at the time and he gave me that assurance. When I raised the point, the Prime Minister said that he gave instructions not to bring back the equipment at that time and that was the end of it. Last year I raised the point again, and after I succeeded in convincing the Prime Minister, he passed on the Order - I would not say to whom he gave it - for it to be brought in. The hon. junior member for St. John said: "No, it would not be fair to Cammie" and it was not done. (ASIDES) I am saying what the hon. member said, and the Prime Minister dropped it like a red-hot brick. He was in favour of it, he gave instructions to bring it in - I am calling names now - but after the hon. junior member for St. John said: "No, it would not be fair" he dropped it.

This is my time this afternoon. I am not waiting until the Prime Minister speaks because I know what

is going to happen. I do not know where they put up these things so that I can go one night and break open the premises and bring them in here next Tuesday. After they have left these premises, they have gone for good and you will be laughing at me, but nobody will be laughing at me this afternoon; it will be more a possibility of my being locked up. I am not allowing the Prime Minister to say one word through this equipment. I am saying this now; I will wait until the Prime Minister comes in, and as soon as he starts, I will work. No one can prevent me from doing it; nobody can touch me. I am sure he will not do it. I have been tricked too many times and this is my time now. I was promised last year that it would be done; he would not do it. Sir, do you think it is fair that we are the representatives of the people and a Minister or the Government on the whole is dictating to us to tell us what we should do? This is very important business. This is the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. It is the people who want to hear it; it is not so much that we want to give it out, but it is that the people want to hear it. You will be muzzling the people if it does not happen and I am muzzling the Prime Minister this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House rose on a point of order.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I really think that we are putting this thing out of proportion. I have already given the hon. member the assurance which he could reasonably want. I have said that when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gives notice of his motion, I will consult with him to everybody's mutual satisfaction.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being after 4.30 p.m. of the clock, it is now time for Government Business. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House caught my eye first.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated to the House last week, it was at this day's sitting that the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance intended to lay before the House the Budgetary Statement and Fiscal Proposals for this year. I now beg to move that that be Order No. 1 under Government Business.

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

Mr. SMITH: On a point of explanation, for the benefit of the Prime Minister who was not in the House - I do not want to do anything that he may not be *au fait* with - but the Prime Minister will agree with me that last year he gave instructions to bring in apparatus so that I would be able to speak, and the hon. junior member for St. John practically threw a spanner in the works.

It is my wish and the people's wish that the Statement on the Budgetary Proposals after being broadcast by the Prime Minister should be broadcast by any other member of this House. Up to now I cannot guarantee that that will be done because it should be settled before the Prime Minister starts.

If the Prime Minister starts without a settlement I am going to interrupt. I am not going to let the thing work. I have my tool, Sir, to work with, Mr. Prime Minister, and if I do not get the assurance before he starts, I will make sure that the people do not hear him either.

What I am going to do you will not see in the Standing Orders nor in the Constitution. So it will not be breaking the rules of the Constitution or the Standing Orders. It is what I am claiming as my democratic rights this afternoon. If I do not get an assurance before the Prime Minister starts, I will throw a spanner in the works. I am claiming my rights. Let me get them this afternoon or else the Prime Minister will be heard through these, but not through those down there.

It is left to the Prime Minister, and to the House and to you. I want an assurance before the P.M. starts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member not refer to P.M.

Mr. SMITH: I was only trying to make it short. I see P.M. in the newspaper. You cannot do wrong in the newspaper, but you can do wrong in here. I am claiming my democratic rights. In the same way that Dr. Martin Luther King fought for the people and lost his life, I am prepared to do it here this afternoon.

I will not let it work before I get the assurance from the Prime Minister. If he starts without giving that assurance I am going to finish it up.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is prepared to break up these proceedings unless I give him some assurance.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I did not say that I was going to break up the proceedings. I said that you will talk here but not there. That is not breaking up the proceedings.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member while I was speaking took up a pair of pliers which is now over his head and said that he was prepared to use them and would not let the proceedings go on. I can only take it - I have no intention of giving way to any such threats. If he thinks that he can do that with impunity, I will read Section 39 of the Malicious Injury to Property Act, 1868-2 which says:-

"Whosoever shall unlawfully and maliciously commit any damage, injury, or spoil, to or upon any real or personal property whatsoever, either of a

public or private nature, for which no punishment is hereinbefore provided, the damage, injury or spoil being to an amount exceeding five pounds, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and being convicted thereof shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour and in case any such offence shall be committed between the hours of nine of the clock in the evening and six of the clock in the next morning, shall be liable at the discretion of the court, to be kept in penal servitude for any term not exceeding five years and not less than three years, or to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour."

Now, there is a popular misconception that if one is a member of the House, he automatically becomes above the law of the land. The hon. member is not a lawyer, and I am giving him free and gratuitous advice. Section 39 of the Malicious Injury to Property Act 1968-2 has not been repealed.

The hon. member may have been carried away because he feels that he has got an audience. I have no recollection of having made any promise, but I would like to remind the hon. member that under the previous regime he had no opportunity to speak into the microphone or at all. The only time his voice was heard was when he said "hon. members in favour will please say 'Aye'", and those against will please say 'No' " when he was Chairman of Committees.

We have instituted the broadcasting of important debates in this Chamber. We have given to the Opposition the opportunity to be heard. It is for the hon. member to regulate with the members on his side what period of time he should have. That is all I could promise the hon. member. He asked me for an assurance that he would be given a broadcast.

If he feels that he will not have an opportunity to broadcast, he should leave that Party and join another Party in which he would have more democratic rights. I repeat that we will not undertake to give them any time over and above what they give the Government. If the hon. member still intends to pursue his nefarious intentions to commit damage to property he is entitled to go ahead; but I think that the whole principle of democracy is being distorted particularly in the minds of members on the other side that this gives them unlimited licence to commit a crime such as this.

I would like to remind the hon. member that although my last Budget Speech was 12 months ago, it is still being debated during Private Members' Business, and the Opposition is enjoying the monopoly of a debate which has been going on for the past 12 months.

It is a ridiculous situation that an Opposition which prides itself on being so replete with financial geniuses should only be able to table a Resolution saying: "Be it resolved that this House note the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the Fiscal Year 1967-68 contained in a Statement made

in this Honourable House on 30th June, 1967, by the Minister of Finance."

4.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the financial year 1968-69.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Now, Sir, I have asked for an assurance of the time that will be given to us. I would like to hear how much time will be given to us after the Hon. Prime Minister has spoken.

The Hon. Prime Minister cannot frighten me by talking about damage to public property and going to gaol. If I go to gaol now, Sir, the devaluation or the cost of living will not worry me. It will worry the Prime Minister because he will have to find money to keep me up there. I am willing to go along now. I should have had a rest long ago. The only way I would really get a rest is to go up there. They cannot make me work if I do not want to work, and I am a sick man at that. I am out for peace. If the Prime Minister takes 10 minutes to deliver his speech, give us 10 minutes. If he takes an hour, give us the same hour. I will agree to that, and if that is agreed upon now, if the Hon. Prime Minister, or the Hon. Leader of the House, gives me that assurance now that it will be time for time, then I will put up my tools. If I do not get an assurance, I will work my tools and put my hands on somebody. You can handcuff me and carry me up. I am for peace, and if they are for peace, too, they will give equal time. If he takes 10 minutes, we will get 10 minutes; if he takes an hour, we will get an hour, and we will then decide among ourselves who should speak for that one hour. If the Leader of the House can give me that assurance, I have nothing further to say.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the assurance was given last year and year before. What happened last year, however, was that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas had equal time with the Prime Minister. I think it was 42 minutes, or whatever it was, and he monopolised all the time. This year if the Prime Minister speaks for 60, 70 or whatever minutes, the other side will have those minutes and it will be for the hon. senior member for St. Thomas to let him have some of the time which is at their disposal.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister made his speech which was broadcast live, and it was then rebroadcast the same evening - 84 minutes or whatever it was. When the Resolution was tabled by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of the Opposition, it was designed for a specific purpose, and since it only took note of the Budgetary Proposals, there would be no question of a Government Minister having the right to reply at the end. Despite the form of words in the Resolution, what the Hon. Leader of the House announced was that half an hour would be given and half an hour for a Government reply. Indeed, my speech was cut off from Rediffusion in midstream.

At the end of half hour it was cut off. The Prime Minister's speech ran its full length.

To be truthful, Mr. Speaker, I am not so impertinent as to suggest that, on the Budget the views of the Opposition - something within the province of the Minister of Finance - should be treated as though they were of the same importance. I believe that we must be heard, but after all the Budget is the Budget. We were cut off in the middle and told that there would then be a Government Reply equal in time to my half an hour. Certainly I was cut off precisely in the middle of my speech.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to know if the Leader of the House has got an assurance beforehand. Apparently he knows nothing about it. Does he know if the Prime Minister speaks for six hours C.B.C. will give six hours' time to the Opposition? Is C.B.C. going to abandon its commercial broadcast for the length of time the Prime Minister and the Opposition may speak?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before I commence my Financial Statement, I would like to reassure, with the deepest sincerity, the hon. member who has just sat down that we will give him 17 times the amount of time which he gave us when we were in the Opposition. I could not be more generous than that.

Mr. Speaker, I now rise, after some delay, to present my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the financial year 1968-69.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have to raise this matter at this stage. I refer to the Economic Survey. I entered the House at a late stage, and I would like to know whether the Economic Survey, which is normally circulated before the Budget Speech, has been circulated to hon. members. If so, I have not had my copy, and really I did not know that we received the Budget Statement before the Survey was in circulation! I thought it was a prerequisite to the Budget Statement. I have not got my copy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot regard that as a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will allow me.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker; I was about to rise on a point of order. I have not got the assurance of the time that will be given to us. If I am not going to get it, I am not asking about it any more. I am going to go. As soon as the Prime Minister starts I am going to start, because, if they really intended to accommodate us with the time, they would do it. Now, the Hon. Prime Minister got up and said that the same time that was allowed to them during the regime of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will be given to us. Now what can I understand that to mean? He is not giving any time. (Laughter)

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Hon. Leader of the House if he will give an assurance regarding the time. If he does not give the assurance, I am going to work. This is the last time I am saying this. If they do not get up, Sir, I will be getting up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps I might be of some assistance. Whilst I agree that 17 times zero is zero, and that is what I gather the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is saying, it is my understanding from the Government that as many minutes or hours as are allotted to them will be allotted to the Opposition. Whether it is X minutes - that is my understanding - there will be an equal amount of time. If I am wrong, will Government instantly correct me?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Your Honour is correct.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, does that mean that the Hon. Leader of the House has that assurance from the Thomson Corporation? Are they promising that for any length of time members of the House of Assembly choose to speak, they will be granted that time?
4.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No Sir. It is not for any time that members of the House of Assembly choose to speak. It is this: that if the Prime Minister and Hon. Minister of Finance's Budgetary Proposals take him 70 minutes or whatever minutes there are to speak then, the other side will have 70 minutes over the air and will divide the time as they see fit.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I keep asking and so far he has not answered. Has the Leader of the House that assurance from C.B.C.? It is one thing for the hon. member to say that here and then come in here next Tuesday, and say "I am sorry I made a promise, but I spoke without C.B.C., and C.B.C. says: "No, they cannot give up all that time." Is he prepared to kiss the Book? Is he prepared to go on oath?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that our Gideon Bibles are not now around the Table; so no hon. member has any facility for taking an oath.

Let the Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance proceed with his Budgetary Proposals.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is now I believe, Mr. Speaker, the fourth time that I have risen to try to make my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals. I am only going to do so, Mr. Speaker, on the assurance that the Standing Orders, specifically Standing Order No. 29 (6) are observed. Standing Order No. 29 deals with the behaviour of members who are not speaking, and Rule 6 states "While a member is speaking all other members shall be silent or shall confer...." (even with the Clerk) only in undertones and shall not make any unseemly interruptions."

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS

Mr. Speaker, I rise now for the fourth time to present my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for the financial year 1968-69.

On previous occasions — from as early as 1962 — I have managed to publish an annual Economic Survey either shortly before or simultaneously with the presentation of the Budget. I regret that this has not been possible this year on account of difficulties experienced in securing the sector statistics upon which we base our analysis of the behaviour of the Barbados economy during the past year. A special team of experts from the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress which visited Barbados earlier this year expressed some concern over the lack of up-to-date statistical material; and although to some degree we must blame an inadequacy of staff, to a larger extent this defect is compounded by the lack of co-operation on the part of the private sector, and even by a modicum of delinquency on the part of some departments of Government. There will be, I hope, considerable improvement in our statistical services by this time next year, even if I have to invoke the authority vested by the law to wrench the necessary information from those in default.

As far as this year's exercise is concerned, I have every expectation that the Economic Survey will be laid on the Table of the House within the next three to four weeks. The need for a Financial Statement and Budget of the kind, nature and quality to which the Legislature has been treated for the past six years arises out of the presentation and passage through Parliament before the 31st March each year of the Annual Estimates of revenue and expenditure both on Current and on Capital Accounts. This has been so from time immemorial, and is now enshrined in the Constitution of a sovereign and independent Barbados.

Whereas a Minister of Finance has considerable latitude in fixing a date for the presentation of a Financial Statement and Budget such as I am now presenting — and indeed need not present a Budget at all if the Government's revenue and expenditure pattern and the economy generally are in that delicately balanced state of equilibrium which it would be inadvisable to disturb, there is no such discretion in respect of the Annual Estimates which with monotonous regularity have always negotiated both Houses of the Legislature before the 31st day of March in each and every year. Behind this, however, lie months of examination on the part of the Estimates Committee of every proposal for expenditure which is not fixed by law put forward by the Government departments. This examination usually begins some time in October and continues five or six days a week until late February under the chairmanship of the Minister of Home Affairs, who has relieved me of this burden for the past two years. Before this I was indebted to the former Attorney General and Leader of the Senate for performing a similar duty on my behalf. Both of these Ministers have been extremely vigilant in their examination of the requests put forward by Ministries and Government departments. My own Ministry has frequently felt the keenness of the axe which they have applied so ruthlessly when necessary. Long before members of this House see the Draft Estimates, the proposals may have been pruned by some two or three million dollars. The time has come, if it is not long overdue, when some formal recognition should be given to the role played by a Minister who is a member of the Other Place in the management of the finances of the country. I have long been advised by my colleague, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, that it is impractical for the person who is head of the Government and also in charge of its foreign affairs to carry sole responsibility for the exchequer of

the country. My personal experience both as regards the chairmanship of the Estimates Committee and attendance at Conferences, more so now that membership of the Inter-American Development Bank and the Regional Development Bank is not far off, fortifies me in the decision that the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs should also assume special responsibility for Finance alongside the portfolio which I shall continue to hold.

In Trinidad and Tobago a Minister of State was created with special responsibility for this subject alongside the Prime Minister who retains the portfolio of Finance. We strenuously avoid proliferation of Ministers in this country which has a much smaller economy than our independent neighbours in the Commonwealth Caribbean.

The year through which we have just passed has been for our country a most eventful one. We in Barbados have not been innocent bystanders in these events, but we have played a leading role in the march forward of our people in the Caribbean, and in the process we have managed to retain and secure the good will and respect of all.

The Free Trade area which my Government initiated in 1965 came into operation on the 1st day of May this year with the additional participation of Trinidad and Tobago. Last week in Guyana the applications of the Windward and Leeward Islands and of Jamaica were unanimously accepted by the four original signatories. By the first of August this year the provisions of the Carifta Agreement will have universal application to more countries and territories than formerly comprised the now defunct West Indies Federation. The Associated States of the Eastern Caribbean have under the impetus of Carifta constituted themselves a Common Market. All this has been accomplished without any assistance from the metropolitan country that formerly strangled and controlled the genius of the West Indian people to devise institutions for themselves; it has been accomplished only because they no longer can confuse and confound. Great Britain herself after scorning the overtures of the Inner Six ten years ago when the Treaty of Rome was drawn up now finds herself a dejected suppliant at the gate of Europe. As early as 1962 I set up a Committee under my chairmanship composed of representatives of commerce, industry, agriculture and Trade Unions together with Government nominees at both Ministerial and official level to examine the implications of Associated Overseas status under Part IV of the Treaty of Rome, should Britain's application to join the European Common Market prove successful.

I also initiated a debate in this Chamber, and reported to Parliament on my attendance at the Prime Ministers' Conference held in London in September, 1962 at which the implications to the Commonwealth of Britain's application were exhaustively discussed. Nothing new has taken place since that time which would have persuaded either the Government or the Advisory Committee to alter its view that in the absence of positive assurances from the Inner Six rather than from Britain that our special commodity agreements would be protected, this country would have to be most concerned over the future of its exports if the application were successful. Whilst Britain stands at the gate with patient expectation, we in the Caribbean cannot afford to stand idly by slavishly reliant upon vague expressions of pious intentions, the fulfillment of which in any event lie outside the control of our major trading partners. We have to pursue new associations which will cushion the shock of final abandonment of Imperial ties, as final abandonment there undoubtedly will be.

It is with this sobering conviction always in mind that we must welcome our acceptance into the Organisation of American States during the past year; our impending membership of the two hemispheric banks to which I have referred; the realisation of Carifta and the greater expectations of the New World Common Market projected for 1985 by the President of the United States at Punte del Este in April last year.

Other significant events which have taken place since my last Budget was delivered have been the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which was held in New Delhi, and from which the countries like ours who are primary producers were expecting some liberalisation in the attitude of the industrial economies. Our Deputy High Commissioner in London attended this Conference which ended in an atmosphere of disenchantment. Barbados was also represented at the World Sugar Conference held in Geneva under the chairmanship of the Minister of Trade of Jamaica. The achievements of this particular Conference are a matter of close concern to us. Whilst no agreement was actually reached, the Conference will be reconvened later this year so that hope still remains alive for the conclusion of a sensible agreement to govern the production and disposal of the commodity which bulks so largely in our national economy.

Barbados was also represented at Ministerial level at a United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation Conference held in Rome, at the International Labour Office Conference in Geneva which is just concluded, and has sent observers to meetings of Inter-American Development Bank at Bogota, Columbia; the Economic Commission for Latin America in Caracas in the Republic of Venezuela; the Inter-American Committee for Tax Administration in Buenos Aires; and the World Health Organisation in Geneva.

On the general question of Conferences, Cabinet has laid down a very firm policy that this country will take part only in such meetings and Conferences as can be demonstrated to be likely to bring about some economic benefits to the community as a whole. We have with regret, therefore, declined participation in such amorphous though laudable exercises as the Human Rights Conference in Teheran, and the recent meeting of the Economic and Social Council held in Washington. We will certainly have to reconsider our attitude to such gatherings as GATT and UNCTAD unless the richer countries abandon their current attitude of cynicism towards the problems of the less developed economies such as ours.

It is also high time that the doctrine that all roads should lead to Rome and Geneva be discarded, and that consideration be given to venues in the Caribbean Countries which now enjoy the facilities which were not apparent during the Colonialist period and the days of the League of Nations. We cannot afford to pay dues to clubs whose administrative arrangements tend always to benefit the richer members at the expense of the poorer ones.

Since the Economic Survey has not yet been printed, I shall give some details as to the performance of the economy during the year through which we have just passed.

The year 1967 was one of continued economic expansion and growth. Indeed, for some sectors it was one of record expansion in activity.

Receipts from the sale and production of sugar were the highest since the year 1957. The contribution to Gross Domestic Product by this sector stood at \$35.1 million; the rate of increase over the year 1966 was

9.7%. Receipts from the sale of sugar abroad amounted to \$37.3 million in 1967. Except for the year 1963, this figure represents the highest earnings from this sector ever.

Earnings from the tourist sector showed similar signs of growth on an unprecedented scale. It is estimated that receipts from tourist expenditure rose from \$29.1 million in 1966 to \$34.8 million in 1967 – a rate of increase of 19%. This is the highest rate of growth in tourist expenditure so far recorded.

Perhaps a more accurate index of the true benefits to Barbados of growing tourist receipts is the growth in the contribution to Gross Domestic Product by the Services sector. The contribution of this sector to Gross Domestic Product stood at \$19.5 million in 1967, compared with \$17.5 million in 1966 – an increase of \$2 million or 11.4%. The rate of increase in tourist expenditures is indeed heartening.

The Government sector continued to expand, and the contribution of this sector to Gross Domestic Product in 1967 stood at \$25.8 million – a rate of increase over the previous year's contribution to Gross Domestic Product of 21.1%.

In 1967 therefore – a year of marked expansion in activity – in the main sectors of the economy – the Government sector has expanded at an even faster rate than those sectors referred to above.

Mr. Speaker, this development of expanding Government activity is of particular relevance to our purpose here today. Both revenue and expenditure of the Government are high and rising in relation to Gross Domestic Product. Between 1960/61 and 1967/68 Central Government Current revenues rose from \$26.0 million to \$50.3 million, an overall increase of \$24.3 million or 93%. Current expenditures have risen even faster. Between 1960/61 and 1967/68 Current expenditure rose from \$22.7 million to \$48.7 million – an increase of 114.5%. As previously observed, this growth in Current expenditure is due mainly to the expansion of Government activity in the economy.

At 31st March, 1968, it is estimated that the Public Debt amounted to \$52.9 million – an increase of \$4.2 million on the figure for the corresponding period in the previous year. Debt charges (*i.e.*, interest and amortization) on previous loans amounted during the financial year 1967/68 to about \$3.4 million.

Of the total public debt of \$52.9 million outstanding at 31st March, 1968, \$18 million was raised to finance the construction of the Deep Water Harbour (which is a self-financing project), and the remaining amount was used to meet expenditures on agricultural diversification, tourist promotion (excluding the building of the Hilton Hotel) and industrial development, extending educational and health services and, also, to improve external and internal communications.

In 1967/68 debt service charges (interest and amortization) absorbed 6.7% of Current revenue as against 7.8% for the year 1966/67. The absolute amount of debt service charges for 1967/68 was the same as that for 1966/67, but the percentage of debt charges to Current revenue declined due to the increase in revenue for 1967/68 over that for 1966/67 by 14.8%.

At 31st March, 1968, the value of Treasury Bills outstanding amounted to \$2.5 million as against \$.8 million outstanding at 31st March, 1967.

In 1967 the value of total imports and exports rose by \$5.3 million over the 1966 level to \$206.6 million. Percentagewise, this represents an

increase of 2.6% and is indeed low when compared with a rate of increase for 1966 of 10%.

The value of total imports amounted to \$134.3 million in 1967 and rose by \$3.2 million (or 2.4%) over the 1966 level. Again, this rate of increase in imports might be compared with a rate of increase of 11.2% in 1966.

The value of domestic exports during the year however, stood at \$54.8 million and increased by \$16.8 million (9.6%) over the 1966 level and compares with the rate of increase for that year of 6.8%.

Indeed, the deficit in the Balance of Trade position (goods and services) for the year shows an absolute decrease from \$71.3 million in 1966 to \$71.1 million in 1967. This decrease is admittedly small. It represents, however, for the first time in many years, a reverse in the trend of a widening negative balance in the visible trade position. An analysis of total imports under this item reveals that while imports of machinery and equipment increased from \$22.3 million in 1966 to \$25.6 million in 1967, imports of manufactured goods did *not* rise at all and imports of food fell by \$1.7 million – all indicative of some progress with our programme of import-substitution and the predictable development that expansion in productive capacity must go hand-in-hand with increased imports of capital goods.

DEVALUATION

The British pound was devalued on 18th November 1967 and forced upon us the devaluation of the E.C. \$ which is freely convertible into sterling at the rate of 4/2 to E.C. \$1. The E.C. \$ is fully backed by sterling investments, and at present the ~~external reserves~~ are 101% of circulation. In addition, there are ~~local~~ assets consisting of participating Government securities amounting to nearly 6% of circulation.

Following devaluation, certain price controls have been instituted on a wider range of consumer goods than formerly. There have been increases in the prices of some goods and services, which increases have tended to cancel out the net advantage increases in wages and salaries achieved within the past two years.

With devaluation the United Kingdom Bank rate was raised to 8%, and interest rates reached a high level. Bank rate has since been reduced to 7½%, but high interest rates in the World's capital markets continue to prevail. In present circumstances the cost of raising external loans for the financing of the Development Programme is very high, if not prohibitive.

SOCIAL SECURITY SCHEME

The Social Security Scheme commenced on the first Monday of June, 1967. There have been initial problems and teething troubles, but the scheme is working satisfactorily. Sickness and funeral benefits were paid as from the first week of September, 1967, while maternity benefits became payable as from the first week of January 1968. Old Age contributory benefit, invalidity and survivors' benefits became payable from the third week of May, 1968. Pensions do not become payable for another two years. The scheme will generate funds for local investment, and at the end of the first year of operations the insurance fund stood at approximately \$4.5 million.

1967/68 REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

I shall deal more closely with the out turn figures for revenue and expenditure for 1967/68. The original estimate of Current expenditure was \$52.09 million, whereas actual expenditure for the year is \$48.6 million,

or a saving of \$3.45 million. This was achieved by careful management and the exercise of rigid financial controls. The revenue for the year amounted to \$50.3 million as compared with an original estimate of \$45.5 million. The final accounts on the year's operations show a surplus of \$1.6 million. The revenue yields were as follows –

	\$ million
Customs duties and Internal consumption duties	22.85
Taxation	17.83
Licences	.28
Interest and Redemption ..	1.41
Net Revenue Government commercial undertakings	.57
Receipts of Government Departments ..	5.63
Other Receipts	1.73
	<u>\$50.30</u>

1967/68 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Capital expenditure in 1967/68 amounted to \$8.6 million, including a loan of \$2.1 million to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation as follows –

	\$ million
Agriculture	.59
Communications and Works ..	1.95
Health, Housing and Community Development	.63
Education	2.75
Home Affairs	.51
Development and Industry ..	2.12
Trade, Tourism, Cooperatives and Fisheries	.03
	<u>\$8.58</u>

Capital expenditure was financed as follows –

Loans raised	\$2.07
Short Term borrowing (Treasury Bills) ..	2.49
Special Bank Loan (C.B.C. Loan) ..	2.10
Current Surplus for year ..	1.64
Cash reserves	.28
	<u>\$8.58</u>

PUBLIC DEBT

At the 1st April, 1967 the funded Public Debt stood at \$48.7 million and Treasury Bills outstanding at \$813,548. During the year loans to the extent of \$2.07 million were raised locally and at the 1st April, 1968 the Public Debt stood at \$52.9 million while Treasury Bills outstanding amounted to \$2.496 million.

1968-69 REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

The Approved Estimates for 1968-69 called for expenditure on the current and capital services of Government to the extent of \$65.4 million as follows:-

Current Expenditure	..	\$56.1 million
Capital Expenditure	..	9.3 ,,
		<u>65.4</u>

Current revenue is estimated at \$50.9 million and capital revenue at \$1.026 million, excluding receipts from loans to be raised. The deficit on Current Account is of the order of \$5.1 million, and it will be necessary to raise some \$8.3 million from loans if the Capital programme is to be carried out in full.

In considering the fiscal action necessary to meet the present situation the following factors have been taken into account:-

- (a) the effects of devaluation on local costs and prices;
- (b) the coming into effect of the Caribbean Free Trade Association;
- (c) the difficulties in raising external loans;
- (d) the need to promote the development of the economy and to increase opportunities for employment;
- (e) the discouragement of tax evasion.

MEASURES TO IMPROVE REVENUE YIELDS

Income Tax

In February 1967 this Government was able to secure under the Canadian External Aid the services of a draughtsman to revise the Income Tax Act and to write a new Act. The draughtsman has completed his assignment, the draft of the new Act has been submitted, and it is hoped to introduce it into Parliament at an early date.

With a view to ensuring that all persons who should pay tax do in fact pay their taxes, the Government has also, under Canadian External Aid, obtained assistance for the training of staff in tax investigation methods and procedures.

The Government hopes that with increased powers under the new Act to deal with tax avoidance, tax evasion and the problem of arrears, and with a trained staff and reorganised department, the increased yields from income tax may justify a review of the rate structure.

Land Valuation and Taxation

With the assistance of the United Nations Development Programme, the services of two experts in land valuation have been provided to advise on new legislation and to train local staff to make competent and professional valuations of property. A new Land Valuation Act has been drafted, and in January last I opened a course for training of staff in Land Valuation. The programme of training and revaluation will together take nearly two years so that any increased revenue from the improved system of land taxation would not accrue before 1970. This is the stage of planning and preparation.

BUDGET PROPOSALS

I now come to the fiscal measures which the Government needs to take to meet its commitments. The new tax proposals have been framed having regard to the effects of devaluation and to the creating of a disincentive to luxury and substitutable consumer imports.

Devaluation has brought with it certain advantages as well as certain problems. It has caused increases in the cost of public services as well as public debt charges. It has also caused price increases in a wide variety of goods.

On the other hand, certain increases will accrue to Customs revenue, and taxpayers will also benefit from sales and other income received in U.S. and Canadian dollars. I need hardly state that the increases which accrue to Government revenue only serve to reduce the amount which would otherwise have had to be imposed to finance Government's operations during the financial year.

This country is producing an increasing range of manufactured products, and it is the Government's aim to promote this development to the fullest extent.

I think that this is the juncture at which I usually advise honourable members to fasten their seat belts and prepare for take-off. If we don't get off the ground, it will be due to the overweight of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, who will appreciate the low taxation.

I therefore propose to introduce the following measures:—

INCOME TAX

As I stated earlier, a new Income Tax Act and Regulations have been drafted and will be introduced into Parliament in the near future. I therefore do not propose any changes at this stage. Such changes as I have decided should be made will be incorporated in the draft. I regret that I have to disappoint those who were looking forward to a reduction in the rates of personal income tax. A re-appraisal of the rate structure will be made, and the rates will be included in the Act.

The income tax collections for 1967–68 amounted to \$15.7 million as compared with a revised estimate of \$14.6 million and an original estimate of \$13.5 million. The estimate for the current year is \$15.25 million and is \$.536 million less than the actual collections for the previous year. From the much larger sugar crop in 1967 than in 1966, receipts over and above the 1967–68 collections should accrue from this source. Further, this department is being reorganised with a view to spreading the taxation net and modernising the system of tax collection generally. For these reasons an additional yield of \$750,000 is expected from this source.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

Import Duties

The proposed increases in import duties are concentrated on certain luxury items, and on some items which at present are either free or where it is felt that there is room for increases. In 1963 duties on certain equipment were removed as a concession to industry. It is felt that the five

year period was sufficient to enable businesses to equip their premises, and some of these duties have been restored. The increases are as follows - I think, Mr. Speaker, that because this is a Revenue Act, I shall have to give the Standard International Trade Classification and all of the old and new duties in detail and *in extenso*. The first figure which I quote will be the S.I.T.C., and the second column will be the class or description of goods; the present duties will be given next in the fourth column, and the new duties or proposed revised duties in the last column. This, I repeat, is necessary because the duties take effect as from today, that is, after 4.30 p.m., and certainly will be operative by tomorrow morning.

The increases are as follows:-

Item No.	CLASS OR DESCRIPTION OF GOODS	Unit for Duty	Present		Proposed	
			Preferential	General	Preferential	General
055.513	Vegetables preserved or prepared by vinegar etc. in airtight containers	Value*	50¢	\$1.00	10%	20%
112.21	Cider and perry in bottle	Gal.	14¢	18¢	40¢	44¢
112.22	Cider and perry in wood	Gal.	10¢	14¢	40¢	44¢
112.491	Unenumerated spirits and other preparations containing spirits not exceeding the strength of Proof	Gal.	\$12.40	\$13.00	\$16.00	\$16.60
112.492	Unenumerated spirits and other preparations containing spirits exceeding the strength of Proof	Proof Gal.	\$12.40	\$13.00	\$16.00	\$16.60
541.92	Medicinal Wines ..	Gal.	84¢	\$ 1.06	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.22
553.04	Perfumed spirits (including Eau de Cologne, Lavender water and Florida water)	Value	20%	30%	25%	35%
553.05	Other perfumed spirits	Value	20%	30%	25%	35%
553.09	Cosmetics and toilet preparations other than soaps n.e.s. (including rouge, lipstick, hair dyes, bath salts and deodorants) ..	Value	20%	30%	25%	35%

*Unit for duty formerly 100 lbs.

Item No.	CLASS OR DESCRIPTION OF GOODS	Unit for Duty	Present		Proposed	
			Preferential	General	Preferential	General
571.11	Propellent powders	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
571.121	Blasting Powder (dynamite)	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
571.122	Other prepared explosives	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
571.21	Mining, blasting and safety fuses ..	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
571.22	Percussion and detonating caps, igniters, detonators	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
571.3	Pyrotechnical articles	Value	20%	30%	25%	35%
571.41	Loaded cartridges ..	Value	20%	30%	25%	35%
571.42	Lead shot, buck shot and bullets	Value	20%	30%	25%	35%
696.01	Knives	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
696.02	Knife blades	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
696.06	Spoons, forks (table and the like) ..	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
698.2	Safes, strong boxes, cash and deed boxes and the like ..	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
698.86	Name plates, sign plates and the like	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
714.11	Typewriters, electrically operated (complete) ..	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.12	Typewriters, other (complete)	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.13	Parts for items 714.11 and 714.12	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.14	Cheque-writing machines	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.21	Calculating machines etc. (electrically operated)	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.22	Calculating machines etc. not electrically operated	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.23	Parts for items 714.21 and 714.22	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.31	Statistical machines (complete)	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.32	Parts for Statistical machines	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
714.91	Duplicating, addressing, etc.	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%

Item No.	CLASS OR DESCRIPTION OF GOODS	Unit for Duty	Present		Proposed	
			Preferential	General	Preferential	General
714.92	Parts of office machinery other than dictating machine	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%
719.121	Air conditioning units 1 hp. or less (complete)	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
719.122	Non-electric parts for item 719.121 ..	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
719.123	Air conditioning units of more than 1 hp. (complete) ..	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
719.124	Non-electric parts for item 719.123 ..	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
719.31	Lifting and loading machinery and parts	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
719.221	Air conditioning blowers etc. ..	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
719.231	Air cleaners etc. ..	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
719.81	Humidifier Machines for air	Value	Free	10%	10%	20%
897.121	Spoons and forks of precious metal ..	Value	10%	20%	25%	35%
899.95	Wigs, false beards, switches and the like	Value	10%	20%	20%	30%
895.11	Filing Cabinets, racks, sorting boxes etc.	Value	10%	20%	15%	25%

CONSUMPTION TAXES AND RESTRUCTURING OF TARIFFS

With the coming into operation of CARIFTA, duties on a wide range of goods will be removed. The revenue effects of the removal of such duties would be obvious and it is necessary to find ways and means of recovering the revenue loss. I propose to employ the consumption tax device for the purpose of recovering revenue losses. In order that the imposition of a consumption tax in certain cases may not raise the price of commodities unduly where the whole market cannot be supplied from the area, it will be necessary to restructure the tariff in the case of a number of items.

Under Annex D of the Caribbean Free Trade Agreement the protective element in the revenue duties applied to the following goods is phased out over a period of five years -

Rum
Beer, stout and ale
Gin, vodka and whisky
Petroleum products

Excise duties are charged on rum, beer and petroleum products, and in the case of beer and petroleum products a consumption tax is also

charged. In order that such goods locally manufactured on which excise duties are charged may be at no disadvantage, *vis-a-vis* similar goods of area origin when the duties have been completely eliminated, it will be necessary to make certain fiscal adjustments.

It is my intention to replace the excise duty on rum by a consumption tax, and to consolidate the present excise duty and consumption tax payable on locally manufactured beer and petroleum products into a single consumption tax. These adjustments will be made shortly.

In imposing consumption taxes, as in the case of import duties, I propose to pursue a policy of higher duties on luxury items.

I propose the following consumption duties:

<i>Items of Goods</i>	<i>Rate</i>
Still Wines, Sparkling wines and Vermouths	\$2.00 per gallon
Whisky not exceeding strength of proof	\$5.00 per gallon
Whisky exceeding strength of proof	— \$5.00 per proof gallon
Brandy not exceeding strength of proof	— \$5.00 per gallon
Brandy exceeding strength of proof	— \$5.00 per proof gallon
Gin not exceeding strength of proof	— \$4.00 per gallon
Gin exceeding strength of proof	— \$4.00 per proof gallon
Cordials and liqueurs not exceeding strength of proof	— \$5.00 per gallon
Cordials and liqueurs exceeding strength of proof	— \$5.00 per proof gallon
Vodka not exceeding strength of proof	— \$4.00 per gallon
Vodka exceeding strength of proof	— \$4.00 per proof gallon
Cigars and Cheroots	— \$2.00 per lb.
Hand made writing paper, envelopes, letter pads and similar stationery used in correspondence (excluding exercise books), copying paper, calculating machine paper, letter paper, foolscap and similar writing paper	— 12¢ per lb.
Refrigerators and refrigerating equipment	— 20% of value
Stoves, cookers and fumaces	— 10% of value
Accumulators (storage batteries)	— 10% of value
Phonograph records	— 10% of value
Poles, piling and posts	— 12% of value
Manufactured Gas	— 12% of value

The following adjustments will be made in the tariff structure:-

Item No.	CLASS OR DESCRIPTION OF GOODS	Present		Proposed	
		Pref.	Gen.	Pref.	Gen.
719.42	Domestic Refrigerators non-electric (complete) ..	20%	30%	10%	20%
725.01	Electric Refrigerators (Domestic) (complete) ..	20%	30%	10%	20%
081.9	Food wastes and prepared animal feed n.e.s.				
	081.91 Food wastes and pre- pared animal feed for farm animals (horses, goats, cows, poultry etc.) (100 lb.) ..	Free	12¢	Free	12¢
	081.92 Other Food wastes and prepared animal feed n.e.s. (value) ..			10%	20%
512.751	Saccharine and other artificial sweetening substances to be used for medicinal purposes only. (value)			10%	20%
512.752	Saccharine and other artificial sweetening substances for other purposes (oz.) ..			\$2.00	\$4.00

MOTOR VEHICLES TAX

I propose to widen the scope of the Motor Vehicles Tax which at present is chargeable on Motor Cars, motor cabs, hiring cabs and goods vehicles (excluding vehicles of a maximum gross weight of or exceeding 4480 lbs.) as defined in the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. By virtue of the definition in this Act a vehicle carrying more than 6 passengers is excluded from the tax. I propose that the charge should extend to station wagons and other road motor vehicles constructed for the purpose of conveying not more than 15 passengers.

RACING SERVICES

I propose to increase the present registration fee of \$12,000 to \$20,000. From my observation of the amount of business that is done by these shops, the increase is justified. It is also proposed to delete the proviso which reduces the fee by \$1,000 for every month of operation after the month of January in each year. The reason for that, Sir, is that certain operators come in and pay a limited fee for two or three months, and then clear out with their spoils. If they want to operate for two or three months they must pay \$20,000.

MISCELLANEOUS CUSTOMS REVENUE

Certain licences and rents are collected by the Customs Department. These have not been revised for a long time and it is proposed to increase them and make them meaningful.

	<i>Present</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Still licences	\$4.80 p.a.	\$100.00 p.a.
Licence to brew beer ..	\$5.00	\$100.00
Petroleum Warehouse Rent	12¢ per barrel up to 6 months	50¢ per barrel up to 6 months
	After 6 months 4¢ per month per 10 gals.	After 6 months 25¢ per month per 10 gals.
Powder Magazine Rent ..	4¢ per lb for 4 years	10¢ per lb per annum.

Certain consequential amendments to the relevant Acts and Regulations will also be made.

Liquor Licences

The fees payable under the Liquor Licences Act have not been changed for over 11 years. The Act under which we are operating is the Act of 1957. I now propose to make the following increases in the Schedule to the Liquor Licences Act of 1957:

SCHEDULE

Duty payable in respect of Licences

	<i>Old</i>	<i>New</i>
A general Wholesale Licence	\$300 p.a.	\$1,500 p.a.
A Wholesale Licence	\$100 p.a.	\$ 500 p.a.
Retail Licences	\$ 50 p.a.	\$ 100 p.a.
Hotel Licence in respect of an hotel containing –		
(a) up to ten bedrooms ..	\$ 50 p.a.	\$ 100 p.a.
(b) eleven to twenty-five bedrooms	\$100 p.a.	\$ 250 p.a.
(c) 26 to 50 bedrooms ..	–	\$ 500 p.a.
(d) 51 to 100 bedrooms ..	–	\$1,000 p.a.
(e) Over 100 bedrooms ..	–	\$1,500 p.a.
Restaurant Licence	\$ 50 p.a.	\$ 100 p.a.
Occasional Licence	\$ 5 a day	\$ 10 a day
Members Club Licence	\$ 5 p.a.	\$ 10 p.a.
Proprietary Club Licence ..	\$100 p.a.	\$ 500 p.a.
Druggist Licence	\$ 10 p.a.	\$ 25 p.a.

The increase from \$50 to \$100 for a retailer's licence represents less than \$1 per week. But since it will be regarded as a deduction against personal and company tax, the real net increase will be less than 70¢ per week. However, I propose to permit the retailer's licence fees to be payable in four equal quarterly instalments, if the retailer so wishes.

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS

I also propose to change the fee chargeable to Commercial Travellers and Transient Traders from \$24 to \$500. The necessary amendment

will be made to the Commercial Travellers and Transient Traders Act of 1935-1. I also intend to include a provision in that statute to make it impossible for an action to be brought against a customer of a commercial traveller or transient trader unless at the time the goods were delivered or the contract made the trader or traveller was in possession of a valid licence.

Only ten traders registered last year whilst it is common knowledge that there are hundreds who descend upon this country in the words of well known poem "like the wolf from the fold", pick the countryside clean and vanish back into the haze of the Caribbean sea when the crop is over. They offer inordinately high prices and unfair competition to the businesses in Bridgetown and elsewhere who not only pay trade tax and other taxes but employ local labour as well. I don't think anyone in this House will shed a tear over that.

FEES OF OFFICE

In the 1967 budget certain fees payable to the Registrar were revised. These were patents, trade marks, company registrations, certificates of births, baptisms, marriages etc. The yield from these taxes in 1967-68 was \$100,000 as compared with \$37,000 in 1966-67. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the increased fees from trade marks which are mostly from countries resident overseas yielded an increase of \$62,000 or \$63,000. I will continue the process of revising the fees payable to the Registrar and I propose the following increases - "If you have tears, prepare to shed them now."

My statement or quotation from "Julius Caesar" was in relation to members of the same profession which we have the honour to belong to on the opposite side; but I will deal first with the medical and dental practitioners:-

Medical and Dental Registration

At present practitioners pay a fee of \$10.00 for lifetime registration. I propose a first registration fee of \$50.00 and an annual renewal fee of \$120.00.

Veterinary Surgeons

At present Veterinary surgeons pay a fee of \$5.04 for life-time registration. I also propose a first registration fee of \$50.00 and an annual renewal fee of \$120.00.

Engineers, Architects

At present engineers and architects are not required to be registered. A first registration fee of \$50.00 with a renewal fee of \$120.00 is also proposed.

Land Surveyors

At present surveyors pay a first registration fee of \$2.40 if paid in January, otherwise \$4.80. I propose a first registration fee of \$50.00 and an annual renewal fee of \$120.00.

Barristers and Solicitors

At present Barristers pay nothing. I also propose a first registration fee of \$50.00 with an annual fee of \$120.00. Fees in the same scale will be payable by Solicitors.

Druggists

Druggists at present also pay nothing. I propose a first registration fee of \$10.00 and an annual renewal fee of \$10.00. The reason for that, Sir, is that there are a lot of young druggists who are just wage earners and who cannot go into business for themselves in the same way that a barrister can hang out his shingle.

I propose that all annual registration fees shall be payable in the month of January, and if not paid within the prescribed time, a penalty equal to the amount of the fee shall be payable in addition. Full time Government Officials will be exempt from payment of professional fees.

Legitimacy Act

On the re-registration of one or two children a fee of \$1.20 is payable, for three children \$1.80 and for four or more children \$2.40. I propose a re-registration fee of \$2.00 per child. This is not really a revenue matter, Mr. Speaker, but in view of the fact that I am making certain changes in the fees payable to the Registrar, I am taking the opportunity to regularise certain anomalies which are there, not necessarily in the upward direction.

Registration of Business Names

A fee of \$1.20 is payable on registration, 60 cents on registration of an alteration and 60 cents on registration of cessation. I propose a fee of \$20.00 on registration and \$10.00 for registration of an alteration or cessation.

Registration of Newspapers

At present no fee is payable. I propose a fee of \$100.00.

Bills of Sale

A fee of 96 cents is payable on filing a Bill of Sale and 60 cents on entering satisfaction. I propose fees of \$2.00 and \$1.00 respectively.

Late Registration of Births

At present a fee of \$2.00 is payable to the Accountant General. I propose that this be amended to \$10.00 payable to the Registrar.

Notarial Executions

Under the Registration Office Act the Registrar is entitled to charge certain fees. The following increases are proposed:

	<i>Present</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
For drawing a protest on a bill, and recording same	\$ 3.00	\$ 7.50
For affixing seal of office only to any certificate and administering oath, if required	\$ 1.50	\$ 5.00
For marking each paper as an exhibit ..	\$.50	\$ 1.00
For noting a protest on a vessel ..	\$ 6.00	\$15.00
For drawing a protest for a vessel, administering oath to seamen if required, and recording same ..	\$20.00	\$50.00
For noting a protest on a bill ..	\$ 1.50	\$ 5.00
For drawing a certificate or deposition and affixing seal of office and administering oath, if required ..	\$ 5.00	\$10.00

I think you can now unfasten your seat-belts.

SUMMARY

I shall now summarise the main features of this Budget.

It is proposed –

- (1) To increase the import duties on –
 - (a) Preserved vegetables in airtight containers;
 - (b) Cider, perry and unenumerated spirits;
 - (c) Medicinal wines;
 - (d) Perfumed spirits and certain cosmetics and toilet preparations;
 - (e) Explosives;
 - (f) Certain items of cutlery;
 - (g) Safes, strong boxes, cash and deed boxes;
 - (h) Name and sign plates;
 - (i) Office machines and equipment;
 - (j) Air conditioning units, air blowers and cleaners;
 - (k) Wigs, false beards, switches.
- (2) To impose consumption duties on –
 - (a) Wines, Whisky, Gin, Brandy, Cordials and Vodka;
 - (b) Cigars and cheroots;
 - (c) Writing, copying, calculating machines, foolscap and letter paper (excluding exercise books);
 - (d) Refrigerators and refrigerating equipment;
 - (e) Stoves, cookers and furnaces;
 - (f) Accumulators, phonograph records, poles and posts;
 - (g) Manufactured gas.
- (3) To consolidate the excise and consumption duties on beer and petroleum products into a single consumption tax;
- (4) To replace the excise duty on rum by a consumption tax.
- (5) To extend the Motor Vehicles tax to station wagons and other passenger vehicles carrying not more than 15 passengers;
- (6) To increase the registration fee payable by racing service shops;
- (7) To increase still licences, licence to brew beer, petroleum warehouse and powder magazine rents;
- (8) To increase the registration fees and annual renewal fees payable by medical and dental practitioners, Veterinary surgeons, Land Surveyors, barristers, solicitors, druggists, architects and engineers and to impose such fees where none are payable at present;
- (9) To increase the fees for late registration of births and re-registration under the Legitimacy Act;

(10) To increase the fees payable for registration, alteration and cessation under the Registration of Business Names Act;

(11) To impose a fee for the registration of Newspapers;

(12) To increase the fees payable for Notarial executions;

(13) To increase Liquor Licence Fees;

(14) To increase Commercial Travellers and Transient Licence Fees.

The measures which I have outlined are expected to produce \$1.27 million made up as follows:—

Import duties	\$ 360,000
Consumption Taxes ..	625,000
Motor Vehicles tax ..	50,000
Racing Service Shops ..	64,000
Licences	8,800
Registration Fees and Notarial executions ..	53,000
Liquor Licences	100,000
Commercial Travellers ..	10,000
	<u>\$1,270,800</u>

CONCLUSION

The Budget for 1968–69 calls for expenditure of \$65.4 million — \$56.1 Current expenditure and \$9.3 Capital expenditure. The Current expenditure is \$7.5 million more than the actual expenditure for 1967–68 and the Capital expenditure \$2.8 million more than the 1967–68 expenditure (excluding the C.B.C. loan of \$2.1 million included under this head).

The estimates of revenue for the current year have been reviewed and it appears that additional revenue may be expected from certain sources. For reasons which I have already stated an additional \$750,000 is expected from income tax. Additional revenue from the airport may also be expected. The receipts from landing fees for the first two months of the current financial year are 43% of the total for 1967–68 and 40% of the estimate for the current year. Airport service charges for the first ten (10) months of operation also exceed the current year's estimate by 28%. In view of this performance and of the expanding number of scheduled flights, additional airport revenue of \$1 million may be expected. The total revenue in sight for financing of Current expenditure is \$53.98 million made up as follows:—

Approved Estimates	\$50.96 million
Budgetary measures	1.27 "
Additional receipts —	
Income tax	.75 "
Airport	1.00 "
	<u>\$53.98 million</u>

This leaves a deficit of \$2.1 million on Current Account.

Mr. Speaker, we were faced with similar situations during the past two years. In 1966–67, despite the heavy increase following the salaries revision, the net out-turn on Current Account was a modest surplus of \$400,000. In 1967–68 the deficit on the Approved Estimates was \$6.5 million. The out-turn for that year is a surplus of \$1.6 million. These

results, Mr. Speaker, as I have said on a former occasion, reinforce my faith in the ability of this country to pay its way. By this time next year I will have presented to the House a Bill to completely revise the income tax laws of Barbados. Immediately after the conclusion of this Statement I shall ask permission to deal with a Bill in all its stages to confirm the existing rates of Income Tax. The House may also look forward within a matter of weeks to a Bill to regulate Insurance Companies carrying on business in this Island. I intend also within the next twelve months to modernise our accounting and paying systems by the establishment of a computer and data-processing centre.

I have good reason to believe that after sorting out one or two mechanical difficulties, and legal points with the local banks, pensioners can receive their pensions by post either in August or at the latest in September.

The Economic Survey, as I explained at the beginning of my Statement, should be available before the end of this month. After honourable members shall have read and digested the Survey, they will no doubt arrive at much the same conclusion as I. We continue to make progress at a rate which is remarkable for a developing country which has not received a great deal of help from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I have never in the course of my Budgetary Proposals attempted to produce by taxation the precise mathematical sum which will close the gap between estimated expenditure and estimated revenue. I have always relied upon the principal of deficit budgeting to avoid a deflationary situation and to encourage consumer demand.

This year I have planned to raise additional revenue of \$1.27 million by the taxation measures I have outlined. Another \$1.7 million will accrue as a result of improved collection of inland revenue and accelerated growth in air traffic. The deficit therefore has been reduced by \$3 million (only \$1 $\frac{1}{4}$ million of which represents new taxation) to a much more manageable figure of \$2.1 million. I look forward on my next Budget day in 1969 to a situation in which we shall have surpassed by more than that amount of \$2.1 million the revenues anticipated at this time. Having eased the pressure on the middle and low income consumer, firstly by price controls and secondly by avoiding any increase in the incidence of direct or indirect taxation which might even remotely affect these groups, I hope that the business community and public officers will exercise the degree of restraint in this year of transition which is only the precursor to our next era of sweeping reform.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am about to give notice of a Resolution on which will be pegged the Budget debate. It is hardly necessary to remind Your Honour.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is precedent for it.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Yes, but it depends on the method of procedure, I am minded to say, because I have in my hand a Statement by Your Honour. I think the date it was laid was 18th February, 1964. I draw Your Honour's attention especially to paragraph 6. "It is accepted as established convention that in matters on which Standing Orders of this House are silent the procedure of the United Kingdom Parliament should prevail." And Your Honour goes on to draw attention to the Sixteenth Edition of May's Parliamentary Practice on a particular point dealing with the functions of the Clerk. I say that in order to remind hon. members that at this stage it is customary - it is convention - procedure, I should rather say, in the English Parliament to have a Resolution on which you could peg a debate in which the Opposition criticises the Government, and for that reason I am giving notice at this stage of a Resolution on the part of the Opposition which reads as follows:-

"That this House strongly condemns the Government's Financial Proposals as contained in the Ministerial Statement just made, and deplores its failure to introduce measures to reduce the high rates of interest now prevailing in this country, its failure to introduce measures to stimulate the building industry, its failure to introduce measures to reduce the high cost of living, and its failure to introduce measures to relieve the high rates of unemployment in this country."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to give notice of certain Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance is seeking leave of the House to give notice of certain Bills at this stage, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, let the Hon. and Learned member proceed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill intituled the Rate of Income Tax, 1968.

A Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Tax Act, 1960.

A Bill to amend the Racing Service (Registration of Premises) Act, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to ask leave to deal with the first Bill in all its stages at today's sitting.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (No. 2) Order, 1968.

The Consumption Tax (No. 2) Order, 1968.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to settle the Rates of Income Tax for the year 1968 and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Tax Act, 1960, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. J. C. TUDOR, a Bill to amend the Racing Services (Registration of Premises) Act, 1964, was read a first time.

6.20 p.m.

RATES OF INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I intimated earlier Mr. Soeaker, that I should like, as it is customary, to deal with the Bill to fix the rates of Income Tax in all of its stages today. I apologise to hon. members that through some mishap over which I have had no control, the Bill which is the same as that of last year, the year before and the year before that, has not been circulated to hon. members. But in view of the fact that there is no new provision and Section 2 of the Bill states that subject to the provisions of Sections 9, 10, and 11 of the Income Tax Act, 1921, and any other enactment with respect to the rates of tax on companies and on persons who subscribe any policy of insurance, other than life, the graduated rates of tax set forth in the Schedule shall be the rates at which Income Tax shall be charged, levied and collected and paid in and for the year 1968, and these rates are exactly the same as those for last year, I am asking leave to proceed with the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned Prime Minister and Minister of Finance is asking leave to proceed with this Bill, after having duly made an explanation as to the shortage of copies of it. If there is no objection, leave will be granted. (AFTER A PAUSE) There being no objection, leave is granted. Let the Hon. Minister of Finance proceed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, as I disclosed earlier today, the rates of income tax for the year 1968 are precisely the rates which were prevailing in the year 1967 and for some years before that. There is no alteration whatsoever in the rates which the taxpayers will be called upon to pay, and since the Bill is a very short one with only two Clauses and a Schedule, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, 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.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and agreed to.

On motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

6.30 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE - CURRENT No.8

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in respect of Head 16, Item 26, Commonwealth War Graves Commission, hon. members already know that \$500.00 was provided in this year's Estimates. We have received advice that the contribution should be somewhat in excess and this Resolution seeks to supplement the provision by \$104.00

I beg to move that Head 16 Item 26 stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Annexed Estimates - Post Office was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move Item 41 stand part.

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

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

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was read a first and second time and was agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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, Sir, I think that hon. members are well aware of the purpose of this Bill which is to enact certain amendments to the Town and Country Planning Act as a result of the abolition of the Local Government Councils. In addition to this, opportunity has been taken to do a certain amount of revision in order to make the Act more effective.

Hon. members may perhaps wish to ask some questions. I cannot anticipate them and I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time. If there are any points raised I will do my best to answer them.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill coming before us at this time gives me an opportunity to call the attention of the House to one or two points regarding Town and Country Planning as a whole.

Are people really taking Town and Country Planning very seriously? At the present moment the Town and Country Planning Department is badly in need of direction for its proper functioning. Mr. Speaker, Sir, time and again offences are committed by private owners, developers and the like, and the attention of the Town and Country Planning Officer might be drawn thereto; but he finds himself in the position that with the Act as it stands at present there is so much red tape that he finds himself with no effective means of dealing with them.

There is a long process in having notices and enforcements served and executed or whatever they

might call it. Throughout this island there is quite a bit of unauthorised development taking place in every parish and the Town and Country Planning Office is not properly staffed to undertake the work.

6.40 p.m.

Quite recently, I understand, they have recruited two temporary Inspectors to their staff, but even then that does not begin to touch the hem or the border of the work that is there to be done. It is so much that it is not being attended to. One officer, for instance, as I said before, has to supervise the work, that is, to carry out inspections; he has to travel; to listen to complaints and investigate them; when applications are made he has to visit the sites throughout six parishes. This is really making the Town and Country Planning Department look like a real joke.

Some people, on the other hand, make applications to carry out development, but the time that is spent waiting for permission to be granted, or your application to be refused, is creating hardships in very many respects. The point is that the Department is badly understaffed, and the few officers who are there have much more work than they can really do, and the machinery for enforcing notices is now lacking in the Town and Country Planning Officer. It seems to me that he needs some guidance, or legal assistance. The Legal Department should be at his service but, on the other hand, one might say that the advice from the Legal Department is there and it has to be sought.

I am just mentioning these things to the Leader of the House to let him understand that it is hard on the Department at the moment to bring certain irregularities under control and to have them corrected. The people who commit these offences, such as carrying out development and so on without the Department's permission, just laugh at the Department when enforcement notices are served on them.

Of course, I know how lawyers feel about these things, because they stand to benefit in the long run. The Department needs more staff; it needs more effective machinery, and it should be better equipped to serve the number of applications that are made and to expedite matters generally. I wonder if the Leader of the House would tell us what plans they have for bringing about any of these things.

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

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House into Committee on the Bill, Mr. YEARWOOD in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 24 inclusive were called and passed.

6.50 p.m.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I see that Government Business is about to come to a close, and there is a Resolution in my name relative to National Insurance, and I understood from the Hon. Minister that he is ready to deal with it. It is non-controversial; so I am asking.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the Standing Orders have not been suspended. I wonder if the hon. member would seek to put that, if it is not controversial, as the first item under Private Members' Business next time.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was asking leave of the House that we revert to Private Members' Business. It is non-controversial and the Minister is ready to deal with it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we can dispose of it in the time at our disposal. There is only five minutes left before dinner, and we would have to suspend and come back. The position is that it is going to take more than five minutes to deal with it because I want to explain the provisions of the Act to the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I venture the suggestion that it be accorded high priority in Private Members' Business in fixing the Order Paper for next meeting.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was thinking that next Tuesday would be used for the reply to the Budgetary Proposals. This is non-controversial, and I am asking leave of the House to revert to Private Members' Business, and we can dispose of this matter in five minutes' time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew has given a clear intimation that he is going to speak - he has not said at length.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, let us dispose of it now. It would not take longer than five or ten minutes.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says it is not controversial. The position is that the hon. member is asking for an amendment to legislation. I cannot agree to the amendment, but I have an explanation for the hon. member on it; so it may be controversial in the end if he does not accept my explanation. I think we should leave it until we can discuss it and thresh it out. I would see no reason why it ought to be after I explain to the hon. member what the position is, but it will take some time, and I have a draft reply to the hon. member prepared. I think the hon. member could let us deal with it next Tuesday and get rid of it under Private Members' time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Opposition indicate their preferences in respect of their business?

Mr. SMITH: Believe me, sir, we started at 2.30 p.m. If it is a question that we have to suspend the sitting for dinner, let us do so and come back and finish this, because I am quite willing to work. I accommodated the Government, and the Government can accommodate me. Last Tuesday we were here from 12 noon until nearly midnight.

Mr. SPEAKER: And we have not forgotten what happened.

Mr. SMITH: The Minister has already informed me that he is ready to deal with it, and now he is asking me to put it off until another time. What I will do is to do it my way even if I am out-voted.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The net result is that Standing Orders not having been suspended, this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m.
7.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

NO QUORUM - ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention.

On the Bell being rung for two minutes, and there being no quorum present,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being more than two minutes after the hour for which this Sitting was suspended, and there being no quorum present, I declare that this House stand adjourned until Tuesday of next week at 12 o'clock (Noon).
7.48 p.m.