

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14th October, 1958.

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

PRESENT

His Honour Mr K N R HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr L. E. SMITH, J., (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER; Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. C. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

Hon. R. G. MAPP entered the House and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 22) Order, 1958.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 23) Order, 1958.

Approved Estimates for the financial year, 1958-59.

Mr. F. G. SMITH and Mr. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

PETITION

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to present a Petition from the Highway Commissioners of the Parish of St. James, praying the House to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways of the said parish. The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Resolution approving the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 22) Order, 1958";

Resolution approving the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 23) Order, 1958";

An Act to amend the Treasury Bills (Local) Act, 1922.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. James to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill to amend the Treasury Bills (Local) Act, 1922 was read a first time.

On motion of Mr. HOLDER, seconded by Mr. SEARLES, the Bill to authorise the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of St. James to increase the salary of the Inspector of Highways was read a first time.

Mr. BRANCKER REFERS TO PRINTING OF MINUTES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the meeting is further proceeded with, may I take this opportunity to refer to the continued absence of our printed Minutes. Sir, it is definitely not good enough that meeting after meeting you have to explain to this House, and no doubt to your considerable embarrassment, that the Minutes are not ready for confirmation. I am reliably informed that it is no fault of any official of this House and our Clerks are doing their duty and doing it expeditiously. It is the fault of the Government Printery. There is something wrong and I must appeal to the Cabinet and that Minister of the Cabinet who is connected with the Printing Department of Government to see to it that this House is not treated in this shabby way by being continually deprived of the opportunity of having its Minutes in time and having them confirmed.

12.25 p.m.

As you know, Sir, with regard to the average Board when members meet and there are no Minutes available, more often than not they decide to postpone the meeting until the Minutes are ready. I cannot recall how long ago it is since last I have been the fortunate recipient of a copy of the Minutes of this House. It seems to me that the Government Printer does not regard this House very seriously because other work is being done but the Minutes of the Elected Chamber are the object of complete disregard apparently by the Government Printer. Last Thursday we had our first meeting after an adjournment for four weeks and even then, although the Government Printer had that length of time, the Order Paper of this House was presented to us in cyclostyled form and not in printed form. Today the Order Paper is again cyclostyled and I know that the reason which will be given for that is that we met last Thursday and there was not enough time between Thursday and today to have the Order Paper printed. However, there was time between

the adjournment of this House for four weeks and the resumption for the Government Printer to pay attention to the printing of the work of this House. I hope that this state of affairs will not continue to happen; the work of this House is being badly done or it is not being done at all by the Government Printery.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, as far as the Order Paper for the meeting of the House for the 9th of this month is concerned, I should like to say that I, myself, was a bit worried because I did not receive my Order Paper. I got in touch with the Clerk of the House and he informed me that he had arranged with the Government Printer not to have the Order Paper printed, that he was prepared to cyclostyle it and send it around to hon. members. Therefore, that is absolutely no fault of the Government Printer. I cannot say why the Minutes are not before us today but I do know that the item on which the hon. member has just spoken - the cyclostyling of the Order Paper for today's meeting - was done on the advice of the Clerk.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The first 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 colony.

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

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 22

HEAD XXV - PUBLIC WORKS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution for the sum of \$12,750. It is a Supplementary Resolution under two Heads and I propose to deal with these Heads separately. The first Head is Head XXV - Public Works. Under this Head the amount of \$11,000 is required to pay for the rehabilitation and modernisation of houses at the Garrison. These houses are the property of the Government, they are considered to be old buildings and they are in a very bad state of disrepair. It has been pointed out that for sometime these houses have not been properly repaired and apparently piece-meal repairs have been done to them from time to time. These buildings are now being modernised in order to ensure that the quarters will be more comfortable and that future maintenance costs will be reduced.

As you know Sir, there are more and more staff, not only overseas but local, who are asking for Government houses. It is more or less the policy of the Government to accommodate these officers wherever and whenever we can do so by supplying Government houses. No funds are available for doing this work and this supplementary provision of \$11,000 is now required for the purpose. I beg to move that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, while I am in agreement with this money being spent for the repair of these flats, what is engaging and motivating my mind is whether only these two lettings Nos. 8 and 11 are in need of urgent repairs. I feel that the time has come when not only these two lettings should be repaired but when most of these Government buildings around the Garrison Savannah, which have been used as flats for Government employees and officials, should be taken in hand and repaired and not

allowed to run to ruin. If more time elapses, the repairs will have to be done at a much greater expense and at a burden to the taxpayers. I am therefore suggesting that a comprehensive report should be made on these buildings around the Garrison Savannah or wherever they may be, because from what I have seen quite recently, many of these flats are not in any proper state of repair, and they have not got the necessary conveniences and amenities which are necessary for present-day standards. In these building officials, some of them of a high calibre, are housed; they are expected to live there for three or five years and even longer than that, and I am suggesting that, instead of effecting repairs to two or three flats, the Government should see whether there are not more of these buildings which, if not repaired at once, will entail greater expense in the future.

That is a timely warning and I feel that buildings which are essential for Government Officials to live in, should be kept in a habitable condition, be modernised and given all the necessary amenities and conveniences which present-day standards demand.

The question that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

12.35 p.m.

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Item 28, Sir, is for the sum of \$1,500 for installing telephones in certain offices which have been recently created. This is for the establishment of a Cabinet Office; the removal of Education Department to its new premises; the expansion of staff and accommodation of the Treasury Department; the installation of a larger P.A.B.X. at the Prison; the establishment of a Ministry of Education; and installation and rental charges on additional telephones approved for the Labour Department (Employment Exchange) and Fire Brigade.

I think everybody will agree that a telephone today is a necessity and every office should be equipped with one.

In addition, there is Item 76, the note to which reads as follows:-

"As stated in His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 19/1957 of 9th December, 1957, the presentation by Barbados of a suitable gift for use in the Federal House of Representatives has been the subject of consultation between the Federal Government and the Governments of the Unit territories.

The detailed plans for the furniture of the Federal Legislative Chambers have been settled and this Government has been asked to donate the President's chair, the cost of which is estimated at \$250."

This was more or less agreed to in principle in response to the Governor's Message No. 19/1957. I think every Barbadian will be proud to know that Barbados has done its share in the furnishing of the Federal Legislature.

I beg to move that Head XXIX - Miscellaneous stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member for St. Thomas to the necessity in these modern days of telephones. Let me again remind him that there is no such apparatus at District "E" Police Court in the Parish of St. Peter. The District "E" Police Court sits in a separate building from the District "E" Charge Room; there is a telephone in the Charge Room which is about 100 yards from the Court, and there is extreme difficulty in getting a message from that telephone to the Court on necessary matters upon which it is essential to telephone and noti-

fy the Court or on any business in connection with the Court. May I through you urge the Cabinet, as they are now installing and increasing telephone services, not to continue to leave out District "E". That is a district which is represented by no less a person than the Speaker and the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, and after all, one cannot understand the reason why that parish and the public in it should be subject to such gross neglect; it is incomprehensible to me.

I hope we will not have again to point out that. Of course, those hon. members who represent the parish have no business in the Court, and I hope they will forgive me for taking the wind out of their sails and referring to this particular point, because it affects some of us who do not represent St. Peter, but who have to go there and represent our households and our duties, even more than it affects the members for the constituency. Do not let us have to go on until the next Estimates. You Mr. Chairman, with your influence with this Government can put a telephone in the District E Police Court.

The question that Head XXX - Miscellaneous stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for \$12,750 do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1958-59 No. 23

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, hon. members will see that this Resolution is for the sum of \$33,513. The sum of \$20,761 is to supplement the sum of \$78,800 already provided for reinstatement of the Runway at Seawell. The provision in the Estimates for the previous year was expended in October, 1957, and the Supplementary provision was not available until 5th December. It was not possible fully to expend the Supplementary provision by the end of March, 1958, and the sum of \$39,660 lapsed.

As members will read from the Addendum, we have now estimated that at the present rate of progress the sum of \$99,561 will be needed to carry on this work to the 31st March, 1959, and, as an amount of only \$78,800 had been provided in the Current Estimates, an additional sum of \$20,761 is now required. The reason why we only provided \$78,800 in the Estimates was because that was all that remained in the Five Year Plan, 1955-60. I should like to inform hon. members that the allocation was \$342,000 plus an estimated sum of \$31,800 to meet increased wages from the 1st April, 1956.

I would be only too pleased to give the Committee any other information which it requires.

So far as the reconstruction of the Taxiway is concerned, the Addendum sets it out very clearly. \$102,752 lapsed at the end of the Financial Year, and we asked for \$90,000 and have come back for the remainder of \$102,752. I think members who have been to Seawell would have been impressed by the rate of progress being made by the Department both in the reinstatement of the Runway and the reconstruction of the Taxiway. A lot of the difficulty is due to the bad nature of the work previously done on the Runway under a former contractor. We have had, therefore, a lot of trouble in this reinstatement. The work is progressing satisfactorily and I have no doubt that the Committee will agree to passing these additional funds.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to hear the Minister say that what is responsible for a lot of this money being spent was the bad work which had been done previously by a former contractor. If that was

not said, I was going to ask what is taking place, because the extent of the bad work that had been done has not fully revealed, and it was work that at one time had been praised. I want to say that there are more investigations apart from the bad work, because I know privately, though the Minister has not told us, how many things have been stolen, missing or have disappeared from the various Departments which come under the heading of Communications. I want to know to what extent the Police have been working on certain things.

12.45 p.m.

This hide-and-seek method of public funds and what has been taking place should not go on. We want to know if you are carrying out departmental investigations into the things which have been missing from time to time either at the Department of Highways and Transport or at Seawell, because that is in the public interest. I am saying here today that it is known that goods have been missing from these places from time to time such as cement, and it is said that some of the difficulties which they encounter when they miss cement is that the cement does not carry a mark H. & T. and, therefore, it is difficult to prosecute somebody. We want to know how much has been missing from the Department of Highways and Transport in the last two or three years, so that we can get an idea of when you put money down to the expenditure of that Department, say it is \$90,000, how much of that goes in things that are missing. I do not think this community can afford it.

The Hon. Minister said that members who visit Seawell would be impressed with the work that has been going on there. I am impressed, but another thing has shocked me. It is this; the workmen who have been required to go to Seawell to work are deprived of the needs of having the opportunity of buying from the Canteen there anything that can approximate to what are the working class rates for buying food. It has been drawn to my attention that the Director of Civil Aviation has refused people coming there to sell bread and fish and things of that sort which the workmen can use. There is no point in carrying workmen at Seawell which is not an industrial area and where there is no shop in the area where workmen can go and buy a meal at the conventional prices they pay. I understand a workman can get a breakfast in town for 50¢ or 75 cents, but they are called upon to pay a rate for breakfast at Seawell which you can call an Airport rate.

Sir, you are doing public works at Seawell. Please allow these people, if the caterer cannot do it or if it does not pay him to do it, to go inside there in a way with things to sell so that the workmen there can get something to eat. Do not regard Seawell as an area where workmen can go and get their meals at conventional prices. Seawell is ten miles from Bridgetown and it is not an industrial area or a place where people would go to provide meals for workmen. You send a man there to work and you give him \$13.20 a week. It is not a district where the Public Works Department can possibly get people from the surrounding area to do the job, and I am asking you to look into that matter.

I am also asking the Hon. Minister to look into another matter. There are cantoniers in this Island - and I am raising this point though it does not come under the Resolution - who work in very far places from their homes. I feel provision should be made for these sort of workmen to have some sort of allowance. When you take a man from St. Andrew to work in St. James you should give him an allowance from the point of view that he has to travel out of his area. I say that, because the rates which you are paying to these workmen cannot connote to anything which the average worker can afford to pay for these things. We do not want to be proud of the Airport as such and of the buildings which you are erecting there; we want to be proud to know that the wages which we are paying provide a living wage for those persons who carry out work there. I do know that some of us are proud of buildings and the edifices which are put up with slave labour, but some of us cannot be proud of having

men working on these buildings who are getting nothing to speak of. I feel the workers should be given better treatment. This whole slave mentality must cease. There is the feeling that a certain type of man who has to work anywhere must get along anyhow, because God so provided that that type of man can carry on in that way by carrying along with him to his work a skillet with stewed dumplings or some sort of thing like that for his breakfast which can only mash up the human system. We must put a stop to that whole idea and I am going to do all I can to assist in removing that idea. I am going to agitate about it until you reach a line of positive resistance against this antediluvian system. I do hope that whoever is in charge of this matter will realise that you cannot take men up to Seawell without providing anything for them and ask them to pay a rate for their meals which would outstrip their own pockets. If you charge at Seawell \$1.20 for a meal and a workman has to buy at that price for six days, he would be paying \$7.20 for his meals up there; therefore, you cannot ask him to go home with the balance to his wife, because there would be nothing for her. Let us get away from this idea of a workman putting his food in a salmon tot the evening before to serve his breakfast next day.

Sir, I raise this point now because it has been drawn to my attention. I feel that it is my duty to say it and whoever is displeased about it, let them get up and say that it is not true. Something may be going on for the last hundred years, but there is a time when it must be stopped. This is an occasion when this sort of thing should be stopped.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Sir, I think the last hon. member who has spoken is a bit confused. I heard him rambling a bit. He referred to the runway which was put up by a previous contractor, and I do not know whom he meant. I do not know if he meant the time when that work was done when he was on the Government. If that is so, he should have talked about it before. Mr. James was brought down here to investigate that work at the time and the hon. member was instrumental in bringing down Mr. James. Now, he is getting up on the housetop and saying loudly that we should remedy it. I say that he should have remedied it.

Sir, I think he has gone astray. Let him shout on the housetop that he should have remedied it. Nobody is trying to keep anything hidden. If anybody can be accused of that, he is the person who can be accused of that. The hon. member must get his facts correct.

Sir, I am very sorry that I have not heard all this complaint which the hon. member spoke about the canteen before now; otherwise, I would have gone into it. I never heard anything about it whatsoever. (Mr. WALCOTT: You hear it now.) If this complaint was existing all the time, I think that it is a pity that it was not drawn to Government's attention before, and the hon. member could have done it by way of a question.

This method is surely reprehensible. What is the sense of getting up today and bawling to the top of your voice about antediluvian practices and slave mentality when these things could be settled with a bit of goodwill? If this were brought to the Government's notice, surely, we could have gone into the matter, but until this day, I have never heard that the workers at Seawell had any complaint about this matter. No approach was made to me whatsoever, not even privately.
12.55 p.m.

No approach whatever has been made to me about this matter so that I could investigate it; but, like a bolt from the blue today, for the first time I am hearing that the workers are dissatisfied with the canteen arrangements made up there. As I have said already, this is the first time I have heard that. I do not know on whose part the slavish mentality exists, but certainly it does not exist over here. We have had the honour of a visit by Mr. Mash and one of the things he said was that he was pleased to see the system which we had set up and he made reference to the Post Office. We have more security of tenure

for the workers than they have in Trinidad. In the Post Office in Trinidad the workers do not have this security of tenure. I ask: is that a slavish mentality? How long have we become antediluvian in our policy? Apparently, we were quite modern and progressive up to 1954, but quite suddenly we have become antediluvian.

The hon. member has referred to the wages paid to the employees at Seawell. These rates are not special rates; they were fixed by the House following Mr. Godsall's Report and they are rates which are paid in common with those paid to other Civil Servants. We have been hearing, and we do appreciate these things, that since these rates have been fixed, the cost of living has gone up and that is a matter which is engaging the attention of this Government forcibly. We have a lot of major works in progress; we have the Deep Water Harbour and other major works being carried out and we cannot pick out the employees at Seawell and pay attention to them alone. We will have to pay attention to all the workers and that is a matter on which we cannot come to any hurried decision because it will affect the whole programme of capital and recurrent expenditure. We are paying the matter very great and immediate attention; for anyone to say that we are not paying any attention to it, that statement would be untrue. We know that in relation to the jump in the cost of living, what we have paid out by the Godsall Report is not now a real wage. These wages have been cut tremendously since we paid out what Mr. Godsall recommended; nevertheless, this Committee will appreciate that this is a matter which is a budgetary matter and we have to come down with proposals relating to the entire Civil Service and not only in relation to the employees at Seawell. This is a matter about which the House will know at a later stage; I do wish the Committee to understand that we are going into these matters and paying them the attention which they deserve. I do not think that there is anything else which the hon. member has said, apart from those ranting criticisms, which I should answer.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have to let the Hon. Minister understand quite clearly that my rantings are as a result of the choice of the electorate. I am not flying in any false colours; what I am in this House, I was that man outside the House. The people elected me knowing what kind of man I am; they have elected me to this Chamber when hon. members on that side and the same Hon. Minister were telling the people not to do so. Therefore, do not let the hon. Minister go back to 1954 when we are going to hear that I was a member of the Executive Committee. It is now nearly five years since I have been of the Executive Committee and I will say that I was never a Minister. In one breath they say how powerful they are as Ministers and in the next breath they say something which is different and they say that I was a Minister too. At one time they tell the people that you are vexed because you are not a Minister and in the next breath they say that you were a Minister. You can see the honesty of that statement. My rantings will continue because the people who have sent me here have elected me to rant for them. If the hon. Minister thinks that I am one of those who look to them for favours - I do not go to them for any favours privately or otherwise. What business have I got going to them privately for anything? I repudiate anything about meeting any Minister privately; those who want to meet the Minister privately are those who want to have favours. I am above any Minister's favours; I do not want any favours from any of them. Imagine the statement made by the Minister that if you are in Parliament and you raise a matter you are making a wrong approach and that Parliament is the wrong place for doing that! How the matter was interpreted was that we are not entitled to come in here with these things. If we are not entitled to raise these matters in here where are we entitled to raise them?

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On a point of order. The hon. member is accusing me of saying a lot of things which I have not said. I have not said that the hon. member should not or could not raise these matters in this House; all I have said is that I have not heard about this matter

before today. I said that if the workers were suffering under these grievances all this time then such grievances should have been brought to me and I would have paid attention to them.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister does not seem to remember what he has said. He cannot accuse anybody else of making any wrong approach to this matter; I was dealing with this matter, the workers were not dealing with it. The hon. member has made mention of Mr. James; who is Mr. James that I brought down here? What power would I have to bring down Mr. James or Mr. Peter? If the hon. member means that the construction of the runway was started when I was a member of the Executive Committee that would be so, but I was not there when it was finished. What am I to do with the fact that you made a contract with somebody to build an airstrip when I was on the Executive Committee and it subsequently proved to be a bad job? I say that it was a bad job and I am happy to ask questions about it.

1.05 p.m.

Were you not repairing Seawell for the last five years? Is it not a fact that you have been working on the same middle strip? You would think, Mr. Chairman, that this job was done by a friend of mine from the way the Minister talked. I do not have any friends in the Government Service to whom to give jobs, nor do I promise to put them in any job; so do not tell me that I brought down Mr. James. I do not know who is Mr. James. The Ministers today have authority to bring people in because they have authority to say whether they require someone. If you regard the point I raised as a criticism, I make no apology for it; it is not a criticism of any person. What the Minister has not said is what is the position with regard to losses in his Department in relation to the things which we purchased to use in that Department. Is it a fact that some of these matters have been drawn to the attention of the Police? Is it a fact that you have losses and that no prosecution has been made? Are you afraid to say these things?

The hon. member talked about being reprehensible. If you read these things in a newspaper, you cannot come here and tell a member that what he talks is reprehensible when he raises matters of public interest. The hon. member is asking how something could be wrong today when it was not wrong some time ago. What I am talking about was drawn to my attention on Saturday. Did he want me to come to his home on Saturday or Sunday? I do not keep pigs for me to go looking for pig-food. God forbid that I should go to his home. If I must see any Minister, it must be on a public basis. I see the Ministers when I am dealing with my functions as a Trade Unionist. I do not see them privately because there is nothing between us. Here is the place for me to deal with public business. I have been elected here for that purpose, and not on any other basis than to come here and express these things. He said it has not been drawn to his attention. Could I have brought it to his attention before even if I so cared? In view of the fact that this matter has come here, I have raised it now so that the Minister can investigate. Does he understand that in Barbados Ministers are regarded as employers? Some of the poor men who work are afraid to draw it to somebody's attention feeling that they would lose their job.

When he talks about Mr. Mash, Mr. Mash does not know more about Barbados than I do; he does not know as much about directing Trade Union matters, and if he says the comparison between Barbados and Trinidad is that in unestablished groups you have more people being given permanent employment than in Trinidad which recognises Trade Unions for dealing with these things - a matter which this Government has not done - I should like the Trade Union to represent these people. They have not done so, and so you have this bogus Civil Service Association.

The point I raised was not a question of not giving them security of employment. If a cantonnier is working out of his district, would it be something wrong to give him an allowance in view of the fact that he is required

to go long distances? As you know, in travelling from St. Andrew to St. Thomas or St. James, there is no cross-country bus service and therefore you will realise the inconvenience of the poor people who have to get up at 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock each morning to get to work at 7.30 a.m. or 8 a.m. in another district. You give some of the poor drivers a travelling allowance, but for such persons who have to move around, you do not do it because of the question of finance. Are you going to say that finance is a means to giving less conditions of employment than are reasonable and right? The question has been raised as to whether it is Government's policy to go into wages and cost of living, because when the matter was raised in 1956, those of us who sat over here did not talk about agreeing. We did not agree with the amount that came down, and in my own view in 1956, I regarded \$15 a week as something for which to fight. There is no point in referring to what I said before, because whatever I say today can be compared with anything I said prior to 1954. I am not saying anything today because I am looking for something; I have passed the stage of having to please any single person in life in a political way. In 1954 he became a Minister, and from that day it is his duty when matters are raised to look into them. He should not say that I have no right raising these matters and saying that it is reprehensible. When I come here, it is not at their good wishes. I am coming because I have a right to be here and because I have been elected here through the people who know what kind of man I am. I am not flying in false colours. I want to see the men working but I do not know the conditions. I am not a busy-body; so I do not have to leave Bridgetown to go to Seawell to interfere with the workers there. It is not my job to go to various work establishments to interfere. It is my duty that if something is brought to my attention and I regard it as reasonable, to raise it, and that is why I said it has been drawn to my attention that the workers at Seawell cannot procure meals. Some of them carry their food, but others would like to purchase something in the canteen and cannot do it. The Manager at Seawell has prohibited certain people from entering Seawell from the point of view of their making purchases. These anti-diluvian practices should be removed; there are a lot that go on and they should be removed. The idea of taking workers from one place and sending them to another is something we have to stop. We agreed to give transport in some instances because it was going on before, so there is nothing wrong.

Suppose in 1954 we had agreed to bring down Mr. James - and at that time I was a member of the Executive - and he did a bad job, is it not somebody's duty to say whether or not it was a bad job? He is not my brother or friend, so do not say that I brought somebody and now I am saying something else.

1.15 p.m.

Has that anything to do with any issue before us? It is the same kind of argument which was trotted out since 1938 and 1939. We should be able to deal with an issue as it arises from time to time and this talk of going back on matters which happened years ago is one of our major dangers. It is stupid argument your going back and quoting something which happened twenty years ago when dealing with something which is in season now. You had better say, let the Ministers work under the same conditions under which they worked in 1938.

Let us cut this nonsense out that it should have been drawn to you in a different way. I want to say from my seat that I want the Hon. Minister to cut this idea out that any member owes it as a right to come to them privately to draw something to their attention. If I had to lead a delegation on some matter, - of course, I would do that. This is Parliament and this is the place where you should air matters. Say that to your friends; that is for your friends who want you to do something for them. They may do so and, therefore, you may go and help them, but so far as I am concerned, I do not want any Minister to help me. So far as airing anything concerning the public interest, I am not looking for any assistance from any Minister.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE HOTELS AIDS BILL 1958

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Hotel Aids Act, 1956.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill which seeks to amend the Hotels Aids Act, 1956, in keeping with the Government's policy as hon. members will remember, in the first Five Year Plan, the Government said then that the Government recognises that the tourist industry was an important factor in the development of the economy of the Island, not only as regards hotels, but in almost every avenue of employment and that the Government is willing to consider representations which may be made to encourage the industry. Consequently upon that, a Bill was passed which gave certain concessions to persons who were prepared to construct new hotels or to make additions to existing hotels. We have made it possible that materials for the construction of these hotels would be brought into the Island free of duty and I think today about 124 licences have been granted to persons for the bringing in of such materials duty free and things of that sort.

In recent days - I think sometime at the end of 1956 - the Hotel Association made certain representations to the Government for further concessions and those concessions asked for were in the nature of the extension of the common definition of hotels to include any group of separate buildings of not less than ten bedrooms, relief on trade tax and money spent on acquiring and installing any plant or machinery, the setting up by the Minister of a Licensing Board of not more than eight members and a further list of equipment to be added to those items - building material and machinery and plant which may be imported free of customs duty and package tax; the provision of air-conditioning equipment and of any public accommodation; duty free importation of machinery and plant to be installed, and so on. Those were some of the items requested by the Association. The Government examined this request and agreed to some of these concessions requested by the Association. We agreed, for example, Sir, to extend the definition of hotel to include any group of separate buildings of seven or eight or so bungalows provided that those buildings have a common kitchen and dining room for the guests. We also agreed to exempt the hotel industry from trade tax. One of the reasons was because they had represented to the Government that in the various parishes the rates varied considerably. I think between St. Philip and St. James, the rates are the highest.

1.25 p.m.

The Government agreed to include in the Bill a provision whereby expenditure could be set off against Trade Tax, just as the position is in the 1956 Bill in which expenditure could be set off against Income Tax. There were quite a lot of items such as bedsteads, linens and things of that sort which the Government was not willing to allow to come in duty free because of the risk involved. However, after carefully considering the matter and realising that if we want to encourage tourists to come to this island we would have to compete against places like Trinidad and

Jamaica - we would have to offer almost equal facilities and concessions to persons who are interested in the industry - we would have to do these things in order to get tourists to come here - the Government has agreed to allow those items which hon. members will find in the Schedule of the Bill to be brought in duty free. I should like to add at this stage that as hon. members will see in Clause 11 of the Bill, the Government proposes to allow the initial requirements duty free, but in so far as replacements are concerned, they will not be subject to duty-free treatment. The Ministry will be concerned with finding out what perhaps might be the minimum requirements of furniture and otherwise, and when that is done the Comptroller of Customs will be instructed to allow only that amount to be brought in duty free. That is in so far as those items which are listed in the first Schedule to the Bill which is now before us are concerned.

Provision is also made where, in case a hotelier has to purchase an item, whether it is a question of urgency or not, an item which is already in the island and on which duty has already been paid, that hotelier will be given a refund of the duty paid on that item, provided of course, that the item was not brought into the island for longer than one year.

The points which I have made are more or less the main points in this Bill. As I have already mentioned the definition of "hotel" is made clearer and it is defined as "any building or group of buildings occupied together containing or intended to contain when completed not less than ten bedrooms for the accommodation for reward of guests and include the curtilage thereof and all structures within such curtilage; but does not include any building or group of buildings, curtilages and structures as aforesaid forming the whole or any part of the premises of a club." This definition follows that which is in general use embracing hotels of a more recent kind consisting of bungalows, cottages etc., provided that in the case of the later type the following requirements are satisfied; these buildings must have ten bedrooms and constitute a single entity. That is apparently intended by the expression "occupied together." They must have a central kitchen containing facilities and the occupants must be paying guests and not tenants. There must be no leasing or tenancy agreement. The definition of "guests" applies to those persons who are living and paying rates of so much per day as the case may be, not anybody who may be here for six months and who leases a building and occupies it with his servants and so on. Such a building cannot qualify for these concessions which are offered under this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is necessary for me to say much more on this Bill at this stage. As I have already mentioned, under this Bill although we do not grant everything or although we are not quite as liberal as they are in Jamaica or in Trinidad, yet we are very close to Jamaica and Trinidad in our liberality towards the hotel industry in Barbados. If there are any questions which hon. members would like to ask I am quite ready and willing to answer them. Perhaps before I sit down I should say, as I have said from the floor of this House on several occasions already, that I was one of those persons who were not frightfully keen on granting certain concessions to the hotel industry and, of course, I have taken that stand for reasons which are obvious. There is no doubt that we would hate to have this country become another Bermuda or Bahamas; we know that in developing tourism people who have good as well as bad habits will come into the country.

1.35 p.m.

For what we have seen as well as heard of these two countries so far as discrimination and the treatment meted out to the natives by strangers which is upheld by the influential natives of the country are concerned, we say we do not want Barbados to be like those countries.

We have had the privilege and the right given to us by the electors of this country to run the Government. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we will see to it that in the development of tourism in this country, these bad, vicious practices which are meted out to natives in other countries

such as The Bahamas and Bermuda are not practised on our people in Barbados. I am not saying that the people of Barbados are much different from other people, but while it is true that some people in other places are quite anxious to have money at all costs and at any price, the people in Barbados have a sense of pride and dignity which cannot be bought or subdued by any stranger. The people of Barbados like to walk with their heads in the air and not be pushed around by strangers, or for that matter by anybody, and therefore we must preserve our position and press forward until there is complete self-determination in this country.

When it comes to tourism, Sir, while we encourage it and are prepared to do as much as we feel necessary and possible to encourage it, on the other hand, if anything such as discrimination pushes its ugly head up, we are prepared to hit it very hard indeed. I would like it to be known by those who are in the industry that with this assistance which the Government is prepared to give, the people who are employed must not be subjected to the old system of depending on tips for their wages. It is true that we have been told on many occasions that the domestics who work in these places are very difficult to organise; that may be so and for that reason advantage may be taken of them. As far as I am concerned and as long as I have anything to do with this Ministry and this Government - that will be a long time in spite of the wishes of my friends or enemies - I am prepared to press this industry to pay reasonable wages to those people who have to work all sorts of long hours.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said most of what I wanted to say on this Bill. I feel as I have said earlier, that we have got to fall in line with other places so far as these concessions are concerned, and although it may appear to some people that this Bill is belated, on the other hand, it is far better in my opinion to be a little slow in doing a thing and then doing it the right and proper way, than to run ahead and do it the wrong way. Now that we have seen things for ourselves, we are convinced that we must encourage this industry as we had set out in our Five Year Plan in order to assist in boosting the economy of this island to the benefit of the many people who are here and the many more who are to come.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would have heard a different speech. After admonishing the hotel industry, the Minister again voiced a lot of old time ideas of the old Conservatives where they wanted to take care of everything in the community. As a Minister he wants to take care of providing the hotel people with money to run their business, and at the same time he wants to take care of the workers and their wages, as well as taking care of the Government. So therefore Government is interested in the hotel industry and in the workers' interest. That is all right from the point of view of ordinary political propaganda, but for it to mean anything economical, it would have to be examined. The Government cannot take care of all these interests because it would be too busy with its own interests to find the time.

It is surprising to see that in 1958 someone is introducing a Hotel Industry Bill and talking about a Wages Council. I believe that this Bill is likely to help a Wages Council which I understand is in the making, because 380 acres of land known as Sandy Lane will be sold, and a new hotel will be put up there. In the industry now as it stands, you have negotiations going on, so if you take one industry and use it with another, do not tell us about a Wages Council, because in the Sugar Industry and the major industries in this island, we do not talk about a Wages Council; we talk about negotiations for people's wages, and that is what any modern Socialist would ask for. No Socialist would talk about a Wages Council because Wages Councils only deal with minimum wages. There are millions of dollars in the industry, and before you tell people

to get together in a proper organisation, you say you are going to see to their interests through a Wages Council. That is an indication of the mentality of the present Minister in so far as labour matters are concerned. He is one of those people who is wedded to the idea that he must take care of all of these things.

In a general way, Mr. Speaker, one would agree to the amendment, because from what is taking place in Barbados today, if you do not industrialise this country, it means that our position will be worse in the next ten years, and we will not even be able to maintain the present low standards which we have at present.
1.45 p.m.

Now that I am on this subject, I am very glad to see that the question of giving aid is being introduced in this Bill, because I was of that opinion years ago. I am a free trade man, but I realise that for certain colonial economy - and I do not want to anticipate my own debate on the Resolution which I have brought in here - colonial territories, have been placed on this type of financing, because it suited the powers that be in those days. Sir, I do not believe a country loses anything in finance by providing rebate in customs duties and things of that sort on something that is not there because it does not deplete the economy which you already have there. All it does is to pump more into your economy in the course of time and that is why I am a believer in giving these incentives. If I may say this, I go a little further than the Government. The Government's method of dealing with economic and financial matters is a bit too slipshod and casual for me. There is no co-ordinating policy. You are dealing with hotels and there are many aspects of Barbadian life, agricultural development and other industrial developments, in so far as aids which you can give to assist in such development. I am saying that you should revamp your policy in order that your economic stability may be improved and provide for people who are likely to lose employment as a result of modern trends and development.

I am giving my support to this Bill and I take this opportunity to bring this to the notice of the Government. I am not opposed as such to the Hotel Industry having this aid, but what I would like to draw to your attention, is that even the project which I have just mentioned of what is regarded as the Sandy Lane project I am not opposed to that either as such, but I want a thorough examination of these things. If the Sandy Lane project is going to be an industrial project, it is swapping one industry for another and you do not know to what extent this one for which you are going to exchange it would bring benefits equal to the other project. I am not dealing with the Sandy Lane Factory as a Factory, but may be, both hon. members for St. James, though I believe more particularly the hon. junior member for St. James, when it comes to certain elements it does not matter to them what is being done as long as those people disappear - I am not thinking so much of the owners of the factory but the project in its economic setting.

I am told by the Government that when it comes to agricultural undertakings, the Government finds it very difficult to agree that any agricultural undertakings should be utilised for purposes other than agricultural purposes. Now, this proposed Sandy Lane project is not going to use only a piece of the Sandy Lane Land, but I understand that it is going to use up 383 acres which are partly all of the beach land.

In a general way, I feel that a large hotel with the amenities of modern hotels could be of use to Barbados, but I want to be clear of its location, site, and so. If you say that agricultural land should be protected, you should not on the other hand say that it should be put into use for the Hotel Industry.

I would ask the Government to expand on what is known as the Development Corporation. Do not mind copying this from other countries like Jamaica and Puerto Rico. This Development Corporation setup is a big ad-

ministration of various projects being done, each one having its own head. The Agricultural Industry is put under one Head, the Hotel Industry under another and any such industry which you have are put under a Head, and these Heads give authority at the various levels, but the authority is guaranteed at the top by the top authority so that your whole economic policy or planning is streamlined under one Head and there is no question of your not knowing what is your whole economic planning. That is why I say that the Government needs an economic expert if you are revamping your economic policy and you are going to focus your attention to economic development. Get an economic expert to assist you even if you get one seconded to you from the United Nations. I say that, because I do not know - and the Hon. Minister did not say - what is the capacity for your hotel development in Barbados. All of these are things about which you must know. We should know the extent to which you are going to invest in these various projects, because in Puerto Rico, they do not allow any one group to have all the investments. All the various plans are subjected to an overall supervision. If the Hon. Minister of Trade is saying that they are doing this after they have looked at all sides of the question, then I ask him to look carefully. I introduced the Puerto Rico Development policy to the Barbados Government, because Puerto Rico is in this area and the country was once an agricultural community though it has shifted from being an agricultural community into an industrial community. The example is there for you to see, and I think it can be very important to us.

I do not know if the Hon. Minister of Trade has read the Report by the Committee which went into the Deep Water Harbour question as regards a Port Authority. I understand that the Committee submitted a Report to him and that is an indication to show what I meant by looking into these projects. I agree with the industrial development which this Committee submitted in its Report. It states the number of people who are likely to lose employment and likely to be employed by the Deep Water Harbour. It states that in 1957, the number of people employed was 2,948, and if the Deep Water Harbour had been in operation then, the number of people who would be employed would be 337; therefore, a matter of 2,600 people would be unemployed. Now, I have pointed this out to emphasise the point which I was making just now that it is not in the light of the hotel industry that you should only think; you should also think in the light of your whole industrial policy. You have to think in terms of what type of capital investment you can pump into Barbados which would help you to find alternative employment for these 2,000 people who are likely to be unemployed as a result of the Deep Water Harbour, notwithstanding the fact that you also have to think of your population which is increasing. You have to think of this serious population problem and this serious unemployment problem which we have. If this hotel project is to be built on the St. James coast, you have to think of what will be the result if it is going to cause the abandonment of a plantation. You have to think of whether you are manufacturing all the sugar you want, and if you are providing employment for workers as a result of your new project in the same way as regards to the number of people who would be going out of employment as a result of your abandonment of a plantation. 1.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am a bit cautious not only with regard to the matter of industrial development, but I am a bit cautious that if there are large numbers of people employed in any one sector and you must make room for a different type of development, I am asking whether you can find places as an interim measure where you will not throw large numbers of people out of employment by the method which you use, or whether you can find lands to do what you want to do without the number of unemployed being so great. That is a matter which must worry us. It is not now a question of whether you like this type of development or not; the hotel industry is one industry. I will not now speak about the other industries which we have to explore but I know that you are helping this industry and you are helping it, in the words of the Minister, because you want to get in touch with other industries; but there are other things, I should like to let the Minister know,

which have to be given similar treatment as they are now giving the Hotel Industry.

That is why I say I favour a broad planning organisation including the various economic elements in the community beginning at the top and then coming down to the various sub-heads and the several groups of people for the purpose of providing employment in Barbados. From what we can see, this Bill is the fruit of the work of an organisation which has been working for its own interest, and because there is an organisation which has been working along these lines, that organisation has been able to accelerate the pace at which the Government acted in this matter. There are other groups which are not as fortunate as the hotel industry in accelerating the pace of the Government, but there are those of us who say that the Government should know that the number of unemployed people in Barbados are more than the number of the employed who are working in the sugar industry at the highest peak. At the highest there are 22,000 people who are employed in the sugar industry and the unemployment figure exceeds that. That is a situation which you have to watch. The number of unemployed will be added to because we are living in an age of swift technological movement. Modern construction will require the erection of hotels on a different basis; the methods used will be on a different basis and the number of people employed, having regard to the capital invested, will not be the same.

Mr. Speaker, I am not expressing the view such as the Minister has expressed, because I do not know how long I will live, that he will always be handling these matters. Hitler and Mussolini said so and both of them have gone. I do not think that the Minister could be as powerful as Sir Winston Churchill was during the War and Sir Winston Churchill went after 1945. The holding on to office makes people say some irrational things; the Hon. Minister has made one of those statements which people make for the lack of having something to say because they are filled with themselves; but let us look at the serious matter underlying these things. No matter whether we are here or not, people will remain in Barbados; we will not always be here but we would do what we want to do in a sense in which anybody can understand it.

Apart from the amendments to this Bill - and I doubt very much whether there is any Department in the Government that can tell us what the position is - the Minister has said that this is their policy; but I should like to ask him how far do they intend to go in this matter of the hotel industry as against some other type of industrial development. I doubt very much that anybody will believe that we do not go as far as Jamaica has gone in this matter. If you do not go as far as Jamaica has gone in so far as the hotel development is concerned - well you will not go as far as Puerto Rico has gone. There is no point in talking about Trinidad as such because Trinidad is down here with us but Trinidad is not regarded as what should be regarded as a tourist country in the sense that it does not offer the natural facilities which the tourists really need. You have to go further North and ask what Antigua is doing because Antigua is further north and it is easier to get to Antigua because you go from New York to Puerto Rico and from Puerto Rico to Antigua. There is no need to talk about Jamaica because it is easier to go from Montego Bay to Miami than to go from Barbados to Bermuda. You will realise that if the Government makes these offers in so far as the tourist traffic is concerned - I do not refer to industrialists because you cannot get people to industrialise based on the number of people you are expecting. The net result is how many people will come to Barbados to utilise the hotel development which we have. As somebody has said, the time has come when the West Indies should try to attract people to these shores not only during the Winter season. We have this good climate all the year round and we have to make the greatest use of it and see if we can fill your public hotels or keep them filled up to 80% as compared with 60%, all the year round. If you can do that, then there will be a more worth while investment.

I would like to say this to people who are hoteliers in Barbados. It is all right for us to help them with these

aids, and the Government should not say that because they are helping these people with these things, they should say what rates these people should charge. That must be left to them to some extent.

2.05 p.m.

What I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no point in the hotel owners in Barbados having all these things and then making certain charges that are so much higher than the charges made elsewhere - and in places where the wages paid to the people who work in hotels are so much higher than what we pay here - that they keep the tourists out. I do not know what the rates of this new proposed hotel will be, but there are some fantastic charges being made here that will help to keep people from coming to the island. If you get the reputation that you are a very expensive rate area, there are some people who will not want to come here. I hope the hotel owners will not take this as a means of getting rich quickly, but as a means of assisting industrial development; they must understand that the Trade Union has to represent workers in the industry, if not, we will close them down at a time when it would inconvenience them most. I say that with a full sense of my responsibility. These owners must understand that the workers have a right to organise and bargain for good conditions of employment, and if they are not prepared to do that with the help that is given, I will assist to the last drop of my blood in organising strikes and sit-downs wherever I can to bring them to their senses whenever the occasion arises. By that I do not mean that I would not cooperate with the owners if they were willing, but this idea of a Wages Council and making the owners believe that we must sit down around a Board and arrive at a minimum wage in the hotel industry should cease. If you are going to industrialise this country and help the Hotel Association, the owners must, of necessity, come in line with modern concept; that is, they represent the Employers Association, and we represent the workers. I say that because what the Minister said is likely to give the impression to some people that they need not worry about the Trade Union as such, and that the Government would provide the means of settling these matters. Whether or not the Minister intended that impression to be given, it is likely to happen.

Barbados is a small community and if it ever got around that the Government would be inclined to set up Wages Councils, employers are likely to be more difficult in accepting organisation among these workers who, all over the world, are not very easy to organise, because they depend on gratuities as a means of getting their wages. Those of us who have been in the Trade Union Movement find it very difficult to deal with workers who have been accustomed to receiving gratuities as part of their wages when it comes to industrial organisations.

I have no objection to the general principle of this amendment, but, as I have indicated, I hope the Government will see the necessity, wisdom and commonsense in having a coordinated policy on the basis of industrial development, because you do not want on the one hand to say that you have an Industrial Development Board and on the other, a Tourist Development Board and a Hotel Board. What you want is a comprehensive organisation with all these Heads.

When I deal later on with the Resolution of which I have given notice, I hope to include in a more expanded form my views on these points when it comes to economic development. In a general way, I agree with this and would ask, if it is not too confidential, if the idea of relaxing Government's policy in so far as agricultural undertakings for such projects are concerned, means that you have also relaxed it in other respects to deal with things which would not require so much money or land as this is likely to need.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, like the previous speaker, I rise in support of the principle of this Bill which has as its object the granting of further concessions and inducements or incentives to the Tourist Industry. This is another step in a series in bringing our Hotel Aids Act into line with the Hotel Aids Act as obtains in colonies

such as Trinidad and Jamaica, and as far as I know, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. There are many other steps which would have to be taken in order to put Barbados on the map and bring Barbados in line as far as concessions and incentives are concerned, in order to compete with these places which I have just mentioned, and which the member who has just sat down has mentioned on several occasions.

I would advise the Minister who, from his speech and from the various efforts and undertakings he has made within recent months, has given a clear indication that everything that is possible for him to do, with the necessary safeguards as enunciated as far as labour is concerned, to assist in the advancement of the Tourist Industry in this island, will be done, and that all inducements and encouragement will be given to Hotel owners so that the Tourist business will be a paying and profitable concern. In doing that, Sir, these four amendments which are the body of this Bill and which have been explained by the Minister, have been brought here today in an attempt to bring our Hotel Aids Act more in line with the Hotel Aids Act as obtains in Trinidad and Jamaica. We see that the definition of "hotel" has been made more elastic in that it does not refer merely to any building with not less than ten bedrooms and having one or more kitchens and one or more dining-rooms as set out, but it refers also to any group of buildings, whether cottages, bungalows or otherwise, situate within the same precincts, served by a common kitchen service and together containing not less than ten bedrooms for the accommodation for reward of guests. That is an improvement of the old definition of what "hotel" meant.

When you take into consideration that most of the coast lands have already been utilised - most of the coast lands where good bathing is available have already been sold and developed, and with the modern trend more and more guest houses or hotels will be built - hotels in future may tend to be built inland. You may find hotels built inland or off the beach, or as we would say in ordinary parlance, on the landside of the road, having a beach house or bungalow on the seaside used as an annex and as an integral part of the hotel proper, but definitely not within the same precincts. I think the Minister should consider cases like that, where the hotel is not connected or within the same precincts, but where you find the main building on the land side having an annex or beach-house on the seaside.

2.15 p.m.

The two work together and for all common purposes are one combine. I think the Hon. Minister should consider cases like that, because as time goes on, he will find that this definition is not sufficiently comprehensive. I want to make my point perfectly clear. In attempting to make the definition of "hotel" elastic, it refers to it as any group of buildings, whether cottages, bungalows or otherwise, situate within the same precincts, served by a common maid service and together containing not less than ten bedrooms for the accommodation for reward of guests.

I am saying that according to modern trends and owing to more recent developments, most of our coastline has been utilised or developed, and you will find that as time goes on, there will be many more hotels built, not necessarily on the seashore itself, but inland or a little way opposite to the site which it has on the seashore. Take, for instance, Hotel Windsor. That is not on the sea itself, but it has a little annexe on the sea to accommodate its guests. Perhaps, Eastray House may be one of such hotels as well as Colleton. There are also one or two places in St. James which have been used as hotels during the last season and they have ten bedrooms altogether with the beach house. They conform to the definition set out here, but, as I have said, the definition as set out here in paragraph (b) of Section 1 is rigid and not elastic, and, as I have just explained, I hope the Hon. Minister would make a special note of what I have said and examine it.

I feel the time has come if Barbados is to keep in line or is to offer competition with places like Jamaica or

Puerto Rico that the Hon. Minister would have to examine very carefully the concessions granted by those places and to see whether we are in line.

There is another point to which I would like to refer and, Sir, I am attempting to assist the Minister. I see that he is anxious to assist the Tourist Industry and if there is any way we of the Opposition can help, like pooling our ideas, I feel it would be all for the better of the Island and for creating employment. I was wondering whether the Hon. Minister would consider the inclusion of station wagons or luggage vans in the schedule of duty free articles. I do not mean that a hotel should have any number of them brought in duty free, but, say, one to each place for the facility of the guests. At present we have that arrangement at some of the hotels. I am saying that we should include these luggage vans and station wagons in the Schedule and I think that that would be of some assistance to these people.

There are many other respects in which further concessions can be granted in the boosting of this Tourist Industry. While I am about it, I would like to comment on a matter which has struck me only recently. I hope that under the new dispensation - and when I say the new dispensation, I mean the setting up of the Tourist Board as distinct from the Publicity Committee which exists at present - it will be truly representative of the people in the industry and non-partisan. I hope that the Tourist Board would not be comprised of only a small selected hand-picked clique as formally existed under the Publicity Committee and of persons who are only interested in their own welfare. I want a Tourist Board set up on a comprehensive basis including all groups and opinions, and people who have the know-how and who have money to invest in the Hotel Industry whether they belong to Barbados or whether their homes are here or whether they are domiciled. In the setting up of the Tourist Board, the Minister should be made more aware of its day-to-day activities. When I say that, I mean that the Minister should know when travel agents are coming out to Barbados, he should have a list of the invitees and that should not be a matter which is just left to the Committee. Under the new dispensation, I want to find a new trend of thought among the Committee and I want each group and each type of enterprise to be properly represented whether it be that of the big hotel owner or the small hotel owner, whether it be that of the big taxi owner or the small taxi owner and as regards the question of colour, class or creed, that should be out of the question. It is not now a private concern as that which Government formerly granted money to, and on an elaborate scale at times. The Tourist Board is now a public concern and the Hon. Minister of Trade should be responsible and should have the right to see and to peruse the list of invitees. He should also have an Advisory Committee and Liaison Officers functioning not only in Barbados, but all parts of the world and also people who know something of the tourist industry and not just only those people around here who are only in the industry for their personal aggrandisement. We must do this thing on a big scale and not on a petty scale. I am hoping that the Minister would have a Tourist Board of people of the right calibre and that Liaison Officers would be appointed who would see to it and give proper advice. They should be stationed in big countries like Canada, United States of America and the United Kingdom and they should be people who know what the tourists need in Barbados and should be able to encourage them to come here and should be able to give advice as regards new plans and techniques so that the Tourist Industry of Barbados could be put on a proper footing and not being run in the lackadaisical way in which it was run before. We want people with the know-how, people with the money, people with proper brains and proper technique and people who have the necessary influential contacts with the big cities of the area.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I, too, welcome this piece of legislation. My only regret is that this piece of legislation was not placed before this Chamber some considerable time ago. As a matter of fact, I should have preferred this piece of legislation to have come down to

this House before the question of loans to hotel owners had ever reached this Chamber. Now, Sir, in this community we are concerned with unemployment and with our ever-increasing problem of over population; therefore any hon. member who is conscious of his duty to this community will undoubtedly give his wholehearted co-operation to any measure which is designed to increase the employment possibilities in this island. It is for that reason that I am whole-heartedly supporting this amendment to this particular Act.

What I should like to do at this stage is to suggest to the Government that the time has come when we must no longer approach the planning of our economy in separate departments. Both in Trinidad and in Jamaica where hotel development has gone far ahead of Barbados, you will find that it is not left to private enterprise, or that it is not only by means of legislation such as this which we have before us now, that the development in these two islands have taken place; it is because the Governments of those islands have established an Economic Planning Unit which takes into consideration what part hotels will play in increasing the national revenue and the national income of those countries. The time has long come when we, in Barbados, should consider the means of establishing an Economic Planning Unit - not just a Tourist Board or Development Corporation, which things are necessary of course; but where the Government is planning for the future development of the country, this matter should not be left in the hands of either of these Bodies. In Trinidad, which is concerned with economic planning, the Government plans ahead for tourism by incorporating it in the present plan for the country. In Jamaica similarly, the Government is concerned with hotels, but not as a separate part of the development; it must fit in with their plans for the entire country.

I should like to say that our legislation here has been rather piecemeal and it is regrettable that in a country such as Barbados we have entirely lost the race in hotel development not only to Jamaica and Trinidad but even to Antigua. During this very year in Antigua they are building seven brand-new hotels; they are not hotels which are being built by means of loans to hotel owners because the policy in Antigua is not to lend money to foreigners to build hotels; the policy is to get foreigners to come in and the Government is willing to make concessions such as these so as to enable the foreigners to build their hotels.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2.30 p.m. of the clock this sitting now stands suspended until 3.00 p.m. of the clock.
2.30 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that there is no quorum present and I am asking that the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time but I understand that there are no answers ready as yet.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no matters ready for consideration under Private Members' Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will now revert to the consideration of Government Business.

STATEMENT BY THE PREMIER

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to make two Statements in connection with my recent journeys abroad.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The first Statement is as follows:-
3.10 p.m.

"As a consequence of reports concerning racial relations in the United Kingdom which were being received in Barbados in August and early September this year, I left Barbados on Saturday 6th September and arrived at London Airport on Sunday 7th. Throughout the following days I paid a number of visits to areas affected by the disturbances, and other centres where Barbadian and other West Indian immigrants were living and working, including London, Nottingham, and Birmingham. I talked with West Indians in factories, hotels, transport systems and other places where they were working, in the streets, and in the houses where they were living. Together with others such as Dr. La Corbiniere, the Deputy Prime Minister of the West Indies, and Mr. Norman Manley, Chief Minister of Jamaica, I addressed a number of public meetings and groups of workers and held discussions with officials of the Government of the United Kingdom. We, West Indians, steadfastly maintained the attitude that there should be no restrictions on entry into the United Kingdom, except in the case of persons with criminal records. It was agreed that steps should be taken for the establishment of Welfare Services or their strengthening where they existed in order that immigrants could more easily adapt themselves to a new way of life and that there should be greater understanding between them and the local population.

It was also agreed that as full information as possible concerning conditions in the United Kingdom and opportunities for employment should be passed on to intending immigrants. For instance, during the Winter months a fall in employment may be expected. One of the causes of these disturbances was nothing but sheer hooliganism and that can be handled by the Law Courts, but the deeper causes require careful thought if they are to be removed.

The view was more than once expressed by the officials of the United Kingdom Government and by the Press that this visit by my West Indian colleagues and myself had helped considerably towards a solution of the difficulties which had arisen. West Indians were greatly reassured that although they were far from home they were not forgotten."

Further to that Statement, there is this Statement as follows:-

"My recent visit to the United Kingdom afforded an opportunity to review with the Colonial Office the progress and financing of the Colony's Development Plan. For this purpose I was joined in London by the Financial Secretary.

In general, it was agreed that implementation of the Development Plan was proceeding satisfactorily and might safely be continued on the lines previously envisaged.

It will be recalled that in 1954 Her Majesty's Government agreed that the Barbados Government should be afforded access to external borrowing facilities for the purpose of financing the Deep Water Harbour Scheme. The timing of this loan will depend upon market conditions, but I have been reassured that the Barbados Government will, at the appropriate time, be afforded the necessary facilities. In the meantime the work on the Harbour will continue to be financed temporarily from local resources.

The means of providing for the construction of the new General Hospital, the planning of which is now largely completed, was also discussed in some detail. It remains our hope that Her Majesty's Government will be able to make a substantial contribution towards the cost of this work from Colonial Development and Welfare funds. The question of how best Her Majesty's Government can help cannot, however, be finally resolved until the United Kingdom Parliament has agreed to make available further Colonial Development and Welfare funds after the current Colonial Development and Welfare Acts expire in March, 1960. Whether such additional funds will be provided should be known definitely within the next few months. In the meantime, the Secretary of State is being invited to agree that the unspent portion of the Colonial Develop-

ment and Welfare funds already allocated to the Barbados Government should be devoted to the first stages of the Hospital's construction."

3.20 p.m.

SECOND READING OF HOTEL AIDS (AMENDMENT) BILL CONTINUED

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew was speaking.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to continue.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I think I should make a few remarks, especially on the comments made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Among other things, the member asked about the potential development of the Hotel Industry in this island, and I take it that he combines that with the Tourist Industry.

So far as that is concerned, I think that he must have read in the Press quite recently that a gentleman by the name of Mr. Homs from Pan American Airways came here and carried out a survey, the Report of which is not yet handed to the Government or the Ministry, and therefore it would be difficult at this stage to inform the House along the lines suggested by the hon. member. Now I listened to the use of the popular phrase "the economic heresy" expounded by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Indeed, I was under the impression when I heard him that either he took lessons from the hon. senior member for St. Lucy or tutored him. Sir, the question of economic this and economic that is nothing that can be toyed with, as you might have heard from the hon. senior member for St. Peter. That is a highly technical subject on which, I am sure, there is hardly anybody in this House who could really do justice, and therefore, I am not prepared to make the same mistake which the hon. member has made.

The hon. member criticised me for saying that I was prepared to see that the workers in this industry got reasonable wages for their work and so on.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be precise in his language. If he does not know anything about economics or feels that it is beyond his ken, I am sure that truth is not beyond his ken. What he is saying is incorrect and I leave it to Your Honour to correct him.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said that I was taking care of the Government, the industry and the workers, and he gave the impression that I was cutting across the functions of the Union. I was doing no such thing, Sir, and I think I am correct in saying that the hon. member was a party to supporting legislation in so far as Wages Councils are concerned. The reason for that was because many of those employees - clerks in Swan Street and so on - were difficult, to use his own words, to organise, and therefore they did not fit into the plan of the Union. In order that some measure of representation could be given to these workers, it was decided to have this Wages Council legislation, and I was merely repeating, when I said that if these people who are employed in the industry did not receive reasonable wages from the industry which we have been helping, and to a greater extent at this stage, that we would have to make arrangements for wages being increased by way of the Wages Council which we have established. As a matter of fact, I have always supported the Workers Union, and even now in these terrible times when Unionists are being asked to sever their connection with the one and only organisation that has existed for all these years, I advocate keeping the Union as strong as possible. We are not prepared to cut across the Union; we want to see the Union live in this island and to see it become stronger and stronger. The Government is never happy when it has to bring into force Wages Council Legislation in order to increase wages and provide better conditions for workers; and that is the function of the Barbados Workers Union. (A VOICE: Of any Union.) I would not say of any Union, because I think I have some idea about Unions. I mean a responsible Union and not irresponsible people who have nothing to

do and run about and make themselves mischievous at times; I am talking about the Barbados Workers' Union. I want to see it stronger; I want to see it go from strength to strength, and therefore I say that there is no point in trying to cut across and to usurp in a Government the functions which are the proper functions of a Union. In the absence of a Union representing these people, then the Government comes in.

I know that the hon. member is very jealous of his position, and I do not want for one moment to appear to be relieving him of some other function.

Now of course, he took me up because I said that I will be here for a long time. He asked if I knew how long I was going to live. I wonder if he knows! On the floor of the House just where he is, he said that the only one who could stop him from going to the Federal Parliament was God. I am going to say it in a different way. I will say that the one who is going to keep me here is God.
3.30 p.m.

Now, I do not think that it is a good thing for the hon. senior member for St. Peter who, no doubt, has an important and responsible role to play in this country to be constantly talking about strikes and organising strikes. These things do not do the workers any good; it hurts them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I made a speech and now the Hon. Minister gets up and says something different. It is incorrect for him to say that. I can repeat what I said. I said that I do not believe in Wages Councils and what the Hon. Minister and the Government should have done was to make it clear to these people just as Mr. Wills Isaacs did in Jamaica that you must recognise the Union and there is no question about that. We will co-operate in this matter, but if it comes to a question that these people do not recognise the Union, then I will be one to initiate a strike. If the Hon. Minister says that is something wrong, I will be accused and if it hurts the workers, let the workers condemn me.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as the hon. member's point about the employers recognising workers, I am in a position to say that there are hardly two employers in this Island who do not recognise workers and who are not willing and ready to meet the Union and to discuss the question of wages and additional services for workers with the Union. It is not fair for the hon. member to insinuate that the Hotel Industry or people like those are not willing to recognise the Union.

Mr. WALCOTT: Again, Sir, it is dishonest for the Hon. Minister to get up and say that. It is not fair to me and I do not know what to say about it. What is the good of the Hon. Minister saying that when my speech was a reply to the Hon. Minister? He is saying that it is not fair to those people for me to say that, as if I were accusing those people. I went as far as to say that it does not exist in these circumstances. Why must the Minister say these things and misquote people all the time?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the remark which the hon. member made about being dishonest be withdrawn.

Mr. WALCOTT: I withdraw it and say in its place that it is most improper for the Hon. Minister to get up and say that. As a matter of fact, he should not have insisted that the remark be withdrawn when he said what he did.

Hon. M. E. COX: No doubt, Sir, the hon. member does not understand what he says.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would not allow that to pass by. Is the Hon. Minister saying that I do not understand what I say? I can get very rigid when men like him get up and say things which are untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wanted to object to the last remark by the Hon. Minister, the hon. member should have done so.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have done so.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have not drawn it to my attention.

Mr. WALCOTT: When I rose and objected to the remarks which the Hon. Minister made, were you not taking that as an objection?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member was making a commentary; you did not make a formal objection.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I said that I left that matter to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want to draw myself into any altercation. It is a simple thing to do. Ordinarily, an hon. member rises and objects to remarks, but when he goes on to make a speech, how can I take that as an objection?

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I merely said that the hon. member did not understand what he said. If he wants those words withdrawn, I will withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER: You said that he made statements which he himself does not understand. Instead of the hon. member getting up and making objection to the remarks, he got up and made a commentary. I did not take that as an objection, because the Chair was not properly addressed on that.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the hon. member considers the remarks unparliamentary I will withdraw them.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister made a statement and I said that I cannot reply to his speeches. He went on to say something which I did not say.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has agreed to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister said that I accused these people of not recognising the Trade Union.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a right to reply to that.

Mr. WALCOTT: As regards the question of the Hon. Minister making the remark that I did not understand what I said, that does not worry me. When I rose, it was not a question of the remark which he made because that does not worry me. What I am worried about is to be recorded in these debates in the way he has quoted me. He has quoted me saying something which I did not say. As regards to his vulgarity that I said something which I do not understand, that does not worry me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member needs not wonder if it has been recorded. It has been recorded.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I think everybody understood that he was insinuating that these people were unwilling to recognise the Trade Union and I said that that was not correct because I know that employers, generally speaking, in Barbados respected, and they have to respect, the Barbados Workers' Union.

I was going on to say that it is not good for the hon. member to talk every now and then about strikes because these strikes do no good to this country and, more particularly, to the many people who become involved in these strikes. I am speaking with authority. The hon. member said that he did not believe in these Wages Councils because Wages Councils fix minimum wages. But, Sir, I am saying that the time he should have shown that he did not believe in them was when that Bill was before the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did say so then.

Hon. M. E. COX: The records does not reveal that. Do not wait until the Government has done something against which you did not raise any objection whatsoever, and then at a later stage, you get up and say that you do not

agree with this and it is this and it is that. It is not fair. 3.40 p.m.

Those are the points which the hon. member has raised. The hon. junior for St. Andrew raised the question as to the establishment of an Economic Planning Unit. We all know that these units exist in Puerto Rico, Jamaica and Trinidad and perhaps it may be a good thing for us in Barbados to establish such a unit even although we would have to do it on a much smaller scale. However, I will promise the House that I will put the matter before the Cabinet. It all depends how expensive or otherwise an undertaking such as that suggested will be to this country and whether or not the benefits derived, if there are any, will compensate for the expenditure involved. However, as the matter has been suggested to me, I will look into it.

Now the hon. senior member for Christ Church has raised a very important point and perhaps at a later stage we may be able to consider the question of the definition of hotels as was mentioned by the hon. member. I really could not promise the hon. member to go into that matter this afternoon; if the Bill is passed and the necessity arises for an amendment, there can be an amendment made at a later stage. The hon. member also raised the point about the structure of the Tourist Board. I would like to inform him that as far as I have been able to gather, this Board is very well represented. It is represented by the big hotel people, by the Barbados Workers' Union, which is the one and only recognised organisation which represents the interest of the workers, by the small taxi people, by the merchants etc., by the small hotel people, by the guest houses, by the large hotels, by clubs and so on. In so far as the point he made about the Minister looking into the matter of invitations and other things given as far as social functions are concerned, frankly speaking, I would not like to undertake.....

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. What I intended to say was in connection with the guests who are invited to functions in honour of visiting travel agents and things of that sort; I take it that there is a regular list by means of which these people are invited to these functions. What I am saying is that the Publicity Committee have their list and there is no reason why, under the new dispensation, the Minister should not have the right to revise the list and not allow the old list to stand. Under the new dispensation, the Minister is responsible, and if he is responsible for improving the Tourist Industry, all I meant is that he might also have a say in controlling these functions or the invitations to these functions, and not have any one-sided affair.

Hon. M. E. COX: I quite appreciate what the hon. member is saying but I would still like to say that I would not like to have the task of even getting the names of the invitees to these functions. However, I feel that the hon. member has made a good point when he referred to the new dispensation; I regret to say that I have seen even in this new day, the invitations to certain functions, and those invitations no doubt reveal that the order in so far as certain people are concerned, has not been changed. The invitees were not representative of this country. We have in this island a large number of respectable coloured people in every walk of life and it is regrettable that sometimes at these functions we only see a coloured person just by accident. That does not represent the population of Barbados at all. I am not prepared to mention any specific case now, but I know of such cases. I would like to say here and now that where I am concerned, I do not appreciate any invitation to such functions when the invitees to them are not representative of the people of Barbados. I say again that although some people believe that I am one of those people who like to be invited to these high-falutin functions and such things, that is not my position at all. I am no social climber to anything, but if you are appearing to be representing Barbados, when people come to this island and you are going to have these functions, you should really represent Barbados and you can only be representative of Barbados when there is a good cross-section of this community invited to attend these functions. As I have already said, I am very glad that the hon. senior member for Christ Church has raised this point; I am

prepared to say on the floor of this House and elsewhere, and I hope that those who are responsible for the arrangements for these functions will take note of it, that if they want to recognise us, they must recognise us not only in thought but also in deed; that is, to let people see that a tourist does not mean an individual of Caucasian race; it means a person who happens to spend twenty-four hours in a country. If that is so, you are a tourist for all purposes.

3.50 p.m.

I hope that a little hint to some of these people will suffice them to know that while they need not invite us, if they are going to invite one because he may be a Minister of Social Services or something like that, it must be as I said a sufficient number which can be regarded as representing Barbados as we know it to be. I think, Sir, that that is about all I have to say in reply to the points raised by hon. members.

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

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called, it reads as follows:

"The Hotel Aids Act, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act) is hereby amended by the insertion therein immediately after Section one thereof of the following new sections:

1. A. (1) For the purposes of this Act an hotel shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (2) of this section mean -

(a) any building containing -

(i) not less than ten bedrooms for the accommodation for reward of guests;

(ii) one or more kitchens in which meals may be prepared by employees of the person having the management or ownership of such building for the guests accommodated for reward; and

(iii) one or more dining rooms shared in common by all the guests accommodated for reward in which meals may be served by such employees as aforesaid to such guests; or

(b) any group of buildings, whether cottages, bungalows or otherwise, situate within the same precincts, served by a common maid service and together containing not less than ten bedrooms for the accommodation for reward of guests:

Provided that within the precincts in which such group of buildings is situate are -

(i) one or more kitchens in which meals may be prepared by employees of the person having the management or ownership of such group of buildings for the guests accommodated for reward; and

(ii) one or more dining rooms shared in common by all the guests accommodated for reward in which meals may be served by such employees as aforesaid to such guests.

(2) Where any building is reserved for use as a club then, notwithstanding that such building forms part of an hotel as defined in subsection (1) of this section or is a building which but for its use as a club is otherwise within the meaning of an hotel as defined in that subsection, such

building shall not for the purposes of this Act be deemed to be an hotel.

(3) Where the Governor-in-Executive Committee is satisfied that any buildings or group of buildings about to be constructed or in the course of construction will on being constructed be a building or group of buildings within the meaning of an hotel as defined in subsection (1) of this section, he may by notice published in the *Official Gazette* declare that such building or group of buildings shall be deemed to be an hotel for the purposes of this Act prior to the completion of the work of constructing such building or group of buildings and as from the date of publication of such notice such building or group of buildings shall be an hotel for the purpose of this Act."

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: I think I will take this opportunity now to correct some of the things which the hon. member said, because I could not reply to him then. This Section is a wide one which embodies the basis of the change, and when the hon. member replied, the first mistake he made in his usual way of being facetious was to regard dealing with economic matters as something beyond the ken of any member of this House. It is a sad commentary. The whole purpose of the Bill is to deal with hotel aid; so I am taking this opportunity of replying to a statement which the Hon. Minister made, when we who had spoken on the second reading could not reply. You are making provision for helping those people with a building which has no less than ten bedrooms. Why not give help to those with six or eight bedrooms? I can go on to show why you should make it for people who have a six-bedroom hotel in order to make it easier for them. What right has anyone in this Chamber to feel that economic factors are beyond my ken? It is strange coming from the Minister of Industry and Trade to say that economic matters are subjects for Professors; we are not teaching anybody economics, but something which relates to the lives of the people in the community which we represent, and we are saying that instead of dealing with this on a piece-meal basis, you should have something like Puerto Rico. But as I said earlier, when I come to deal with my own Resolution, I will deal with that. There is no point in being facetious when we are dealing with financial matters. We do not need an economic expert to tell us that we should have hotel aids.

Another point which I want to make is that when I spoke about Wages Councils, that was in reply to what the Minister said, and he must answer people precisely. I did not initiate any debate on Wages Councils; so when the hon. member talks about my agreeing to a Wages Council, may I tell him that there is no record in this House of Assembly in which I spoke of a Wages Council for these people. In dealing with it as an Act, the Union is on record as saying that it does not believe in Wages Councils, but there are certain instances in which you have to change your Wages Board to a Wages Council; so do not let the hon. member be confused about what I said in agreeing to changing the Wages Board to a Wages Council. We could not agree to a Wages Council for anything like the Hotel Industry, because as I pointed out, the industry is unorganisable, and an industry in which the Union had already met people and discussed wages and conditions of employment. I say that because of the statement which was made about strikes. Nobody likes strikes, as the member said; nobody likes war or anything that is likely to be disastrous; everybody likes things to run smoothly and work peacefully, and if the occasion arises and you have to strike, whether or not you like it, you have to do it. If the Minister of Labour is giving out this idea to the employers, I will tell him that when the occasion comes and it has to take place, all he has to do is to pass a law prohibiting strikes. You could not strike in Russia, and when Hitler was in Germany, you could not strike.

I raised the question about Wages Councils because when the Minister of Labour speaks about a Wages Council in a Bill like this, it makes some employers believe that

they need not worry with what they regard as tedious methods of negotiations. The hon. member must quote me correctly. As he said earlier, there are some Barbadians who like to hold their heads high. I am one of those Barbadians who will hold my head up, even in a crisis.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, as I intimated in my second reading speech, the definition of the word "hotel" is not in my opinion sufficiently elastic, although an attempt is made in Sub-clause (b) whereby the definition of "hotel" is set out. It says: "any group of buildings whether cottages, bungalows or otherwise, situate within the same precincts."

I attempted to point out to the House at the time that within recent years, it has been a trend for hotels to be constructed not necessarily on the sea but in some cases, inland and having an annex on the sea; so I want to bring to the attention of the Minister that in such cases they are not within the same curtilage, but for all general purposes they are the same hotels owned by the same people. In the case of a hotel having eight or nine bedrooms on the land side and two or three on the seaside, would the definition of a "hotel" apply? On the face of it, it would not, judging from this definition, and I feel that it would be a hardship meted out to those people who would not qualify under the definition set out here in this new amendment.

4.00 p.m.

But if you find a Hotel or Guest House with an annexe on the sea with an overall total of ten bedrooms or over, in a case like that, I am suggesting that it should be left to the discretion of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, meaning of course the appropriate Minister and probably the Cabinet. I am asking if you would incorporate a case like that.

I see in the Bill at paragraph (b) that you have a Hotel to mean any group of buildings, whether cottages, bungalows or otherwise, situate within the same precincts, served by a common maid service and together containing not less than ten bedrooms for the accommodation for reward of guests.

I just wanted an assurance from the Hon. Minister on the question which I raised, but the Hon. Minister has given no assurance; and in view of that, I feel a hardship will be meted out to those people - our future hotel owners - who owing to the paucity of obtaining building land on the sea would be tempted to secure land inland or on the side of the road opposite the sea, that is to say, not necessarily on the seashore, but just in conjunction with the beach house in order to make up ten bedrooms. I would like the Hon. Minister to agree to this amendment, but he seems unwilling to make any amendment. I know how long it takes for Government to bring down an amendment. I am suggesting as an amendment that the words "situate within the same precincts" be deleted and if those words are deleted from paragraph (b), it would bring the Clause into line with the suggestion which I have just made, so that two houses used as a Guest House - one on the beach and one inland - and both amounting to ten bedrooms or over would also apply with the term "hotel". I am going to move this as an amendment. I think my point should be understood by now. I am moving that the words "situate within the same precincts" be deleted, so as to make the definition of the hotel more elastic and more attractive to future hotel owners who may have to pay very expensive prices for beach land, but who have in the normal course of events a cottage near the beach or opposite to the beach and who are functioning the same as if they were a hotel, they having a cottage on the beach proper.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid, first of all, that I cannot agree to the amendment made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I am wondering, as far as I can see, if this Bill is a money Bill, because it has to do with the revenue of the Island. In other words, the amendment which the hon. member is making will in my opinion tend to take away revenue from the Government, because at present, owners of Guest Houses such

as those which the hon. member wishes to include, have to pay trade tax and things of that sort and they also have to pay customs duties on the equipment; therefore, if the hon. member includes places like those in the exemptions, it means that you are interfering with the money which goes into the Treasury. This is a money Bill; therefore, the motion made by the hon. member appears to be unfortunate.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I am not trying to encroach on any special preserves of the Hon. Minister; I am merely attempting to assist him, or the Government or the Island as a whole to knock this Hotel Aids Bill into shape so as to induce people to come here. I am attempting to change the definition of hotels to make it more elastic and more comprehensive. In other words, I hope I have not interrupted the actions of the Government. I take it that Government wants suggestions which are constructive and which go further than this Bill goes. It is not that I have any intention of keeping money out of the Treasury or encroaching on anybody's preserves. The amendment which I have made to the definition of the word "hotel" would be a means of helping more prospective owners of hotels for the reasons which I have given. The coastline of the island is more or less fully developed; therefore, you can well understand that many future prospective hotel owners would fall to fall within the present definition. But if they could be allowed to have a building inland and when I say inland, I do not mean any great distance from the sea, they would be able to qualify. Take Hotel Windsor as an instance. It is on the land side of Hastings and for this purpose, if that Hotel had less than ten bedrooms, it would not qualify. I have no brief for any Hotel or Guest House. The Blue Waters Hotel if it were built would be also a case in point. I am saying that if you found any hotel on the land side with the main building and an annexe on the seashore, it should qualify. I am saying that the definition here is too rigid; it should include a hotel building which is on both sides of the road and, therefore, this definition should be made more elastic to include a case like that.

Mr. SEARLES: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very simple question which can be solved very easily. Here it is you have a building on one side of the road and another on the opposite side. The owner holds the right of way to the public road which is between the buildings; therefore, that can be taken to mean situate within the same precincts. 4.10 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I have never heard a more preposterous suggestion, to put it mildly, than what the hon. junior member for St. James has just made. How could a Government highway be regarded as precincts? A public highway is a highway for the use of the public at large and for the use of public vehicles. Assuming that a person owns two buildings on the opposite side of the road - as a matter of fact, what is confusing the hon. member is that he has a smattering knowledge of the law (*Laughter*) and he is saying that if you have two buildings exactly opposite to each other, the whole road forms the precincts. He is saying that the public highway is the owner's precincts, curtilage or backyard. What the hon. member is saying is so preposterous that I do not know how his Party colleagues will take it; what his Party colleagues want or need is assistance but not that nonsense.

Mr. SEARLES: I accept what the hon. member has said, but this is what I hold; you cannot block a public highway, but you pay taxes on the land; the fee simple is vested in you. If you own the land on both sides of the public highway the road is there; it is a public highway and you cannot block it. However, you are paying parochial taxes on it and therefore it is yours. The Government keeps the road in order because they have the right to use it, but I maintain that the precincts are yours.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Clause was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Mrs. BOURNE,

Messrs. HOLDER, SEARLES, STRAUGHN and L. E. SMITH - 9.

NOES: Messrs. WALCOTT, TUDOR, TALMA and BRANCKER - 4.

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

Clauses 3 to 10 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 11 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, as to this Clause, reference is made to the Second Schedule to this Act and to items which are therein set out. When we come to the second Schedule we will find in paragraph 1 the following:-

"Furniture made wholly or mainly of metal, including beds and bedsprings, chairs, tables, sofas, dressing tables, chests of drawers, desks, wardrobes, presses or mirrors;"

Now Sir, some time ago the Department of Education sent around a circular to the Governing Bodies of Schools urging them against the use of metal desks or chairs or imported desks or chairs in the Government-aided Secondary Schools because of the unemployment which would be caused to local workmen, and the opportunity which would be afforded for employment locally in the making of this furniture would be lost. If we pass this Clause of the Bill as it stands, and we consider it in the light of this Schedule, it means that we will be encouraging these hotel people to import furniture, including chairs which can be made locally, tables, dressing tables, chests of drawers, desks and so on. The result will be that while the local workmen would be justified in looking forward to getting the job of building this furniture for the hotels, they will find that because of the facilities of importing this furniture, people like Messrs. K. R. Hunte & Company will benefit. I am suggesting that if we pass this Clause as it is, we will be doing a great disservice to the local workmen. 4.20 p.m.

I should like to know if this matter has been given full thought by the proposer, and what is the reason for making this particular concession having regard to the unemployment amongst people in this island in the joiner trade. If there is no reasonable explanation forthcoming, he cannot expect us on this side to support the inclusion of this Section. Similar remarks will apply to Section 13.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I should like to tell the hon. member and I think he knows, that even though we might not express it, we on this side of the House are just as anxious, if not more anxious, to see local industry developed and improved, and thereby keeping as low as possible the unemployment figures in this island. I am sure that he would not for one moment suggest that somebody is going to import a metal chest of drawers. We have allowed metal furniture in this Bill, because sometimes even in Government offices, you find it more convenient for some employees to use certain types of metal chairs; therefore we do not consider it fair to rule out metal furniture as a whole. Bedstead springs, you will agree, are metal and we see sometimes metal desks and so on. This obtains in Trinidad, Jamaica and elsewhere, but we are not even going as far as these islands with some of these items. The items which we have here are part only of what Trinidad and Jamaica allow to come into the country. Again I should like to say that we cannot on the one hand hope to advance and develop the industry, and on the other hand, say that you cannot bring in this or that. I have every reason to feel that only the minimum of these metal items will be imported to the island.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this Section which deals with the First Schedule, you will remember that in my remarks earlier, I suggested that Government should consider the inclusion of Station Waggon and Luggage Vans. What has just struck me,

Sir, is that cutlery and crockery do not seem to be included. I was wondering whether the Minister had any special objection for omitting cutlery and crockery on this list, because in all hotels and hotel business, cutlery and crockery play a very important role. There may be some special reason why these items were omitted, but I am asking the Minister - I do not know if he can consider it off-hand - if there are any special objections to Station Waggon and Luggage Vans, cutlery and crockery being included on this list in the First Schedule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I ask which Schedule you are referring to?

Mr. TALMA: I am referring to the First Schedule, and if you look at it, you will see that it refers to the principal Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Section 11 makes reference to the Second Schedule of the Act, but you are making reference to the First Schedule, and therefore you are out of order.

Mr. TALMA: I will reserve my remarks until we get to the Schedule.

The question that Clause 11 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE; Mr. HOLDER; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. SEARLES and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 9.

NOES: Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER - 3.

Clause 12 was called and passed.

Clause 13 was called. It reads as follows:-

"Section thirteen of the Principal Act is hereby amended as follows:-

(a) by the deletion of the words "machinery or plant as may be specified therein," appearing therein and the substitution therefor of the words -

"other items as may be specified therein;"

(b) by the addition at the end thereof of the following -

"Provided that where any of the items specified in the licence is an item set out in the Third Schedule to this Act it shall before importation be marked as clearly and indelibly as is practicable with the name of the hotel within which it is to be used."; and

(c) by the deletion of the words and symbol "machinery & plant" appearing in the marginal note thereto and the substitution therefor of the words -

"or other items".

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 13 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, just as I pointed out in discussing Clause 11, I make a similar comment in respect of Clause 13, because that also will be providing facilities for importation of furniture made wholly or mainly of metal including chairs, tables, desks, wardrobes, presses, and chests of drawers, which could be made in Barbados by local joiners of whom there are so many unemployed in this country, and who are seeking work so badly. You have no reason to assume that allowing this Clause to pass will not affect them. The temptation would not be so great.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To which Schedule are you referring?

Mr. BRANCKER: I am speaking on Clause 13 but I am referring to the Schedule. The comment which I made

in reference to Clause 11, I repeat in reference to this Clause, because we have no guarantee to feel that advantage would not be taken of getting this metal furniture to the detriment of local workmen.

The question that Clause 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE; Mr. HOLDER; Mrs. BOURNE and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 8.

NOES: Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER - 3.
4.30 p.m.

Clauses 14 to 18 inclusive were called separately and passed.

The First Schedule was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the First Schedule stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, for the same reason which I have given earlier, I am proposing in respect of this First Schedule that paragraph (1) be deleted and that the other paragraphs be renumbered (1), (2), (3), and so on.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I too should like to move the inclusion of the following: This will be numbered (12). "Luggage Vans and Station Wagons, Cutlery and Crockery." I have already given the reasons. These items are all essential in the running of a hotel.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I think I have replied to a similar motion made already, but I am afraid that I did not hear your ruling on that. I was pointing out that this was a money Bill.

The hon. senior member for Christ Church has made a motion which would include luggage vans. I must confess that we did not give any consideration to that. What I do feel is that these hotels which now own these luggage vans are at an advantage to other hotels and if we were to allow them to bring in these items duty free that would put them at a greater advantage, which must operate against, for example, the people whom we are encouraging in the taxi business. I think that the hon. senior member for Christ Church knows that since some of these hotels have been using these luggage vans, they have reduced considerably the number of jobs which the owners of hired cars used to get. I understand that the hon. members opposite represent the small taxi owners. Whatever that means, I do not know; but I am sure if that is correct, the hon. members would do everything to help them rather than to do anything which would not help them. I said in the first place that it is not fair, because I have a feeling that they are profiting by it, but along with that, they are allowed to do trade in that they can take people to the hotel from the plane or ship and they can also take people around the Island and that practice competes against taxi owners, large and small alike, but perhaps, more particularly, the small taxi owners; therefore, if you allow them now to bring in these vans duty free, particularly when it was never suggested to extend them that facility, privilege or concession, whatever you may call it, it would operate at a greater disadvantage to these hard pressed taxi owners whom the hon. members on the other side represent.

Sir, I have no intention of including or even recommending or suggesting that items such as these should be included as any duty free concessions. I think we have gone fairly far already. In the case of crockery and cutlery, the duty on these items due to the fragility of them is very low and there is absolutely no hardship experienced by those owners if we do not allow crockery to come into the Island duty free. As regards the bringing in duty free of these items, in view also to the fact that it is said that

items such as these have imaginary feet, the Government feels that it should not extend a concession on these items. These are two of the items which I mentioned just now which are allowed in Trinidad duty free but to which we did not agree.

Sir, we had quite a few discussions with the people who represent the industry and we told them what we intended to give and what we intended denying them, and they already know that we are not allowing crockery or cutlery to come in duty free.

4.40 p.m.

There is one last point I would like to make and it is on the question which has been raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about allowing metal chairs and things of that sort to come in duty free. I have already said and I repeat that we, on this side of the Table, are no doubt truly representative of Labour and, in fact, we are not as other people who will say that and which can be regarded as sheer lip service - we have taken all that the hon. member has said into consideration and we are satisfied that this Clause will not create any undue hardship on the workers of this island, especially those who are engaged in joinery. We also have to appreciate the point that there will be people coming from the United States of America and establishing and running hotels here and in the United States of America these items are mass produced. These people will be able to get these items very much cheaper than they can get them here, and, of course, the supply is also more easily available and readily obtained than if these people had to depend on having all of these items made in this island. Again, I say that if we are to encourage the hotel industry, we cannot allow a few items such as these to prevent us from having these hotels established, which must inevitably bring considerable revenue to this country.

There is one thing which hon. members must remember. As I pointed out earlier, this allowance is only an initial allowance and as initial requirements of the industry, the Government has agreed to allow these things to come in duty free. I have already informed the House that any replacements will not qualify for any duty-free concessions and therefore I do not see any reason why hon. members should quibble over our including in this Schedule a few metal chairs and, it may be, a few tables.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, for fear that a wrong impression may be conveyed to hon. members, I would like to clear the point which I made in connection with the inclusion of luggage vans and station waggons. As hon. members are fully aware, the large hotels invariably have their luggage vans and station waggons; therefore any exemption of inclusion of luggage vans and station waggons in this list in the first Schedule to this Bill would assist the small guest house keepers more so than the large hotel owners and it is the small hotel owners whom I had in mind when I spoke. At the present time there are luggage vans and station waggons attached to the large hotels but that does not hamper the taxi owners, more especially the big taxi owners for whom we have no definite brief. This inclusion does not hamper them at all; I am concerned at this stage with the small hotel owners who may welcome having a luggage van or station waggon and we should not deprive the small taxi owner of his opportunity of securing essential commodities for the hotels, commodities like vegetables and greens for providing meals at guest houses or hotels. I do not see how the assistance of a luggage van or station waggon could prevent any guest from hiring a taxi or a "drive yourself car" because the large hotel keeper would hardly have more than one station waggon or luggage van. If we include a luggage van or station waggon in the first Schedule of this Bill and if we grant the right to the small or the large hotel owners to keep a station waggon or luggage van, I cannot see that that would deprive the small taxi owners of making a livelihood. To try to convey that impression is, in my opinion, trying to convey a wrong impression. On the question of depriving or trying to deprive the small taxi owners of a livelihood, I should like to say that the Party which I have the honour to represent is the Party which has the small

taxi owners at heart. (*Hear! Hear!*) A station waggon or luggage van could never run in competition with taxis as such; no one hotel, whether large or small, would have any number of luggage vans and use them as taxis for their guests. I do not think that that would be practicable; by no stretch of the imagination would the taxi owners be deprived of a living by having a station waggon or luggage van included in the first Schedule to this Bill.

4.50 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I should just like to say that perhaps the hon. member is not conscious of the fact that these Luggage Vans with seats attached can carry a considerable amount of people. I also want to say, by the way, that I do not envy him for his position as representing the taxi people, and that I was only drawing to his attention that it appears to me unfair in encouraging the hotels to purchase and run these Luggage Vans by allowing them to bring them in duty free. That duty will rank anywhere around \$600 or \$800, and you will be placing a lot of people at a disadvantage. Of course, now that I have raised that point, I can very well see why the hon. member would attempt to defend it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it needs any defence. As a matter of fact, I was wondering as I listened to my colleague, why he appeared to be so hesitant to say quite plainly that he disagreed with the Minister that our request that Luggage Vans be brought in free of customs duty was something that we should not do. The Minister admits that the large hotels now have them; that is true.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything like that. I said that there are some vans running around but I do not know whether they belong to large or small hotels.

Mr. TUDOR: We are saying that there are some small boarding houses and hotels of a smaller range who would like to have that particular privilege and to whom it should be given. He said that it means \$600 or \$800 remission of customs duty; I did not know it was so much, but today, Mr. Chairman, that should not necessarily harm the small taxi-man, because the grievance of the small taxi-man does not lie in that region at all. He is not complaining of competition between himself and the owners of the Luggage Vans; he is complaining of the competition between himself and the runners and owners of the big taxi companies, and his bitterest complaint is that Government permits Mr. Dear and Mr. Parravicino to get the upper hand of him at the Airport and at the Customs. If it is a question of looking after the interest of the taxi-man, let the Minister search out the direction in which his real and only grievance exists and remedy it there. That is why the Democratic Labour Party can ask quite boldly that Station Wagons be brought in or that the concession on Station Waggon be given to small hotels and boarding-houses, because we do not agree that it will conflict in any way with the interest of the small taxi owner. On the other hand, if they are prepared to make an issue of this and to make it appear to the taxi owners that the Opposition far from championing their interests are betraying them, we have the same argument against them, if the argument is supposed to be on that level, because the Leader of the Opposition has been suggesting to Government that instead of bringing in metal chairs and other items, they should give the local joiners and craftsmen a chance to make them for the Hotel Industry. The Minister does not see it that way; he feels that the interest of the industry requires the bringing in of metal chairs, because I think I heard him say that these things are mass produced in the United States, and that it is possible to get them cheaper there than here. We are asking that the interest of our own craftsmen, joiners and carpenters be put first by allowing them to produce chairs for the hotels. The Minister says "no".

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of order, I know the hon. member cannot speak without misquoting and stretching what I say.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it is a long time since we have had anything like this in this House. If the hon. member wishes to correct me let him do so.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say what he said. I particularly said that it will be necessary at times. We are not ruling out or saying let these people bring in these chairs. I said it would be necessary at times for these people to bring in some of these items. We are putting that up so that if they want to bring in these items at any time, they can. But that does not prevent the local man from building chairs, tables or anything. The local man can build his chairs, tables and desks and sell to the same people, but we do not rule out the possibility of a person who wants to bring in something from bringing it in.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in making his explanation he has even strengthened our argument further, because the facts are this: a Boarding House or small hotel will possibly want only one Station Waggon and may keep it perhaps for only three years or even longer than that; but if as it is, this House is helping the industry, more hotels both large and small will be put up and the need for furniture will increase far beyond the need for Station Waggons, so that in refusing our suggestion that one area of the furniture trade should be reserved entirely for our own people, I think the Government are doing greater damage, if damage it is, to the local craftsmen than we can be said to be doing theoretically to the taxi drivers. We do not see the force of their contention because you cannot argue that the big hotels have Station Waggons and realise at the same time that the small ones may want, but might not be able to get. All we are saying is that since it is the entire industry which you are trying to promote, and we are with you in that, you should do something in this direction for the small hotels and Boarding-houses so that they can get Station Waggons if they want to. They would be able to have them if you take off the duty, and it will be easier for them if you take off that concession, and the taxi owner will benefit from the increased volume of trade in the greater number of tourists that come, and that would not be offered competition from the Station Waggons. You have to see to it that they are not offered competition from bigger fellows, because that is where the grievance is and not from the other side.

Mr. TALMA: Sometimes you set out to do what is good but you are misinterpreted, and having had some experience with taxi owners in the past, I think, for fear lest the wrong interpretation be given to my motion whereby Luggage Vans and Station Waggons be included in this Schedule, on more mature consideration and realising that some of the large hotels may use their Station Waggons for transporting passengers from the Airport to the hotel proper, I am asking leave to withdraw both "Luggage Vans" and "Station Waggons", because I happen to know that some of the large hotels at present utilise their Luggage Vans and Station Waggons in the wrong direction, and deprive the small taxi owner of fares in transporting passengers from the Airport to the hotels.
5.00 p.m.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to refer to an allegation which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy when he was speaking about these taxi drivers. He said something to the effect that the Government allowed two large taxi owners, and he mentioned the names of Mr. Dear and Mr. Parravicino, to come at the Airport and at the Baggage Warehouse to have privileges or some remark of that nature, but that the individual taxi drivers were not allowed such privileges.

Now, Sir, I think the hon. member is living in the past and is not aware of what is happening today.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, if the hon. member will give way, on a point of order -

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am on a point of order. He should rise after me on a point of order. I am not finished

yet. All I am saying is that the new Taxi Drivers' Association -

Mr. TUDOR: How has he risen on a point of order when he was not talking from another hon. member? I do not know if he heard me correctly. I said that that was the burden of the complaint.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I was just pointing out, not only for the enlightenment of the hon. member, but the Committee and I think they may have heard this already that I did see in the correspondence in the *Advocate* the accusations which were hurled at each other and the new Taxi Drivers Association drew this to my attention and, as a result, I wrote a very strong directive about the matter. Recently, the Association said that they are very satisfied and they have no complaint.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two amendments before the Committee. One is by the hon. senior member for Christ Church for the inclusion in the Schedule of crockery and cutlery and I will put that first.

The question is that the words proposed to be inserted stand part.

The question was put and decided in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. TALMA and Mr. BRANCKER - 4.

NOES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. SEARLES, Mr. STRAUGHN, Mr. L. E. SMITH and Mr. F. G. SMITH - 10.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The second amendment is by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy for the deletion of the first paragraph in the Schedule.

The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part.

The question was put and decided in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Messrs. HOLDER, SEARLES, STRAUGHN, L. E. SMITH and F. G. SMITH - 10.

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT, Messrs. TUDOR, TALMA, and BRANCKER - 4.

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

The Second Schedule was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that the Second Schedule stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, for the reason which I gave in respect of the First Schedule, I again make a similar motion that paragraph (1) of this Schedule be deleted so that we can get rid of this concession as regards furniture made wholly or mainly of metal which inclusion must be to the detriment of local craftsmen who turn out as good a job in mahogany which is just as lasting and proof against termites and so on.

I beg to move that item (1) of the Schedule be deleted and Items (2), (3), (4) and so on be subject to consequential renumeration.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. SEARLES, STRAUGHN,

L. E. SMITH and F. F. SMITH - 11.

NOES: Messrs. WALCOTT, TUDOR, TALMA and BRANCKER - 4.

5.10 p.m.

The Third Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 18 ORDER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order, 1958."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order deals with a Resolution to provide additional staff at the Waterworks Department, namely, an Assistant Electrical Engineer. As is appointed out in the Addendum to the Resolution, for the past few years, it may be ten years or so, the water supply of this island has been doubled or more by the addition of such pumping stations as Sweet Vale, Haymans and Warleigh. Consequently, there is the need for additional staff. The present engineering establishment of the Waterworks Department consists of a Chief Engineer, a Mechanical Engineer and an Assistant Engineer; hence this Resolution is for the appointment of an additional Assistant Engineer, especially since it is expected that within a short while the Chief Engineer may retire and also the Mechanical Engineer.

As I said before, the need is felt more in the Electrical Department in this Engineering set-up. I think that this matter is quite clear; we know that there is an improvement in the distribution and pumping of water and we will readily accede to the passing of a Resolution of this sort. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the passing of that Resolution concludes the consideration of Government Business for the day.

SELECT COMMITTEE DISCHARGED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to discharge the Select Committee appointed to consider and revise the Rules of the House.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if, at this stage, a matter which has been standing in my name on the Order Paper could be dealt with. That matter was a Resolution which I understand was not circulated to hon. members, but it was the sort of thing which I thought would have been circulated like the Order Paper, because it was a small Resolution in so far as words are concerned. I would like to know what is the procedure if, before the official time for the adjournment of the House, an hon. member can proceed with any matter which is on the Order Paper under "Private Members' Business."

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage, the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business has been passed and the matter to which the hon. member has referred is a Resolution under Private Members' Business; then the hon. member may not proceed with his motion until the Resolution has been circulated. I hope that the hon. member will have the opportunity at the next meeting of the House to deal with the Resolution standing in his name.

5.20 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 21st October, 1958, at 12 noon.

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

MEETING TIME

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am moving an amendment to that motion. We have been meeting at 12 o'clock since the new Rules have been in operation, and now that we have had the opportunity of seeing how they work, let us point out the disadvantages. You ask members to meet at 12 o'clock before they can normally have any proper lunch. It is true I do not eat lunch here, but the time permitted for hon. members to take anything that can approximate to anything substantial in half an hour's time is beyond any person's proper eating capacity.

It is not fair to any man doing serious public business to ask him to come here at 12 o'clock. Prior to this we had 45 minutes to take lunch which is regarded as the main meal, but we are now asked to come here and take it in 30 minutes. The nonsense which hon. members eat for lunch does not suit me, and those who are forced to eat it either do so because it is provided free or because they do not want to say anything against it.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I tell the hon. member that he must not cast any aspersions on hon. members?

Mr. WALCOTT: If we had to pay for it, the circumstances might have been different. I do not know how the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, coming from where she does, can enjoy it; she might be one of those enduring persons. I feel sure that the sentiments which I have expressed can only be reasonable, and that is why I am moving the Adjournment until 3 o'clock, so that it would permit members to have a decent meal which they cannot take in half an hour.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the amendment made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. When the Rules of the House under which we are at present suffering were being debated in this Chamber, I pointed out that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member refers to the Rules as something we should not have done, he is reflecting on a vote of the House.

Mr. BARROW: I did not intend it in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may not have been the hon. member's intention, but he did it.

Mr. BARROW: When the Rules of the House under which we are at present abiding were debated - I refer to Your Honour's interpretation - I pointed out that when the Labour members or the people who were supposed to be representing Labour first entered this Chamber in substantial numbers, the then Leader of the House had the time of meeting changed from, I believe, 12 noon to 3 p.m., because it was considered that the earlier time was one which would suit only those persons who were enjoying unearned incomes and large rents and profits. Now that the same Labour members have been bereft of their professional Leadership, we find ourselves dis-

playing the same kind of atavistic tendencies which we were accusing the former occupants of this Chamber of exercising to the detriment of the general public of Barbados and good Parliamentary debating standards.

For the last few Meetings of this Chamber, we have managed to get through the business in a comparatively short space of time. Without reflecting at all on the vote at the time when the Rules of the House were being discussed, I will again remind Your Honour that I said that mad dogs and Englishmen come out in the midday sun, but it is not for any well-thinking Barbadian who is accustomed to enjoying what is known for want of a better name as "breakfast" or "lunch" some time between the hours of 11. a.m. and 12 noon, to come to this Chamber and give of his best in the heat of the mid-day sun. There are certain personal inconveniences suffered by the members of the House on this side. If the inconveniences which we suffer were suffered in a good and worthy cause that better legislation was the outcome of our earlier meeting, I would be the last person to level any kind of strictures against the practice of the Government now to railroad legislation through this Chamber in the heat of the mid-day sun. If I, like some hon. members, cannot always turn up to this Chamber at the earlier meeting hour, that is a matter which I will have to adjust after weighing carefully the conflicting demands which are made upon one's time. I am making no complaint on that ground, but I am convinced that in view of the fact that the Government is not so bankrupt of legislation, and we can normally get through the work put forward by the Government in a matter of three or four hours, our meeting at 12 noon in the heat of the sun is not in the best interest of the taxpayers of this island.

Quite apart from that, I have already said that I think that the less meals provided for members of this Chamber out of the taxpayers' pocket, the better perhaps, for the island of Barbados. I do not think we should try to create a privilege for people who regard their main industry as coming into this Chamber and giving vent to their personal grievances or giving expression to their ideas. I do not consider that the Ministers of Government suffer any convenience at all, because on their side, it is merely the substitution of a *locus in quo*, the transferring of themselves from the Government buildings to the Assembly Chamber during their normal hours of work. The less said about the Backbenchers on the Government side, the better; some of them are gainfully employed. Without being personal in any way, I do not regard this as any kind of slur upon them. I want to say right now that I envy them very much the leisure which they at present enjoy, and it is perhaps because I am so envious that I want to make it absolutely clear that I regard the earlier meeting as an unnecessary encroachment upon the time of those who have to earn a livelihood outside of politics. At this time of the evening we do not enjoy the same facilities or have air-conditioning which the Other Place enjoys, and this time of the evening in my opinion is the time when people like the hon. senior member for the City, like Arethusa arising from her couch of snow, can come forth from their bedrooms and give of their best to the public of Barbados. This is the time of the evening when the atmosphere of this Chamber would be less conducive to heated arguments and debates than it would be in the earlier hours of the day.

With all these considerations in mind, Mr. Speaker, I want to support the motion made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and I hope that the House will see fit at a very early stage - and I am prepared to make a substantive motion to this effect - to make some alteration in the present Rules *vis-a-vis* the time we are supposed to meet here.
5.30 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before that question is put, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few remarks. I think the whole crux of the thing is that certain hon. members of this House have not yet been able to appreciate the fact that the taxpayers' business should be given the priority of their time. What happens in this case? Hon. members

who come in here and criticise us, as you have heard just now, for meeting at 12 o'clock instead of three or four o'clock are those who are engaged in their own private undertakings.

Now, Sir, nobody envies them for that, but what they are saying is that everything must remain until they are finished with their private business and when they are finished with that, then the Government Business can proceed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am the hon. member who made this motion. I never suggested that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not accuse himself.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister said that they want to do their private business first and then come in here to do the Government Business. Only two persons have spoken on this matter and although the Hon. Minister used the word "they" and that means more than one, only two hon. members have spoken and if I made the motion, I would have to be one of them. There was no suggestion from me that something should wait until I finish my business. With the experience of meeting before, I quote that as an example. It was not a question of the convenience of members, nor is it a question of priority.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I was saying, and no doubt, nobody is annoyed with hon. members who have other undertakings to carry out before they come to the House, but that does not necessarily mean that we who regard the business of the people as a priority should not give it priority. (Mr. WALCOTT: You are a full-time Minister and get paid for that.) Sir, before we started to meet at 12 o'clock, we were meeting at 3 o'clock and a Committee of this House, including the Hon. Leader of the Opposition agreed to meeting at 12 o'clock, but, of course, as you will see, there is no discipline over there; everybody is Head; everybody is parallel with one another. (A VOICE: It is a good race between them.) I do agree with the hon. member; therefore, if there be no followers, there would be no leaders and that is how they have been moving.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was a member of that Committee which sat and agreed to these hours.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I unfortunately was not present at the meeting of the Select Committee which fixed the hours for the meeting of the House.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of correction. That Committee to the best of my knowledge fixed the hour of 2.30 o'clock for the beginning of the meeting of the House. It was only subsequently changed to 12 o'clock noon at the last moment.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I go further and inform the House that only today the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested - and we over here agreed - that the House should meet at 1.30 o'clock instead of 12 o'clock (noon).

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the understanding which I had today was that I promised you that I would discuss with the Hon. Premier the question of the change of the luncheon interval having been pointed out that 2.30 o'clock was regarded by hon. members on this side of the House as a bit too late to wait for luncheon. I gathered that you had a word with Mr. Clerk - I had no word with the hon. members on the opposite side - and he produced a new time table and asked my view about it and that is as far as we have gone. That time table fixed an earlier hour for meeting so as to get an earlier luncheon interval. I said that I could not commit myself without my colleagues. Everyone of them is a human being and they can think for themselves.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition confirms what I said. I was pointing out that instead of meeting at 12 o'clock the Hon. Leader of

the Opposition was being notified that it was suggested to meet earlier so as to have an earlier luncheon interval.

The hon. junior member for St. John, who no doubt is a very busy man has found himself in the position that this is the second occasion since the earlier time for meeting that he has come and found that the House was on the point to adjourn. He comes now and criticises the setup so far as our meeting at 12 o'clock, but again, Sir, the House can decide what time it should meet and the House has decided by its Rules that we should meet at 12 o'clock (noon), and it is the duty of every hon. member who can find time to come to the House at that time. I put it that way so as to suit the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. I repeat, that I regard the work of this House as no secondary thing. The hon. senior member for St. Peter no doubt ran into trouble on the question by criticising hon. members who take meals. I remember, Sir, that on a former occasion when this question was raised, the hon. member was the lone member of this House who criticised the provision of meals for members and after criticising it, he was forced beyond his wish, at least for some time, not to use meals in here.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister cannot say that it was beyond my wish. How can he say so when he does not know my wishes? If the Hon. Minister had been correct in repeating what I stated, he would have known that it was agreed by some of us, after members were being paid, that they would not accept meals being provided in the Assembly free and that was not the opinion of myself alone, but other members of the Government also felt that way. I can eat in here whenever I feel like eating in here, but I have decided not to eat in here as a matter of protest.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member takes objection to my remarks, I withdraw those words. It must take him some time to go somewhere else to eat here. I do not think it is fair for the hon. member to get up and criticise what this House by a vote has done. This House has made it possible by a vote for members to get refreshments when they are in here and I do not think that any member should criticise it.
5.40 p.m.

I hope that the hon. member will desist from constantly referring to our coming here and getting free lunch and that cheap kind of stuff.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member must choose his language carefully. I did not criticise any vote of the House; I said that as a result of what has been done and with the experience which we now have - the House never used to adjourn at 2.30 o'clock p.m. for lunch and come back in at 3 o'clock p.m. Even in the old days the adjournment for lunch was at 2 o'clock; that is a reflection as to whether it is convenient for us who have to eat here and who find it inconvenient to eat here and the type of lunch which is provided.

Hon. M. E. COX: In conclusion, I would like to say that it would be the height of nonsense to change the Rules now that we have agreed to them.

Mr. BARROW: There is no question of changing the Rules now and I think, Mr. Speaker, that you ought to point that out to the hon. member. If the House adjourned (A MEMBER: At 9 p.m.) at 9.00 o'clock p.m. - we have not sat until that late hour for such a long time now that I have forgotten the hour for the adjournment. However, the Rule says that after the first sitting unless the House otherwise decides - hon. members can meet at any time when they want to meet especially when they are making the motion for the adjournment.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member said that it was hard to ask people to come out in the heat of the day, thereby insinuating that the heat of the day makes the debates hot. I should like to say that we have been sitting in the absence of the hon. member and everybody will agree that the debates were pretty cool.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot speak now, the hon. Leader of the House having already replied.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am making another motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can make another motion. I should just like to look up the relevant Rule if the hon. member would give me a minute. (After a pause.) The hon. member cannot make any amendment at this stage. Rule 27 of the Rules of this House says this:

"The mover of a motion may reply after all the other Members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, and after such reply no other Member may speak, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Order."

Paragraph 2 of this Order does not arise now. The hon. member is not entitled to speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am saying that it is my privilege to be given the opportunity to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would never deprive the hon. member of that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As you will observe, Sir, as soon as I came into the House and bowed to Your Honour, the Hon. Leader of the House got up and replied.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member had given the slightest indication that he wanted to speak before the Hon. Leader of the House replied, the hon. member would have had that opportunity.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will bow to Your Honour's ruling but I would say that it is quite an easy thing for an hon. member to get up and reply

Mr. SPEAKER: The Rules govern me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suggest that Your Honour be very careful in this matter or at least you should not allow the Hon. Ministers to get up and reply like that. However, I take it that the procedure would have been for the Hon. Leader of the House to make a motion and he has replied to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot be speaking on anything now because he cannot speak under the Rules.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am drawing to Your Honour's attention that the hon. member who has just sat down would have made an original motion. What is the position? (Asides).

Mr. SPEAKER: How many Speakers have we got now? It is not the first time that I have applied the Rules and it will not be the last. I am ruling that the hon. member has not got the right to speak at this stage and that will apply to any member of the House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is Your Honour ruling that I cannot make a motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot speak.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on the motion -

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. member cannot speak unless he is speaking on a motion. The hon. member will now be speaking on absolutely nothing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: A motion is made, an amendment is moved and is it the procedure that no further amendment can be made?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not after the Hon. Minister has replied.
5.50 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do you mean that no amendment can be made now after the reply?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is an academic question. The Speaker always gives a ruling on these things, but not in the House. I can give any hon. member of the House a ruling if he would come to my Chamber.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope Your Honour will not think me rude, but I do not quite understand. Maybe it is because the Rules are new.

Mr. SPEAKER: You do not question the Speaker from the Chair to get answers on Rules.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I quite appreciate that, but I am neither replying to the motion before the House nor the amendment of the motion before the House. I am seeking Your Honour's guidance as to whether I am not entitled to reply to the motion or the amendment to the motion before the House. I should like to know, whether as a member of the House, I am entitled to make an amendment to the Adjournment of the House. That is something which I should like to know, not for my guidance only, but for every hon. member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this stage.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of Order, I wonder whether it is within your recollection that the Hon. Minister said "speaking on the Amendment" when he got up, because my impression was that after I had seconded the motion he was exercising his right and privilege to speak on the Amendment, and not speaking on the reply at all. That has come in my respectful submission without challenging the ruling which you made *vis-a-vis* the right of the hon. senior member for the City to speak. Rule 26 reads as follows:— "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."

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that after the hon. senior member for St. Peter made the motion, I seconded it. Again, Sir, and I am speaking under correction - the normal procedure would be that Your Honour would get up and put the amendment to the House, and then it would be thrown open to debate. I cannot say with certainty that that procedure was observed on this occasion. My recollection is that as soon as I had sat down, - I want to make it clear that I do not intend this as any reference on the Chair - the hon. member for St. Michael got up, and I was under the impression that he said "speaking on the amendment". I am not saying that he said it; the Reporter would know whether or not he said that. I am not accusing him of saying it, I am only saying that it was my impression with the alacrity with which he jumped to his feet after I sat down. It was not made clear to the members on this side that the member for St. Michael was not speaking on the amendment, and that he was, in truth and in fact, replying to the motion because the amendment had not been put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment did not have to be put before the reply.

Mr. BARROW: Your Honour has done so on most occasions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The reply comes last always.

Mr. BARROW: What I would like to point out is that no one spoke on the substantive motion at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: No one could speak after the member had spoken.

Mr. BARROW: No one has spoken on the amendment so far.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only correct way to interpret it is the way I have done.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sure you will give me the privilege as the Mover of the Amendment to say without in any way dealing with your ruling, to draw your attention to the point which I want verified. I will read the Rule slowly.

"A member who has spoken may speak again when a new question has been proposed by the Speaker, such as a proposed amendment."

I take that to mean that the proposed amendment which I made was to amend the original motion that this House do now adjourn until 12 noon next Tuesday. My proposed amendment was that this House do now adjourn until 3 p.m. and it was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. John. The hon. senior member for St. Michael did not give His Honour the opportunity of having the amendment read out by the Clerk. What happened is that the Hon. Leader of the House took the opportunity when the Hon. Seconder of my motion sat down to reply to what we had proposed, and therefore it meant that he, without doing it on purpose, replied to what we were proposing. The motion from this side is still the motion which the Mover of the original motion will have to bear in mind, and any member who wanted to support the original motion should be given an opportunity to do so. When the hon. member for St. John sat, the Leader of the House rose very quickly, and I was under the impression that he rose in order to reply, if that was a means of setting everybody's mind at rest. As far as the Rules are concerned, we will have to see how they work for subsequent purposes, because since the new Rules have been in operation, when a motion is made and a proposed amendment is made to it, the question is read by the Clerk and hon. members can get up and speak. It is clearly a matter, therefore, of procedure and for Your Honour to decide at what stage hon. members are permitted to speak on an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already so decided.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st October, at 3 p.m. was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: F. G. SMITH; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; and Mr. BRANCKER - 7

NOES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Mr. HOLDER; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. STRAUGHN; and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 11

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 21st October at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Mr. BRYAN; Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. COX; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE; Mr. HOLDER; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. L. E. SMITH - 11

NOES: Mr. F. G. SMITH; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. TUDOR; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW and Mr. BRANCKER - 7

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

6.00 p.m.