

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th February, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m., o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Esquire, Q.C., (Speaker); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, (Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister of Communications, Works and Housing); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Mr. G. V. BATSON, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. G. B. YEARWOOD.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meeting of the 19th February, 1963, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members: and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (After a pause.) Hearing no objection, I declare that the Minutes of the meeting of that date now duly confirmed.

Hon. E. W. Barrow entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

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

Resolution to place the sum of \$149,091 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 41, which forms the schedule to the Resolution.

QUESTIONS

The following notices of Questions were given:-

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is it a fact that grave dissatisfaction exists among the staff of the Barbados Fire Brigade due to firemen having to clean the yard, toilet bowls, basins and places where they may be observed by the passing public?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider stopping such a practice?

3. Will Government further consider the employment of Janitors for such work, thereby relieving some of the unemployment in this country?

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

In view of the fact that not only males but also females administer Justice throughout the Island, will Government seriously consider the inclusion of females to serve on the Jury from the next sitting of the Court of Grand Sessions?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolution of which notice has just been given by the Hon. Premier.

REPLY LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform the House that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 84/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas on the 6th November, 1962, is now ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only answer which has been laid to an Oral Question today is that of No. 84/1962 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas.

FIRE STATION FOR ST. THOMAS

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government explore the possibility of erecting a Fire Station at some central spot in the parish of St. Thomas in view of the number of fires that have been taking place in the said parish?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

The question of extension of fire Services in the Island is under constant examination by the Government. Statistics of fires, however, do not indicate that the incidence of fires in St. Thomas would place this parish in a priority position for the establishment of a fire station.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no other answers to questions ready and the House may now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it has been intimated to me on entering the House that hon. members on

the other side of the Table are quite prepared to have us proceed now to Government Business in order to deal with a single money Resolution, and after that to take the adjournment. I may add, Sir, that the Police Authorities are also anxious that we should conclude this sitting of the House as early as we possibly can in order not to interfere with the arrangements for the current festivities. They have asked us to co-operate in the matter.
2.50 p.m.

They have not suggested anything; they have merely asked if we could co-operate; therefore, Sir, if hon. members are agreed, the Government is quite prepared to deal with this single money Resolution on the Order Paper and then adjourn today's meeting until next Tuesday.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the House were not made in the tone in which they were made, I would regard it as gross parliamentary impertinence when he made the suggestion that something was intimated to him. Normally speaking, this is Private Members' Time, and I am going to stamp out completely in this House the idea that the Premier or any member of this House can undertake to enter into Private Members' Business. I think that last Tuesday or some Tuesdays ago my colleague made it quite clear the functions of the House in certain matters in which it is Parliament's prerogative. The Standing Orders are here; they have not been suspended, and with respect to the question of any intimation to the Hon. Leader of the House, I must say that respect is due to each member. Who could intimate something to him in this House other than the person in whose name the first Order stands under Private Members' Business? Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in my name; so who could intimate to him that my Order was going to be postponed? If some member of this House is so impertinent and discourteous as to try to ignore another hon. member and his rights and privilege in here, I am not standing for it. Moreover, the other outrageous remark about the Police Authorities.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member is not correct. When we came in here earlier before the House started, the hon. member was not here. Other members on the Opposition benches made the suggestion to me; I did not ask them. As soon as I saw the hon. member in his place, I asked the Marshal of the House to go to him and ask him whether he would agree to the suggestion. What more could have been done?

Mr. WALCOTT: And I said "No".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: He did not tell me so. Furthermore I do not want to go on with this. All I am saying is that I know they would like us to end the session as early as is possible, and therefore if we can, we will co-operate. They could not be so rude as to tell us when to end.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I interpose and say this? Realising that today would be what we all know it to be, and also that the business of Parliament is first in the nation, I had an official communique sent to the Commissioner of Police wherein I stated 'The House of Assembly is scheduled to meet at 2.30 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, 26th instant. In view of the fact that Carnival processions, etc., may be taking place during that afternoon, and possibly in the vicinity of the Public Buildings, I am instructed by the Speaker to request that adequate arrangements be made by the Police to ensure that the business of Parliament may proceed without undue interference or interruption.

In anticipation of the wholehearted co-operation of Your Department, I am instructed to tender the Speaker's thanks."

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As the Hon. Premier intimated, the Police are quite prepared to accede to your request. As a matter of fact, they notified him this morning that they are doing that, but merely in the interest of allowing the public to give vent to their feelings in Carnival to the maximum extent possible, we are suggesting to have the proceedings come to an end as early as possible. The

Police themselves have made it quite clear that they have acceded to Your Honour's request, and that everything necessary will be done to ensure that none of the revelry interferes with the proceedings of the House.

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON RESOLUTION re. FARM LABOUR PROGRAMME IN THE U.S.A.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter: to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution re. Farm Labour Programme in the U.S.A. When the House adjourned on the previous occasion, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was exercising his right of final reply. Does the hon. member propose to continue?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, in normal circumstances, it might not be necessary for me to say what I propose to do on this occasion, but in recent weeks the attitude of the Leader of the House, and may I say the Government, in matters such as this, have lacked a certain measure of understanding of dates. I am not running Government Business, and I think it is appropriate that those who have been entrusted with the responsibility of so doing must make themselves aware and acquainted with all the so-called national events, and do not subject us to any position subsequently on these dates that we have to accommodate people. Last Tuesday it was within the province of the Leader of the House to have adjourned this House until mid-day today or to have adjourned it for a fortnight or for any date convenient for those revellers who want to enjoy what is known as Carnival in Barbados. We were invited to come here at 2.30 p.m. today when it is Private Members' Time; the hon. member has exercised his privilege in dealing with this matter, and now that I have to reply he is asking me to forego the time in order to accommodate the revellers. The Permanent Secretaries and Secretaries of Government must inform them of these national events, and let them postpone Parliament to suit these things.

I would say that the Government today is not a cocktail Government, a Carnival Government or a cricket Government. For that reason I felt when they adjourned until today that they did not in any way care anything about Carnival or any of these events and that Parliament came first. I was literally shocked to hear that we were going to accommodate this situation when the accommodation was in the hands of the Hon. Minister to have adjourned the House to a date that suits the Government in all the events. I am not going to shorten my speech by a half second in order to accommodate any Carnival or any revellers, and I say that at the beginning, because when the hon. member was making a statement on this matter, he made by innuendo a remark that you do not want to pander to people's feelings in this matter, and this Resolution, apparently, so far as he is concerned, was one in which the mover had been pandering to the wishes of people who had gone to the United States and had been sent back. My parliamentary record.....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, is the hon. member quoting me when he said that by bringing this Resolution he was pandering to somebody's wishes? Nothing that I have said could even most remotely be interpreted to convey that suggestion.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not quoting him, Sir, because you will very well remember that the hon. member made a long speech, and I would have to be blessed with more than an ordinary memory to repeat it. I am saying that at the beginning of the hon. member's opening remarks, he conveyed to the House that we have at some time or other to act in a manner not of pandering to people's feelings and wishes, and that is how I took it. There cannot be any point of order on that; but if the hon. member wants to state precisely what he said, I am not opposed to that. I made it clear in my opening remarks that my parliamentary record does not bear that out so far as my attitude to matters go, and I even drew reference to what had taken place earlier. Last year or during the year when some section of workers in this Island wanted to hold my Organisation and myself up to ransom, I said even then that the workers found refuge

among Government Ministers in their unreasonable attitude, and to show my attitude I did not care where they found refuge as long as I felt what I was doing was right. On a matter such as this, I would like to make it clear that this Resolution was introduced by me, Mr. Speaker, on the 11th December, 1962.
3.00 p.m.

Today is two months after this Resolution was moved by me and, may be, the circumstances have changed in that we had a long Christmas recess and the House did not have the opportunity of debating this matter closer to the event. Therefore, we are discussing this matter two months after the event. I pointed out that to the Government.

I should also draw to Your Honour's attention the text of the Resolution and I will reply to what the Hon. Minister said when he was dealing with the matter. What he said left me a little dumbfounded because I wondered how he could have made the speech he did and at such length replying to the text of this Resolution. The Resolution reads as follows:-

"WHEREAS the Barbados Government sent a Mission to the United States of America to investigate the causes for the breaches of contract of Farm Workers employed under the Migrant Scheme;

AND WHEREAS the Mission submitted a report to the Government, which was approved by the House of Assembly;

AND WHEREAS, notwithstanding the action of the Government and the report of the Mission the recent return of large numbers of workers from the United States of America justifies an investigation;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the House of Assembly request the Government to call upon the West Indian Regional Labour Board to carry out an investigation into the causes of the recent termination of contracts of Farm Workers in the United States of America.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House of Assembly request the Government in collaboration with the other member Governments of the West Indian Regional Labour Board to include a Trade Union Representative from the Caribbean Congress of Labour on the West Indian Regional Labour Board."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the facts are that sometime between the months of October and November, 1962, 109 workers left Barbados one week to work on U.S. Farms and the following week 108 returned. I was away from the Island and as soon as I came back, at the first meeting of the House which I attended, I tabled this Resolution. No opportunity was given to me to discuss this Resolution nearer to the return of the workers and now, two months after, I have the opportunity to do so.

The Hon. Minister read out figures supplied him from the U.S.A. in a general way, but this Resolution was dealing specifically with an investigation into the circumstances. When the Hon. Minister spoke on this matter, I thought he would have taken the opportunity to state that in view of the fact that this Resolution was introduced on the 11th November last, and he had the opportunity after six weeks to reply, he was now in the possession of information which no longer made the carrying out of an investigation necessary. In other words, what I was seeking for on the 11th November he was in the position to give us the information dealing with the facts.

What the Hon. Minister said at the beginning in so far as the attitude of the U.S.A. Government and the U.S.A. employers is concerned, has caused me to say again that if something can be regarded as gross parliamentary impertinence and inferiority of the lowest order, it is for any Government in any part of the world to challenge the right of parliamentarians or of a parliamentarian within his own country to ask that an investigation be carried out on behalf of workers of its own country. To do so is one of the grossest pieces of parliamentary indifference, and we would be

reducing ourselves to the very lowest bottom of any parliamentary position.

The Hon. Minister said that this Resolution would cause the U.S.A. President to look upon us and what we were doing as prejudicing the scheme. He said that if this Resolution was passed it would prejudice the scheme in the U.S.A.. I object most strenuously to that. We had this same sort of position when some Barbadians felt that Dr. Williams was wrong when he expressed his opinions when dealing with the question of the Chaguaramus Base with the U.S.A. Government. What has happened is that today we find that Dr. Williams said what he did and the U.S.A. Government has the highest respect for the Trinidad Government and for Dr. Williams, and nothing has happened to his country as a result. As a matter of fact, he is regarded with higher respect by the U.S.A. Government than may be what existed before. If you are afraid of reality, then I happen not to be a Barbadian.

If the Hon. Minister had asked that I withdraw the Resolution after we had discussed the matter and he had given the information which I asked for, I would have willingly withdrawn my Resolution.

In my Resolution, I was asking the Barbados Government to investigate the circumstances; I did not ask to send a Mission to the U.S.A. After all, you must credit me with some atom of commonsense. Why should I ask the Government to send a Mission back to the U.S.A. when I myself went on the Mission for the Government in connection with the same matter earlier in the year? I asked for an investigation. I asked that you investigate the question of the return of those workers. There was nothing wrong in your telling me why it was that those people came back and what were the circumstances that led to their return.

I think the Hon. Minister of Trade has fallen into the normal Barbadian attitude that when you ask for an investigation like this, you want somebody to go to the U.S.A.. Americans at this time of the year want to come to Barbados; do you think Barbadians would be begging at this time of the year to be sent to the U.S.A.? I know, Your Honour knows, what it is to be cold in a cold climate. I am a man who is interested in public affairs, and I do not mince matters in any matter that comes under public affairs. When I feel that I should deal with a specific matter under public affairs, I am going to deal with it and this is a matter which reached such proportions that I felt it should be investigated; therefore I resent and repudiate the suggestions of the Hon. Minister that what we were doing would prejudice the situation.

The hon. member spoke of an article in a newspaper. I never wrote any article in any newspaper. But we are not here referring to any article which was written in a newspaper or anywhere, neither should any newspaper dictate to us our public affairs, because if we were to do that we would have to arrive at decisions based on what newspapers said. I do not feel that we have to pay too much attention to articles appearing in newspapers as long as we are satisfied that our facts are right.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see where the Hon. Minister of Trade could have reached the stage when reading this Resolution that it had any suggestion that you had to send somebody to the U.S.A. to carry out investigations. Moreover, I made this clear in the Resolution — and I would say that it is a very carefully prepared Resolution because it gives the Government credit for taking action and it gives the House of Assembly credit for approving of the report of the Mission which was sent to investigate. It goes further and requests — not a demand — and there is nothing wrong in requesting the Government — not commanding the Government or doing anything of the nature more than being persuasive — to call upon the West Indian Regional Labour Board to carry out an investigation into the causes of the recent termination of contracts of the farm workers.

Now, Sir, I did not know that the House was going to adjourn when it did on the 11th December last, the date on which I introduced this Resolution. I knew then that there

was going to be a meeting of the West Indian Regional Labour Board in Jamaica and I felt that a Resolution like this would have given the Government of Barbados the opportunity, if they so agreed to pass it, to request the West Indian Regional Labour Board to carry out an investigation for the Government. In any event, I took it that the Government would ask the West Indian Regional Labour Board for a report on the matter.
3.10 p.m.

It was done in December when a Labour Board meeting would have been held in January; it was done in order that this could be presented to the West Indian Regional Labour Board. But the Hon. Minister is regarding this request of the Regional Labour Board as an affront to the West Indian Labour Scheme in the United States, to the United States Government and to the United States employers, and they are to condemn this House and a parliamentarian for attempting to do something which he has a right to do and which is in the interest of the community. What I was requesting is what the Hon. Minister was at pains to say that he had investigated, but the employers do not regard it as something for him to investigate and we were calling upon the West Indian Regional Labour Board to carry out this investigation. What is wrong with that knowing that we employ in the United States of America a Central West Indian Labour Organization of which Mr. Edwards of Jamaica is the head? What is wrong in asking him and the Liaison officers to carry out this investigation and let the Government know why 108 people have returned from the United States of America? Are you saying that because Barbadians have gone there and have returned in large numbers, because some of them have acted stupidly, we are to lose our rights and privileges as parliamentarians in asking questions because the United States Government or the United States employers do not like it? What do you want to reduce us to? Are we serfs or doormats for American employers?

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the benefits which we get from this scheme, let me make it quite clear that we are getting the benefits of this scheme because the workers in the United States of America have no love for that sort of work. If they had love for work in Florida, the United States Labour Department would never issue any certificate to bring foreign labour there to do that work. They manufacture sugar in the United States of America, for instance but none of these foreign workers are employed to go into the United States sugar factories because American workers can work in those factories. Do not let us regard this scheme as something for which the United States Labour Department is bending over backwards in order to recruit labour in the United States of America; but the farm vote is a large vote. You cannot get the American workers to do this work in America so easily; they are still employing labour to cut canes; but as soon as the Barbadians hear about the slightest crisis, they find an answer. You will find out that, as a net result, when you have a few cane-cutters and machines are doing the work, some of the machines will go overboard. That is only an aside. The Hon. Minister was a protagonist of this emigration scheme since 1944 and he should be aware that the circumstances today are quite different from what they were in 1944; he should know that this investigation was not an investigation into the working of the scheme in itself, but it was an investigation into the reasons why so many people have returned to Barbados notwithstanding the fact that there was a Mission which went to the United States of America early in the year. This request which I am making is quite a reasonable one which you would ask the Government to make. What I take real objection to is the gradual derogation of our parliamentary rights by innuendo made by the Minister about the American employers and that the American Government would look dimly on this scheme. I spoke about an article having been written and I would like to know what article....

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I do not know if I can refresh the hon. member's memory, but the article to which he is referring was not an article in the sense that it was an original article written by any newspaper. It was merely an article reporting the fact that the hon. member had tabled this Resolution in this House and the article was merely giving the text of the Resolution. That is all.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, look at the gross impertinence! Somebody is quoting the text of a Resolution which an hon. member has put forward in Parliament on behalf of workers who are working in a foreign country, and somebody is regarding that as something which has been quoted *verbatim* as if we have to get their approbation before we do something in here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. It is not that anybody is taking the article, as the hon. member seems to think, and using it in a derogatory sense to the established rights and privileges of Parliament. I have always said that in view of the fact that the Regional Labour Board normally and automatically undertakes annually this investigation, and moreover, it undertakes an individual investigation in the case history of every single worker who returns here before the expiration of his contract, it would be superfluous to ask the Regional Labour Board to undertake what it has already done. That was the approach by the employers and the State Department; it was not an approach, as the hon. member seems to think, that the rights and privileges of a parliamentarian in Barbados are being assailed and being detracted from or disregarded in any way. It is merely that possibly the hon. member was not aware of the fact that automatically the Board has to carry out an investigation and therefore there is no reason to call for another.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for the ignorance of employers in the United States of America. I am not one of those who believe that ignorance is so scarce in the United States of America that it cannot pass over the United States employers.
3.20 p.m.

The United States Employers and other people are very touchy on Communism. What idiot is going to go along with everything that the American Government says about Communism because their attitude is what it is? When we see a "C" which can stand for "Clyde" or "Coward", are we going to say that it means Communism? What am I to do with an ignorant employer who takes up the text of a Resolution and is incapable of understanding the text of the article, or a foolish American writing for money, writes something to satisfy the employer? Why should I be afraid of that? The hon. member is making excuses for the American employers and the American Government in relation to this Resolution. I want the hon. member to understand that the West Indian Regional Labour Board is run by workers' money; it is not United States money; it is not the Barbados Government's money; it is not the Jamaican Government's money; it is money contributed by all these workers over the years which has reached a substantial proportion through their earnings from all the way back in 1944. The workers have made contributions to the West Indian Labour Board with the idea that it can stand up as an organisation.

Now, Sir, I do not think anyone can say that I am asking the Workers' Organisation to carry out an investigation, but the hon. member said that they carry out these normal things. Here in this Island the Minister was more concerned about some workers who had been displaced and compensated as against workers who came back from the United States and you did not know the reason, and the hon. member was asking the Government not to give them any work in the crash programme for which they would be paid from the Government Treasury. We are asking the Government to request the Regional Labour Board to carry out an investigation into this matter. The hon. member is saying now that this investigation would normally be carried out because he is now speaking in February, but he could not have given me the information he has given me today if he had spoken on the Resolution on 18th December before the West Indian Regional Labour Board met. Before the Board met and this was requested to be put to them in January, what would have been wrong with it? He is acting as though this request came to him after the Regional Labour Board met. This Resolution was here before and I maintain that there is absolutely nothing wrong in requesting it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the hon. member must not be making these mis-representations. To begin with, I would not have come in here to speak on this

Resolution without first informing myself as to what is the position. The fact that the Regional Labour Board met in January has nothing at all to do with the investigation. This is common routine operation of the Board; therefore whether or not they met in January, the moment I began to study information on this case, I would have come up against the knowledge that normally it is the practice of the Board to conduct an annual investigation. Furthermore, he must not say that I do not know why they came back, because before I intervened in this debate, I made it my business to find out why they came back; and not only did I do that, but I brought into the Assembly a report of every individual case of every returning worker and also showed it to him, and told him that of the 264 people who came back, 241 came back purely on the grounds that they refused to cut canes, and of the 264 only 23 came back for other reasons other than refusing to cut canes.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member speaks to the side, but I am a man who has nobody at my side buzzing in my ears. Besides I object to his statement about misrepresentation. The hon. member does not listen. I never misrepresented anything he has said. I said that if he had to speak on this on 18th December, he could not have given the information which he gave; but speaking today in February was a different matter. The hon. member could not have done that when I tabled this motion. I happen to know more about this matter than the Minister under whose portfolio it falls, because the Regional Labour Board is not anything that meets like a Board of Directors. The Regional Labour Board only meets annually; it is not a Board meeting like the Cabinet from week to week or from day to day. This Organisation meets once a year; so he would not have had a Report from the Board. He had a report from the Central West Indian Labour Organisation in Washington which is a different thing from the Board, because Mr. Edwards could give him a report. The hon. member must understand that I am a student of public affairs, and I knew in December that the Board was going to meet in January as distinct from the Central West Indian Labour Organisation.

Mr. Speaker, my Resolution was based on the 108 people who came back, and people also returned to Jamaica. The circumstances with the October and November returnees are different from anything that existed before; therefore is the Minister suggesting that because something happens today in the Government for which there is no enquiry or investigation, that if something happens which involves more people he is going to say it is the same thing? Is he saying that 108 people returning out of 109 is the same as 42 or 30 coming back? Do you not regard that Mr. Speaker, as something that requires investigation? When the hon. member tells me it is superfluous to have a Resolution investigating into a matter that transcends anything that has ever happened before, I must say that this is the highest number of returnees that ever came back to Barbados from any batch you have sent at any time, and it was also a high proportion, and the hon. member spoke not in percentages. One million people are a lot of people whether in Russia or China; but because China has four million people, you cannot walk through one million and say that is only one million out of four million, and it would be a different thing if you did that in the West Indies because it would be one million out of three million. A million is a million in the context that you are dealing with people. You cannot ignore 108 out of 109 people as nothing and regard it as an every-day occurrence.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the Government and the Hon. Minister is no different in this respect from his predecessor where whenever you ask them to investigate something when they happened to be in office, they regarded it as an investigation into their character. I am not asking any person where he goes at night or what the Minister does. I am not asking questions about his private affairs.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I really must object to this. The hon. member is completely unconscionable. He ought to be the last person to accuse me or any member of this Government of being unwilling to conduct an investigation into this matter or

any other matter, for the simple reason that the hon. member knows that the very first step I took in assuming office was to conduct an investigation into this matter and ask him to participate in this matter, and it is absolutely absurd for the hon. member to come here today and with his tongue in his cheek and with absolute disregard for the facts to say that any member of this Government is to be compared in terms of indifference and irresponsibility with members of a former Government. He knows that when we came into office and found that the situation needed investigation, not only did we investigate, but asked him to participate in the investigation. It is the most illogical and unconscionable remark I have ever heard him make in my life.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member may talk about unconscionable. Does he think that I am a political loafer? I want to make it known to you or to anybody in Barbados that I am not in public life to ask any favours. You do not do me any favours; so there is nothing about being unconscionable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I neither admit nor deny having done the hon. senior member for St. Peter any favours.

Mr. WALCOTT: And I hope not to ask anybody. I want no favours from anyone.
3.30 p.m.

This Resolution begins by saying that you sent a Mission to the United States of America. Do you think, when I went on the Mission myself that I would ask the House to participate in sending another Mission? By his reply he is acting in the same way as his predecessors. He said it was superfluous.

Mr. SPEAKER: Whose words were those?

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are intelligent enough to know that you do not have to repeat "the Hon. Minister" all the time. You can use the pronoun sometimes. I am sure you would not ask me each time to state "the Hon. Minister" because You Honour knows that I am not referring to Your Honour but to the particular Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for assuming that amount of intelligence to the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister of Trade made a lengthy speech on this matter and the hon. member talked about my being unconscionable. Well, Mr. Speaker, you very well know that sometimes if you are not in a good mood you would really lose your temper. When the hon. member said that it was unconscionable, even if I grant you that I have no conscience, I would say that the Hon. Minister is completely devoid of what a basic human being should have, and that is commonsense. I say that because any man with a modicum of commonsense who read this Resolution would not make the retort which the Hon. Minister made. He started off on the premise that I was asking the Government to send somebody to the U.S.A. I said "No"; I was asking the Barbados Government to carry out an investigation because in one week 108 workers returned. Because of that, I said: "Let me know why those workers returned." The Hon. Minister said: "How can we pick up somebody now and send them to the U.S.A. after sending a Mission earlier?" That goes to show that his premise was wrong and he was labouring under the impression that this Resolution was asking the Government to send somebody to the U.S.A. I say that for anybody to have this Resolution in their hands for eight weeks and then to say what the Hon. Minister said, you would say that something is wrong with his intelligence because the Resolution was not asking this Government to send somebody somewhere, it was asking the Government to ask the West Indian Regional Labour Board to carry out the investigation.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker. Some Ministers do not like to admit that they are wrong. The Hon. Minister of

Trade started off by asking the House not to vote for the Resolution because it would be stupid to send another Mission to the U.S.A..

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not start off with that. I merely started off by quoting a letter sent from the Employers' Organisation stating that the tolerance and the sympathy of the American employers had been strained by these comments and criticisms on the Labour Programme in the U.S.A.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You must kindly note that you cannot regard that as a point of order. Something which I said must be repudiated. I said that this Resolution was not asking this House of Assembly to send a Mission to the U.S.A. but to ask the West Indian Regional Labour Board to carry out an investigation for you and I said that the hon. member started off by asking the House not to vote for it. The hon. member must say that he did not say that. I repeat, he said it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Hon. Minister risen on a point of elucidation to elucidate a point raised by him in the course of his speech?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I rose on a point of order. I rose to say this. My reason for asking the House not to support any investigation was given in the most simple terms and only at the end of my speech. Before I said that, I put the facts and figures which I had and all the other circumstances. Then at the end I said that in view of all this, we could support the latter request, but we could not support the other paragraph in the Resolution. It is quite simple. I did not start off by asking the House not to support the Resolution at all.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, my Resolution is not an indictment on anybody. The Hon. Minister has failed to understand what he said. The sequence of his speech and the burden of his speech was that this Resolution was asking that you send another Mission to the U.S.A. which he considered was a waste of money. The Hon. Minister must be big enough to acknowledge that he said so. Why should I rise on a point of order then when I realised that I have the opportunity to reply?

I challenge the Hon. Minister to go and read his speech and he would see that he said that it would be a waste of time to send a Mission again. As a Minister, he has the right to come in here and draw to Your Honour's attention that what I am saying is wrong. I repeat, he did not read the text of the Resolution carefully. If he had read it carefully he would not have made that error because he continually associated an investigation with a Mission, and he continued to say that this Resolution was asking the Government to send a Mission to the U.S.A. I pointed out that the Regional Labour Board had to meet in January and the reason why I chose to introduce the Resolution on the 11th December was to give the Government an opportunity, if the Resolution was passed, to request the Regional Labour Board to carry out the investigation, and if this Resolution was passed then, the Regional Labour Board could have carried out the investigation.
3.40 p.m.

What I thought the hon. member would have taken the opportunity to say is that in view of the fact that I had brought forward this Resolution on the 11th December, 1962, they were now in a position to give me the information on it. I thought he would have said that he would give me the facts about what I have asked. In that case, I would have thanked the hon. member very much for the information which he had given to me because he would have given me what I had requested. But the hon. member wants to hold somebody up to ransom as if I am putting up a Resolution knowing that the facts are there and knowing that he has given me the information; however, he is forgetting that this Resolution was tabled on the 11th December. He is giving the impression that the American Consul, the American Government, the President of the United States of America or any employer in the United States will be saying that if any hon. member of this House were to ask

this question they would ask that the whole scheme be withdrawn. Mr. Speaker, that would be a very atrocious situation; you cannot have that. Under the I.L.O. conventions, migrants are entitled to be represented.

Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to deal with this matter like this. I do not regard it as any indictment on the American employers, the American Government, the Minister or anybody else. I have said that if you want a proper emigration scheme you should go into all of these things. The hon. member started off his speech by talking about emotionalism; what emotionalism is he talking about? Is there any emotionalism in this? I would be quite prepared to accept even now that the hon. member has given the information which he has given and which has satisfied me, that an investigation was carried out; but I do object to this sort of innuendo that you are putting up these things. The type of speech which the Hon. Minister has made cannot do the Government any good. He seems to think that the American Government would take offence at the Government of this colony, that they will back off and say that if we do this thing the American Government will stop giving us any aid, they will stop the lendlease, they would take away the naval base in St. Lucy, and that sort of thing. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not beggars. When are we going to get up and assert ourselves like men? All of these little petty arguments which you see some idiots write in the newspaper, and all of the rubbish you see about the same argument being written about political fears are to pressurise people; now you get the Hon. Minister acquiescing in this sort of rubbish and telling us that we will lose all of these things. The hon. member knows that Mr. Williams went to Jamaica in January and he would not have all of this information which he now has. I want to say that if the United States Government gets offended because I have tabled this Resolution, then let them pass a Resolution in their Parliament protesting against it.

The hon. member spoke about the Jamaica Government. What we are asking in this Resolution is that the Government, in collaboration with the other member Governments call upon the West Indian Regional Labour Board to include a Trade Union representative from the Caribbean Congress of Labour on the West Indian Regional Labour Board. That was asked for by the Caribbean Congress of Labour as a regional labour organization, and it must be remembered that when they had the old West Indian Federation, one of the Senators in the Senate raised this question about the Farm Labour Programme in the United States of America and that caused a flurry on one occasion. Some Trinidadians went up to the United States of America subsequent to my going up there and they had a big flurry about the Farm Labour Programme. By and large it was not an ideal programme, and therefore the representatives of the Workers had asked their respective members of parliament to draw this matter to the attention of their respective Governments and ask them to include on the membership of the Regional Labour Board a Trade Union Representative from the Caribbean Congress of Labour. Mr. Speaker, I am a very busy man; I am not a displaced politician who is looking for a trade union to organise; I am not looking for work to do; I am an extremely busy man; I do not find the time to do the things which I have to do. I worked on Saturday last when there was a Bank Holiday and I may say that I cannot meet all the commitments which I have this week. I have to attend a meeting in Brussels this month. I am not looking for any pork-knocking board. I have been in public life for too long not to know what it is to serve. There was a situation in California which the Mexican Labour Board had to deal with.

The hon. member says that the Jamaican Government feels that they have a person on this Board already. I do not go on with this soft footing when it comes to this sort of thing. I do not subscribe to the view that a man should be a Minister of Labour, the General Secretary of a Trade Union and should carry on a strike in the right hand and receive a Ministry in the other hand. I do not pressurise the Government that they must do this thing or that thing; I do not go to the Government Headquarters and say that if you do not give me so-and-so you will get a strike; neither do I subscribe to the view that the Government should run

a Trade Union and you must know who is to be put on the Executive. The Jamaicans have good reasons to object to this; but the same Manley Government would like this Trade Union to be affiliated to the big Industrial Organization. I represent a strong Trade Union in a little place, but I must say that they cannot get that to work unless I give them the O.K. The West Indian Regional Labour Board is not as big as the I.C.F.T.U. which represents 55 million people all over the world and that is where the Bustamante Union wants to be now. We do not care who goes; but we are saying that the Caribbean Congress of Labour should have a Trade Union representative on the West Indian Regional Labour Board, and I do not see that there is anything wrong with that.

The Hon. Minister was quite wrong in imputing motives about me. My attitude about the Minister is this; if anybody talked with his tongue in his cheek about labour matters, it is the Minister himself. I am not a Socialist or a Labourite out of expediency; I am a Socialist and Labourite right deep down in my soul. I do not believe in that because I am in this position; I am in this position because I happen to represent the workers. When the hon. member talks about my talking with my tongue in my cheek, why would I have to talk with my tongue in my cheek when I am asking for an investigation into this matter?

3.50 p.m.

The reason why I said the hon. member is acting no differently from his predecessors in this matter is because whenever you asked his predecessors for an investigation into any matter, they always made the excuse that they had done it already or that they were just thinking of doing it, just as the Minister is saying that my Resolution is superfluous. I am asking you whether this is something which should not be investigated. The fact that 108 people returned out of 109 requires investigation. If that does not require investigation, what does? The hon. member should not make the remark about my talking with my tongue in my cheek. You say that about people who do not mean what they say, but say it for effect. The hon. member in his speech talked about emotionalism. I would be the last person to look for emotionalism, because I am not afraid to die. People who believe they are not going to die would have to be afraid, because they think they can postpone death.

Mr. Speaker, there are men walking about Bridgetown who can scare Government, but you can write all the threatening letters you can until you are sick, that is not going to make me afraid. On the other hand, the members of the Government have to listen because they want votes. You have to get votes to put you in power, but with me if you do not vote for Frank Walcott, you do not vote, but I have not lost any Government. I am one of those men in Barbados who tells workers that they must understand that at some time in their lives somebody is going to tell them what he thinks, without being afraid of the reaction and consequences that arise from telling them so. I am not going to tell a man that I will get \$100 for him when he can only get 10 cents; so it is not a question of emotionalism with me. Those days are past. I have been married for twenty-three years and all my emotionalism has gone; it is reality now. I have been in public affairs too long for you to tell me about emotionalism.

What I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister in connection with this same matter is that he should examine his own Employment Exchange and Registration and Recruitment of Workers Regulations, copies of which have been printed. We have no power to deal with these Regulations, Mr. Speaker, because the Act confers that on them; but there is no provision in the Regulations for the renewal of registration. After you have printed a big document like this and there is no provision for renewal, if a man goes to America or if he is sent to prison, he is still a registered worker, and you would have cluttered up down there a large number of names and top-heavy bureaucracy for which there would be no means of relieving the list; so the hon. member should look into that and make provision for renewal so that after you have registered once, you will have to go back and renew your registration, because under these Regulations only a magistrate can can-

cel your registration; the Labour Commissioner cannot cancel it.

It is my business to read these Regulations, and I would invite the hon. member not to waste public funds by having the whole of Barbados registered on this basis, because you will give a top-heavy outlook when you come to the statistics to find out who are unemployed, because you will have a man who is already in employment being registered, you will have a man who has gone away being registered, and you will have a man who has died being registered, and if this list does not come up for renewal, it would never be up-to-date and you will have no true record. They would produce another mathematical conundrum just as the Barbadians are famous for doing. You get some ignorant people after elections saying that the ones who lost got more votes than the Government, because they added all their votes with the other man's votes and called them their votes, so that there were more people voting in Barbados than the total population. A gentleman by the name of Mr. Chase produced that political conundrum which people think is sacrosanct and sacred. I asked Dr. Lewis in the presence of the hon. member about this conundrum where in a double constituency the man who lost got more votes than the man who won. The man who lost added his votes to those of his partner and said that he got more votes than the man who won; so you get this whole joke where more people vote in Barbados than the people who were born, and that included all the little children, all the mad men and all the people in the almshouses. This is the same conundrum which the Labour Party produced in which they only had 1,600 people unemployed or some fanciful figure like that, and in which by adding one and one and by some other method they produced five jobs from one job, and by this method they were going to create 40,000 jobs; so they would have to import people to carry out their programme.

Mr. Speaker, if names are put on the list in this fashion, in five years' time the Barbados Labour Exchange will have more people on the list than the total population of Barbados, since those who go away and never come back are still on the list because there is no provision for renewal. This may have been put up to the Minister by the Department; but we have a Department too, and I have to read these things.

Notwithstanding the less elegant remarks made by the Minister to me on this matter, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I thank him for the information he has given relating to the investigation which had been carried out since this Resolution was placed before the House. That is what I was requesting, and not for him to send a mission to the United States of America. I thank him very much for the statistical information about people returning and the reason for it. I thank my colleague for the support he has given me in this Resolution, and I now ask leave to withdraw the Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is seeking the leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution which has just been completed, and which was seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted to the hon. member. No objection being audible, leave is granted the hon. member to withdraw the Resolution. The Resolution is accordingly withdrawn.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be the next Order of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. James who is not in his place.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask for leave to suspend further consideration of Private Members' Business.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who would care to proceed this afternoon with Private Members' Business?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is another item before mine, but I take it that my Order which is No. 3 would be finished since we have a few more minutes. I would not mind closing off the debate now, because the Minister was replying.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is not giving way?

Mr. SMITH: Yes.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, may I say this? The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was the first member on my entering the House today to propose to me that we should not deal with Private Members' Business and, therefore, I assumed that he would not have insisted at this stage to deal with his Order.

RESHAPING OF ROADS AND TRACKS THROUGHOUT ISLAND

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution re the reshaping of roads and tracks throughout the Island in preparation for the coming crop season.

When this debate was adjourned on the last occasion, according to my record, the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing was speaking.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying on the last occasion, the contour of the land in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew makes it extraordinary hard for canes to be loaded by labour out of the fields to the tracks where lorries or carts can convey them to the factories where they are to be ground. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has asked that Government prepare these tracks and widen them for the lorries and carts to be able to convey them out of the ground to the factories.

Over the past year, the Department of Highways and Transport carried out work on Mount All, Baxters, St. Andrew; King Street, St. Simons, Swans Condemned Road, St. Andrew and the road over the Spa Hill. I have inspected several of these areas, Mr. Speaker, and bridges would be required in some of these instances to facilitate the moving of these crops to public highways. No doubt, when one examines the terrain in the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph, one can see the reason why the former estate owners in these parishes sold out the land to peasants because it would be uneconomical to get these crops out of the fields to highways for transportation.

On careful examination and in certain instances, I have consulted with my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and with his technical officers as to the diversification of crops in these parishes, and although clearing and cutting of tracks would to some extent save a small amount in the hands of peasants, yet I do not altogether believe this is the entire solution to this matter. As I have said, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries along with his colleagues and technical advisers are studying the change of land use possibly for the growing of bananas or citrus or some other crop which would be more beneficial. However, it is the intention of the Government to help as best as we can in all these stages as long as the requirements needed are not beyond the economical usage of the land in certain of these parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew which are more undulated and better suited for the growing of other crops.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member want to add to this debate before the Hon. Mover of the Resolution exercises his right to reply? *(A Pause)*

The hon. member can proceed, if he so cares.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing and I know that he said that he

took up the matter with his colleague, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, and with their technical experts who had the technical knowledge of the terrain, and so on, in those areas. Well, Sir, I do not know how the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing understands these experts, but I know that it is very difficult sometimes to understand them. I think there was a time, or I heard it stated, that the experts had turned down Stockton as a site for a hospital and they said it would not be suitable. What is happening now at Stockton? I did not hear that it was done by an ordinary layman. The new Hospital is now being built on the same site.

I would listen to experts and swallow everything of what they have to tell me when I do not apply my own common-sense; but when it comes to this terrain and places which I am talking about, I will only listen to an expert. And that is all. He would have to listen to me because I know that many of them live in places where they never saw water come down the side of a gutter in such torrents as they have seen here. To tell such a man that you go to sleep and leave a tree standing here and in the morning you see it a good distance away but still standing, they would not believe it.

I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister visited every site or every place concerning the roads and tracks to which I referred and which need reshaping. He may only have visited where he was told to visit.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At no time did the hon. member specify, if you will remember, any track or tracks in the parishes of St. Andrew or St. Joseph.
4.10 p.m.

If you will remember, Sir, I asked the hon. member on several occasions if he would specify the names or give us the names of some of these places to which he was referring.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the hon. member's first chance of specifying these places because this is the first opportunity which the hon. member has had to speak since the Hon. Minister has spoken.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member went into St. Joseph and St. Andrew, and I suppose in other places too; but if he wanted to know about something in St. Joseph, that parish has two representatives who should know more about it than the hon. member or his colleagues or his experts. He should have paid one of us the courtesy of asking us to meet him when he is supposed to be going through the parish and then he would have known the particular places, where, when and everything; but the hon. member has taken it upon himself to go along with his experts. What do his experts know about these roads? He has mentioned one in Spa Hill, but I can take him to one road in Spa Hill where you only need to reshape it; he would not have to build a bridge. These Ministers have a belief that when you are not a member of their Government, they can go through and do things and leave the representatives of the parish completely out; but they will pay for that if they continue to do it. It is the people who voted for the representatives, not the representatives themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am not asking them to reshape a road for Lloyd Smith; I am asking the Government to reshape the road for the people. When it comes to a Minister going around without the representatives of the particular parish, he does not know where he is going. I suppose that if I were to ask him to take me to Spa Hill without my saying one word to him, he would never find it; but he says that the expert says this and that. I know that an expert has turned down a particular site in the parish of St. Joseph and the site is serving the same purpose for which it was intended. You must only listen to experts when you cannot see things for yourself and when you do not know. When it comes to the question of building a bridge, I would not know about that; but when it comes to telling me something about the parish of St. Joseph or about this island of Barbados where I know about the soil, I am not going to listen to any expert. The

experts read out of a book. I have always said that no headmaster in any part of the world can put commonsense into the brains of anybody; he can write something and give it to a person to read and that person would know it. The experts read from a book; and when any one reads from a book and acts from a book it is not his own knowledge. I say that it is stale; if the writer of a book is right, then you will be right; but if he is wrong, then you will be wrong too.

I am asking the Government to help these peasants by reshaping some of these roads. As soon as this Resolution is passed, if it is passed, and these people who really need help see that the Resolution is passed, then they will make the necessary representation either to the Ministry of Communications or to the Department of Highways and Transport asking them to reshape these roads. You must make a way so that these people can apply for help and get it. I do not want to speak too long on this matter because several speeches have been made on it and I would like to see this Resolution dealt with either in one way or in the other. When it comes to the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, I will say that on the 12th February this year, he asked the Government a question calling upon them to do the same thing for which I am asking. Like everything else, I am not asking for assistance for a parish alone; the hon. member asked for assistance for St. Thomas, and he wants to help St. Thomas regardless of what happens to the people of St. Andrew or those of St. Joseph. I will take off my hat to the hon. member for seeing after the people of St. Thomas, but in the hon. member's speech he has answered his question. I do not think he is expecting any more replies from the Minister because he has said that it cannot work. He has agreed with my Resolution in principle, but he said that it cannot work.

Mr. BATSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that it could not work; I said that I have had the experience that some of the peasants were not co-operative with the Government in relation to having these tracks cut. Some of these peasants objected to the release of the land on either side of the road. I did not say that I objected to the Resolution; I was just trying to enlighten the hon. member on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member very much for trying to enlighten me on this Resolution, but what has he done with himself in the eyes of the people of St. Thomas? The hon. member has come in with the same Resolution asking the Government to do the same thing when he is butting up against the same snag. However, Sir, I am appealing to the politicians of 1961, the late politicians I would call them, to be more sincere, and if they are trying to fool the people I know exactly what will happen. I am not asking the Government to make any tenantry roads; the hon. member may be talking about the tenantry roads because when we come to these tenantry roads one particular owner of land may object to the release of his land.
4.20 p.m.

I mentioned in introducing this Resolution that there are some people who are not on good terms with other people, and in order to prevent them from getting the same road or facilities, they refuse to let the Highways and Transport Department go through with a road, or ask them to buy the particular site when in truth and in fact they cannot buy it. I believe that is what the hon. member may be referring to, but I am not asking for that; but in order to make himself look ridiculous to the people in St. Thomas, the hon. member said there is going to be a snag. There is only one snag, but I would not say where it is. Here it is: you have three or four people in a particular area who are asking for a road to be shaped so that a lorry can go in and take out the canes. These people would be glad if you could send a bulldozer to shape the road; so what snag would there be, except the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, to prevent the Government from going into this area with a bulldozer and just shaping the roads so that people can get out their canes? I am not asking you to build a road or to surface or re-surface one.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is apparently giving the impression or

attempting to give the impression that Government policy is diametrically opposed to the repairing of these tracks. I want to draw most forcibly to his attention that the Government is actually repairing such tracks, and the Hon. Minister of Communications has already given the names of road and tracks which have recently been repaired. He referred to Mount All, Baxters in St. Andrew, King Street, St. Simons, Swans, and the road off Spa Hill. If you listened to the hon. member you would get the idea that the Government is opposed to doing these roads, but the burden is on the hon. member to submit a list of the tracks he wants done. If he wants tracks in St. Joseph done, let him submit the names of the tracks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has directed attention to the point which he desired to bring to notice.

Mr. SMITH: If the Hon. Minister wants me to submit the names of the roads, as soon as this Resolution is passed, I will do so. He has told me that the Government is not opposed to doing these roads and that the Minister of Communications has read out the roads which have already been done. I do not want to know what has been done; I want to know what they are going to do now with the others, because I am concerning myself with the ones that are to be done, and I want them done as soon as possible because the crop is on now, and these people would really like these tracks reshaped so that the lorries can go in and load the canes. The Minister said that the plantation owners sold out the land because it was uneconomical to plant canes. Well, somebody must have bought it and it would not take the world for Government just to reshape these roads, because these people contribute to the taxation of this colony. As I have said, in one day a bulldozer can reshape several roads, because it only has to move forward and clear the tracks on each side so that a lorry can go in and bring out the canes.

I would say to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that he must be more careful in making his speeches, because the intelligent people and even the foolish ones will see that he introduced a question asking to do the same thing, and now he gets up saying that he had this trouble already and there would be a snag on the part of the Government. This would make them think twice next election. I would not go any further, Sir, but will sit and allow this Resolution to pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member who introduced the motion exercised his right of final reply, and before he spoke I looked around and waited for any hon. member to speak before calling upon him.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I just want to get the procedure straight, because I would not like to pass a matter like this and let it get on the record that it was the accepted procedure. With all due deference to the Chair, I noticed that Your Honour was very anxious to uphold the right of a private member who never rose in his seat at all to speak on a Resolution after a Government Minister had got up to speak, and now as I understand the statement which you are making, you are referring to Private Members' Business and a Government Minister has no right to get up after a private member. This would be totally incorrect.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say that; and I have not concluded my remarks. What I was pointing out was that, under Standing Order No. 27, the mover of a motion may reply after all other members present have had an opportunity of addressing the House and before the question is put, but I was about to proceed to refer to the exception in paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 27, that "a Minister may conclude a debate on any motion which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government Officer," and I was then about to enquire of the Hon. Leader of the House, as he rose, if he proposed to seek under this paragraph in Standing Order No. 27 to reply, because he regarded the motion as being critical of the Government or reflecting adversely on or calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or Government Officer. That is all there could be in respect of the reference I made to a Private Member's motion, but I would say that it is a recognised procedure for any hon. member of the House to intimate to

the Chair that he will be seeking to catch his eye and that he desires to speak on a particular subject. That is one of the conventions of the House of Commons which I have accepted, and which I regard as worthy of acceptance by the Chair of this House.

HOUSE COMMENCES GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: It being 4.30 o'clock p.m. Private Members' Time is expired and it is now time for Government Business.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to Government Business, on a matter of privilege, I just want to draw to the attention of hon. members that this Government does not accept that it is the right or prerogative of any member who has not indicated to the Leader of the House who conducts Government Business that he wants to speak on a Resolution, to be called upon by the Speaker, so that the Speaker will be regulating the order and the procedure of the debates.
4.30 p.m.

If a member wants to catch the eye of the Speaker he has to rise in his place, and that is what the Standing Order says. We cannot have a Government by consent unless the consent is visible for all to see. Therefore, I reiterate that the correct way to draw the attention of the Chair is not by private conference at anybody's home, but by a member rising in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have never had any member in private conference at my home, and no such conference has ever taken place. I will also reiterate that whoever catches my eye first has the right then to speak; and I will also reiterate that it is entirely within the province of any hon. member to intimate to the Chair that he proposes to speak, and it is up to the hon. member then to rise so that he may catch the eye of the Speaker. That is an elementary convention of the Mother of Parliaments which I follow.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am very glad to hear Your Honour say that because what I have intimated to hon. members is if the Speaker calls upon a member to speak, it is an act of supererogation. A member has to catch the Speaker's eye; he cannot intimate that he wants to catch the Speaker's eye and sit down and carry on a conversation and wait on the Speaker to intimate to him to speak.

I am glad that Your Honour and I have reached a consensus of opinion on this matter because I would hate a disruption of this House because of any misinterpretation of Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not misinterpret, I interpret Standing Orders. An hon. member may differ, as so often people differ from Rulings of Judges in Court. However, hon. members can review a decision of the Chair upon a substantive motion. I have never called on any hon. member to rise, even although such member has intimated to me his desire to speak on a matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I rise on a point of order. I am afraid that I would not enter into discussion on the merits or demerits of that statement.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF DUTIES AND TAX BILL

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is a slight amendment by the Other Place to the Bill relating to the Provisional Collection of Duties and Tax, and I am asking leave of the House to deal with the amendment at this stage. It is merely a typographical correction in the second Section of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has asked leave to proceed to deal with the amendment of the Other Place to the Bill which he has mentioned and in respect of what he has assured the House is merely a typographical correction which the Other Chamber has made.

If there is no objection to leave being granted, leave is granted the Hon. Leader of the House. (A Pause)

The Hon. Leader of the House may proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Section 2 of the Bill reads as follows:-

"When the Governor-in-Executive Committee has, during any session of the Legislatures,....."

The amendment is to make "Legislatures" singular.

I, therefore, beg to move that the amendment be now read a first time.

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of a Resolution, a copy of which has just handed to me.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the expenditure required to supplement the expenditure of the Port Department for the year 1962-63, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House to go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1962-63, No. 40

WAIVER OF CROWN RIGHTS

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, under the peculiar system which we have adopted in this country as regards Property Law and Estate and Succession Law.....

(A VOICE: I cannot hear you.)

I am sure that hon. members will be able to hear me if they employ people who knew something of the equipment which they operate, instead of bringing in butchers to handle carpenters' tools. I will say no more on that.

Under the peculiar system which we have adopted in this country where Property Law and Estate and Succession Law is concerned, when a person dies intestate without any visible corollaries or next of kin, his goods and property go by default to the Crown. In other words, the property falls by way of escheat to the public revenue of this Island.

Within the Island people are very often related, but for one reason or the other, the deceased person under the Crown Law sense of the term having by reputation or by birth or having a common ancestor is not commonly recognised; but there has been developed in this territory a system where you can recognise all persons who are not strictly related to the deceased person and waive the right of the Crown whereby the deceased person's property would normally fall to the public revenue of this country.

In 1953, a gentleman who was popularly known in this Island as "Bison", Mr. James Nicholson Ovide, a very famous sportsman, died and left a brother surviving which was his half-brother. From 1954, his half-brother was petitioning the Government of this Island to exercise its discretion under the Escheat Act and to waive the claim which the Government would normally have to the property of the deceased which was considerable.
4.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, right from the beginning the legal opinion was given that sufficient evidence had been provided by the beneficiaries and that the half brother of the deceased would have a good moral claim to this property. The purpose of this Resolution therefore is to waive the rights of the Crown in respect of the property of the deceased, Mr. James Nicholson Ovide, and give the Executive the authority to vest the real and personal estate in his half brother, Mr. Andrew Ovide. The total amount of money which is involved in the estate is of the order of \$11,011.82. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that the Government has made this humanitarian effort in waiving the rights of the Crown. I say that for personal reasons. I have had a very long association with the late Mr. Ovide and what I have benefited from Mr. Ovide has stood me in good stead against the rapacious politicians. Had it not for that, many people would have trampled me, but I was able to take my stand against many people because of the manly art which I got from Mr. Ovide. Today I am very glad to be able to have some say in dealing with this matter concerning Mr. Ovide. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Government has done this thing.

As everybody knows, Mr. Ovide was one of Barbados' outstanding athletes. He died at a comparatively early age; he died in the bloom of manhood; but that is one of the ironies of fate. I am very pleased to be associated with this Resolution. I do not know if this is a precedent on the part of the Government, but I would like to say that it is a very good

precedent, and if there are any similar cases in which people can be relieved of this legal difficulty, I sincerely hope that the Government will go into the matter and let the beneficiaries or relatives have the benefit of this provision. This is a very worthy thing indeed and I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first time and second time and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Resolution brings Government Business to an end for the day. In accordance with the expressions which I made earlier, the Government proposes to adjourn the House at this stage.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 5th March, 1963, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 5th March, 1963, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

4.50 p.m.