

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th June, 1958.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. R. N. 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. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); 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; Mr. L. St.A. THORNE; Mr. T. W. MILLER; Mr. F. G. SMITH, B.A.; Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc. and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

Mr. L. E. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting have not yet been printed and circulated.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:-

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half-year ended 30th September, 1957, from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. Thomas;

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for half-year ended 31st March, 1958, from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. Thomas;

Also, Statement of Revenue and Expenditure in connection with tenantry roads for half-year ended 31st March, 1958, from Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. Thomas.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1958.

An account of the Transactions in Rum in the several districts in the Island for the Quarter ended 31st March, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Resolution to place the sum of \$33,407 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59, No. 4 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General)(Amendment) No. 9 Order, 1958."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On behalf of Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:

Resolution to place the sum of \$5,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No. 3 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Bill to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Bill to amend the law relating to the guardianship, custody and property of infants.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS:

Bill to make provision for Arbitrations.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: On behalf of Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:

Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Address:-

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House desires to draw to Your Excellency's attention that there is very great need for the establishment of a Social Centre and Play-field in the "Silver Sands" area, Below the Rock, in the parish of Christ Church.

2. The House would wish to point out that the facilities of the Play-field at Sargeant's Village do not meet the needs of the parishioners at the other end of the parish, and in keeping with the recent policy of the Government, should without delay, establish a proper playfield and Social Centre for this developed parish.

Also:- THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

The House respectfully request to draw to Your Excellency's attention the urgent need for the construction and establishment of communal baths and latrines on an island wide basis, and more especially in so far as the parish of Christ Church is concerned, at the densely populated districts as Rockley, Bath Village, Sargeant's Village, Saint David's, Maxwell Hill, Vauxhall, Lodge Road, St. Patrick's, Pilgrim Road, Enterprise Road, Thornbury Hill and Char-nocks.

2. The House further suggests that at each of these communal centres a Slot system Public Telephone Service should be installed.

3. The House is of the view that such essential amenities should be met out of the Rural Amenities Fund.
3.25 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:-

Bill to amend the Apprenticeship Bursaries Act, 1928.

Bill to amend the Law relating to the guardianship, custody and property of infants.

Bill to make provision for Arbitrations.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, the Bill to amend the Natural Gas Corporation Act, 1950, was read a first time.

STATEMENT RE SECONDARY EDUCATION

Hon. Dr. H.G.H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to make a statement. I may say that it was drawn to my attention that in the local weeklies, there appeared some statement with regard to Secondary Education. I am aware that there is a certain amount of mental perturbation as a result of that statement, and I am therefore asking leave to make the following Statement:-

"The Ministry of the Premier in consultation with the Department of Education is at present conducting a survey of the development of sixth forms in secondary schools. The Ministry is paying particular attention to the recommendations contained in the report on Secondary Education in Barbados by Mr. G. S. V. Petter, formerly Education Adviser to the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies. The Petter Report has been considered by the following bodies:-

- (i) The Association of Heads of Secondary Schools.
- (ii) The Association of Assistant Teachers in Secondary Schools.
- (iii) The Secondary Education Committee.
- (iv) The Board of Education.

The Acting Director of Education has also discussed the Report with the Governing Bodies of the aided secondary schools.

These bodies agree that an adequate Sixth Form Department provides courses in a variety of subjects - Classics, Mathematics, Science, Modern Languages, Modern Studies (including English, History, Geography, Economics.) By such provision it is possible for students to select groups of studies according to their aptitude.

It follows that a school which can only offer two or three subjects in a particular group is not fully equipped to

serve the interests of its pupils in any wide degree. For this reason it is more desirable that Sixth Form schools should be organised so that pupils have the benefit of a wide selection and also expert staff, rather than that they should cater to a limited sixth form course.

The present survey of sixth form education is being conducted with particular reference to the second grade schools and especially St. Michael's Girls' School where the greatest demand for the provision of facilities for sixth form education exists at present.

In discussions with the Governing Body of St. Michael's Girls' School the principles laid down in the Petter Report have been carefully considered. These principles briefly summarised are:-

(i) Does a school possess a staff sufficient in number and quality to undertake sixth form work?

(ii) The ability of the pupils.

(iii) The possibility of neglecting the lower and middle school for the benefit of the top few.

(iv) The diversion of Modern Studies of young people with a definite mathematical or scientific bent.

The Governing Body of St. Michael's decided to approach Queen's College to discover whether the girls about to undertake advanced courses in September, 1958, could be accommodated. A favourable reply was given and the parents of the St. Michael's Girls' students, were notified that they could, if they wished, apply for entry to Queen's College. It is understood that all have expressed their intention to seek entrance.

The Governing Body of Queen's College has received 20 applications for admission to its sixth form in September, 1958 from the following schools - St. Michael's Girls', Foundation Girls', Alexandra School and St. Winifred's School. Places will be available at Queen's College for all those who qualify for entry.

It is usual for girls at Queen's College who pass from Form V to Form VI to be demoted if they do not obtain five passes in the G.C.E. at Ordinary Level. Inasmuch as it would be invidious and embarrassing to send back newcomers to their respective schools if they fail to obtain the necessary passes it has been decided to test the eligibility of all applicants for entry to the sixth form by means of a special examination.

It is the present policy of the Ministry to encourage the concentration of sixth form teaching at Harrison College, Queen's College and the Lodge School where facilities exist for a wide variety of sixth form courses. It is expected that pressure for the establishment of new sixth forms will continue and probably increase. With this in view, the Ministry and the Department are giving attention to the preparation of a workable transfer system. The future development of advanced courses at all secondary and grammar schools is also being studied in the light of the provision of adequate accommodation, equipment and staff."

Mr. DOWDING entered the House and took his seat.

SOIL CONSERVATION (SCOTLAND DISTRICT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:-

To move the House into Committee on the Bill to make provision for the improvement and conservation of the soil and for the prevention of damage or deterioration by erosion of land in certain areas of the Island and for matters connected therewith.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has already passed its second reading and I therefore beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. T. O. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 1 – was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, before we begin to deal with the Clauses, I should tell this Hon. Committee that there are a few amendments, some of them insignificant, to this Bill and as we come to the various Clauses I shall ask leave that the amendments be made.

I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
3.35 p.m.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendments:-

(i) In sub-clause (1), substitute a full-stop for the semi-colon at the end of the sub-clause.

(ii) In sub-clause (2), substitute "of" for "or" in the second line.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 as amended stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:-

"(1) There is hereby established for the purposes of this Act, a Board to be known as the Scotland District Soil Conservation Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board.)

(2) The Board shall consist of -

(a) The Director of Agriculture, who shall be Chairman;

(b) The Senior Conservation Officer; and

(c) Five other persons appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee who shall include representatives of the agricultural community.

(3) The members of the Board (other than the Director of Agriculture and Senior Conservation Officer) shall hold office for a period of three years but shall be eligible for re-appointment.

(4) Any casual vacancy on the Board arising from death, resignation or removal from office shall be filled by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the member appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office only so long as the member whose office is vacant would have held office.

(5) If a member of the Board is prevented by illness, absence from the Island or other cause from exercising his functions on the Board, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may appoint a person to act as deputy for such a member during such time as he is prevented from exercising his functions.

(6) The powers conferred on the Board by this Act shall not be affected by reason only of there being a vacancy in the membership thereof.

(7) If at any meeting of the Board, the chairman shall be absent the members present shall appoint one of their members to be chairman for such a meeting.

(8) Three members shall form a quorum.

(9) The Chairman of the Board may at any time summon a meeting of the Board and shall summon a meeting within seven days after a request so to do by any two members.

(10) The proceedings of the meetings of the Board shall be determined by the Board.

(11) The Director of Agriculture shall assign an officer of the Department of Agriculture to be secretary of the Board.

(12) There may be paid out of moneys provided by the Legislature for the purpose of this Act to the members of the Board (other than a member who holds an office in the public service of the Island) such remuneration and such travelling allowances as may be determined by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this Clause, as you will see, is to establish a Board, to be known as the Scotland District Soil Conservation Board. The constituency which I represent is going to be affected to a very large extent by the actions of this Board when and if it functions, and I am drawing to the Minister's attention that he must see to it that he appoints on this Board honest men - men who have no vested interest in agriculture, and who obviously will be conversant with the purpose which they have to undertake. The Government has, on occasions, appointed to Boards people who had absolutely no recommendations for them whatsoever. I can give an instance of the Alleyne School Governing Body where they picked up Tom, Dick or Harry who was a planter and put him on it, without any reference to his interest in education, or anything of the kind. I want them to know that in view of the fact that the powers of this Board are fairly wide, I want to see when this Board is constituted that it has on it persons in whom the small property owners can have confidence. I do not want them to pick up any numb-skull and put on this Board, because you will see from the powers which are vested by them in the Director, as well as in the members, that it is absolutely necessary that the men should be men in whom the planting community in St. Andrew should have absolute confidence. I am only warning that it is necessary to do that if the amicable relations which have existed so far between the Soil Conservation Expert and the people are likely to continue. I will make reference from time to time, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister concerned as to how very important it is to have proper persons on this Board.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that I was at pains to see that that was done, and two respectable gentlemen of the parish are members of the Board. I think when he knows who they are, he will be very happy about it.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendment:-

In paragraph (f) substitute for "improvement land of" the words "improvement of land."

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 as amended stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 5. was called

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendments:-

(i) Insert a dash after the word "necessary" in the second line of sub-clause (1).

(ii) Delete the comma after the word "shall" in the twelfth line of sub-clause (1).

(iii) Substitute "thirty" for 30 in the last line of sub-clause (3).

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 5 as amended stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 6 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendment:-

"Substitute "thirty" for 30 in sub-clause (2)."

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 as amended stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendment:-

Substitute a full-stop for the semi-colon at the end of the Clause.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 as amended stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 8 was called. It reads as follows:-

"Any owner or occupier of land in respect of which the Director of Agriculture makes an Order who fails or neglects, without reasonable cause (the proof whereof shall be on such owner or occupier) to carry out any measures provided by the Order, within such reasonable time as shall be fixed by the Director of Agriculture, shall be guilty of an offence and on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction shall be liable to a fine of one hundred dollars and the court may order such owner or occupier to carry out the said Order."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendment:-

Delete the word "of" in the 9th line and substitute "not exceeding".

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 8 as amended stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion when we debated this measure, I mentioned in this hon. Committee that I was not satisfied with the almost dictatorial powers given to the Director of Agriculture in this matter. In this country, as you would know, Sir, there is a sort of hallowed approach by the peasants to the land which they fortunately own, and you will agree that to own land at all in Barbados at any time is certainly an achievement; therefore this Section, as it stands, to me is placing on the peasant an unnecessary and harsh burden, because it says "any owner or occupier of land in respect of which the Director of Agriculture makes an Order who fails or neglects, without reasonable cause (the proof whereof shall be on such owner or occupier) to carry out any measures provided by the Order, within such reasonable time as shall be fixed by the Director of Agriculture."

I am not happy at all, Sir, that the Director should make an Order. In his own mind, he fixes the time which he thinks is reasonable and at once orders the peasant or the person whose land is being used to carry out the Order within such reasonable time. I feel that the matter of reasonable time should be left to a court to decide, taking all the circumstances into consideration; and even although the necessity for action may be great, if you look at the time this matter has been on the Order Paper, you will see that time was not of the essence of its passing, because you will notice that this Bill was read a first time on 4th March, 1958, and a second time on 15th April. If this matter is as urgent as Government intends it to be, certainly I think that the question of reasonable time should not be left to the Director at all. I would amend it to read "within such reasonable time as in the opinion of a Court." What I mean is this; it is going to be tried by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, which means a Police Magistrate will be trying it, and I should prefer it to read, "within such reasonable time as in the circumstances shall appear to the Police Magistrate of the District."

3.45 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member does not really anticipate that the person who stands to gain more because of this measure is going to sabotage this work. We hope that those persons would be most co-operative and would give notice within a reasonable amount of time. I think he realises that all of us are reasonable Barbadians and we are human beings; therefore, I do not think you should anticipate that they will go to court before they try to co-operate.

A person will be given a certain amount of time to do certain things, and I think the people in that area would be very anxious to get their land reclaimed. This is a thing which Government has started in the hope of getting everybody to co-operate. I make this plea to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. I hope he will do his utmost to get the people in his constituency to co-operate. My sincere request to him is that he makes it his bounden duty in asking his constituents to co-operate. Personally, I do not envisage any trouble in this matter although of course we have to anticipate things of that sort. In a scheme like this, it is these people who really want their land developed; and if, for instance, one man with half an acre is trying to prevent two others from getting something done, why should you allow that one man, because he does not understand or because he has some prejudice, to sabotage the work? You should not allow that especially when you think of the money which we are investing in this scheme. This is a big scheme and it is costing us a lot of money and we may have to vote more money to carry it out successfully. We must forget party differences when it comes to this matter. Let us reclaim all this land so that future generations would call it a blessing.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not against this, but I do not think this is going to benefit too many peasants. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell this Committee how many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on this scheme and how many people have benefited so far.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member is asking for something which he should get himself. I can tell him that we are spending a lot of money on it and everybody knows that. As to the number of peasants who have benefited, I do not know at present.

Mr. F. E. SMITH: Two.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Yes, two, but up to now I do not

Mr. F. E. SMITH: They are not going to give any trouble.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I am talking of the two peasants. I have got it on good authority that those who butt and abound to this land up to now have given no trouble, and I do not envisage any trouble from them. I do not see the fear which the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has envisaged.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I just want to say that the hon. member for St. Andrew may be thinking of the penalty involved and we have not heard the Hon. Minister on that. It is not whether the scheme is bad or not; that is besides the point. We all hope that full co-operation would be given by the peasants; but the fear is that if too much power is given to the Director of Agriculture, as he is given in this measure, he may abuse it, more especially when it comes to peasants in St. Andrew who may not be fully aware of their rights.

We have here in this Clause: "subject to provisions of Section 16 of this Act." Everything is subject to Section 16 and the Hon. Minister should explain. Section 16 reads as follows:— "any person who wilfully obstructs or hinders the Director of Agriculture"

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. We are dealing with Section 8.

The question that Clause 8 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 9 was called. It reads as follows:—

"If any owner or occupier of land subject to the Order fails or neglects to carry out any Order or any measure provided by such Order within such reasonable time as the Director of Agriculture shall determine, the Director of Agriculture may subject to the provisions of section 16 of this Act, for the purpose of carrying out or completing any measures necessary to give effect to the Order, carry out any works pursuant to the provisions of Section 12 of this Act or exercise all or any of the powers conferred on him by section 13 of this Act."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, in the ninth line you have the expression "Section 12." The word section should have a small "s". I beg to move that Clause 9 as amended stand part.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, sections 8 and 9 are tied up with one penalty clause and Section 16 controls Section 8 and 9 where this penalty clause is involved. I was attempting to explain to this Committee that the material section is Section 16. Section 16 reads as follows:— "Any person who wilfully obstructs or hinders the Director of Agriculture or his servants or agents in lawfully carrying out his or their powers or duties under this Act, shall be guilty of an offence and on conviction by a Court of summary jurisdiction shall be liable to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months."

Well, Mr. Chairman, these are the people in whom my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, is interested. If you give unlimited power to the Director of Agriculture, or anyone for that matter, who is not competent or who has not got to exercise his judgment reasonably and he has power to say what is reasonable and what is not reasonable, the whole question revolves around whether he would exercise a reasonable judgment in dealing with everybody, no matter whether they are small peasants or large owners. I feel that the penalty is ex-

cessive especially when it comes to the term of six months' imprisonment.

What a peasant may consider a reasonable time may be a month, whereas the Director of Agriculture may think a reasonable amount of time is three days or a week. Who is to determine what is a reasonable amount of time? Should we leave it to the whims of the Director of Agriculture or should we say that that should be vested in the court as was suggested by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew? We feel that instead of the Director of Agriculture exercising this power, the court should exercise it, because in doing so the power to penalise and and imprison is vested in the magistrate. We therefore say: let that power of saying what is a reasonable time be vested in the magistrate. We feel that the Director of Agriculture has too much power: therefore let a court of competent jurisdiction decide what is reasonable. A term of six months' imprisonment for an offence which cannot be regarded as a very serious one is very severe. We feel that is unreasonable.
3.55 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: All I can point out to the hon. member is this, and I am sure he will agree with me. Section 16 says this:

"Any person who wilfully obstructs," he has no right obstructing; "or hinders the Director of Agriculture or his servants or agents in lawfully carrying out his or their powers or duties under this Act, shall be guilty of an offence and on conviction by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction shall be liable to a fine not exceeding \$100 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months."

The words I want to emphasise are the words "not exceeding." I think the Magistrate can use his discretion; he might impose a fine of \$1 or he might reprimand or he might just caution a person. We have to see to it that we prevent people from sabotaging such things, and therefore, a penalty, small as it is, must be applied. If the hon. member will see reason, he will see that the words "not exceeding" have been inserted.

Mr. TALMA: On a point of order. I have already explained that. The hon. member does not seem to understand ordinary English. I have already referred to the words "not exceeding" and therefore, there is no reason for the hon. member to shout them out.

The question that Clause 9 as amended stand part of the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 10 was called passed.

Clause 11 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert in this Clause the following amendments:—

(i) In sub-clause (1) delete the comma after the word "Agriculture" in the 8th line and insert a comma after the word "may".

(ii) Substitute "cost" for "costs" in the 3rd line of sub-clause 2.

(iii) In sub-clause (7) in the proviso substitute "leasehold for "lease-hold" and "fee simple" (two words) for "fee-simple".

(iv) In sub-clause (9) substitute "operate" for "operated."

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 1 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 11 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 12 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: In this Clause, I am asking leave to make the following amendments:-

(i) Substitute a semi-colon for the colon at the end of the paragraph (a).

(ii) In paragraph (e) substitute "sow" for "sew".

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 12 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Clause 13 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: In this Clause, I am asking leave to make the following amendments:-

(i) In sub-clause (1) third line, substitute "that" for "this".

(ii) In paragraph (f) of sub-clause (1) delete the comma after the word "building" in the fifth line.

(iii) In sub-clause (3), "re-settlement" should have no hyphen (one word).

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 13 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I certainly could not sit down here and allow the placing into the hands of one man such wide powers as are embodied in this Clause. I do not think I would be representing my constituents to the best of my ability if I did so. This Clause makes the Director of Agriculture a small Hitler. It says this:

"The Director of Agriculture shall, in addition to any other powers given to him by this Act, have and possess the following powers, this is to say:-

(a) He may, without any previous payment, tender or deposit, enter upon and use any land for the purpose of taking therefrom any earth, clay, stone, boulders, gravel, sand, and other material;"

That is saying that he can ride roughshod over the rights of peasants in the area. I cannot allow this power to be in the hands of one man without protesting against it. This Section also gives power to the Director of Agriculture to take down houses and all. It says this:

"In the event of its becoming necessary for the Director of Agriculture to remove any dwelling house for the purposes of this Act, he shall make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses."

Where is the Director going to send these occupiers? Is he going to send them to the Almshouse? This man may be entirely unsympathetic with the needs of a particular type of peasant and you are placing in his hands not only the power to knock down dwelling houses, but you are also allowing him to make arrangements for the accommodation of these occupiers! I am protesting against the Director of Agriculture sending these occupiers to the Almshouse in St. Andrew; I do not mind where he sends them where St. Joseph is concerned. You are saying that not only may you have a man who may be far removed from the aspirations and the needs of the community, but you are placing in his power the right to make accommodation elsewhere for peasants who may have lived in Walkers or elsewhere for some time. Then the Section goes on to say this:

"If at any time after the occupiers of any building removed as aforesaid have been accommodated or settled in accordance with the provisions of the preceding subsection the Governor-in-Executive Committee considers it ex-

pedient to resettle such persons either in the conservation area or elsewhere, the Director of Agriculture shall make such arrangements for the re-settlement in that area or in any other area or place as the Governor-in-Executive Committee considers suitable for that purpose."

That is giving power to the Director of Agriculture to put occupiers of buildings wherever he likes; this is like putting people in concentration camps. You are telling people who have been living in a district for a considerable period, that the Director of Agriculture can remove them from St. Andrew to Christ Church. Do you think that I could sit down here and allow the Director of Agriculture to have all this power? I am not saying that the Governor-in-Executive Committee will deliberately remove a man from St. Andrew and send him to Christ Church, but you still have to respect a man's rights and his love for a particular area. 4.05 p.m.

I personally think, Mr. Chairman, that to give powers like these either to the Director to house them during their temporary displacement or for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to say where they must live for the future is not good enough. I certainly could not sit down and allow that to be passed without raising a protest on behalf of the constituents I represent. It is too wide, and places too much power in the hands of the Governor-in-Executive Committee as well as in the hands of the Director.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, I hope the hon. member will bear with me, but under the system of Ministerial Government, the Director always discusses these matters not only with the Board but with the Minister concerned, and I do not see how any Minister who is alive to his political duties and what he has to do as far as the interests of the people are concerned, can sit down and have advantage taken of anybody. Laws are made to prevent people who will sabotage any particular scheme. The people who are willing to co-operate will not find any hardship, but there are those who will try to sabotage, and you have to guard against those things. If you do not have this authority, you will put the Director in any invidious position; so in order to give him authority to carry out the work, you must give certain power. I said in my opening remarks that some good people happen to be on this Board, and I do not think you need fear any hardship.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I share to some extent the anxiety of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, but I was also glad to get the assurance which the Minister has just given, and that is, that I would expect that any Minister of any Government of Barbados to be so alive to his duties that any Director of Agriculture or any Civil Servant in that category should be made to report to him on these matters before they take any such high-handed action. I am happy to feel that I am assured that the present Minister and any other Minister of Agriculture will make sure that he does pay careful attention to any action that may be taken up in the Service.

With regard to the point of making people move from one place to another, although the hon. junior member for St. Andrew might be a little anxious as to where these people might go, I am quite certain that I cannot envisage them going to almshouses, because I look forward to a Socialist Government abolishing anything like almshouses.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as one who has had practical experience and is not speaking through his hat, I am in a position to say that these powers should not be vested in the Director of Agriculture but should be vested in the Minister, because the Minister will not be aware of many of these things until about two weeks after they have happened. If the Minister wants to be responsible—he should be and will be eventually for these acts of omission and commission—let him make the amendment and substitute Minister of Agriculture for Director of Agriculture. If you do that then you will be able to control it. You should not give the Director all this power and then find out later on that he is harming the people whom you are trying to help.

Mr T. W. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I will vote in spite of seeing such conditions. This is giving too much power to any individual; more power than Hitler or any dictator throughout the world. We are not questioning the principle of the Bill or the scheme; we agree that the scheme is a good one. I may say that unlike the hon. junior member for St. Andrew this might not directly affect the constituency which I represent, but the kindest father would not give up the reins of business to the dearest son. This is power being misplaced and I hope the Government will not have an opportunity to regret. I will vote for it but I repeat that this is unscrupulous power being put into the hands of one man; he has more power than the Governor of this country.

I am a member of the Molasses Board, but here is not the place to say everything. It is the Director of Agriculture to whom you are giving these unscrupulous powers, and when the wrong is committed, the Minister will know three or four weeks after. It is the very thing which a Socialist Government should try to stamp out. I share the views of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew and the hon. senior member for Christ Church even though I will vote for this because no Socialist Government should give the slightest appearance of any dictatorial act. It is not to say that we do not have confidence in the Minister; we know that the scheme is a good one and we wish it well; but this is power being misplaced in the hands of one man, because the Director of Agriculture might not consider a peasant in St. Andrew as he would consider the Minister of Agriculture. It is an indisputable fact that he can abuse this power, knowing human nature as I do. It is not that we are so anxious or believe that something is going to happen, but the fundamental principle is always to avoid anything that gives the slightest suggestion of dictatorship.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not share the apprehension which has been felt by hon. members who have spoken before me; that is because I happen to know a little more about human nature than the three hon. members who have spoken, and perhaps because I know a little more about the operation of the Soil Conservation Scheme than other hon. members who have spoken up to now. I know the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is going to say right away that I am casting insinuations and making attacks, but I am merely stating facts.

The reason why these powers are not vested in the Minister is a very simple one. In the same Clause which members are so fearful about, power is given to the competent authority, who is the Director, to move a person from one place and establish him in another place.

Now I entirely agree with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture when he said that no Government in its right senses would allow any injustice to be done to the constituents of any parish that may in time be favourably disposed to a particular Government. We are not talking about the Government in power at the particular time, but I am putting it in less happy language than what I understood the Minister to have said. I may not be exactly quoting the words used by the Minister, but I hope he will forgive me if in the same Clause I see a danger, because being a person of a suspicious disposition when it comes to political matters, I can see things which the hon. members have not anticipated up to now. You will not move against your political enemies at all; you let them die a natural death. There is the view that if a person is not a supporter of your Party you will not be particularly concerned about where you house him; but if you have a friend who has a ramshackled house you can, in Section 12, move him to a mansion.
4.15 p.m.

That is very simple, and obviously no Minister of the Government is going to take responsibility if a public scandal comes about, if the responsibility is vested in the Director, for saying that a roof of an owner should be turned into a mansion when that owner was occupying a 16' x 9' house before. I want to congratulate the Hon. Minister for his political perspicacity in the phrasing of this particular section.

I do not think anybody should have any of the powers which we are vesting in the Director of Agriculture by Section 13, because it not only gives power to an individual to do wrong in the sense of, perhaps, dispossessing a peasant or small holder of his property, but it also gives him power which is far more dangerous in a democratic society and that is to invest in some holding.

I want to say again that I am not at all criticising the hon. senior member for St. Andrew who has recently taken her seat, but it is significant that she is the first beneficiary under this soil conservation scheme. She is one of the most eminent back benchers. Even before this Bill came into the House we saw in some reckless newspaper - I do not want to call any particular journal - that this Bill sounds of nepotism and favouritism; therefore, it is far much better for an astute Government to give this power to the Director of Agriculture because he can take all the responsibility for it. If the scheme proves successful, you can then say to that the Government had instituted the scheme. I think that they have been acting with a great deal of astuteness in this scheme, but when it comes to the morality of it, that is a different matter. I question whether the Government should have given this amount of power to one man. However, I want to congratulate them on divesting themselves of all the responsibility; but I certainly want to criticise them for having given no consideration to the inclusion of an iniquitous measure like this in a Bill which has so far reaching effects on the people who unfortunately live in a particular part of this island. As you can see, I am congratulating the Hon. Minister but I am also attacking the principle. I am not saying that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is guilty of anything. I am saying that 99 percent of the politicians with whom I have happened to come in contact would have done what the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has done in this matter. But the point is this; it should not be done at all.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: I wonder if the Hon. Minister is himself aware of the danger. You are placing in the hands of the Director of Agriculture the power not only to make temporary but permanent accommodation for people whose dwelling houses have been demolished under this scheme. I beg to move this amendment to this particular paragraph.

(2) "In the event of its becoming necessary for the Director of Agriculture to remove any dwelling house for the purposes of this Act, the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am afraid that there is a tremendous lot in what the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has been saying but I am somewhat worried over his amendment. You can put in an Act that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should do something but in effect it means that the particular officer in charge is the person to do it. Actually, no one would come down from Government House in his motor car and decide to do something. When you say the Governor-in-Executive Committee, that still means that the Director of Agriculture should do it. What I am more worried about is that he should make arrangements for temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses. We are all still clinging to freedom and it is dangerous to have any one man to say where anybody in any area should reside.

This Bill is a good one and we all agree that it is absolutely necessary; but what is dangerous in it is this; why should any one man, be he Director of Agriculture or not, be in a position to say where any person should live permanently or temporarily? Suppose he takes ill. I am wondering whether "permanently" should not be cut out of the Bill.

The hon. junior member for St. John made quite a lot of fun but I am serious. Let the Hon. Minister think for a minute on this matter. None of us has accused the Director of Agriculture of doing anything wrong; he may be doing something right but somebody may, say, be working down at Bawdens or a particular area or may be living in an area to get his children to school and for him to get back to work. It may suit the Director to say that not only should he be re-

moved temporarily from that particular place, but permanently; and to go behind Walkers. You may get a Director coming here from Kenya or South Africa; you may not have a Barbadian Director where we may be able to get up in the Lower Green and say "we know where you come from". As I have said, you may get a man from Kenya who may be a first class man but the type of man who likes to shove around people.

I am not at all satisfied that the amendment which the hon. junior member for St. Andrew moved is the correct thing. If you put in "the Governor-in-Executive Committee" it means the Director of Agriculture. Let me ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture this: people are more satisfied to see two or three people doing things for them. Why don't you say the Director of Agriculture along with the majority of the Board? You must enact legislation not only to satisfy ourselves, but to satisfy the people. What about inserting the majority of the Board together with the Director of Agriculture? This is a scheme which must be put into operation. It must work, and it must also be possible for people to be removed from where they are; but do not put the power of moving the people and placing them somewhere else into the hands of one man.

4.25 p.m.

It will always be possible for buildings to be removed, but you cannot allow the removal of buildings and placing them wherever you like to remain in the hands of one man. The ultimate responsibility is that of the Minister; but will the Minister say that it will be possible to have this section so worded that in the event of the Director having to remove any dwelling house - the Director may say that it is absolutely necessary to remove Mr. X's house; Mr. X is dissatisfied about it and there is no right of appeal. Is it not better to say that the removal of any building should be the decision of a majority of the Board? When we argue things out and we are not against the principle of the Bill, I am suggesting that it is better to postpone the consideration of the Bill and get the correct phraseology which will suit the wishes of the Opposition. The Opposition is not opposing merely for the sake of opposition. It seems to me that you should have some amendment here whereby not merely the Director of Agriculture, but the Director of Agriculture in consultation with somebody else, should take steps in these matters. In the parish of St. Andrew, they are famous for using wampas and cutlasses on people's heads; if you have to remove a man who has been living in some place for some time, you might convince him that he has to remove, but you may not be able to convince him that he has to remove to some other particular place, and the man may react with his wampa. I think that you should take these things into consideration. I am not very much in favour of the use of the words "Governor-in-Executive Committee;" if the hon. member will postpone this section until we get a little further on with the Bill, we may be able to think the matter out.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to counsel the Hon. Minister of Agriculture not to pay any attention to remarks which have been made by the last few speakers, because I really do not think that this Section should be amended at all; it should be deleted altogether. I confess that it is our policy to let the members of the Government make all the mistakes except they encroach on the privileges of the members of this House. It is also politic to let them pursue a course which will lead to their destruction. Being sincere in the representation of the people and since my parish is affected, I would enjoin the Minister not to pay any attention to what has just been said. I do not want to say anything uncharitable, although it would appear from the speeches made by two hon. members on the Government side that they themselves are beginning to have doubts as to whether they, as representatives of a Socialist Government, would suggest that the whole Bill be taken back whence it came. Let them take all the land in this area; let them take all the land in the Schedule and go to Jamaica and study the scheme there; let them go to the Tennessee Valley Authority for which Mr. Henry Wallace must take credit and come back to Barbados and run the land on a co-operative basis, and issue land bonds to each landowner in proportion to the amount of his holding in the conservation area. Then you would not have to think of the use of wampas or any damaging of houses. The Minister could not be exposed to

ridicule or contempt or public outcry, but you would have a Co-operative Board running the show. If you do not do that, then you are not a Socialist. That is how it is done in countries which are more enlightened than we are. You would not have a dictator at top, but you would have the people themselves making decisions - which would be the co-operative idea - and they would accommodate each other. That is how I see it.

The Hon. Minister may not have contemplated such an idea. I know that the Minister is anxious to perpetuate his own ideas, but if he really wants to do something in this district, if he wants to immortalise himself, he should issue land bonds to landowners. There are no large estates in St. John which are involved in the Bill which is now before us; the last large holding in that parish was divided up some four or five years ago. The parish of St. Andrew is a parish with peasant proprietors in the predominance, and so is the parish of St. Joseph; all the large estates in St. Joseph have been divided up or they are on the verge of being divided up. This is a wonderful opportunity for the Hon. Minister to set up a co-operative system for the running of the whole Scotland District in which they would have entire control over the area and the landowners would guarantee their security by the issue of land bonds in respect of the area which they own in comparison with the total area embodied in the scheme. These bonds would become negotiable, and when an owner decided that he had had enough of it, he could sell his interest to the Government or otherwise dispose of it. He would be able to raise a mortgage on his land bonds and have a certain amount to liquidate, but he would have enjoyment while he is owner of a parcel of land in fee simple. He would not merely be owner of the land, but he would be a shareholder in a joint co-operative scheme which would be a wonderful monument in my view, to the Minister if he would give heed to the few words of advice which I have given.

4.35 p.m.

Therefore the whole thing should be postponed, and I should like him to take it back and set up a Tennessee Valley Authority for the Scotland District.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, again we are seeing how cumbersome this Bill is and the difficulties which will be encountered as we go on.

Now looking at Clause 13, the Director has power to do many things. He may, without any previous payment, tender or deposit, enter upon and use any land for the purpose of taking therefrom any earth, clay, stone, boulders, sand, and other materials. I want the Minister to explain how long these people will have to wait on compensation for land, because the Director of Agriculture may do just as the Government did in the case of the bus owners, take over the land and let the people wait for compensation until two or three years after the land has been taken possession of by the Director of Agriculture.

I have not seen anything in this Bill which deals with compensation for the land of which they have been dispossessed, and I should like the Minister to explain that to our satisfaction. Right through this Section the Director of Agriculture is given all sorts of power. In short, he can dispossess anyone of his land and have him removed from the area temporarily or permanently. All this power is vested in one man to remove a family from their home where they had been living for twenty or thirty years, and send them to live in a place which they may not like or which will not suit their purpose, without their having a say. Why have a Soil Conservation Board? One would have thought that the powers which have been vested in the Director of Agriculture should be vested in the Soil Conservation Board. We have a Soil Conservation Board which is comprised of the Director of Agriculture, the senior Conservation Officer and five other persons appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. One would have thought that people drawn from the peasant class in the area would be more conversant with the wishes of the people who are being removed from the area; and so the Soil Conservation Board would be the competent authority in which to vest many of these powers, including power of removal whether temporarily or permanently, I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. Andrew would accept a further amendment

to sub-clause 2. I am suggesting that it should read as follows:-

"In any event of its becoming necessary for the Director of Agriculture to remove any dwelling house for the purposes of this Act, the Board shall make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses." My amendment therefore is to delete the word "he" and substitute the words "the Board". If that is done, I feel that the residents of the area and the people generally will feel more satisfied, knowing fully well that in all such matters they have the right to appeal to the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Minister. Unless this scheme enjoys the confidence and co-operation of the peasants, it would not be as successful as it should be, and we are saying that emphasis should always be laid on the Soil Conservation Board and not on the Director of Agriculture, no matter how wonderful a man he might be, or how knowledgeable on such agricultural matters. We should like to make this amendment not only to this Clause but to many other Sections. You should not give the Director of Agriculture alone such wide powers that he should be a virtual dictator to whom the peasants would not be able to explain themselves.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am not against the principle of this Bill, but I think the word "permanent" is a little too strong to remain. You might have a case in St. Joseph where the Director might call upon a person to leave a particular site, but that person may have a bit of land elsewhere and would be prepared to go to his piece of land, while the Director has the power to say he must go next door. As you know, Sir, nobody living in an area which is subject to slipping would be prepared to move next door; he would like to go miles away from that site. If this man has a bit of land elsewhere and the Director of Agriculture refuses to recommend that he should go on that particular site, then you will be creating a hardship on this man. 4.45 p.m.

I feel that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture should take back this and decide upon making a small amendment. I would say that after the word "permanent" you should put "with the approval of the occupier." The words "temporary or permanent" can stay but you should have "with the approval of the occupier;" that is to say, if this is the place where the Director of Agriculture is calling upon an occupier to go, it should meet with his approval. I do not think that amendment will do the section any harm. It is all right for us to stay here and pass this Bill on paper, but after this Bill comes into operation, even myself will be faced with that problem, because I am living in St. Joseph and this Bill is providing for St. Joseph and St. Andrew; and even if it is not myself, it may be one of my constituents. I am sure that they will be coming to me first, if the Director should call on them to go and live somewhere else where they do not want to go. The Director of Agriculture may say to somebody in St. Joseph "go down Coggins Hill." I am sure nobody in St. Joseph would want to go down Coggins Hill.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I would not have the hon. member speaking disparagingly of my constituency.

Mr. L. E. SMITH: I do not think I am speaking disparagingly of anybody or any constituency. Mr. Chairman, I was saying that there are some places in St. Joseph where as soon as the rain sets up, you cannot sleep at night; you always have to be on the look out because sometime you leave your coconut tree besides your house, and the next morning you look out you see it all the way down the hill.

You have to start somewhere but I feel the soil conservation experimental scheme should have been started in the Spring Field Area where the land is slipping all the time. That is the place where the Government is always spending a lot of money through the Department of Highways and Transport.

Sir, I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture not to go ahead with this particular section as it stands and

without making an amendment to it. You can leave in the word "permanent" but insert "with the approval of the occupier" and I think that amendment will be right. You will be satisfying the Board, and the Director of Agriculture and everybody else; but you leave this section like this and the Director of Agriculture calls on an occupier to go where he does not want to go, that would be the cause of much dissatisfaction. Sir, as you know, some people would prefer to stay at home and die before they go to the Almshouse although they know that they would be getting better attention there. You are calling upon an occupier to go some place where he may not want to live. I cannot vote for this Clause as it stands. It is all right with the word "permanent" but you should insert "with the approval of the occupier" I think you would be acting with fairness to everyone.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on further perusal of the Bill, I have observed that you have clearly set out the duties of the Board but I am wondering if you are referring back to the duties and functions of the Board which you will see at Clause 4 (c). In this section with which we are dealing, you are saying that the Director shall do all these things. I am one of those members who think that you should have a Bill like this, but I do not want to take away rights from the average citizen. In this particular sub-clause you say "he shall make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses." Is it unscientific, is it bad draughtsmanship - and the Clerk of the House should be able to tell us - to repeat that the Director of Agriculture must act in consultation with the Board? You see, Sir, I want to take away that power of dictatorship from one man. If he is acting after consultation with the Board, that is all right because the Minister is responsible for appointing this Board, and therefore the Director after consultation with the Board would be able to say that you should remove and so on. In one section you say that "the Director of Agriculture, after consultation with the Board," should do so and so. In another you say "the Director in consultation with the Board," but in this Section you say "the Director of Agriculture" shall make arrangements.

I am appealing to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. Do not be strong-headed. I know that this is a specialist Bill and I appreciate that as well as anybody else; but specialist Bill or not, I am concerned with the rights of everybody. In this Act you say that one man has the power to do so and so. Why do you not say that he shall, in consultation with the Board, do so and so or better still, take the words "Director of Agriculture" out and say "the Board" because the Director is part of the Board. If you do that, you will have no row at all. Do not let us be hasty. If you feel that what I am saying is not scientific draughtsmanship or if you feel that it would be superfluous, then postpone this section and pass the balance of the Bill. These are the arguments of the Opposition. None of us would like to see this Bill thrown out. I think what I have just said is logical reasoning. In Section four, you say that the functions of the Board shall be to advise the Director of Agriculture generally on the utilisation of lands in the conservation area. You say further in Clause 12 that the Director of Agriculture can over-ride all of that and do as he likes. If you look at Clause 5, you will see it stated that the Director of Agriculture shall do so and so after consultation with the Board. What is wrong with putting that in where we say it should be put in this Section? We say that you should put it in this Section and take away all this power which you are giving to one man. I am absolutely sure that if you put in "after consultation with the Board," the people with whom the Director will have to deal would realise that the Director has had consultation with the members appointed by the Government. I say again that if you do not want to accept that responsibility, you should pass the other sections of this Bill and postpone this particular section so that you can go back to the Attorney General with it and he can tell us whether this amendment can be put in it. 4.55 p.m.

I am wondering whether, with your plans and authorities for housing, you will have some place for decanting houses and so on. However, do not let us argue that point any more. My words are addressed to the Hon. Minister now. If he is not a legally-trained man and if he does not want to put in

an amendment here, let him postpone the consideration of this particular section of the Bill and go back to the Attorney General with it. Even if he says "No", we feel that this provision should come out. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticise Government policy; and if we agree on something, it is for the lawyers to put what we want in parliamentary language. If we reach a compromise on anything, they must have words to convey what we want.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Hon. Minister is going to accept the very reasonable proposal which has been made, that he should give this matter further consideration, and after that further consideration has been given in the light of the constructive criticisms which have been made, he would come back to the House with the improvements which have been pointed out to him; otherwise, we are bound to insist that this power be taken away from the Director of Agriculture. In no democratic country could any such unlimited and dictatorial powers be given to any official. Let us look at Sub-section (1) of this Clause. It says that the Director of Agriculture shall, in addition to any other powers given to him by this Act, have and possess the following powers, which powers are set out in sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e) and (f). Then in sub-section (2) it says this:

"In the event of its becoming necessary for the Director of Agriculture to remove any dwelling house for the purposes of this Act, he shall make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses."

Imagine that they had one official, perhaps an imported official or a bird of passage, who would be given power to make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses! I wonder if after this Bill had passed through the hand of the Draughtsman, the Hon. Minister had time to give the careful study to it, which would be expected of him. I realise how busy he has been with the election campaign along with the Premier, but still there are other things which are important and which have to be looked after. Why should we give these unprecedented and wide powers to the Director of Agriculture? This is something which you would not expect in a democratic country, something to which in a democratic Chamber you would not expect the majority of them to say "Aye" or "No" at the crack of the whip.

I therefore beg to second the motion of my colleague that the word "he" occurring in line 3 of sub-clause 2 of this Clause be deleted and the words "the Board" be inserted in place thereof.

I am suggesting that the Board should have this power—the Board which comprises the Director of Agriculture, who is Chairman, and who would have a casting vote in the event of a "tie", the Senior Conservation Officer and five other members appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee who shall include representatives of the agricultural community; and the final responsibility is that of the Minister. It is the responsibility of the Minister to see that the five other persons appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall include representatives of the agricultural community. If the Hon. Minister will decide to have this matter postponed for further consideration, or in the event of his deciding against that, I would suggest to him to accept the amendment which has been moved by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. We have recommended that the further consideration of a measure be postponed, because we were not at all happy in the first instance about many things which we saw in that Bill and now it has come to us again, we find that there are fifty-three alterations and amendments proposed from the original Bill which was laid before us!

As usual, the Opposition was right. The matter was not considered then and now it has come back to us with fifty-three amendments to a comparatively small Bill. Anyhow, we have given our attitude in this matter, that we cannot consider giving the Director of Agriculture these wide powers. It does not matter whether the Director of Agriculture in Kenya or in Ghana or in Calcutta has these

very powers. We are not prepared to give up the rights and privileges which we have had in this Chamber for so long, to individuals who may be here until they can get another job, or who may be entirely out of sympathy with the aims and aspirations of the people of this colony.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, while the Opposition might have been right on the last occasion, I counsel them now to give grave consideration to any matter of amendments to this Bill. I also counsel them to give grave consideration to the holding up and the impeding of this scheme any longer.

Mr. Chairman, the parish of St. Andrew - I do not speak now of the hon. member's constituents, but the parish of St. Andrew has been for years and years a liability in this Island, mainly due to the fact that there was no expert guidance in the maintenance of the good soil in that area. 5.05 p.m.

The Government and other persons have seen fit to obtain the services of a man who is known throughout the world as the foremost soil conservation expert. Now, Sir, that man with the Government's approval, on money provided from local sources as well as other sources has come here and made a successful start even without legislation necessary to give him the dictatorial powers which everybody is talking about. He has already shown his ability to conserve the soil and to preserve good relations - which any human being should - between the people of the district and the necessary authorities. He is now at a point where he must go further. Unfortunately I understand that he will be leaving in the near future; I am not quite sure when, but probably within the year. If he cannot at this moment get the necessary authority to fulfil the scheme in St. Andrew as an overall picture, the little piece which he has done stands in jeopardy of being removed by other pieces higher up. The money, time, effort and consideration that have been given to this project will have been lost merely because of the argument deduced by members that one man is being given dictatorial powers.

Sir, let us consider very carefully the granting of dictatorial powers for this particular scheme; let us consider very seriously the suggestion made by the hon. junior member for St. John that we have an over-all picture of a scheme of land controlled and then after everything is finished, put the people back on it. These are the two alternatives, and frankly at this juncture I fail to see the wisdom in delaying this matter any longer. There is absolutely no doubt in the minds of every citizen of this country that there comes a time when it is necessary for the Government to step on their rights. This, Sir, is a definite case. Surely, it is not advisable for this Government to allow the good soil of St. Andrew to continue its way out miles past Long Pond. Surely, Sir, it must be realised by those who know land in that area, that this power which is being asked for is subject to a Board, which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has assured this House will be made up of persons of the necessary calibre. They must realise that these powers are necessary because of the specific and scientific necessity of this scheme. It is necessary to have these controls, as I pointed out in my second reading speech, because a single individual due to his ideas, stubbornness and perversity, and situated in a strategic spot on a hundred acres of land, can ruin the whole conservation scheme in that area.

As regards the point of consultation, in certain cases where certain elements have been let loose, the time it takes to go and consult is valuable, and a man who knows his job and has to wait for consultation, will find an area which has already been done lost. This is a scheme which deals with such possibilities and we cannot at this juncture do anything else than continue with the scheme as it started. If the Minister, as someone has suggested, is going to be in the position that not even he but the man in direct charge of the scheme is going to be the man of the moment, it is only as I have envisaged it here, and that is, that he has to work through the Head of the Department and will have to account to the Minister, while the Minister will give an account to this House.

Now, Sir, while the powers might seem wide, the necessity for them is there, and then it is up to the hon. members of St. Andrew to ascertain that the Minister does his job. Can hon. members imagine the Director of Agriculture removing a person from a certain area in St. Andrew and putting him in Christ Church?

5.15 p.m.

It may be necessary for the Soil Conservation Officer to say, (A VOICE: Go to St. George.) Well, if he goes to St. George he would not have the problem of soil conservation anyhow. Sir, it may be that it is necessary for action to be taken quickly and it has been put to this House that in certain cases he may say to remove somebody to Christ Church. I think no Government would allow that to happen because I can very well see that any Government can well be defeated on a situation such as that. (A VOICE: It depends on how you vote.)

Sir, a particular necessity may occur in dealing with a large area of land where you will have to remove persons from, say, ten acres of that land and allow nothing else to be grown there but trees. I envisage that this matter of movement is purely one for the Soil Conservation Officer in consultation with the Board and for the Director of Agriculture to be able to decide that Mr. A who is now living on an area which is to be planted in trees and must remain in trees for a life time must be removed to another area and it may be that Mr. A may be quite permanently set up in his husbandry in that particular area from which they want to remove him, and it would be necessary for a decision such as that to be made by the Director of Agriculture. As you know, Sir, boards are sometimes difficult matters to convince and one must rely in a scientific scheme like this on the ability of the person in direct control. Up to now, there has been no showing of problems as far as control is concerned and I hope that hon. members of this Assembly would give grave consideration to this Bill before they amend it.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members seem to be in favour of putting in the amendment "in consultation with the Board" for the purpose of this temporary or permanent settlement. I do not think it is a compromise which cannot be considered rather than to hold up this Bill and not compromise. I hope that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who I feel fully appreciates the situation will compromise, and I can see that already. I think it may be advisable for him to consider its inclusion.

Mr. BARROW: If the hon. member who has just sat down had made a single reference to the subject which we are now discussing and if now for the second time within a couple of weeks, the hon. member had not displayed the unfortunate predilection for dictatorship, I would not have risen to my feet. It is significant that on both occasions the hon. senior member for St. George has made a speech which ostensibly supports a second reading speech, and is a speech which can be termed a reply on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture whom he considers inarticulate.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that I have reflected on the Hon. Minister as the hon. member is implying.

Mr. BARROW: The mere fact that the hon. member arrogates to himself the function of making a speech in reply to criticisms and suggestions made shows that he is either joining the Government Party or he considers the Minister inarticulate. I do not think that the Hon. Minister shares the same view-point. The hon. senior member for St. George in his own folly seems to think that the Minister cannot speak for himself.

Mr. DOWDING: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a democratic Assembly and an hon. member has the right of stating his views in this Chamber.

Mr. BARROW: That shows the unholy alliance which is taking place between the hon. member and the Government Party. It is significant that on each and every occasion that he has got up he has supported measures which other hon. members of the Opposition have criticised, and which even the more enlightened members of the Government

seem to think to be totalitarian. The first measure was as regards the beaches and the second is as regards this soil conservation. Out of his own mouth you get him saying that there is no need for the Soil Conservationist in St. George. Why is it that he should get up and support totalitarian methods? I do hope that, when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture comes to this House and introduces a Bill to bring all the hapless and unfortunate people living in the gullies of St. George out to the front road and to acquire some of the land and vast domains of the hon. member, he will not get up and say that they are totalitarian methods when a member gets up and says that nothing will happen on account of that. I hope that, when the Government brings in provision for those people, we do not have the nauseating experience of listening to him and that he would say it is a good measure. A word to the wise... I advise the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to bring all those houses in the gullies of St. George out to the front road and I do hope the hon. senior member for St. George would not turn tail and say that it is totalitarian.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. junior member for St. John. I think I have given you sufficient latitude. We are not dealing with houses in St. George.

Mr. BARROW: We are talking of the dictatorial and totalitarian powers which are reposed in the Director of Agriculture by Section 13. I am a member of this House and I say what I have said advisedly. You will remember that, in the early part of the debate when I spoke, I was in a whimsical mood, and I was supporting the Hon. Minister because I felt deep down inside of me that the Hon. Minister appreciated that what I was saying of co-operatives was a right approach to this problem. The hon. senior member for St. George is not concerned with co-operatives; so he says that these powers which we consider are dictatorial are well vested in the Director of Agriculture.

5.25 p.m.

The hon. junior member for the City let slip something in the course of the debate, and it is that very often when the Director of Agriculture has got the power vested in him by law, acting as Chairman on the several Boards over which he presides, he does act in a dictatorial manner contrary to the best interests of the people of this Island. Since I am a responsible member of this House, I will give you an illustration. When I was a member of the Sugar Production and Export Control Board an iniquitous practice arose in this country which the hon. senior member for St. George should know about, of breaking the contract which this country had with the Ministry of Food in England. (*The Chairman knocked the gavel.*) I am giving an illustration of the dictatorial powers given a man and I think, Mr. Chairman, that you would be the last person to try to stifle any free expression of opinion on a matter which is now before us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have given sufficient licence to explain the dictatorial powers to which you have made reference, but, in my opinion, the hon. member is going too far.

Mr. BARROW: I am now giving an illustration of them. You did not stop the hon. junior member for the City when he made mention of the Molasses Board and I am now mentioning the Sugar Production Board.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. junior member for the City did not go as far as that.

Mr. BARROW: Because he had nothing to say.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: On a point of order.

Mr. BARROW: I will qualify that statement; he had nothing further to say.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. John has said that you gave me more scope in dealing with the Molasses Board than you are giving him now and you replied that I did not go as far as he wants to go. He in reply has said that I had nothing to say, but that he has something to say.

Mr. BARROW: I corrected that. (Mr. T. W. MILLER: What I did say was that everything is not said in this House; by that, I meant that everything should not be said in this Chamber.) (*Laughter.*)

Mr. BARROW: I want to explain that the hon. member had no further useful contribution to make to the already valuable contribution which he has made. Whether it was a matter of discretion or of valour, I am not fully conscious. I am giving a concrete illustration of how the powers vested in the Director of Agriculture in Clause 13 could be misused. That is all I am doing. When I was a member of the Sugar Production Board an illegal practice of exporting sugar was taking place, and the Board directed the Director of Agriculture to get in touch with the Ministry of Food in England to find out whether this practice existed in prejudice against the contract which we had with the Ministry of Food. At the next meeting of the Board, the Chairman informed the Board that he had not sent any telegram to the Ministry of Food, because the Controller of Supplies had said that everything was all right. That is how dictatorial powers have been misused; instead of our telegram going direct to the Ministry of Food, the Executive Committee was surreptitiously informed of the steps which a responsible Board intended to take to deal with the contravention of a sacred agreement. I am sure that there are some things which the hon. junior member for the City would have found it not convenient to give expression to at the same time, but I am not restricted in that way.

I want to say that the exact phraseology of this Section is something which is beneath the notice of hon. members, because the whole Bill has been misconceived. We now have a splendid opportunity of establishing as a living example for the rest of the West Indies, in the first instance, and perhaps for the rest of the under-developed areas of the world, a co-operative system of land ownership which would be easy to operate with less distress and without expropriation of land by a single individual or by a Board. Everybody would have an interest in making the scheme a success. The Jamaicans have gone half-way along towards the solution of the problem with which we are now confronted by setting up land bonds, and what I have suggested to the Minister of Agriculture is that a careful study should be given to the approach to this matter, and instead of having acrimony heaped upon their heads, because they seem to vest totalitarian and dictatorial powers in individual people, what they should do is to establish an agricultural democracy in Barbados for the first time, because a danger is arising. I am only asking hon. members not to pay any attention to what the hon. senior member for St. George has said, because this scheme is outside of his area of operations and his scope of thinking. The idea of co-operative ownership is anathema to the hon. senior member for St. George and that is why he is seeking to draw a red herring across the trail by suggesting that these powers are necessary to be given to the Director of Agriculture. I say that they are necessary in so far as they exist to show members of the public that the thinking of the Government Party and the henchmen on the opposite side is not on the high level on which it should be in matters of this kind.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I know the Hon. Minister is anxious to get along with the job, and I am also like other members anxious to get along. However I want to say that considering the contribution that has just been made by the hon. junior member for St. John, I would say that to this particular debate the contribution was nil, and I would be loth to spend the time commenting on such a contribution when I feel the time would be wasted in so doing, except to say that such contributions find their way into the public eye and are grossly misconstrued. I would like to make mention of just one fact in answer to the fear of moving people from St. George and so on.

As regards the idea of the hon. junior member for St. John who talked about the wonderful opportunity which the Government now has of showing to the West Indies and the world what a co-operative venture could do, I do not believe that the hon. junior member for St. John or perhaps anybody else has any more interest in co-operatives than members of this Government, and I am quite certain that we will see proper co-operative schemes; but I wonder how much love this gentleman has for the people of the area when you consider that the soil which is now under consideration is the least arable, some of the least accessible,

the least worthy, some of the most dangerous, and certainly involves some of the worst risks you can think about in investing in any scheme. Does the hon. junior member for St. John seriously contend that this is the kind of land which we should try to take up for a co-operative venture in this country? I would say that the Government is completely on the right track. If you want to have a co-operative venture, you should make sure that the land is good enough, so that when the venture starts you would not be throwing away what enterprise you are going into. The hon. member had to admit that when you have these bonds and you want to dispose of them, you might have to sell on the open market. Are you going to sell them on the open market where they would have the least value? If there is any interest in this scheme, let the Government make sure they buy land in a proper area and then think of it; but do not ask about a co-operative venture before the land is ready. That is the only observation which I would like to make against the rambling statement made by the hon. junior member for St. John.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to straighten out the hon. member. Apparently it is going to take a long and tortuous process to straighten him out; it may take years if I have to assist him in any way.

I was not for a moment suggesting that the Government would not have technical assistance, but I would advise him to go, if he does enjoy a vacation at any time, in the near future and have a look at the scheme in Jamaica and the Tennessee Valley scheme, and he would understand what I am talking about. He seems to think that a co-operative has to be a Bank or an aided self-help enterprise. I am talking about an agricultural co-operative in which each and every inhabitant of the area would have a vested interest in making the scheme a success in so far as their own losses or capital expenses are concerned; they would be underwritten from the same source and by the same authority by which the present scheme would be underwritten. That is all I wanted to point out.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before the Government replies, I think that the entire burden of the Opposition by the Opposition has been lost in a lot of meaningless debate, especially of course from the Government Benches and especially from the last speaker from the Government Bench. He merely sees one particular angle of the Opposition's contribution on which to comment, because his remarks about a co-operative are merely a side issue. His suggestion about a co-operative authority or an authority working along co-operative lines is merely for the administration of the area both during the soil conservation scheme and after. Implied in the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is the suggestion that you cannot have a co-operative because up to now you have no soil conserved. That is nonsense, because obviously what the hon. junior member for St. John must mean is that your co-operative authority would take over the administration both during and after the soil conservation scheme.

The burden of the complaint by the hon. junior member for St. John and the Opposition is that the Bill gives too wide and dictatorial powers to a single Civil Servant. The Bill has twenty-seven Sections of which at least twenty-one refer to the Director of Agriculture and each gives him more power, you should give him power after consultation with his Board. Any fool can understand that.

In Section 3 which we passed a little while ago, we established a Board to be known as the Scotland District Soil Conservation Board hereinafter referred to as the Board which consists of the Chairman, who is Director of Agriculture, the Senior Conservation Officer, and five other persons appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Well now, do you know, Mr. Chairman, that only in one of these Clauses do we call the Board into action to make decisions with the Director of Agriculture? Every other Section empowers the Director to do this, that or the other without any reference at all to the Board. I have never in all my life in this Assembly seen any piece of legislation which grants more power to a single man than the Bill before us. I go so far as to say that outside Soviet Russia and the countries within the Iron Curtain, you are not going to find any single official of state possessing the power

which this Bill gives to the Director of Agriculture. If you read the Clauses carefully, you will shudder at the power put into the hands of the Director of Agriculture. He fixes the time for the owners or occupiers to take measures prescribed by him; if you do not do that, he prescribes the penalty, and he has power to take any steps he likes that are just and equitable to him to take; and only in one Section is his power circumscribed by the Board, and that is Section 11, with regard to the amount to be levied for the cost of any work for which a claim might be made. In every Section, Sir, the Director of Agriculture is empowered to pay what compensation he likes, to say where people who are to be removed must go, whether temporarily or permanently, and he may without any previous payment, tender or deposit, enter upon and use any land for the purpose of taking therefrom any earth, clay, stone, boulders, gravel, sand, and other materials which he wants.

5.45 p.m.

It goes on to say that he may at all reasonable times by his officers, agents and workmen, and with or without vehicles, loaded or unloaded, enter into and pass through and over any lands for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, altering, repairing, and maintaining any works under this Act, and for that purpose he may make on those lands temporary roads or approaches to the works, doing thereby no unnecessary or unavoidable damage to the lands.

He may lay or deposit in any lands any materials whatsoever to be used in connection with any works under this Act, and erect thereon any temporary shelter for any workmen, or other persons, causing thereby as little damage or inconvenience as may be.

He may deposit on any land any soil from any works constructed under this Act, or remove from any watercourse in the cleansing, repairing, maintaining, or improving of the watercourse.

He may realign or break up the soil of any roads, street, ways, or footpaths and excavate and sink trenches, and do all such other matters and things as he deems expedient, necessary, or proper for making, cleansing, repairing, maintaining or improving any road or watercourse or other works to be made, done, and provided by the Director of Agriculture under this Act.

He may remove any erection, article, or thing other than a building (including a chattel house) from any lands and may with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee remove any building, (including a chattel house.)

Then it says at (2): "In the event of its becoming necessary for the Director of Agriculture to remove any dwelling house for the purposes of this Act, he shall make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses."

"(3) If at any time after the occupiers of any building removed as aforesaid have been accommodated or settled in accordance with the provisions of the preceding subsection of the Governor-in-Executive Committee considers it expedient to resettle such persons either in the conservation area or elsewhere, the Director of Agriculture shall make such arrangements for the re-settlement in that area or in any other area or place as the Governor-in-Executive Committee considers suitable for that purpose."

Then at Section 14 it says:-

"(1) The Director of Agriculture may make grants or loans to any person or body for all or any of the following purposes:-" I will not worry to read them. Then it says that any person who obstructs him is liable to a penalty. He also has power to take or lease land and to cultivate and manage such land.

I cannot go on any further. It is not fair to read sections which we have not got to yet, but up to where we are - section 13 - I doubt very much whether the Commissar of Agriculture of Soviet Russia has been given anything approximating to what is in this Clause. All the Opposition is saying is that you do not vest this power in the Director of

Agriculture except with reference to his Board. That is the amendment which has been moved by the hon. senior member for Christ Church and all the remarks so far are in support of his contention.

It is certainly not intellectual honesty for any member on the other side, including the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, to get up and say what we are saying is insignificant to the section under debate. The point is this: whether you have a land authority, a co-operative authority or a soil conservation agency, or call it whatever you like, that is incidental or unimportant in so far as our main contention is concerned.

I merely want to make the position clear so that when we vote, as we are going to vote, in support of the amendment made by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, we are not voting for any co-operative or land settlement scheme; we are merely voting to take away some of the dictatorial power with which the Bill seeks to endow the Director of Agriculture of Agriculture. What in the world are you going to have a Cabinet System for when a Minister ought to have all this power and it is vested in the Civil Service? The Transport and Natural Gas Co-operation are competent agencies. Certainly, not one of those agencies has anything of the power which this man is given in this Bill. Unless there be reasons which have not been vouchsafed to us so far for the report of the Bill as it stands, we contend that nobody in his right senses can vote for it; therefore, we are going to vote against it.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I have listened so far to all the comments made and I have taken into consideration everything as coming from the Opposition. There are times when I think the Opposition should not oppose for the sake of opposing. This is a new Bill and a new scheme. We have never had any such scheme in Barbados before. It is absolutely new and it has to do with the reclamation of land. This is not making regulations for a school or for something which we have had already. This is something which people of goodwill have been hoping to see long before. It is for the reclamation of all that vast area of land in the Scotland District.

Let me ask one serious question. I am not rowing with anybody. Seriously, I do not think that the Opposition is really opposing this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to accept that. I must do this for the purpose of the record. The Hon. Minister is saying that we are opposing for the sake of opposing. Let me say that I am in favour of this Bill, and if it were not so I would say so. The Hon. Minister is saying that the Opposition is opposing just for the sake of opposing. That is not so. I am making my position quite clear. I am in favour of the Bill, but I am not in favour of giving such wide powers to the Director of Agriculture. If you do not want any amendment, what you should do is either to accept what we have put to you or postpone the particular section.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is making another speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am really saying is this. I am merely asking the Hon. Minister either to accept the amendment or if he cannot accept it, postpone this section and come back with it. Do not go on to say that the Opposition is opposing this Bill for the sake of opposing it! The Hon. Minister has said something which on a point of order I must explain.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Having made the motion for the amendment, it is on these very grounds, as far as I am concerned, that I think this Bill was postponed on the last occasion because it was felt - and it was argued on the floor of the House - that too much power was vested in the Director of Agriculture. One would have thought that the Minister would have come down on this occasion with some other amendment to meet the requirements of the House. To say that the Opposition is opposing for the sake of opposing is ridiculous.

I would like the Hon. Minister to tell me how was this Bill framed; what Bill were they guided by. We know that the legal draughtsmen get a copy of a Bill from, say, South Africa, Kenya, Jamaica or some other country. Which part did you copy it from? It seems to me as if you followed the guiding copy verbatim and where the Director of Agriculture appeared, you just copied it like that.
5.55 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, when we take the Director of Agriculture out of this section, whom do we put in? The Minister? (A MEMBER: No, the Board). All of that is set out in Clause 4 of this Bill. That Clause says:

"The functions of the Board shall be to advise the Director of Agriculture generally on the utilization of lands in the conservation area in such a manner as will tend towards the conservation of the soil and the prevention and mitigation of soil erosion and in particular -" and the various things are set out as to the functions of the Board. Having set out all of these things and this advice having been given to the Director, then he goes on to execute these things in Section 13 of the Bill. The Board as such cannot execute anything; the Director as such must have the power to execute these things, because he is responsible to the Minister in the last analysis. There is nothing to fear. I should like to read this passage for the benefit of hon. members.

"The Head of a Department will be responsible to the Minister for the administration of his department and will act as adviser to the Minister on professional or technical matters falling within the scope of his Department. It will be the duty of the Head of a Department to keep the Minister fully informed either directly or through the Permanent Secretary of all the important activities of the Department and to execute such decisions of policy as come within the scope of the Department."

Mr. MOTTLEY: What Section is that?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: That is in the Constitution. Let us take the hon. junior member for St. John; he was jovial in his criticism. He did not mean any harm, but some of the less witty members of the Opposition got up and tried to blaze the trail.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. I do not want the hon. member to think that because I was in a whimsical mood that I was making sport.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I did not say that he was making sport, but he was in lighter vein.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I was perfectly serious, but they have very thin skins; and when you say things in a straightforward manner, they think that you are being critical. They, themselves, have asked me not to hurt them so much by making these remarks.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I will stress this matter any more. The Director of Agriculture has a Board whose duty it is to guide him. The Board has already been appointed. You have all local gentlemen who reside in the parish as members of this Board, so that you need not fear anything about the peasants having their representation. Apart from all that, if you have the Board to guide the Director of Agriculture in these matters, then he must have the authority to carry out these things. Do hon. members still say that we must still have in this Section the words "in consultation with the Board?" On one side you have consultation and on the other side you have implementation, and the Director of Agriculture must have the power to implement. If you put in the word "temporary," and you do not put in the word "permanent," then "permanent" is left out. The law must be very strong on these points.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this Bill is so clear, that I do not see any hardship in it. If you represent the Government and you have the good fortune to be a Minister, even if you lose your seat in this House - I am not perturbed about that because we have to stick to the principles. We have to make laws and regulations for the reclamation of

this land, and there may be people who have been living on this land for numbers of years - people who might try to prevent the reclamation of the land. Suppose you have a few nincompoops or ignoramuses up there!

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I object to that statement.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I wonder how many people from St. Andrew go to the Asylum.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: They are not nincompoops; they may be undernourished, but they are not nincompoops.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this work can be sabotaged by somebody who does not understand the implications of it and you have to protect the Director of Agriculture. Suppose you are trespassing on somebody's land - the Director of Agriculture may have to trespass on somebody's land and suppose he is told: "You cannot trespass here!" You must give the Director of Agriculture some power to trespass on lands.

Relative to the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. John, I should like to say that I like co-operatives myself. I am not trying to brag or anything like that, but I can say that I have strengthened the co-operative movement in this Island. However, I think we should get ahead with the work of reclaiming this land first. There is nothing wrong in what the hon. member has said about co-operation. I believe in co-operation, and as he gave an illustration of certain things I would like to say that sometime ago, we were trying to have an irrigation scheme; we wanted to improve the peasants' irrigation service, and one man in the whole set-up tried to prevent people from trespassing on his land. Therefore, before we talk about co-operatives, let us try to stop the erosion in that area and try and get one-sixth of the land into cultivation.

As you will see in Section 5 sub-section (1) of this Bill:-

"The Director of Agriculture, if he considers that measures are necessary

(a) for the conservation of the soil in the conservation area;

(b) for the prevention and mitigation of soil erosion in the said area.

(c) for the prevention of damage by storm water;

(d) for the utilization of land in the said area in such a manner as will tend towards the attainment of the best use thereof or any of the objects aforesaid; shall, (after consultation with the Board) prepare proposals for the conservation area or any part thereof and for all or any of the purposes aforesaid."

Those are the things which are stipulated.
6.05 p.m.

These are things which are done after consultation with the Board. Having done these things, he has to have the authority to carry out the necessary decisions. You cannot give the power to the Minister, because the Minister does not administer; he is only responsible for policy. If the Director does anything without coming to me, I have it within my power to call him in and direct policy. If he does anything amiss, he, the Queen's Representative and I will go into it; either he or I might go, and I cannot go; not so. You have to vest power in somebody for the carrying out of the work. The Board must meet and decide on certain things; so I want to allay your fears.

As I said before, this is not a dangerous Bill nor is it dictatorial. At first, I thought that the Director of Agriculture appeared very often in this Bill, but after reading and re-reading, I had to look away from that. When you are part of a Government you have to maintain law and order. Everything that is brought here cannot please everybody, and sometimes I may have to do things which I myself as a politician might not want to do; but as a statesman, I have to bear the price, even if it makes me unpopular, if it is for the good of the Island. This scheme is so valuable that if you do not give the people who have to administer the scheme certain powers, there are those narrow-minded persons

who although they might have to give a little for the greatest good, are nothing to do with that. I can give hon. members an instance where in St. Philip we wanted to build a tenantry road, and one particular man refused to let us cut off his hedgerow of grass, and up to now the people have not got a road. Why should one particular man be allowed to impede progress? This scheme is not for the present generation only, but for posterity; so I am inviting hon. members although they might be in opposition, to see it in a wider perspective. This is a permanent scheme to stop the land from tumbling and washing into the sea and to bring it into production. There are few people who like regimentation; some people do not like Sanitary Inspectors to go into their backyard. Human nature is like that; but if we are to get ahead with this job unmolested, we must give the authorities power to do certain things.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see anything in this Bill to cause me to accept an amendment; if I did, I would do as I have done on other occasions. To do that now would be to alter the whole substance of the Bill. I submit, Sir, that this gives authority in consultation with the Board to implement certain things. The Board has already been chosen and on it are two persons who are sons of the soil there. I think they are very interested in this work and the peasants will find protection in them.

Sir, although some people may say that I am dense, I have not yet been convinced. I am not quarrelling with anybody; I am trying to state my case, and I think I have made out a case.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I suppose the hon. member has made out a case as if he were dealing with a Jury. Anyone listening to the hon. member would come to the conclusion that the Opposition is diametrically opposed to the Bill. I am not mentioning anything here for the purpose of catching votes, because the only way I would catch votes from this is if you were to conserve the Constitution Swamp and I was going to get some of that land to give the people. I am not opposed to the Bill but I am opposed to this Section. I read in the Press where the Attorney General in reply to someone in the Other Place said that the difficulty with these Bills was that they did not come back to him after they left his office and therefore they were not perused. When a layman attempts to criticise, the first set of people to criticise him are those laymen who think themselves Lawyers. I am one of the people who have sufficient courage to criticise anything so long as I feel that it is not palatable and not suited.

Now I listened very carefully to the hon. member trying to make out his case. Section 4 of the Bill sets out the functions of the Board.
6.15 p.m.

Now, these are the functions which are set out here. I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us exactly why you have in Section 5: "the Director of Agriculture, if he considers that measures are necessary - (a) for the conservation of the soil in the conservation area; (b) for the prevention and mitigation of soil erosion in the said area; (c) for the prevention of damage by storm water; (d) for the utilization of land in the said area in such a manner as will tend towards the attainment of the best use thereof or any of the objects aforesaid; shall (after consultation with the Board) prepare proposals for the conservation area or any part thereof and for all or any of the purposes aforesaid;" and then in Section 6 (1) you have: "after considering such representations as may be made, the Director of Agriculture may (after consultation with the Board) make such Order or Orders in writing as he considers necessary for any of the purposes of this Act, and so on. In each of those clauses, you have "after consultation with the Board."

The Hon. Minister said that Clause 4 applies to everything but certainly it does not apply to Clause 5 and 6. It is of less importance if the Director wants to do anything than if he wants to remove an occupier. He must do all that is mentioned in Clauses 5 and 6 "after consultation with the Board;" but in the event of it becoming necessary for the Director to remove any dwelling house for the purpose of this Act, he shall make arrangements for the temporary or

permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses by himself. Are we unreasonable in what we are saying? If for the other things he must do them 'after consultation with the Board,' how is it when it comes to the human right, he must do it without consultation with the Board?

As I have said, the Hon. Minister has said that all the functions are set out in Clause 4 and therefore, that covers everything; therefore, wherever you see Director of Agriculture, it means the Director of Agriculture in consultation with the Board. I say that this has got to go back to the Attorney General's office. If the Attorney General says that in drafting the Bill, wherever the term Director applies that it means the Director of Agriculture in consultation with the Board, that would be all right.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member will read Clause 13 -----

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is no point of order.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I rise on a point of explanation then.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: (To the hon. member for the City) Sit down.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, that is not a point of explanation.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: If the hon. member will calmly read paragraph (f) of Clause 13, he will see that it is stated: "he may remove any erection, article or thing other than a building (including a chattel house) from any lands and may with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee remove any building (including a chattel house)."

He has to get the approval of the Executive Committee and that includes me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Thanks, I did not see it, but that makes it worse. Do you know what your trouble is? You have some gentlemen -----

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. May I inform the hon. member that the Attorney General has made these amendments which I brought in today himself. He has gone into them himself.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What amendments do you mean?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The amendments which I introduced today.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not dealing with those amendments, I am dealing with this. You have here in (f) that the Executive Committee is to give the power to remove the people but you have in Clauses 5 and 6 that the Director of Agriculture has to consult with his Board to do all the things I have read out in those Clauses. You specify them and you say exactly what he can do in those sections; but when it comes to the human individual right, that is not so. In the other things, he must go to the Board; but in the event of its becoming necessary for the Director of Agriculture to remove any dwelling house for the purposes of this Act, you say that he shall make arrangements for the temporary or permanent accommodation and settlement of the occupiers of such houses himself.

We are not opposing the Bill; but we are saying that just as you have put in Sections 5 and 6 "after consultation with the Board," if he is going to remove an occupier either temporarily or permanently he should do it in consultation with his Board. The Hon. Minister in his argument has said that you may get a man being stubborn and it may become necessary to remove him to save one hundred acres; so therefore the Director must act. But we are saying that you may have a Director from Kenya! Bear in mind that this is not legislation to suit the present Government. The present Minister of Agriculture may only be there the next 24 hours or two days from today. You are not legislating for today and tomorrow; you are legislating for

the distant future. You are saying that the Director of Agriculture must do all the other things in consultation with his Board; but when it comes to the individual and he has to remove him, he can act without the consultation of his Board. I am asking the Hon. Minister to see this matter in this light. The hon. lady member can confirm this. You may get your Director of Agriculture on reading this Act saying: "Of course, I do not have to ask this Board anything when it comes to this Section, because if section 4 was overriding and was to cover everything, you would not put in sections 5 and 6 "after consultation with the Board," and if it were to be so for this section, you would have put it in at the end of this Act." If you mean that this should be so, well then, put it in at the end of this Act and save all this argument. 6.25 p.m.

What we are saying is this: unless the hon. member says that he will promise to amend this section in such a way that wherever the words "Director of Agriculture" appear, they mean the Director of Agriculture in consultation with the Board, we cannot agree with this Section. You may get any tyrant as Director of Agriculture here, or you may not get another Minister of Agriculture with the same views as the present Minister of Agriculture. I know that the Minister of Agriculture would not allow the Director of Agriculture to hurt one hair in the head of any peasant so as to cause any trouble. I pay the Hon. Minister that compliment; but he must remember that we are here just for a little while. Who knows who is to become the Minister of Agriculture or the Director of Agriculture in the next few days or in the next few months? I will quote from the Psalms, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" The Director of Agriculture may put somebody somewhere without consultation with the Board. The fact that you had people of the plantocracy as Magistrates, made people feel that they should go to the Assistant Court of Appeal; the people felt also that with the Court of Appeal comprising two or three Judges, there was the opinion of more than one person.

Show me your socialism. You change the name of a rose to a different name and it is just as stink. I am not voting for this Section as it stands. I counsel any hon. member who wants to see justice and who wants to be fair to people not to vote for this Section. If the people in the Other Place who do not have to ask for one vote had made this suggestion which we have made, this Bill would have been sent back to the Attorney General; but the position is just the reverse now. I will not vote for this Section, unless you put in that where the words "Director of Agriculture" appear, they mean the Director of Agriculture in consultation with the Board.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the attitude of the Hon. Minister towards this Bill now that we have come to this Section. The duty of the Opposition is to oppose. We are an enlightened Opposition and it is not our fault if the Government fails to appreciate the function of the Opposition which we perform. This Section gives power which should not appear in any Act except in Soviet Russia, and I doubt whether even the Commissar in Soviet Russia has the power which appears in this Bill. The Hon. Minister seems to think that we are still dealing with the second reading of this Bill, but we have passed the second reading. If the Hon. Minister has not realised that we have passed the second reading, I can tell him that we have already dealt with 12 Sections of the Bill. It is a matter for the Minister if a word to the wise is sufficient; but perhaps, the word is not to the wise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two motions before the Committee - the substantive motion made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, and the amendment moved by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Read the amendment.) The amendment is that the word "he" appearing in line 3 of Sub-clause 2 of this Clause be deleted and the words "the Board" be inserted in place thereof. I will put the amendment first.

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

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Mr. HOLDER, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. THORNE, SEARLES, STRAUGHN and DOWDING - 10.

NOES: Messrs. F. G. SMITH, MOTTLEY, GODDARD, TALMA, BARROW, CRAWFORD and BRANCKER - 7.

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

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Hon. F. E. MILLER; Mr. HOLDER; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. STRAUGHN and Mr. DOWDING - 10.

NOES: Mr. F. G. SMITH; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. GODDARD; Mr. TALMA; Mr. BARROW; Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 7.

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

On the motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting for half an hour.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the House was in Committee.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. Bryan in the Chair.

Clause 14 was called. It reads as follows:-

"(1) The Director of Agriculture may make grants or loans to any person or body for all or any of the following purposes:-

(a) Fencing any land so as to protect vegetation thereon for the purpose of conserving the soil;

(b) Constructing defences against water and any other works for preventing the erosion of soil;

(c) Purchasing, planting, and maintaining trees, shrubs, plants, or grasses for the purpose of conserving the soil;

(d) Executing any other works or doing any other act or thing which in the opinion of the Director of Agriculture it is necessary or expedient to execute or do for the attainment of any of the objects of this Act;

(2) Any grant or loan made under this section shall be made upon or subject to such terms and conditions as the Director of Agriculture thinks fit.

(3) Any loan made under this section may be made either without security or upon such security as the Director of Agriculture thinks fit."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendments:-

(i) Substitute a full-stop for the semi-colon at the end of sub-clause (1).

(ii) Insert a full-stop at the end of sub-clause (3).

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 14 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this Clause is open to the same objections as the predecessor Clause. Certainly the only difference between this Clause and Clause 13 is that Clause 13 was much more vital and gave even wider and more unlimited powers to the Director. All his powers are set out here, and I think that having passed Clause 13 which is even more important than Clause 14, I take it that we would be expected docilely to swallow this; but I only rise to point out that this is just as objectionable even though to a somewhat lesser extent. It is a principle which was accepted by the majority of this Committee earlier on. Clause 13 gave unlimited power to the Director and Clause 14 the same unlimited power is given to him. He alone decides whether a loan may be made with or without security; he alone has the power and the right to decide whether a grant or a loan should be made at all; but it is the same principle. If the majority of this Committee feels disposed to pass that so to create a Hitlerian character, it does not matter to the minority.

The question that Clause 14 as amended do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 15 was called. It reads as follows:-

"The carrying out of any works pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of this Act or the exercise of any power conferred on the Director of Agriculture by section 13 of this Act shall be subject to the following restrictions.

(a) before entering upon private land for the purpose of carrying out such works or of exercising any such powers the Director of Agriculture shall, except in the case of an emergency, cause twenty-four hours' previous notice of the intended entry to be given to the occupier of the land and also to the owner, if practicable;

(b) as little damage as possible shall be caused to any land or premises."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendment.

Insert a dash after the word "restrictions" in the fifth line.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 15 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, after reading Clause 15, I need not comment on the fact that here again the power to enter and carry out work on private land is vested in the Director, and there is no reference here to consultation with the Board; therefore the general blanket powers given in Clause 4 can be ignored because they are purely advisory. The Board shall advise, but there is nothing to make the Director take that advice. Is it sufficient, Mr. Chairman, for merely twenty-four hours' notice to be given? 7.20 p.m.

If the Director wants to enter on any person's land to carry out works in connection with the soil conservation programme and it is because of an emergency, he needs not give any notice at all. It is he who determines whether it is or not an emergency. If it is not an emergency the occupier would only get 24 hours notice.

Now, Sir, soil conservation is nothing you can do overnight. It is part and parcel of a long range programme and of a well laid out scheme: so that the Director must know - in case it is not an emergency - long before 24 hours, that his operations would take him to a certain piece of land on a certain area. The decision to give only 24 hours notice is nothing else but an extenuation of the general totalitarian principle of the Bill, considering what he is given to do and the wide powers he has.

According to this, in the case of an emergency, he

gives no notice at all, and when it is not an emergency he gives 24 hours' notice. Sir, twenty-four hours' notice could not possibly be long enough. After all, a man in this country who owns a piece of land either has inherited it or sweated his brow to gain it; and the fundamental essence of British jurisprudence is that a man's home is his private domain and should be treated as such. The section which we have just passed empowers this all-powerful Director to enter any land and take from it stone, boulders, gravel, and what not, and break them up, and sell and realign it and all that kind of thing. Now, under Section 14 which we also have just passed, he can fence up any land, construct defences against water and any other works for preventing the erosion of the soil, and now under this Section in order to carry out all this far-reaching work on a man's private property, all he needs to do is to give the man 24 hours' notice that he is going to act.

Sir, I am second to no one in my desire to see every available square inch of land in this country under cultivation. Within recent years I have on innumerable occasions castigated the Government for its indifference with regard to the hundreds of acres of land lying fallow in this area so that nobody can accuse me of not wanting the maximum soil preservation campaign being put into effect. You have heard me, Mr. Chairman, denouncing the Government repeatedly for the 226 acres of unused land in St. Joseph and St. John through their failure to construct the East Coast Road; therefore it would be silly for anybody to interpret my opposition to any section of this Bill as a general hostility to the principles underlying the Bill as a whole. Certainly, 24 hours' notice by no stretch of the imagination can be regarded as sufficient. If you give him any notice, he cannot remove the land; so in ordinary fairness to the occupier or owner and in the interest of democracy I think that the minimum time, except in the case of an emergency, should be 96 hours. Therefore, Sir, I am going to move that 15 (a) should read as follows:

"before entering upon any private land for the purpose of carrying out such works or of exercising any such powers the Director of Agriculture shall except in the case of emergency, cause not less than 96 hours' previous notice of the intended entry to be given to the occupier of the land and also to the owner if practicable.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I rise to second this motion on the grounds that a reasonable time should be given to the average tenant or present occupier of these holdings before entering on his land for soil conservation purposes. In the case of an emergency one can well understand the Director entering on the land without any notice at all, provided the emergency is a fact; but even if that power of deciding whether it is an emergency is vested in the Director of Agriculture. However, if it is a real emergency, one can well understand it; but you are vesting all this power in the Director of Agriculture and ignoring the owner of the land and just entering on his land after 24 hours' notice and doing all sorts of things including removing him altogether. In other words, what section 15 is saying is that the Director of Agriculture by just giving a 24-hour notice can remove the occupant of the land and remove him either temporarily or permanently elsewhere. That is not good enough. Surely, if the Director of Agriculture and the Soil Conservation Board are going to take steps in a certain area, they would know many weeks in advance what they are about to do and should be able to give more than 24 hours' notice. We are hoping that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will see the wisdom of giving a reasonable notice, surely not 24 hours' notice. Even in the Courts of law, as far as the ejectment of tenants from houses goes, in the case of a monthly tenant, the tenant is given a month's notice in the first place and then ten or three days' notice, as the case may be. We know that this is not a case of a tenancy. 7.30 p.m.

We are suggesting that even a period of three or four days' notice is reasonable, but not a period of twenty-four hours. It would be very inconvenient for a tenant or a peasant proprietor to get together his things within twenty-four hours and leave that land and whatever he may have there, and make provision without any notice to carry on

his business elsewhere. We are asking the Hon. Minister to re-consider this matter. There is no necessity for vesting this unlimited power in the hands of the Director of Agriculture. I suggest that the giving of twenty-four hours' notice is over-doing things; although one will agree that the Director of Agriculture will need some powers so as to execute and implement this Bill, yet there is no necessity for making things so drastic. If a reasonable time of three or four days' notice is given, that will be bringing reason to bear on the matter. If the Minister is going on with a dictatorship; then he will go on with this notice of three or four hours. This Section says this:

"The carrying out of any works pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of this Act or the exercise of any power conferred on the Director of Agriculture by section 13 of this Act shall be subject to the following restrictions.

(a) before entering upon any private land for the purpose of carrying out such works or of exercising any such powers the Director of Agriculture shall, except in the case of an emergency, cause twenty-four hours' previous notice of the intended entry to be given to the occupier of the land and also to the owner, if practicable;

(b) as little damage as possible shall be caused to any land or premises."

I repeat, that a period of three or four days' notice is reasonable - not twenty-four hours' notice.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, in case of an emergency, the Director can walk in without any notice at all. If you give a period of seven days it would not matter, because in a case of emergency, the Director can walk in right away. There is no definition Clause as to what an emergency is and therefore, that is left to the discretion of the Director. You may have a flood; you may have an act of God; nobody suggests that the case of an emergency should be taken out. In this Bill, provision is made for a case of emergency. The position is this: a lot of this land is under occupation by tenants; the actual owners may be out of the Island. If a matter is in the Law Courts, even there you must give a certain amount of time. Nobody could say anything of any action being taken in the case of an emergency, but where you have notice of an intended entry within twenty-four hours, that is not even sufficient time for the postman or the Writserver to serve the notice. I repeat that twenty-four hours' notice is not sufficient time. You must respect a person's right. I feel that seven days' notice is the correct thing. I say that the case of emergency should be left in.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. If the hon. member moves an amendment for allowing seven days' notice, I will accept it. My reason for saying four days is that a Government which proposes one day would more likely agree with four days than with seven.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We must leave in the case of emergency, so that an officer can walk in at any time; but outside the state of emergency, why do you put an owner of land who might even be out of the Island in this position? To my way of thinking, a person should be given seven days' notice. I am offering a further amendment that a period of seven days' notice should be given. How could a notice of seven days hinder the operation of this Bill? If you had an emergency, it would only be an Act of God, but "emergency" has not been defined. It has been left wide open. If a man blocks water, that is not an emergency.

I therefore beg to move that the words "twenty-four hours" be deleted and the words "seven days" be inserted in place thereof.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I do not want the Opposition to think that I do not want to reply to anything, but not one member of the Opposition members has been on the scene and seen the work which is in operation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Do not let the Hon. Minister make such sweeping remarks, because I have been down there.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I, myself, have been to see the work which is being done at Morgan Lewis fully a year ago. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: A year ago!)

Mr. BARROW: I should just like to inform the Hon. Minister that not only did I go down there and see for myself the work which is being done in St. Andrew, but I have also seen the work which is being done at Boscobel Plantation which belongs to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. Furthermore, I went down to Morgan Lewis two days after the Minister of Agriculture had stood up in the road as monarch of all he surveys and said that he could call off all this work anytime he wants to do so. He said that in the presence of several persons.
7.40 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to know in whose fertile brain such a thing emanated, because it has never been factual at all. It is one of the biggest fabrications I have heard in this House in recent times.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member saying that he never said that he could call off all those workmen if he wanted to?

Mr. MOTTLEY: He was on Mt. Sinai looking down.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, you cannot let people get away with that sort of thing. I expected more from the hon. member than that, but I suppose when you are in a different Party you cannot do differently. When I was over there, I used to do that sort of thing. The debate so far has been on a high level but now you are trying to degrade it. That is hitting below the belt. It would be all right if you were making sport on a platform outside where I could reply, but do not say things under the wings of the privilege of this House, because they are taken for granted. People do not realise that when you are in here you cannot be brought up for libel or slander.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to get it straight and I will give way to her when I have finished making my statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for St. Andrew may speak.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. junior member for St. John who has been making a statement the whole night about my land on which the scheme is being carried out, I should like to say that it is no special favour being done to me because I am a member of the Government. It happens that the area in which the soil conservation work is being conducted includes my land. When the soil conservation work was talked about, there were several proprietors who refused to allow the soil conservationists to go on their land. The Government wrote to the owner of Morgan Lewis and to myself, because that area was under consideration, and I gave them this land for experimental purposes. If I wanted to get up and waste time like other hon. members, I could speak more on that than the hon. member who has just sat down because his calling is in the Law Courts. This is part of my property and everyone looks after his or her interest.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see anything in this to create a debate, because if the hon. member were living in that area, like me every day he would be on the spot where the gentleman is doing an excellent job to see what is being done. This Bill does not make provision to ruin any of the people in the area. No member on that side of the Table is more sympathetic to the people he represents than those of us on this side and we have always proved that. It is all well to play politics and to say "poor people," but there is a time when we must be realists and let them know that if there is something to be done they have to bear the burden so that the community might benefit. There is a small house at Boscobelle belonging to me which Mr. Collett wanted removed, and I told him to take it down, because what is the use of Government spending all this money in this area and for people to object to the use of a small plot of land?

I will give the hon. member an illustration of a case at point; when the road along Belleplaine near the Franklyn's was to be done, people were approached but one or two people prevented the road from being constructed. Mr. Chairman, this is no special favour being granted to me as a member of the Government.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to make this clear. I have already extended my felicitations to the hon. and charming member who has just sat down on being fortunate enough to be a land owner in this area under discussion, but what really surprised me now is her munificence in the statement that she has given Government this land.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is famous for that sort of thing. I have not said such a thing as having given Government the land. I said that Government had written to the owner of Boscobelle Plantation and myself, and I allowed them to experiment on that part of my land. You cannot twist what I said to suit yourself. I cannot sit here and allow the hon. member to misconstrue what I have said, so let the hon. member shout for order as much as he likes.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, for a long time I have been admiring the collar which the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is wearing, but I never thought she would get hot under that collar. She made a statement here, perhaps not fully consciously that other people refused to co-operate and that she gave the Government that land.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I said no such thing, and the hon. member must not misquote me. I said I have given them the land for experimental purposes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the hon. junior member for St. John, what I understood her to have said was that she gave permission to enter the land and use it for experimental purposes.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this is making a mountain of a mole hill, but I just wanted to say what we heard on this side. She may not have intended to say that but if the record were left uncorrected, it would redound unfavourably against the hon. member, and I am glad that she has had an opportunity to explain herself. This is not the first occasion on which I have congratulated her on being fortunate enough to own land in that area; I said it when the Beach Protection Act was being debated.

7.50 p.m.

I have never suggested that she has been singled out for any special favour. What I was replying to was this. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture stated that none of us had actually seen the Soil Conservation Scheme. I have made three visits. It is a project in which I have been interested long before the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was interested. I have special interest in a project of this kind for reasons unknown to the hon. member. He thinks that we are living in rabbit holes in our constituencies. We represent not only our constituents but the taxpayers of Barbados. What is significant is that not one of the land owners who have benefited from the soil conservation measures which have been carried out has made one single contribution, including the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to assist with the conservation scheme. Mr. Chairman, I am saying that seriously and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture knows that is true. I hope, for these long term benefits and for the land being put under cultivation so that profits can be made by private land-owners, that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would get up and say what contribution she has made, and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture would have to say whether the people who enjoy holdings in this particular area should make or should not make a contribution to the Treasury towards the conservation scheme. (A VOICE: That is in the Bill.)

I will say that it is unfortunate that the people of St. Andrew were not public-spirited enough to get to this scheme before the hon. senior member for St. Andrew and it is unfortunate that a member of the Government Party should be the first person to benefit from it. As a matter of fact, she is not the first; she is the second.

While on this topic, I just want to say that we have to maintain a standard of conduct. I may have incurred the displeasure of hon. members on that side when I said what I did some years ago of the Spa Road, but we must maintain a sediment of propriety in the transactions which we have with the people's money. I am not accusing the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. I do say that this is a very good and excellent scheme and I congratulate her and will continue to congratulate her not on her ability but upon her success.

As far as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is concerned, there is nothing slanderous in any statement which I made. He accused us of not going down there. If he takes exception to the statement which I made, I would like to ask him a simple question. Did he or did he not have power to withdraw the workmen? If it is a slanderous statement to say that he can stop people working on that scheme, or whether it is Mr. Collett or somebody outside of the island who had the power to stop them, what I would like to know is who has the power to do it. I do not see anything slanderous about that. I would like to tell the Hon. Minister that I would take his word against several people who told me that they heard it.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I came in just as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was generating some heat. I know that there is a rule in this House which says that no member should vote on any matter in which he has a direct pecuniary interest and the vote of any member so interested would be disallowed. Not only was it not proper for her not to say anything on the matter, no matter how much she supports this scheme, but she should have kept silent because the section of the Act gives the power and directs that the person whose land is damaged is entitled to full compensation.

Sir, there is that rule, and you know it better than I, therefore, when I came in and heard her talking, knowing that she has a pecuniary interest in this scheme, the first thing that came to my mind was that she should at least keep quiet and say nothing.

Mr. Chairman, ask her if the house which she has on that land has been occupied. It has not been occupied for sometime. If it is knocked down, she will probably get a new one for it; she would not lose anything if it is knocked down. I see my hon. colleague is laughing but it is a question of public morality. Why does she not get up and say that the house is occupied if she is saying that I am telling lies? Let her get up and refute this statement of mine. Let her get up and tell this House that this house is of some profit to her. She said that we misquoted her. Why does she not say that I am a liar?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am instructed that the Hon. Minister says that nobody on this side has seen that scheme. I speak for myself. I was down there up to last Sunday afternoon and I have seen that scheme on several occasions. I have stopped and taken some water for my motor car midway up the hill and I go down to Morgan Lewis almost every Saturday afternoon because I have now become interested in fishing and so as to relax.

I too, Mr. Chairman, agree with the Opposition in this matter in that 24 hours previous notice of intended entry to be given to the occupier of the land and also the owner, if practicable, is not sufficient. Who is to decide whether it is practicable? How can I come in here as a representative of people in St. Andrew and allow, in a matter like this, the Director or his employees or his servants or his agents, to enter on land belonging to people in that constituency without giving any notice at all? It is a fact that he can argue that it was not practicable to give any notice. How can I support a section like this? I think seven days is a reasonable time because if the Director is moving on to another step, he does not move on to another step after deciding it overnight. The question of a soil conservation scheme is a question of planning. You do not wake up and say that tomorrow you are going to move on to there. If you are going to move from here to there next week, it gives you time to give proper notice and to allow the owner of the house previous notice. Twenty-four hours' previous notice is de-

finitely too short and it is not fair and is not good enough to the peasant in St. Andrew to make the necessary preparations.

8.00 p.m.

The reason why I say that you should give a longer notice than this is that in previous sections of the Bill if a man does not act within such reasonable time as the Director may prescribe, he can be prosecuted; if he cannot carry out the Director's orders within such reasonable time as the Director shall demand, then he can be prosecuted. Therefore, you are saying that a man should do what the Director says, because the Director himself has ordered a reasonable time; but on the other hand, you are allowing people to enter upon a man's land for these purposes and at this notice if practicable. How can that be fair and right? I want to make my position clear in connection with this Bill. I am one hundred per cent in favour of the scheme, but at the same time I have to safeguard the rights of the people who voted for me on the last occasion. As long as I have the honour to be here as their representative, I shall fight their cause as I see it. I do not think that this Section gives a peasant sufficient notice and warning of what the Director intends to do, because the Director has power to lay down what is a reasonable time for the peasant to carry out his instructions. I say that a week's notice is a reasonable time. I agree with the hon. senior member for St. George that decisions must be made quickly, but they must be made more than 24 hours before hand. The Soil Conservation Expert would not go to bed and dream that he will do something; he must plan it and he must plan it so as to give the peasant a proper warning of his intentions.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that the debates of this House cannot rise above the level of personalities, back-hand insinuations, attempts to ridicule and implications of all sorts such as personal benefit to be gained and all that sort of thing. (Mr. BARROW: In other countries they call it fraud and corruption.) The hon. member who refers to fraud and corruption is more capable of playing with words than I am. I can assure those hon. members that to imply any ridicule in my direction is purely a matter of water rolling off a duck's back. It is obvious that anybody who cares to look into the past with the psychological background caused by the circumstances of the situation would not assist the hon. member in these particular insinuations; I will not, thank Heavens. I intend to apply myself more seriously to the task I have been elected to perform, and I intend to make every effort in trying, if it is possible, to see this Hon. House rise to a standard of debate which is above personalities.

As to the point raised by the Opposition, it seems to merit some consideration, but again, I have been through this whole scheme. In spite of the fact that the Minister does not seem to think that many of us have been to the scene of operations, I have been through there with Mr. Collett and other experts on more than one occasion. The reason for this necessary speed is the fact that a man may decide to plough a bit of land which, in the interest of the scheme, it has been decided should not be ploughed and within 24 hours the ploughing of that land can ruin a large part of the scheme. If "emergency" covers a case such as that I have quoted - the case of a person ploughing land which would ruin the whole scheme - then I feel that a period of seven days' notice is quite sufficient. I am not a draftsman nor an expert in this particular matter and I think that some consideration should be given to it. I hope that the Hon. Minister will be able to give us a definite statement in this matter; if "emergency" includes an act of man, as well as an act of God which is in the opinion of the Director, harmful to the scheme, then seven days' notice cannot work. If "emergency" does not cover such a case, then 24 hours is reasonable. I should like to hear the Hon. Minister on this point.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I started off by saying that if hon. members had gone down there and seen this work in operation, they would realise that there are times when the Soil Conservation Officer has to rely upon emergencies. You have places slipping from time to time. Since the Soil Conservationist started this work, we have had land slipping and he has to have the power to do what

he had planned only yesterday. For instance, we had to draw water from a certain area, because it was helping to remove certain soil thereby causing erosion. When you have slipping from you overnight certain work which you had done yesterday, are you going to give 72 hours' notice that you want to reclaim that land?

Mr. MOTTLEY rose to speak.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. MOTTLEY: All right, I will reply when the hon. member has finished speaking.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: As I was saying, Sir, anybody who has been down there and has seen the nature of this work, must realise that the Director of Agriculture must have certain powers. You are not dealing with cultivated land, nor are you interfering with boundaries; the land is mostly mountainous and it is also rab land for the most part. I want the House to realise that on one occasion I nearly lost my life down there. (Laughter)
8.10 p.m.

If for some reason or other the jeep had fallen on somebody else's land and we did not have the authority to fetch it, perhaps I would still be there. This is so serious, so formidable and so ambitious a programme that I see nothing to make sport about. We should all be on a high plane with this. This is reclaiming land for future generations; we are trying to bring this abandoned land back into cultivation, and I think it is laudable. This is such a serious business that hon. members should be a bit more serious and not let themselves go on such frivolities. I wonder if the Opposition realises that the Government tried to get this scheme elsewhere, but there were those people who refused to have the scheme started. This is a pilot scheme and we are trying to get the economics and mechanics of it, because we are going to move from there. I would not like to say certain words because I do not want to be offensive. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Do you mean bad words?) No, no!

As regards the point raised about a man ploughing a bit of land, I know the hon. junior member for St. John is going to say that this is collusion. This is serious and technical work on land which is slipping. I want you to get your thoughts in the proper frame of mind. The way the Opposition is carrying on today makes me feel that they have not been there and studied this work seriously, or otherwise a lot of things would not have been said.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to find out from the Minister the case which I quoted of ploughing land being included in an emergency. I think he has missed the point made on this. The point is that if the Director in an emergency, man-made or God-made, has power to enter immediately, what is the necessity of giving a man twenty-four hours' notice under other conditions. I should like it to be made clear if in the case I quoted a man were to plough a piece of land, whether it would be necessary to control that situation within twenty-four hours. Does this Bill state that this emergency is man-made and that the Director can move in in this particular circumstance?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture has a great amount of common sense, and is one of the people who believe in public opinion. If you were to take my argument and your answer and submit them before a bar of public opinion, you would be condemned to death, and I would have to appeal to have you reprieved. We agree with the Bill; the Bill states that "before entering upon any private land for the purpose of carrying out such works, or of exercising such powers the Director of Agriculture shall, except in the case of an emergency, cause twenty-four hours' previous notice of the intended entry to be given to the occupier of the land and also to the owner", which must mean by the act of God or by the design of man. The Minister himself replied and said that if somebody started ploughing too soon, causing the land to slip, the Director must have power to move in twenty-four hours. In an emergency he should be able to take action right away. What is

wrong with the hon. member is that he has common sense but he is being misled. I have gone to St. Andrew and have seen the scheme and no one man should be allowed to hinder a scheme which would benefit the entire island; therefore if he started to plough or do something which caused the land to slip, the Director should be able to act immediately. You say he should have twenty-four hours but I say "no." If that Minister was over here, he would not at the perils of death say 'twenty-four,' because he would feel that the Director should be able to move immediately on to the land. We say that the time should be seven days in other cases because the idea of twenty-four hours is to allow a letter to be sent through the mail. As a matter of fact, members of the House of Assembly cannot get their papers in twenty-four hours. The hon. member is saying that we of the Opposition are opposing for opposing's sake. Ask the bar of public opinion and see what we are saying today. If there is an emergency you should give power to move immediately, but we are asking you not to pass this piece of legislation without deeper reasoning at all. You should give people time to go to their solicitors as is the case with the Law. This is not Russia, and you are the people who are fighting against that sort of thing.

8.20 p.m.

You are a people who are preaching against that sort of thing. Look at this and read it! Surely, you would not do that. All of us would agree to a case of emergency. Sir, do you know what is the idea? Hon. members over there are so dumb, blind, ignorant, wicked; they are just clothed in authority. Most of them are more than ignorant. The Hon. Minister knows well enough that if the hon. members of the Opposition had been saying that if it were a case of emergency to give two or three days' notice, I would say no to that; you would be hindering the scheme. Therefore, the answer should be in a case of emergency to go right ahead into it.

You say here: "before entering upon any private land for the purpose of carrying out such works or of exercising such powers the Director of Agriculture shall, except in the case of an emergency, cause twenty-four hours' previous notice of the intended entry to be given to the occupier of the land and also to the owner, if practicable." Do you know that all that you have here is a case of emergency because all that you have here is a proviso for an emergency. This is superfluous; this is stupid. Do not do this. I want you to do things; I want to see this scheme get on but I might not be travelling like the Minister incognito. If it be just for sheer weight of numbers, that they are not listening to reason, let them vote for this as it stands. The Hon. Minister gets this Bill put into his hands and because it is put into his hands he says that it is right. Are you honest? Would you say that this is right? You ought to be ashamed to say that it is right. Sir, I will not vote for it as it stands.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of the matter which seems to escape the Hon. Minister's attention. Now, as you have it here, the Director is the medium of intervening either in the case of emergency and if it is not a case of emergency after twenty-four hours' notice. What is the difference for practical purposes between an emergency and twenty-four hours' notice? Sir, knowing the ways of the Civil Servants of this Island, or anywhere else for that matter, can you imagine that even when there is an emergency they will be moving within twenty-four hours? Therefore, for all practical purposes, the Bill does not help because any emergency will be dealt with only after twenty-four hours have elapsed and if the alternative to an emergency is that you can only get twenty-four hours' notice, you are not doing anything different.

There is another aspect. No matter how good your intention, the laws are made in this Chamber but you have to administer them in Court. The Director of Agriculture of this Island happens to be a planter; at least he is of a planter family; therefore, he will be sympathetic to planters and not necessarily to peasant proprietors. We can therefore expect that if any practical case arose in which he had to deal on the one hand with our friend, the hon. senior member for St. George, and on the other hand with the small peasant proprietor, he would not insult the hon. senior member for St. George by giving him twenty-four hours'

notice, even although the law says that, because as one land owner to another, he would expect that a certain amount of courtesy is due and therefore he would be ringing up whoever owns Lower Estate and would be saying: "I am sorry to trouble you, but would you please tell me which day would suit you best to have my staff coming on your premises and doing this thing?" Then, when he is dealing with lesser land owners, like the hon. senior member for St. Andrew or the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, he would be guided with a certain amount of diminished courtesy because he would not want to push them around as he would know that while they are not persons of large property, yet they are persons of substance belonging to the Government Party, the one a Minister, the other a cherished supporter and that would scare him off. But it is the little man with the half acre or acre, like my friend, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who owns the little Spa, with whom the Director of Agriculture and his servants would certainly think of giving a twenty-four hours' notice, especially since the hon. member has been thrown out in the cold from that Party. He would not even be granted more than that twenty-four hours' notice. Sir, it is the small land owner who has the most to fear because they are the people having no one to speak for them. That is why I say that a man who has property in St. Andrew be only given twenty-four hours' notice is a gross insult.

If, therefore, the Hon. Minister cannot see that a hardship would be worked on the small person, he will never see anything else in this world. I could remember standing one night listening to a former member of this House speaking on the platform of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. That person was replying to a speech which had been made in another part of that constituency a week or so by Mr. Rex Gill who was then a candidate and the burden of that member's speech on her platform was this: fancy a conservative wants you to push ahead with the East Coast Road. I am not going to do it because I am not going to put more money in Josh Haynes' pockets.

8.30 p.m.

It is hypocritical on the one hand, to refuse to do something which would help the whole Island on the plea that one person would benefit from it, and now, on the other hand, to say that you are doing it for everybody and you are still including in the Measure the very provision which will work a hardship on people. That is their idea of Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there is just one short word which I would like to say in addition to what the hon. member has said. The hon. member who has just sat down has made reference to the same very matter to which it was my intention to refer; it is a fact that for over ten years the construction of the East Coast Road was held up and 226 acres of land were left lying fallow in the St. Joseph and St. John area, because it was claimed by the same Government that the construction of that road would have enhanced the value of the land of the largest landowner in the district. You had the example of the owner of the land, who was a member of this Assembly, standing on the floor of this House and voluntarily offering the Government every additional penny of the appreciated value of the land.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have allowed passing reference to be made to that matter by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, but I am afraid that I cannot allow the hon. member to go on with that. Please do not carry that matter any further.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the claim is made by the Government that they are bringing fallow land into cultivation. All I am saying is that the same Government has refused to take action which would have put a greater area of land in cultivation on the spurious plea that one individual would have benefited from it. There is one further point which I would like to make. A little earlier in the debate we heard the implication that the Opposition is prone to make statements which outside of the Legislature, would not be privileged, merely on the false assumption that the speeches made in here are privileged. I am yet to learn that what is called *lex et consuetudo parlamenti* applied to a Colonial Legislature. Lest it be thought that any member of the Opposition is so silly as to try to shelter behind this

assumed belief that speeches in here are privileged, I want to make it perfectly clear that that applies only to the experienced parliamentarians on the Government Benches.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, there is one remark which I should like to make. The hon. member who has just sat down has said that one person would benefit from the construction of the East Coast Road. For his information I should like to point out that if he were to enquire in that area, he will find out that there are quite a number of peasant owners who will benefit from that scheme. There are several land proprietors up there.

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

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Mrs. BOURNE Messrs. THRONE, SEARLES, HOLDER, T. W. MILLER and STRAUGHN - 10.

NOES: Messrs. F. G. SMITH, DOWDING, MOTTLEY, TUDOR, TALMA, BARROW, CRAWFORD and BRANCKER - 8.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: (Sitting) Mr. Chairman, before the vote is announced I should like to draw your attention to Rule 151. I should like to find out whether the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is entitled to vote in view of the fact that she has a direct pecuniary interest in this matter. I should like to have your ruling on that point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In reply to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, these conditions apply to the House of Commons. According to May's on page 442, both the Speaker and Chairman have disallowed such objections. They have disallowed objections by virtue of the fact that members vote on their own salaries and they are allowed to do so. The Rule has therefore fallen into abeyance. Secondly, I would like to inform the hon. member that he should give notice of this question on a substantive motion.

The question that Clause 15 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

8.50 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Suspension, the House was in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee; Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Clause 16 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Any person who wilfully obstructs or hinders the Director of Agriculture or his servants or agents in lawfully carrying out his or their powers or duties under this Act, shall be guilty of an offence and on conviction by a court of summary jurisdiction shall be liable to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 16 stand part.

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

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Clause 16 is the clause wherein there is a penalty for obstructing any work which the Director might want to carry out. One has to pay particular regard to the word "wilfully". In view of the numerous suggestions or amendments which were moved but which have not been adopted - and I refer to the notices and the orders which have to be given or conducted by the Director of Agriculture or his agents, whether without any notice at all in the case of an emergency or at short notice of twenty-four hours - one can well understand that most acts committed by any of these tenants or occupiers of land could be regarded as wilful obstruction, whereas in truth and in fact, it might not be anything wilful, meaning that the tenants might not have received notice owing to the brevity of the notice. This might be interpreted to refer to the case of a small tenant who owned half an acre of land or who might not thoroughly understand the implications of this Bill, because it is hardly likely that the Government will explain to the tenants or occupiers of land the intricacies of this Bill and the penalties attached thereto. I am saying that what may appear on the face of it here to be quite normal, with all this power in the hands of the Director, may work a gross hardship on the small peasant owner or occupier, and I regard the penalty of "not exceeding six months imprisonment" as being too harsh and too dangerous a penalty to be imposed. It is too punitive to suggest that anyone who might not understand the implications of this Bill may be penalised and imprisoned to the tune of "not exceeding six months" which I feel is too much. I feel that a penalty of six months is too severe, and if the Minister were to consider it carefully, he would see that a term of "not exceeding three months" would be just as effective as a term of six months.

Again, the fine of "not exceeding a hundred dollars" is excessive, when you compare this penalty with other penalties of fifty dollars in other Bills where the interests of the bigger land owners are involved.

9.10 p.m.
In this Bill you are dealing with peasants and smallholders and you are imposing big penalties and imprisonment terms! One would hardly expect a Labour Government to be imposing such high penalties on the very people whom they claim to represent.

The question that Clause 16 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 17 was called and passed.

Clause 18 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 18 stand part.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, in this particular section, you will have noticed that the Director shall have power to take or lease land for the purposes of this Act and to cultivate and manage such land; (b) to cultivate and manage land as agent of the owner or occupier and to enter into agreement with the owner or occupier for the payment by

him of the whole or any part of the cost of management and cultivation; (c) to lease or sub-lease land at his disposal on such terms and conditions as he shall think fit.

I do hope that the Hon. Minister will give me the assurance that the Director will not take one man's land on lease and sub-lease it to another man. He has power to take land on lease and sub-lease, and if he feels that John Brown from whom he took the land is not likely to make the best use of that land he can sub-lease it to Harry Jones. I am sure you will agree with me that that will cause a great deal of dissatisfaction among the peasants. If a man is dispossessed temporarily of his land and if the Director after bringing it into cultivation can sub-let it to another, then priority should be given to the man from whom it was originally taken.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sir, I realise that the hon. member like myself regrets some of the irresponsible acts that are being perpetuated under these Acts at the present moment, but I do not think that the Director has descended to that state of irresponsibility at all. Only a person who is irresponsible would attempt to do that.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Let me say that it has happened in England and the Minister of Agriculture had to resign. They had taken property from certain owners during the last war and they were given back to different owners. It is true that it happened through the fault of the Civil Service, but the Minister of Agriculture had to resign.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I would give the hon. member the assurance that this will not happen. With such wide powers being given to the Director of Agriculture, I think it is one of the things which I would have to watch very closely. I can assure the hon. member that this particular section will be watched very closely.

The question that Clause 18 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 19 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendments in Clause 19:-

(i) In sub-clause (1) insert the word "are" after the word "which" in the 7th line.

(ii) In sub-clause (4) substitute for the word "of" in the first line the word "or"

(iii) In the same sub-clause (4) substitute the word "nor" for the word "not" in the fifth line.

(iv) In the same sub-clause (4) insert the word "he" after the word "shall" in the seventh line.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 19 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. SMITH: Here again, Mr. Chairman, in respect of Clause 19, that power which the Director of Agriculture is given is to seize or caused to be seized all sheep, goats, cattle, horses or other animals found on any land in the conservation area and he can also destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of animals seized in such a manner.

Now, in this House, we have discussed before several measures, particularly at the Seawell Airport, which involved the impounding and the destruction of people's property; and of course, while we have admitted that in the case of the Airport there is no excuse for animals being found on the runway, this is an entirely different case and an entirely different set of circumstances; therefore, it requires different treatment. The powers given to the Director of Agriculture to take up and to sell or destroy people's property in the form of animals are very wide, and it is alright for the Hon. Minister to talk of a sense of responsibility, but Civil Servants, particularly the higher servants who only see this matter from an armchair, are not known for their

sympathy or their gentle-heartedness towards poor people and the animals of poor people. Therefore the Hon. Minister should think twice before he gives consent to such wide powers in a matter like this.

It is not in any way weakening the argument on this side to say that compensation should be given in certain circumstances, because when you destroy a pig or a sheep, it is seldom that the person is compensated to the full value, if only for the fact that you can prove him in the wrong and he must suffer his loss on his own. It is difficult to prove, in cases where animals are found in this area, that their owners are entirely responsible for their being there; all these considerations must be taken into account. You do not satisfy this House of Assembly by saying that the Director of Agriculture is a responsible person. In every case that comes before him, it will be dealt with as a matter of routine; and as all these matters are purely of a routine nature they will not have the time to argue which case should be dealt with separately or even to hear extenuating argument on it. That is why I say that we do not feel happy about it at all and I want the hon. Minister to think very seriously before he commits the House in this matter.
9.20 p.m.

You will see that in this same Section, the Director of Agriculture or any person authorised by him to seize any of these animals is exempt from liability if he has reasonable cause to believe that the person to whom an animal was delivered or to whom the money from the sale thereof was paid, was the owner of such animal. That is to say, if the Director should seize or impound any animal and sell it, he should be holding the money for the real owner of this animal. If somebody says: "I am the owner of the animal," and the Director mistakenly hands over the money from the sale of the animal to that person, he is exempt from liability. I would suggest that just as a man who interferes with the work can be placed before a Police Magistrate, this Section should be so worded that the matter should be referred to the Police Magistrate for a decision as to whom the money is to be paid. You have certain people in this country to whom all black people look alike; they find it difficult to distinguish one black person from another. Do you not think it would be fair, in order to avoid any inconvenience, to say in this particular Section that, instead of exempting the Director from liability if any dispute should arise as to the person to whom the money from the sale of an animal should be paid, the matter should be referred to a Police Magistrate or to a Court of Summary Jurisdiction to decide? It would then be a matter before a court of law and you would not be exempting a man who honestly believes that a person is the owner of an animal. If you refer the matter to a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, it would be a matter of evidence; rather than exempt the Director from liability in paying money to the wrong person, I would suggest that the dispute should be referred to a Court of Summary Jurisdiction. That would be the fairest method of deciding who is the owner of the animal; and if the matter is decided in a Court of Law, a person is more expected to be satisfied than he would be in the other case.

If the Director believes that another person was the owner of the animal, then the real owner of the animal has lost his money; on the other hand, if the matter is taken before the Courts where a man has to kiss the Book and give evidence, he is liable to be prosecuted for perjury if he gives evidence falsely.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when we were dealing with the question of animals straying on Seawell Airport, I supported the Government then, because I felt it was all right for some hon. members to air their mouths and talk nonsense; but if you have a plane landing and an animal ran across the airfield - well, I voted with the Government that the Director of Civil Aviation should have power to destroy it. You have some wonderful copyists with no idea at all of local conditions. I feel that you should have some protection where animals trespass on these lands; I should like to hear the hon. senior member for St. Andrew speaking on this Section. It says:

"It shall be lawful for the Director of Agriculture or

any person authorised by the Director of Agriculture to seize or cause to be seized all sheep, goats, cattle, horses" even members of this House, (*Laughter*) "or other animals" which may be members of the Government (*Laughter*) "found on any land in the conservation area in respect of which any conservation measures or works are being carried out and the Director of Agriculture may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of any animal so seized in such manner as the Director of Agriculture shall think fit."

I am suggesting that where you have the words "destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of," the word "destroy" should be deleted. The people of St. Andrew on whom we depend (Hon. D. D. GARNER: For what?) for mutton. (*Aside*) The hon. member says that it is people of St. Philip on whom we depend for mutton. Well, if this Bill concerned St. Philip, the hon. member would agree to the word "destroy" being taken out. I say; let the Director of Agriculture seize any animal which is found on this land and sell it, but let him give back the people their money. You may have as Director of Agriculture some person from South Africa who does not like the people in St. Andrew; do you think I would sit here and agree to the passing of an Act which gives power to somebody to shoot somebody else's animal? In the case of animals which are found straying on the Airport, I agreed that they should be destroyed; but I would not agree to their being destroyed in this case. In this case, I agree that these animals should be seized, impounded and sold, but not destroyed. It is true that "destroy" could only mean what some hon. members over there would like to do with the members over here. How do you apply this Bill to local conditions? Does the hon. member know of Walkers Pasture? You actually have the animals loosed there. If you can argue that it would be a grave danger if these animals cross this land, then I would be the first man to vote for this Section. I am moving that the word "destroy" be deleted. As a matter of fact, the words "or otherwise dispose of" should also be deleted, because these words can also mean to "destroy." Remembering whence I have come, I could not sit down here and vote for this provision in this Bill. I am as serious as a judge in this matter; I will not allow anybody to have the power to shoot a poor woman's animal.

The Hon. Minister seems to think that I am making sport. I say; let the Director impound or seize, or sell an animal, but why should he destroy it? The Section says that the Director of Agriculture or any person who is authorised by him should have this power; but of course, the Director of Agriculture is not going to come from Codrington and go down to St. Andrew to destroy anybody's animal; do you know what destroying an animal would mean to some poor person who was rearing a pig, let us say, in order to get money to pay the school fees for his child? (*Aside*) The hon. member says that I am talking to the gallery; well, we all talk to the gallery.

9.30 p.m.

The hon. member said that I am speaking to the Gallery; they all speak to the Gallery to get in here, but then the time comes when they have to eat everything they said and be dishonest. I do not have to speak to the Gallery because I am honest. I do not pretend to be a Socialist; I tell them that I am a Conservative. You have not studied this Bill but you have brought it here because somebody has drafted it. This Bill gives the Director authority to appoint anybody in charge of that area to shoot somebody's goat. I agree that you should impound it, but why destroy it? I am moving the deletion of the word "destroy". In other words, you can sell it by auction, send it to the market, but not destroy it.

I am not concerned about the fear of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, but I should like to say this; when the hon. member for St. Andrew, the late Mr. Foster was in here, he always made it clear - although the hon. junior member for St. Philip does not think so - that we in this island had to depend upon the peasant proprietors in St. Andrew who raised stock because of the land in that parish which could not be cultivated. The hon. member would like to say not, but I am sure that the member for St. Joseph who had a tremendous lot of experience in St. Andrew would bear me out, and it would seem very unfair to allow anybody to shoot these animals. If you impound them there would be no row, but if you shoot them you are going to

throw them into the gully. Do you think I would vote for this?

I beg to move that the word "destroy" be deleted.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that, and in doing so I would further point out that not only has the Director power to sell or destroy, but he is not liable for the death or injury of such animals. The Director has power as set out in sub-section (4) of Section 19 to sell, destroy or otherwise dispose of the animals found on the land which is wanted for conservation purposes, but having taken these animals he is not liable for them at all, and more especially in the case of injury or death. I should like the Minister to explain whether that is in order.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it seems that the hon. Minister, the member for St. Philip, has decided to continue with his immorality as a result of this Bill. He is the one who is responsible for creating the greatest of all dictators in the Caribbean area, because there is no doubt about it that he is so stuck on this Bill that he is not prepared to listen to reason or make the slightest concession so long as he sees a sufficiently large number on his side to ensure anything, however ridiculous, fantastic or dictatorial, to be passed. We have already swallowed the worst in Section 13 which gives the Director of Agriculture powers which have never been contemplated before in any Civil Servant in any part of the British Empire, and I might be wasting time in Section 19, this committee having already passed Section 13. This Section gives power to seize, sell or destroy any animal, and sub-section (2) says that "if the owner of any animal so seized shall claim such animal within five days of the seizure thereof, the Director of Agriculture shall, on payment to him of the sum of \$1 together with the reasonable expenses incurred in seizing and impounding such animal, deliver the animal to the person claiming it." Sub-section 3 reads: - "On the sale of any animal so seized, the Director of Agriculture shall, after deducting the sum of \$1 together with the reasonable expenses incurred by him in seizing and impounding such animal, hold the balance of the sale money for the owner of the animal sold." What becomes of the dollar which he collects, Mr. Chairman? Then it goes on to say that he shall not be liable for the death or injury of any such animal when seized.

I suppose when this Bill goes on the Statute Book, if the Other Place proceeds to sanction its passage as this Chamber apparently will, the hon. member can take pride, if it is a matter of pride to him, that he has gone down in history as having introduced and piloted a Bill which created an official with the greatest, widest, most irresponsible dictatorial powers of any public official in any public service in any part of the British Empire. I do not know from what Bill this was copied, because draughtsmen in Barbados are not known for their originality; they are not known for anything but their ability to copy, sometimes not extremely well and sometimes without regard to adapting what they copy to local conditions. One really wonders in time to come when the effects of this Bill are actually seen, what the hon. member for St. Philip will think of himself, because as soon as it passes into Law, and if its provisions are carried out, you will have that hon. member keeping far from St. Andrew or going there in disguise during election campaigns, picnics, excursions or anything like that.

9.40 p.m.

The worst feature of this Bill is that of people's animals being seized, shot or otherwise disposed of and the Director of Agriculture exercising his various powers. It is rather unusual to create a dictator by this method. Normally, they attain their position by means of assassination or through the powers of an Army or Navy but as the hon. junior member for St. Philip has said, we are showing the world an example of how to create a dictator peacefully in a democratic Assembly.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I cannot be as restrained as my colleague in this matter. I think what we are doing is nothing short of a criminal act. I remember a friend of mine who lives in St. Lucy who earns her living by keeping pigs, and sows at that, and I picture if the conservation expert had to work in that part of St.

Lucy what would happen to my constituents. Can you imagine your having a sow in a rotten cane pen --- (A VOICE: That is against the law.) Imagine a sow being kept in a rotten cane pen where the young pigs can run out and run all over land where the Soil Conservation Expert is working and it pleases him not only to shoot the sow but to shoot each of these little pigs. Mr. Chairman, you represent St. Michael. I see a representative of St. Thomas with his mouth open, and around the Table, I see representatives for the parishes of St. James, St. John, St. Joseph, the City of Bridgetown and Christ Church. There are 18 or 19 of us and only two of us can remain indifferent to this whole matter, and they are the two hon. members who represent the City of Bridgetown. Everyone of us must be concerned in an issue like this. It is impossible for any of us to be happy about it whether we live in St. Michael or anywhere else for that matter; therefore, in every constituency, except that of Bridgetown the operation of this law can take place. Do you mean to tell me, Sir, that the members of this House are going to sit down and give power to a big planter to shoot pigs, goats and the sheep of poor people? I know that by the time we are ready to cut the throats of members on that side on this issue, the debates of this House would not be printed and that is what they are banking on: but the memories of the Opposition will not fail as regards today, the 17th June, and we are going to let the people from whom they are asking votes know what they contemplated in this House tonight and I am sure everyone is going to see to it that they lose public favour from what they are doing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, when the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was speaking, he referred to the fact of a woman keeping a sow pig in a rotten cane pen. Some hon. member said that it was against the law. It is absolutely correct that it is against the law but 99.9 percent of the peasants in the country districts who keep pigs observe the law in the breach. It is the ambition of all agricultural workers to keep a pig.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: In my parish they do not keep pigs in rotten cane pens.

Mr. MOTTLEY: They live in palaces.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Be realistic.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Do you mean to tell me that the people in your parish do not keep pigs in rotten cane pens? I know when I am stinging people. (HON. D. D. GARNER: Stinging whom?) Mr. Chairman, this calls for a lot of restraint. It is really wicked. Let them pass this clause as it stands! You know your Barbados. You were born like me without any silver spoon. There are people today in this island and who are living within this area with which we are dealing who will continue to live as they are accustomed for a long time. There are those who will continue to raise pigs in rotten cane pens - and in no pens; therefore, if those pigs go across this area, they will be shot. Take them up and make them pay for them, but take this thing out about destroying them. Do you think it is right to have them destroyed? Mr. Chairman, if that was taken out and you left in that the animal can be seized and sold, would that hamper the working of this Act? Would you say that if a few pigs got away that would interfere with the area? If the Hon. Minister can convince me that that would interfere with the working of the Act, then I would withdraw my motion. Let him try to convince me or anybody. He cannot convince me because he knows that it is wrong. What I would like to see happen is to remove the Hon. Minister from over on that side just for ten minutes and allow him the opportunity of arguing the case which I am arguing. Sir, I am going to wait and see if hon. members on that side are going to vote blindly on this clause.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members should be careful lest they continue to create a sense of irresponsibility among the population of this colony. This thing is going too far now. Instead of their trying to get people to be good citizens, they are trying to get people to be lawbreakers and irresponsible. Unfortunately, a Minister of the Government and the Government have to set an example. All these things which the hon. member is talking of are only foolishness. People obey laws of the

country or they are punished. A Minister has the right to get up and say that even if he does not get in the next Session. No irresponsible sentiment! no playing to the gallery! no; none of that! What law is it, unless it has a penalty attached to it? When do you try to create proper citizenship?

You have a new venture up there. There are those who let loose their animals wildly. They will say: "for all the years I have been letting loose my animals and now, you come to tell me that I cannot do it. I am not going to do such a thing." When you get a situation like that; what are you going to do? We had that same thing occurring at the Seawell Airport. I was surprised one morning when we were confronted with a situation which we felt was becoming criminal, to put it mildly, because there were goats, sheep, cows, all over the pasture endangering the lives of people. (A VOICE: We supported you on that.) The same thing may arise in this area. You may get stubborn people refusing to obey. (A VOICE: Take their stock up.) You have your say; I have mine; you are not my schoolmaster. I am saying that the same thing which happened at Seawell Airport is likely to happen over there.

9.50 p.m.

We have people who do not understand what these things mean, and if you do not make the penalty commensurate with the crime, you cannot get anything done. I want to make this further plea. Does the Opposition really believe that they are more sympathetic towards the people of Barbados than the members on this side? (MEMBERS: Yes.) That is a joke, that is a big joke. Of course, I, as a Minister, cannot pander to people, even if I lose my seat at the next General Election. We have a certain amount of responsibility and we must carry it out irrespective of what the consequences are. If this Government were to soft-soap things and think of the consequences - we have to stand up and train people in the right direction and so I would not associate myself with that. I know that when I was a member of the Opposition we used to do things only because we wanted to talk to the gallery and become popular. I was in the hierarchy then; the Opposition members are still in the old racket and they want to put the same stunts on me who was with them; but that cannot work. They will have their say and I will have mine.

Mr. Chairman, I do appeal to hon. members in all seriousness. There are some people who will not listen to others and they have to be dealt with. There are some neighbours next door to you who are cantankerous by nature and all you appeal to their commonsense and their sense of fairplay, they will not listen to you; they will not do anything until you resort to law. Sometimes, you hate to do that. We expect to spend a lot of money down there and we have to protect the people who have to administer these things down there. You cannot really create good citizens when you pander to them and we do not fool them when we say: "You are not poor people, you are fortunate people." Do you think we got in here through any votes by proxy? When you create irresponsibility, do you realise what you will have around here? We want to have a strong citizenship, people who are alive to their responsibility. If you have people who are irresponsible, if you even win by irresponsibility, do you not see the consequences which are awaiting you? I am appealing to hon. members; you cannot win by default, because something will overtake you. We want to have people who will use their intellect and their sense of fairplay. (Mr. MOTTLEY: You are not answering us.) What do you want me to answer?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member wants me to say what I want him to answer. He is talking about irresponsibility and he is saying that you have to train people. I hope he will train some of the Ministers first. What I want the Hon. Minister to answer is this: the Bill says that the Director of Agriculture may seize or cause to be seized all sheep, goats, cattle, horses or other animals found on any land in the conservation area and he may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of any animal so seized in such manner as he shall think fit. Why should he have to destroy these animals? Will not selling and impounding these animals meet the Bill? If people refuse to come for their animals, then you can sell them. Why have you got to destroy these animals by way of shooting them? Further-

more, when the Director destroys these animals, he is not liable to the owner thereof. If the Hon. Minister can tell me that for the good working of this conservation area, you have to destroy these animals, then I will withdraw my motion. I agree with the Government that you must shoot animals which are running across Seawell Airport, but let the Hon. Minister satisfy me that animals crossing this conservation area is comparable with animals running across Seawell Airport. Let the Hon. Minister satisfy me with that.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I have read this Section of the Bill most carefully, and it seems to me that the word "destroy" is causing the argument in the whole Bill. If you take the Petty Trespass Act and read it, you will see that it the first thing it says is that animals trespassing on lands may be killed or impounded, so that the word "destroy" appearing in this Bill is not -----

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anyone could do violence to the laws of Barbados like that. In the Petty Trespass Act, it says the kind of animals you must destroy. How can the hon. member get up there in all seriousness and say that you can destroy animals under the Petty Trespass Act? The Act says that any sheep, goat, hog or feathered stock when found trespassing on lands may be killed or impounded; it does not say that a horse or a cow which is trespassing can be destroyed. 10.00 p.m.

Mr. HOLDER: The hon. member said that you would see a sow with the young ones. I was a Livestock Inspector in the Department of Agriculture for the four northern parishes. After listening very carefully and hearing everyone speak, I shall read this Act. It is Section 2 of the Petty Trespass Act, 1903.

"It shall be lawful for the owner, proprietor, attorney, overseer, or other person in charge of any plantation or place, to cause any sheep, goat, hog, or feathered stock, when found trespassing on the lands of such plantation or place, either to be killed or impounded on such plantation or place."

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that there is nothing new in the word "destroy" as set out here in this Bill. When I worked as a Livestock Inspector for the four northern parishes including St. Andrew, I had to get a permit from the Hon. Sir John Saint and Mr. MacIntosh to pass on to certain people in that area. The purpose of the permit was because there had been wild animals, and you had to have authority to shoot them. As far as I can remember at the moment, there were no houses at all in the area with which we were dealing, but on mornings I would meet people with ten or fifteen cows with baskets on their mouths; in the afternoon these cows were taken back home while the wild ones remained. If you are going in for cultivation, contouring and planting of trees to hold the soil and wild animals eat the trees, when will you get the scheme going? I am so versed with this that after listening to what was said, I want to know whether this Bill has just brought "destroying" into Barbados. If after warning people I found their animals on my land, this law tells me what to do, but God forbid that should happen in the Holder family. You can take them to the Police Station, or if you keep them, you cannot allow them to suffer and the person will have to pay you what you charge per day.

I rose to say, Mr. Chairman, that the destroying of animals found on one's land is nothing new, so that if the Director of Agriculture is vested with rights over certain lands through the Ministry of Agriculture, he is represented. I feel that you will not have to do any shooting except in the case of wild animals which stray on to the land and keep destroying the trees that are planted to protect the soil.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must congratulate the hon. member for St. James. I do not know whether this is his maiden speech.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am surprised at the hon. senior member for the City. If he studies carefully he will remember that I spoke during the

Five Year Plan debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I congratulate the hon. member but what I want to say is that tonight he has convinced me that either I am carrying the wrong label politically, or the hon. member together with members over there are masquerading with peacock feathers. The speech which he made should not even be made by the hon. senior member for St. George. The hon. member who is a member of a Socialist Government got up and quoted an Act passed sixty-one years - before I was born - by the plantocracy of this country. This Act was passed in 1903 when people looking like the hon. member could hardly come to the door of this House. You would expect to hear what he said from the hon. senior member for St. George who would have a large vested interest; but you are saying that a Socialist Government must follow the multitude to do evil by following an Act passed by an overwhelming majority of the plantocracy of this country who had vested interests. There is nothing wrong for him if Government passes an Act saying that you can kill anybody's stock which comes on your land; so the hon. member is justifying what the Conservative Government did at the time.

If the hon. member reads the Act carefully, he will see that horses and mules were not mentioned, because if Bawdens mules got away and went over the River or to Hyde Mill, you did not hear anything about shooting animals. 10.10 p.m.

The hon. member displayed such crass ignorance. In those days, they did not say horses because they owned horses and they owned mules and cattle. The hon. member comes to justify what they did then. The hon. member has enlightened us tremendously and I hope it will go down in history that the hon. member talked of having wild animals in St. Andrew. Tell me some of them? Have we wild boars and wild sows in St. Andrew? The hon. member can sit down and vote blindly but do not think that you can make us do that.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I feel the hon. member has misquoted me. I said that I got a permit from Sir John Saint who at that time was the Director of Agriculture for catching wild goats. You were not allowed to catch one without that permit; so you had to go and get that permit. The animals were wild. I would say that there is a difference between the wild goats of which I am speaking and these belonging to the people, but there was a time when we had wild animals. This Bill today is very strong with the use of the word "destroy" but when the Seawell Airport Bill was debated sometime ago, the word "destroy" was in it also.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly on this matter. Are there any wild goats or wild pigs in St. Andrew? It is known that in any country which has wild animals you must get a permit to shoot them. You will remember that when a similar thing came up for the Seawell Airport, I voted for destroying the animals because human life and safety were involved. I say that I would not vote for this clause as it stands because no human life is concerned.

The argument which the hon. member is using would be very well for the people in St. Andrew, but fortunately for me and unfortunately for him, the House of Assembly is placed in the centre of the most enlightened parish of the island and, that is the City of Bridgetown; therefore, we cannot use that type of argument on the floor of the House. Surely, some of us felt very strongly on the Seawell Airport Bill because if you have people landing in an aeroplane, why should you allow a fowl or a sheep to cross the runway to endanger human life? The hon. senior member for St. James comes in here and says that in 1903 you had this word in a Bill. You have not justified it by saying so. Because we have taken over a system, do you mean to say that we should continue with it? The hon. member ought to be ashamed to say so. Let me put it this way. When the Hon. Premier came into this House as a member, they had on the Statute Book an Act called the Located Labourers Act. Is it justifiable in having that Act on the Statute Book today?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It certainly is not, but it is a very essential ele-

ment in our lives to have good manners and to remember that some of the old things, for instance, the Ten Commandments still stand firm. Good manners and certain old things still stand firm.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What does the hon. member mean?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Just what I said. Everything that is old is not bad.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What does he mean? Did anybody say that everything that is old is bad? I said that the one man who fought for the repeal of the Located Labourers Act the Hon. Premier. I knew that and that is why I made that reference. Has the Hon. Minister of Agriculture seen the picture "The Ten Commandments" recently? Is that the only memory which you have of them? I will almost bet that the Hon. Minister does not repeat the Fifth Commandment without making a mistake. Let him repeat it. I am serious as a church on this. Why should the hon. senior member for St. James rise in defence of this clause just to quote an Act which is in existence? Let them quote all the Acts and I will answer them one after the other. I am in first class form. Why did you lower the franchise?

Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough. The hon. senior member for St. James tried to justify the inclusion of this clause, I will ask the Hon. Minister this question. Can you say tonight in all seriousness if you leave in this clause that cattle, sheep, goats, horses, and so on can be destroyed - and that word can mean only one thing; it does not mean taking it in your bosom, it means destroying it - that its inclusion is necessary for the working of the conservation area? If you can convince me of that, I would withdraw my motion. The hon. senior member for St. James tried to convince me by saying in effect that two wrongs make a right. He said that before we were born, there existed a law which says that you could destroy a thing. He however told me in the same breath, "God forbid that any member of the Holder family would destroy anybody's animals." Is he going to sit there with his conscience and vote for something which he knows is wrong?
10.20 p.m.

I did not refer to him as a politician of the House; I referred to him as a gentleman member of the House. I was looking to see where the hon. junior member for St. James is. I am wondering how I should refer to him; well, I refer to him as an old member of the House although my hair is more grey than his. The hon. senior member for St. James has made an attempt to defend the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, but there is no force in what he has said. You cannot convince anybody with that; you cannot stand before the bar of public opinion on that defence, because it is too weak. The hon. member says; "Let us shoot and destroy some horses and cows." The hon. member has a heart; he knows well enough that in Orange Hill, there are people who still keep pigs in the rotten cane pens around the hon. junior member for St. James. (Mr. SEARLES: But they are in pens.) Some people will come in here and preach one thing and practise another. They will preach one thing on a platform, but they will practise another.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member has rested all day and now he feels fresh; but if he wants to talk all night - I always hear that if you want to keep a man down you have to remain down with him. If you want us to remain here all night, then you will have to remain with us and the effects which it has on my health, it will also have on his. If the hon. member will read Sub-section 2 of Clause 19 and stop all this electioneering -----

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, has this Chamber become a highfaluting debating society or is it Parliament? If it is Parliament, I am asking you to rule. This is the sort of thing which is done at the Vestry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Sub-section (3) says this:

"on the sale of any animal so seized the Director of Agriculture shall, after deducting the sum of one dollar together with the reasonable expenses incurred by him in seizing and impounding such animal, hold balance of the sale moneys for the owner of the animal sold."

If you take the hon. member's argument to its logical conclusion, you will see that quite a lot of things have to take place before an animal is shot. The owner is given the chance and the opportunity to pay for the impounding of the animal.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The hon. member has quoted that Sub-section. All that he has said is correct, but the Section says: "the Director of Agriculture may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of any animal so seized in such manner as the Director shall think fit." If the animal has already been destroyed, what can the owner get? He cannot get anything when the animal has already been destroyed.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Apparently, the hon. member has not read and studied this Bill thoroughly. Certain things appear to him and on the spur of the moment, he says what he wants to say. If he reads Sub-section (1) of Section 19, he will see what it says. It says this:

"It shall be lawful for the Director of Agriculture or any person authorised by the Director of Agriculture to seize or cause to be seized all sheep, goats, cattle, horses or other animals found on any land in the conservation area, in respect of which any conservation measures or works are being carried out under this Act or which are on any such land in contravention of any order made under section 6 of this Act or of any regulations made under this Act, and subject to the provisions of the next succeeding sub-section the Director of Agriculture may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of any animal so seized in such manner as the Director of Agriculture shall think fit."

(At this stage, Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair and the hon. senior member for St. John took the Chair.)

Hon. D. D. GARNER: This Sub-section particularly says "and subject to the provisions of the next succeeding sub-section the Director of Agriculture may destroy, sell or otherwise dispose of any animal so seized in such manner as the Director of Agriculture shall think fit."

I hope that the hon. member will realise what the position is. He has not read this Bill, but he gets up on the spur of the moment and makes a splash; but the Section particularly says that subject to the provisions of the next succeeding sub-section the Director may destroy and so on. Suppose that in trying to capture an animal, that animal was hurt and no owner called for it! What would the Director do with it? Suppose that in trying to capture a horse, that horse got injured! What would you do with it, if the law did not permit you to do something with it? The hon. member is a landowner and I know that his land has been fenced in. I have mine fenced in too. I made a mistake, Mr. Acting Chairman; his land has been walled in. I do not think that the hon. member intends to persist in this sort of thing. If certain things happen to an animal you must call in an officer of the S.P.C.A. to deal with it.
10.30 p.m.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I am quite convinced after listening to the explanation of the Minister that the Act, as it is worded, is quite correct, and I believe that the hon. senior member for the City would be able to see it if he does not himself keep insisting on the interpretation that destroying is the first thing that is going to happen, because the Act itself does not say so. The Act says that that would be the last thing to happen; it says you would seize and do all the other things and subject to sub-section 2 which follows, if after a certain time the animal is not claimed, destroying will take place. If you take the word "destroy" out of its context, what will you do with the animals which you cannot catch? The word "destroy" would have to be there although the interpretation is incorrect if you say that

destroying is the first thing to happen.

I was anxious about the Bill myself, but if it is not the first thing to happen - and that is what is said here - I do not see the fear of the word "destroy" remaining. I believe sincerely, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. senior member for the City may have been anticipating that destroying was the first impossibility. I do not see it written here as the first possibility; I see that seizure and all these things will take place, but the destruction of the animal is the last resort. If hon. members are disagreeing with the principle of destruction at any time, it is an easy possibility that the animals will destroy the trees as the hon. senior member for St. James pointed out. Some animals run about without being taken care of. I happen to be pretty acquainted with St. Andrew myself, and if the animals run about and belong to nobody, and if they destroy the trees they will be caught; but destroying them will be the last resort. I believe the Act as it is worded justifies the Minister's stand. The hon. member does not have to wax warm over the matter, but I do feel that taking it out of the context, and talking about people raising pigs to educate their children, makes dramatics. Taking it as it is worded, it is evident that destruction of any animal - and it is a possibility - would be essential as long as the animal gets hurt and nobody claims it. Perhaps you should call the S.P.C.A. if the Director feels like doing that; so I do not think that the argument that there should be no destruction at all stands on its own feet strongly enough to merit that the word "destroy" should be deleted. It is a possibility that an animal may not have an owner, may be seized and not claimed or may be damaged while being pursued; so this as it stands is correct and I give full support to my Government on this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: To whom else would the hon. member give his full support?

Mrs. BOURNE: For the information of the House, the hon. senior member for the City inquired whether there were any wild animals in St. Andrew. Recently in St. Andrew, at Walkers Bay there were a number of cows and other animals which have never been tied and I remember hearing that Mr. Dan Springer had to catch these cows. A number of small boys had to be put after these animals and one particular cow finding itself trapped on Chalky Mount, jumped down the cliff and broke its neck. Pigs are not tied either.

From what I have seen, Mr. Collett had a number of fruit trees and grasses planted, but if you go there now you will not find one; so that if you are going to spend money to conserve the soil you cannot allow the animals to destroy what is being done. Destroying the animals is only the last resort when people will not adhere to regulations.

As regards impounding the animal or calling the S.P.C.A., why not call a speculator or a butcher instead, sell it and put the money in some fund where one day the owner can come along and claim it? I can assure you that the people in St. Andrew would not allow that money to go unused. As I said, there is no reason why the word "destroy" should not remain in the Bill because in any case the butcher will destroy it. I do not think that the Director of Agriculture or anybody else can seize an animal that is tied; he can only do that under the Petty Trespass Act if the animal has strayed. It is only when you cannot impound that you have to resort to killing, and if a person knows that his animal is going to be shot he will keep it off the area. Even if he has to pay a shilling in the morning, he will take it to graze at night.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, at least I must thank the hon. member who has just sat down for what she has said, but I think that she misunderstands the difference between untied animals and wild animals. I know that there were 45 untied animals and owned by a man; but there are no such things as wild animals. I also thank her for seeing something in my argument and expressing the view that while she would like the word to remain, she certainly does not feel like seeing the animals destroyed. I rise because I realise that however much I argue, the word would remain unless the hon. member is given the cue by the Hon. Premier.

As far as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is concerned, I see that Government has added hoits strength another budding legal luminary. The hon. member is trying to explain to me with his experience that I cannot take something out of its context.

10.40 p.m.

I am suggesting to the hon. member that he cannot take anything out of the context. The fact remains that you are destroying anyhow. The point is this: there should be no destroying. The strongest argument has been made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. She said that they should be destroyed, but by a butcher, because you would be able to sell the meat to the people. (A VOICE: It seems as if the hon. member is limping somewhere.)

Mr. Chairman, I have already said that I would not vote for this. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph thinks that I have taken this out of the context. My contention all the time is that there should be no destroying at all. However much hon. members over on that side may say that I am only playing to the gallery, I just want to say that everyone of us, as soon as we are elected, must talk to the public and do things to satisfy the public. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member is making sport.) You satisfy yourself. During the entire discussion, the Hon. Minister and myself were at pains to parry blows. The Hon. Minister is a member for whom I have a great regard. During the discussion he referred to the Ten Commandments and the people having good manners. I do not think even up to this minute that he is referring to me. If he is -----

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member likes to say whatever he likes but when anybody says anything he takes exception. I said that there are still certain old things which you should emulate, such as the Ten Commandments and good manners. Such things are still very useful. Whatever you do, you cannot break away from them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What he says must mean that we must be grateful and show gratitude towards old legislation. However, I take it that it might be a lapse on the Hon. Minister's part because I can protect myself against all-comers in this House. This is their Bill; they have brought it down; they have the numbers; therefore, they can pass it. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that it cannot be done without this clause. Our point is that there should be no destruction allowed at all and if you read Clause 4 you will see why we say so. The Hon. Minister knows that he can win out but I still feel that these words should be deleted.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, I never vote unless I clear my conscience. It is all well and good to bring omissions of the past and to compare present socialists, conservatives, this, that and the other, but all those things do not add to the debate at present. This point revolves around what to my opinion the hon. senior member for St. James mentioned in passing in his speech; that is to say, you should have it so strong in this section as to prevent the animals from destroying the trees planted.

Now, Sir, it is all well and good in saying that the animals can roam everyday and you can impound them. That will destroy the whole scheme if it is allowed, so which is better? Is it better to destroy the animal or to destroy the scheme? To argue that the impounding of these animals day after day can be advantageous to this scheme is in my opinion utterly wrong.

(Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN took the Chair.)

The main object of this section is to control one of the greatest dangers to the soil and that is the goat or the sheep grazing the land day after day. Indeed, it may be necessary to stop grazing of animals on certain parts of this scheme. If we can debate this matter unemotionally and forget about the plantocracy or masquerading today in any colours whatever they may be, we can dispassionately come to a decision. I feel that it is time that we close up shop. I think the hon. senior member for St. James made a very good point when he pointed out that there is legislation existing today, regardless of who made that legislation, regardless of whether the Conservatives, or the Socialists, or otherwise

have made it, they have not seen fit to remove it, and therefore, there must be something in it.

The animals in St. Andrew within my knowledge are domestic animals. They were originally wild animals and if they are not kept under domestic conditions they will again return to being wild animals. There were wild animals in St. Andrew which had to be destroyed by high-powered rifles. There are goats roaming at their will the cliffs all around this area which is being worked on now. I am personally under the impression that some of these animals do not have any owners. I do not think we are going too far in this section. I think what can be debated is the destruction of horses or mules because I do not believe that horses or mules are as dangerous to soil conservation as the goat, the sheep or the pig; therefore, I think consideration can be given by the Government to the possible deletion of "horse or mule."

10.50 p.m.

As far as the actual amendment to this Section is concerned, I am just another layman, perhaps, and in these days we are becoming so flooded with professional men, that we who are ordinary laymen cannot understand what is going on. Personally, I see that this Bill gives a period of five days in which to impound an animal; at the end of the five days and the animal is not claimed, then comes the possibility of destroying or selling the animal. I feel that is reasonable. I feel that it is important to control these animals; to anyone who knows the danger which a goat can do to soil conservation, it must be borne in mind by the members of the Government in voting for this suggested amendment.

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

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Messrs. T. W. MILLER, THORNE, SEARLES, L. E. SMITH, DOWDING and STRAUGHN - 10.

NOES: Messrs. MOTTLEY, TUDOR, TALMA, CRAWFORD and BRANCKER - 5.

The question that Clause 19 as amended stand part of the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Messrs. THORNE, SEARLES, L. E. SMITH and STRAUGHN - 8.

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

Clause 20 - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, in this Clause, I am asking leave to make the following amendments:-

(i) In the first line of Sub-clause (1) insert the word "interest" after the word "or".

(ii) In the seventh line of Sub-clause (1) substitute "of" for "or".

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 20 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 20 as amended stand part of the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative

without division.

Clause 21 - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make the following amendments to this Clause:-

(i) In sub-clause (4), insert after the word "which" the words "he claims compensation, the respondent may by notice".

(ii) In sub-clause (5), last line, "judgment" has no "e".

(iii) In sub-clause (7), "filled" should be "filed".

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 21 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 21 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 22 - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, in this Clause, in the third line of sub-clause (1) the word "extent" is wrongly spelt, and I am asking leave to make that amendment.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that Clause 22 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 22 as amended stand part of the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 23 - was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make the following amendments to this Clause:-

(i) In sub-clause (1) after the proviso to paragraph (a), add the following paragraph (b) -

(b) The special suitability or adaptability of the land for any purpose shall not be taken into account if that purpose is a purpose to which it could be applied only in pursuance of statutory powers or for which there is no market apart from the special needs of a particular purchaser or the requirements of any Government Department or any local or public authority.

(ii) In paragraph (c) of sub-clause (2) insert the word "been" after the word "have" in the third line.

(iii) In the same line as (ii) above delete the words "or effected" at the end of the line, and insert instead the words "within two".

(iv) At the end of Clause 23, substitute a full-stop for the semi-colon.

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 23 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 23 as amended stand part of the Bill, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause - 24 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make amendments to this Clause as follows:-

(i) In the 4th line of sub-clause (1), delete the word

"of".

(ii) In the 3rd line of sub-clause (3), substitute "no" for "bo"

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 24 as amended stand part of the Bill.

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

The question that Clause 24 as amended stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 25 was called and passed.

Clause 26 was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 26 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I only rise to point out to the Committee in case it is unobserved that this Section again is a Section which shows the unlimited nature and extent of the power which this Act confers on the Director of Agriculture. This Section actually says that the Director of Agriculture may delegate to any person or body such of his powers, authorities and duties under this Act as he may from time to time consider expedient.

Not only has the Director of Agriculture almost unlimited and undoubtedly more than super-dictatorial powers vested in himself, but he may go further than that and delegate to any person or body such of his powers or authorities and duties under this Act as he may from time to time consider expedient. I realise the weight of numbers on the side of the Government, but I do not want it to be said that it was late in the night when we passed this Bill not realising what we were doing.

11.00 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, if you look back at sub-section (2) of Section 14, you will see that "any grant or loan made under this Section shall be made upon or subject such terms and conditions as the Director of Agriculture thinks fit". Then sub-section (3) says "any loan made under this Section may be made either without security or upon such security as the Director of Agriculture thinks fit."

I agree with the hon. member that you cannot have such an elastic Section when you give specific power in Sub-sections (2) and (3) of Section 14 when it comes to the granting of public funds as he thinks fit. Then it says that he may or may not take security for it. That is power in the hands of the Director which he may delegate to any person or body as he may from time to time consider expedient. I cannot vote for this Section as it stands; he has power to grant money subject to such terms and conditions as he may think fit, with or without interest, free, and for any amount of years, whether it be fifteen, fifty or a hundred; then he can delegate these powers to any person or body.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, I think that just what the hon. senior member for the City has said also destroys what we are trying to build up. I do not see that the Minister can create another Director of Agriculture; perhaps if there is an acting Director he would be able to do what the former Director would have been able to do, but in delegating certain powers to another person does not give the other person all the power of the Director of Agriculture. This does not say that the Director shall delegate all of his powers to one person to carry out some scheme of work.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has missed the point. The Director of Agriculture may delegate to any person or body such powers, authorities and duties under this Act as he may from time to time consider expedient. We have been arguing about the unlimited powers given to the Director of Agriculture. He can make loans with or without interest, for one day or for one thousand years and in this section he can delegate such authority to any person. We

cannot vote for this; how can you allow him to delegate all these powers?

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, what Section 26 can do and provides for is that the Director of Agriculture, whose powers as we have pointed out today and tonight are unlimited by the Act, may from time to time deem it expedient to delegate to anybody any of his powers, any of his authority and any of his duties under this Act. This is saying that any of the power or authority which this Act authorises or impowers the Director of Agriculture to have he may turn over and delegate it to any person whatsoever or whomsoever, because that is what it says, and that is the only reasonable interpretation which one can put to this Section. The Director of Agriculture may delegate to any person or body such of his powers as he may think fit; the choice is left to him.

The question that Clause 26 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS; Hon. D. D. GARNER; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES and Mr. STRAUGHN - 7.

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

Clause 27 was called. It reads as follows:-

"(1) The Director of Agriculture after consultation with the Board may with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make regulations for or any of the following purposes -

(a) the establishment, functions and powers of Conservation Councils for any part of the conservation area;

(b) prohibiting the lighting of fires in the conservation area or any part thereof, except under such circumstances and subject to such conditions, limitations or restrictions as may be prescribed by the regulations or pursuant thereto;

(c) regulating or prohibiting the destruction of or interference with trees, shrubs, plants or grasses in the conservation area or any part thereof;

(d) prohibiting or regulating any change in the use of any land in the conservation area or any part thereof;

(e) restricting or regulating the use of any land in the conservation area or any part thereof for agricultural or pastoral purposes;

(f) anything which is required to be prescribed;

(g) generally for giving effect to the provisions of this Act;

(2) Any regulation made under this section may be made to apply to any class or classes of land or to all land other than land of any specified class or classes within the conservation area.

(3) No regulation made under this section and no direction, requirement, prohibition, condition limitation or restriction given or imposed under any regulation so made shall be deemed invalid on the ground that it delegates to or confers on the Governor-in-Executive Committee or the Board or any other body or person or class of persons of any discretionary authority.

(4) Any regulations made under this section shall be laid before each House of the Legislature as soon as possible after they are made, and if either House, within the period of forty days beginning with the day on which the regulations are laid before it resolves that the regulations shall be annulled, the regulations shall thenceforth be void but without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder or to the making of new regulations.

In reckoning any such period of forty days as afore-

said no account shall be taken of any time during which the Legislature is dissolved or prorogued or during which both Houses are adjourned for more than seven days."

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert the following amendments:

(i) delete the word "to" in the 3rd line of sub-clause (1).

(ii) insert the word "all" after the word "for" in the third line of sub-clause (1).

(iii) substitute a full-stop for the semi-colon at the end of sub-clause (1).

(iv) insert a comma after the word "condition" in the second line of sub-clause (3).

(v) in sub-clause (4), delete the word "of" after the word "persons" in the 7th line.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Section 27 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to show the hon. member that we are not all fools. Read the beginning of this Section.

"The Director of Agriculture after consultation with the Board....." All through this Act you will see that the Director may do so and so, but this Section says "after consultation with the Board."

I had experience in here when dealing with the Executive Committee Act, but I think that the ex-Premier admitted when we were dealing with it that wherever "Executive Committee" occurred, it should read Governor-in-Executive Committee. This Government fails to see that in certain Sections you have specific powers given to the Board, while in others there is no mention of such a Board. 11.10 p.m.

This Government feels that, although in certain sections you have specific powers for the Director and in other Sections that he can do nothing without consultation with his Board, that is all right. The Hon. Minister feels that this Bill is all right; therefore it must remain so. I venture to suggest that if all these arguments raised were taken into account and this Bill was taken back to the Attorney General, he would be bound to say that there was some omission in dealing with the Director of Agriculture because it seems to me that there was never any intention of allowing the Director of Agriculture such wide powers to do something without consultation with the Board; therefore, wherever "after consultation of the Board" is left out, it is just an omission. I am suggesting - and I know I cannot be wrong - that we can get over this by putting something in at the end of the Bill. I need not point you again to sections where you will find the words "after consultation with the Board" and the other sections where there are not put in, leaving it so that the Director can do absolutely as he likes. I remember during the 1948-51 Session when we were dealing with the Executive Committee Act that we made out a case where it was rather confusing to have in some places of that Act, "Executive Committee", "Governor-in-Executive Committee" and "Committee," and in the end the then senior member for St. Joseph had to cover them by saying that wherever such words occurred in the Bill, they meant "Governor-in-Executive Committee." How are you going to get over this in a Bill which is far-reaching as this Bill which deals with large sums of money, loans and all that sort of thing? In one breath you say "the Director" alone. I am no legal draughtsman; I am no legal luminary; but I suggest strongly that this should be drawn to the attention of the Legal Draughtsman. In this section which gives the Director the power to make regulations, you have "the Director of Agriculture after consultation with the Board." If this section were not worded in this way, we would have raised the same argument as we did in those sections where the Director was given power to act by himself. We would

say: what have you a Board for? Why vest authority in the hands of one man?

Sir, we vote for this section but we must draw your attention to the fact that even in the final section you say that the Director of Agriculture after consultation with the Board shall do so and so. It is for this reason that we suggest that the Hon. Minister should draw to the attention of the Attorney General that some sections of the Bill say "the Director" alone and some say "The Director after consultation with the Board." Do not butt your head against a wall. Do what you may; when the time comes, you are going to find that we on this side were absolutely right. We have no objection against this section because it says what we have been contending all the time, that is, "the Director after consultation with the Board." I know, when this is finished, you are going to say that the Opposition was talking nonsense; but I am sure that if this is raised with the Attorney General he is bound to say that you should put in the clauses where the Director appears alone the words "after consultation with the Board," or put in some clause at the end that wherever the Director appears in this Bill, it means the Director in consultation with his Board.

The question that Clause 27 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 28 was called and passed.

The First Schedule was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make the following amendment: (i) in the heading, change "1957" to "1958."

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that the First Schedule as amended stand part.

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

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

The Second Schedule was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to make the following amendments:

(i) in the heading, change "1957" to "1958";

(ii) in the fifth line, change "1957" to "1958"

There being no objection, leave was granted the

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that the Second Schedule as amended stand part.

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

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

The Third Schedule, Form A, was called.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to make the following amendments: in the third line, change "1957" to "1958;" also in the sixth line of the "WHEREAS" change "1957" to "1958"

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that the Third Schedule, Form A, as amended stand part.

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

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

The Third Schedule, Form B, was xalled.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to make the following amendments:-

- (i) "1957" to be changed to "1958";
- (ii) in Table A, delete the word "described" in the brackets in italics and substitute "describe";
- (iii) in Table B, delete "described" and substitute "describe."

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

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to move that the Third Schedule, Form B, as amended stand part.

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

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

On motion of Honourable D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported The passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. D. D. GARNER, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

11.20 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 7 ORDER"

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two small items which we would like to get over. The first is Order No. 4. I am asking leave to take that Order as the next Order of the Day.

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

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. 7 Order, 1958."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order provides for an additional post of Instructor at the Technical Institute. The services of this Officer are being sought for the opening of the Institute in September and the post has to be advertised. The salary is set out in the scale \$4,704x 192 - 5,280 x 240 - 6,000. From the beginning this Institute has based its staff, so to speak, in accordance with the advance of the curriculum. They want to start Technical Engineering, and they are asking that this Officer be appointed.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) No. 8. ORDER"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also 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. 8 Order, 1958."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, - This Resolution is a similar Resolution to the one which we have just passed. The Order which it seeks to approve, is in relation to the Labour Department; As the Addendum shows, the Order provides for the creation of an additional post of Long Grade Clerk for the Labour Department in place of one post of Stenographer. This Clerk will function as the records Clerk of the Department. His duties will include inter alia keeping and maintaining a register of incoming and outgoing files, recording and filing all correspondence and opening Departmental files.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 8 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1921.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple Bill. It is a Bill the object of which is to make provision for the non-payment of Income Tax on local bonds sold to people abroad. We have had quite a few enquires from people abroad as to the purchase of debentures as to whether they could be relieved of their income tax here so that they will pay their income tax in the country of residence only. The Income Tax Commissioner has said that that can be taken care of and there would be no danger if we agreed to this provision. The whole matter is that of avoiding the payment of double income tax. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, it really never occurred to me that the Hon. Premier would have chosen a comparatively thin House - I speak advisedly - at five minutes to twelve at night to introduce and have passed a Bill of this far-reaching nature. It would have been better in common courtesy for him to have consulted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition so as to discover whether we were ready and willing to make our contribution to this Bill now. (Hon. D. D. GARNER: You are making sport.) Naturally, I am making sport, because they can rely on their numbers. The Premier said that he wanted to deal with two small items. He has already dealt with two items and this one with which he is now dealing and one which he calls a small item, is this Income Tax Bill. We have to study these things; you cannot amend an Income Tax Act and make a speech on it in two minutes and say that all you are doing is avoiding the payment of double taxation and using terms which will have far-reaching consequences on this Island. You cannot recommend such a Bill to this House with a speech of two minutes duration and call it a small Bill.

One of the consequences of this Bill is that you will be, first of all, admitting that the rates of income tax in Barbados are too high; because, if you have to exempt foreigners from Barbadian Income Tax, that is a tacit admission that your own people are paying too much Income Tax. That is, perhaps, not an important point; a more important point, if I understand the Hon. Premier correctly, is that the purpose of this Bill is to exempt from the payment of income tax persons outside of this Island who lend money to the Barbados Government, who buy Barbados Government debentures, and who are therefore, creditors of the Barbados Government Bank. The Premier has not explained this and in less than two minutes, he dismisses it. I doubt whether

there is any hon. member on this side of the House who has given this Bill careful thought or any thought at all, and it deserves careful attention being given to it.

What is the reason for this Bill? What lies behind it? Surely, this Bill deserves more explanation which should not be given to a minority. What the Hon. Premier has said is little different from what is set out in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill. How does the Government propose to stop or remedy a situation in which people from Barbados send out their money and then have it re-invested in Barbados? What are they going to do about that? What is there to prevent people from trying to get their money out of Barbados and then employ agents to lend it back to the Barbados Government, if they can even get exemption from Income tax? How are you going to prevent that?

You may claim that it is a provision only to prevent people outside of Barbados from paying two sorts of Income Tax, but there is nothing in this Bill we have before us which makes sure that unscrupulous Barbadians who feel they are not getting sufficient in tax relief, will not have money sent back to be lent to the Government without paying income tax on it. It is all very well for them, Mr. Speaker, to dismiss this sort of Legislation in two shakes of a lamb's tail; but you are not helping this island much by this sort of thing. It is possible that they may have been directed to do it by the United Kingdom Government, but do not let us be fooled that this has anything to do with the development of this island. This is a different sort of measure from a Bill which permitted investors not to pay income tax; it is not as if people were coming here and putting down factories and you were exempting them for a certain amount of years from income tax. That would be liable because the benefits would be immediate and substantial; but this is just a financier's gamble which might look good on the surface, but covered only by the cloak for a lot of shady manoeuvring in the immediate future. This Bill ought not to be read by itself; it ought to be studied in conjunction with another Bill on the Order Paper, the one to amend the Rate of Interest Act, because they are closely tied as you will see when it is before us for the second reading.

I do not propose to say much more at this stage because what I have said so far is by way of protest at the fact that Government did not think it proper to inform us that they proposed to consider this Bill tonight. This is not a small thing and I would not like the Premier to get away with the statement that he is detaining the House to do two small things. I would grant him the Civil Establishment Order, but a Bill which effects the financial future of this colony is rather serious.

Why should Barbadians, Mr. Speaker, be asked to remain content at paying one rate of income tax when somebody, merely because he has lent money to the Barbados Government, is allowed to pay something else? How is the Barbadian taxpayer to know that a neighbour next door has contrived to get money out of the island to avoid paying Income Tax on it?

I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that further consideration of this Bill be postponed, not because I am against it, but quite frankly, unlike the Premier I have not studied enough of it to be able to define so quickly my attitude towards it and be able to dismiss or recommend it to the House in two minutes. (Mr. STRAUGHN: You have not done your home work.) It is all very well for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to talk about not doing homework; in the Party in which he finds himself, you have the numbers. When we on this side oppose it, we have to know what we are opposing and be certain that we are doing the right thing, because we have to defend our public actions at a later stage. No hon. member can say that he understands all the implications of this Bill. By an indirect method I heard today from Sir Archibald Cuke what the supposed reasons were for the introduction of this Bill by Government, and curiously enough the reasons which I got from Sir Archibald Cuke are the reasons given to this House by the Premier. Sir Archibald Cuke's ideas might be good enough for him, but quite frankly they are not good enough for me, and if it took him two minutes to explain to the House why this Bill should be passed, it took me two minutes to hear what Sir

Archibald Cuke said, and that is why I am convinced that something more should be said.

I am therefore moving, Mr. Speaker, that further consideration be postponed on the grounds that the Premier has not dealt fairly with the Leader of the Opposition, because he did not intimate to him that an important Bill of this nature would be dealt with tonight; and it is wrong at midnight to deal with financial Bills. If they wanted to have this measure properly debated, they would have told us last week that they wanted it done today, and if they considered it of such importance to have it passed at midnight with three members of the Opposition present, they would have broken off the discussion on the Soil Conservation Bill in order to do this, which according to them is of such great importance. It is unfair and wrong, and if you start that kind of way, we will know that it is a war to the death with them, and they cannot expect us to give them consideration if they do not observe the decencies of the Parliamentary game.

It is not true that this is a small matter; on the contrary it is very important, and if the Premier wants to play fair, he will see the wisdom of having further consideration postponed. If you look around there you will see eight or nine members, while there are only three of us on this side. They can do what they like in that respect, but I certainly will not forget it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. Speaking subject to correction, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the Leader of my Party, said that he got the assurance from the Leader of the House that this would not be dealt with tonight.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I want to correct that; the Leader of your Party was referring to the Usury Bill, but I told him I wanted to do this tonight.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thought you said that you were not dealing with this, but you may have said the other one. A Bill of this nature, though not voluminous, is of great magnitude, and really hinges on the other Bill, that is, the amendment to the Usury Act.

This Bill hinges on the amendment to the Usury Act. These Bills are what I would call brother and sister, as one hinges to a tremendous degree on the other. Sir, we were not actually prepared to do this Bill tonight and I can quite see the necessity for it in many respects. If we must give some traction for development, and after a survey is made, it is felt that there is not enough capital in this country, then you must give some inducement. I am really wondering whether there is this necessity that we must hasten this Bill at this stage. As I have said, this is like the amendment to the Usury Act. It is one of those things in which, I think, sufficient latitude should be given to hon. members for the expression of views and I am wondering whether Government feels that it is unnecessary to send it to Select Committee. However, I think it is one of these things which none of us would like to pass without giving it some thought. I must confess that I do not know if I should vote for or against it; and if I vote for the passing of it tonight I would not be satisfied in my own conscience, because I would feel that I am voting for something about which I do not know enough. I do not pretend to be any financier; therefore, when it comes to a Bill like this, I like to discuss it with some people who know a tremendous lot about it more than I.

Sir, I do not know whether it is necessary that we should go further than giving it the second reading. Let us vote for the second reading and then put it first on the Order Paper for next Tuesday. If that is done, we would have agreed to the principle of the Bill. As I have said, this is an inducement which you are offering to people and I have certain ideas in my mind. There seems to be a feeling with the sort of relaxation at present on dollars that this may be some attraction being handed out in order to see whether you could get some insurance companies willing to put back money into the Government. I am not sufficiently au fait with the information; but I would like to vote for the principle and then let this matter stay over for further consideration next Tuesday. Let us pass the second reading tonight

and put this matter first on the Order Paper for next Tuesday, so that hon. members would be able to give expression to their views when it is being dealt with in Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with this Bill after midnight. Look around you and you will see how empty is this Chamber. What I am suggesting is that you would not want to pass a Bill like this without letting the Press know that you are passing a Bill of this kind. Where is the Press?

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you drawing my attention to strangers?

Mr. MOTTLEY: No Sir, but you should not pass this Bill without having someone to proclaim to the world that what you are really doing is trying to attract capital; therefore, I suggest that we pass the second reading now and postpone it for further consideration next Tuesday.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy started off on the wrong line. He ended up by saying that our rate of income tax was too high and this and that. I said from the very beginning that this Bill is an adjustment so as to avoid double taxation, and that there were people from abroad who would be willing to buy our local bonds or local debentures; but they could not afford to pay double taxation. They have said: "I am willing to buy but I cannot afford to pay double taxation." There is some justification in that and the Government passed on the information to the Income Tax Commissioner. He said that it is perfectly all right to grant them exemption but they would have to prove to his satisfaction that they are residing outside of Barbados.

The Bill also makes provision for fees. The hon. senior member for the City has adopted a conciliatory attitude though I have to challenge his statement about doing this after midnight. He almost fell in the same trap about our doing this after midnight. That does not come into the picture at all because we have sat here until after six o'clock the next morning.

Let me say that this Bill was on the Order Paper since the 28th April and as long as there is a quorum in this House I am prepared to do business. If the Opposition approaches me in a reasonable manner as regards not dealing with an item, I would be sympathetic. Do not just get up and say that it is after 12 o'clock; it is wrong. So long as there is a quorum, it is perfectly legitimate to do any sort of business on the Order Paper.

Sir, in deference to the suggestion by the hon. senior member for the City, I am quite willing to pass the second reading and let it stay at that tonight. As regards the comparison made with this Bill and the Bill making provision in the increase of the Bank rate, I do not see any relation between the two Bills. They are two different things altogether. As I have said before, I am perfectly willing to agree to the suggestion made by the hon. senior member for the City: that is to pass the second reading tonight, and leave over the consideration of the further stages of the Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion of my colleague. The main matter of yesterday's meeting was Order No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip. Order No. 2 is in the name of an Hon. Minister who has leave of absence, Order No. 3 is in the name of an Hon. Minister who is present and one would have thought that an attempt would have been made to deal with that. Likewise, Order No. 7 is in the name of the Hon. Minister whom, I think, I see opposite. Therefore, we have jumped from the main item and with the exception of two comparatively small items - Orders 4 and 5 - we have jumped to Order No. 8, and as a matter of fact, we are now on Wednesday morning. I think that the matter is of sufficient importance for us to have had intimation that it was intended at all costs to proceed with this Order, either yesterday or today, by skipping over some other items in order to achieve that objective.

I am therefore seconding the motion that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

The question that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. TUDOR and BRANCKER - 2.

NOES: Mr. BRYAN, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Hon. F. E. MILLER, Messrs. HOLDER, THORNE, SEARLES, STRAUGHN and MOTTLEY - 10.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 24th June, 1958, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, there are two things to which I would like to refer. One of them is in respect of the Bills which are now printed for us for presentation to this Chamber. As you may observe, Sir - and I trust the Government Printery will take note and act accordingly - we get our Bills in the usual foolscap size, and also in a size somewhat smaller. It is extremely difficult for us when it comes to filing purposes, and I feel that the Government Printery should standardize the Bills which they print for us; otherwise, we will have to have many files of different sizes in order to conveniently and comfortably accommodate the different sizes of paper on which these Bills are printed. That is really more a matter for Your Honour and the House as a whole, but this is the opportunity for mentioning it publicly in case that hon. members want to agree or differ from that point.

Secondly, Sir, may I say this? As you are aware, a statement was laid before the House yesterday by the Hon. Premier, and may I say that the Opposition will be seeking an opportunity at the next meeting of this House by way of a motion for adjournment or other method of which Your Honour approves to discuss certain matters in connection with that statement which was laid yesterday? So that in mentioning this now everyone will be aware that it is our intention to seek an appropriate opportunity at our next Meeting for the Opposition to initiate a discussion on certain matters which arise and are connected with the statement with reference to the Sixth Form which was made yesterday.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there is one matter which I would like to draw to the attention of the appropriate Minister - I believe it must be the Premier himself. Quite a lot of hardship is being caused to certain categories of Government servants with respect to applications for loans for purchasing houses which they have sent in. I understand from the appropriate Department that the Law would have to be amended, because Government wants to change the rate of interest at which the loans will be made. It is not always understood by the persons concerned that this is the reason for the delay and quite a lot of hardship and bitterness is being experienced. I know that in my own constituency quite a lot of people who are employed by Highways and Transport Department are objecting to the long delay which they are having in getting their money. It has not been thoroughly explained to everybody that the reason for the delay is the fact that the Law has to be amended. I am drawing it to the attention of the Minister for two reasons: I think it would be a good thing if a statement would be issued in the Press and perhaps over Rediffusion explaining the reasons why these loans cannot be had at the moment, and secondly I think it would be a good thing if the legislation which it is proposed to bring to the House was brought as soon as possible so that those public officers in the lower categories can get these loans as quickly as they hope.

The question that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday, 24th June, at 3 p.m. o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.