
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd March, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House met at 12 noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); 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*); Mrs. M. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE (*Minister of Education*); and Mr. J. W. CORBIN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last two previous meetings have not been circulated.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 31st January, 1959.

PAPERS LAID

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

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1959.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Drawback of Duties on Sale of Goods to Tourist (Amendment) Regulations, 1959.

The Wages Council (Conditions of Office) Regulations, 1959.

The Wages Council (Meetings and Procedure) Regulations, 1959.

The Wages Council (Notices) Regulations, 1959.

The Wages Council (Commission of Enquiry) (Meetings and Procedure) Regulations, 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 30th November, 1958.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice

the following:-

Resolution to approve the Drawback of Duties on Sale of Goods to Tourist (Amendment) Regulations, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,910 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59, Part 1 - Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimate 1958-59, No. 49, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next Meeting to consider the money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Order No. 1 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Orders Nos. 1 and 2 and to take Order No. 3 as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, before the Order is considered, may I ask whether it has been circulated? I have not received a copy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that Order No. 3 has not been circulated.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I just do not understand why some members have not received copies, and I am informed by the Chairman of Committees and the Ministers that they have received copies.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker.....

Hon. M. E. COX: I am not finished yet. I was saying, Sir, that it is difficult to understand why all members have not received copies, because some members received their copies over the week-end.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I can understand that. The fact that it has not been circulated is, I think, due to the Printing Department.
12.25 p.m.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 7

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with Item No. 7 on the Order Paper as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House can deal with any Order on the Order Paper as he thinks fit, but what I want to draw to your attention first of all is that the Hon. Minister made a comment just now and I do not know if the innuendo is that we are stating we did not receive these things when we have received them

or something has gone wrong. I have now been handed in the House of Assembly a copy of the Minutes of the 24th and 26th February and this Resolution; therefore, I would like to make it quite clear that what I have said has been substantiated by other hon. members, I cannot quite understand what the Hon. Minister means when he says that he does not see why

Hon. M. E. COX: I rise on a point of order. I never said "why".

Mr. SPEAKER: You did say "why some hon. members on the other side did not receive theirs."

Mr. WALCOTT: Am I entitled to finish a sentence?

Mr. SPEAKER: I took exception to his point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: He said why other members did not receive theirs while other hon. members received theirs.

I am raising objection to dealing with Item No. 7 as the first Order of the Day because I would like to know if we are going to postpone Government Business after concluding that item. It seems strange that the Government after fixing its Order Paper in this manner can now come and deal with the last Order first.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House has asked leave to deal with Order No. 7 I would like Your Honour's guidance. This Order which is a Resolution reads as follows:-

"Resolution to approve that the sum of \$18,500 being the unexpended balance of the amount of \$30,000 provided by Resolution No. 73/1958."

I would like Your Honour's guidance as to whether it is correct. Why should we have on our Order Paper a Resolution referring to Resolution 73/1957 when there is no such Resolution in the records of this House up to now?

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I have been able to gather with reference to money resolutions which have come before this House, this House has only passed as far as Resolution No. 47. I have been informed that the way of numbering Resolutions by the Governor-in-Executive Committee is not the way of the Clerk. What appears as Resolution No. 73/1958, may be a Resolution which we have passed already under a different notation. I do not know if the Hon. Leader of the House can explain which is that Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: As far as the Addendum to this Resolution is concerned, I do not think that reference number - Resolution No. 73/1958 - is of any material particular.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Resolution should be capable of other explanation, so to speak, with reference to the unexpended balance.

Hon. M. E. COX: I agree. Your Honour will recall that this House passed a Resolution for \$30,000 to provide for the planting and development of certain grasses, and in that Resolution at the time, certain items were stated in the Addendum and others were not. This Resolution only seeks to allow the Government to carry out the programme and to purchase those items which were not mentioned in the Addendum at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that the Resolution for the planting of Pangola Grass?

Hon. M. E. COX: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as this House is concerned, the Hon. Minister has been able to describe the Resolution to which this Resolution refers; therefore, I think the direct notation of it - Resolution No. 73/1958 - can be deleted. The Hon. Minister has been able to describe what hon. members will be called upon to deal with. I do recall the

Resolution for \$30,000 for the planting of Pangola Grass; therefore, I do not think the notation of it is anything to hedge the Hon. Minister from dealing with it if hon. members are satisfied that such a Resolution was passed by this House.
12.35 p.m.

Mr. DOWDING: No explanation has been given. He has explained that a Resolution has been passed by this House but there is the Order Paper of this Honourable House which has been given to hon. members in order that they may do their work before hand, and it is a serious matter when the Order Paper is incorrect. That is the part which I would like to be clearly explained to Your Honour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The number attached to Resolutions which come to this Chamber is not our responsibility; that is done by the Secretariat and not the clerical department of the House of Assembly. In this Resolution we find No. 73 and I have directed that that number be deleted. That has come to us but we do not accept it. The Honourable Leader of the House has described the Resolution which deals with the unexpended balance of \$18,500.00 of the \$30,000 in connection with the pangola grass experiment which I remember having been dealt with in this Chamber. As long as we know what we are doing, there is no further reason for hedging. I have directed that that number No. 73 be deleted.

Mr. WALCOTT: May I point out to Your Honour that in view of the fact that this is a Money Resolution and it will be printed for the Other Place and the Other Place cannot really amend the Resolution, the proper course would be, as Your Honour has said, that this number No. 73 be deleted.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will sit for a moment, I will give a further explanation. I now have the appropriate Resolution in my hand. In our system of annotation, the number was No. 21, but in sending out this Resolution to the House the Secretariat copied their Number which was No. 73. It was a Resolution for \$30,000 and it reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that the sum of THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLARS be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1958-59 Part 11 - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1958-59 No. 21, which forms the schedule to the Resolution."

We now know what we are dealing with; No. 73/1958 was the number attached by the Secretariat. Let this Resolution be passed on to hon. members who may have any doubt about it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I was drawing to Your Honour's attention the wording of this Resolution. If this Resolution is wrongly worded then we should adjust it here because when it goes to the Other Place they cannot amend this Money Resolution. Let us amend it if it is wrong.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should like to say that this is not, in the true sense of the word, a Money Resolution; this is an abstract Resolution. The money has already been voted by the House for the purpose of the development of this grass land and this Resolution is seeking the approval of the House to carry out the plan. When the Resolution was before us, only certain items were set out in the Addendum. This is an abstract Resolution and it has always been the custom in so far as abstract Resolutions are concerned, to deal with them in the House and not in Committee of Supply.

Mr. WALCOTT: The question of whether it is an abstract Resolution or not does not matter.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is hard to see the reason for this Resolution; it is set out in the Addendum. Hon. members will recall that sometime last year, a Resolution came down to this House for the sum of \$30,000 and it was passed; but only certain items were stipulated in the Addendum in connection with the

scheme. Now that we are ready to pursue the scheme further it has been found that we cannot utilise the balance of the money because we had certain items listed in the Addendum. This Resolution now seeks to give us the authority to spend the unexpended balance towards the scheme in full. The former Resolution was Resolution No. 21 and in the Addendum these items were mentioned:-

1 Fergusson (Medium) Diesel Tractor, 1 Mounted disc harrow, 1 chain harrow, 1 Cambridge roller, 1 fertilizer distributor, 1 mid mounted cutter bar, 1 square baler, 1 side delivery rake.

They were only part of the things in connection with the scheme. Apart from that, there are many other items which have to be bought. We have to buy fittings so as to start and develop this pangola grass and these things were not mentioned in the Addendum to that Resolution. Further to that, we have to install water so that the cattle can have a full supply of it. That was the entire scheme but only certain things were listed in the Addendum to the former Resolution. Now that we have spent what money we had on those items and we now propose to go further with the scheme, we must have the authority from the House to continue this expenditure. I think that this matter is pretty plain; now that we know what things we want, we are asking for the full unexpended balance. I think that that explanation satisfies hon. members. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have no particular objection to this scheme but I think that what should be in its proper perspective is this; the Hon. Leader of the House has said that this is not a Money Resolution, that it is an Abstract Resolution. That is not correct. The original Resolution was a Money Resolution; it was a Resolution for the sum of \$30,000 and the Addendum stated this:-

"Recent trials by the Department of Science & Agriculture have shown that the new Pangola grass which is suitable for grazing and which can also be made into hay, will grow well in Barbados. The successful development of Pangola pastures will foster the development of the local livestock industry and it is proposed to utilize certain areas of Government land to investigate the techniques of establishment and cultivation of Pangola grass as well as the economics of grassland cultivation. The Government now has under consideration schemes for the development of the dairy industry, the rearing of beef cattle and the establishment of a sheep farm.

The establishment of pasture (including the making of hay) is a specialised form of cultivation which requires special machinery and funds are accordingly now being sought for the purchase of the following items of equipment. 1 Fergusson (medium) diesel tractor, 1 Mounted disc harrow, 1 chain harrow, 1 Cambridge roller, 1 fertilizer distributor, 1 mid mounted cutter bar, 1 square baler, 1 side delivery rake."

That is the Resolution and the purpose for which the Hon. Minister said he wanted the money. The addendum to this Resolution, which is now before us, states this:-

"By Resolution No. 73/1958 of the Legislature the sum of \$30,000 was provided under Supplementary Estimate No. 21, Part 11, Capital - Head V11 - Agriculture, Item 12, Grassland Development, for the purchase of equipment for the establishment of pastures of pangola grass. The items of equipment listed in the Addendum to that Resolution have been acquired....."

The items have been acquired; what you want the money for has been acquired.
12.45 p.m.

The money has covered what you wanted it for. The items cost \$11,500 and it is desired to utilise the unexpended balance of \$18,500 to purchase additional equipment. What

the hon. member is saying is that this is not a money Resolution but an abstract Resolution. To carry that to its logical conclusion, if you vote a certain amount of money to construct a building, after you have completed the building, on this business of an abstract Resolution you can come back and utilise the other part of the money for some other embellishments which you want to put to the building. You can see why this is done. In these days you hear so much about corruption; this is something to stop corruption where you came to the Legislature and said you wanted \$30,000 to buy ten items, it only cost \$11,500, but to safeguard the public purse you cannot now use the unexpended balance to buy something else which you require. You have to come back to the Legislature. We are giving approval today, Sir, not to \$30,000 but to \$18,500 which has not been used on the scheme it was going to be used for because it cost less. You estimated it would cost \$30,000 but it cost less. What I am pointing out is that it is not the technicality that Your Honour must leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. I am not suggesting that at this stage because we have already been in Committee of Supply to deal with the \$30,000; so our action today in voting for the remainder or unexpended balance is still in essence giving the Governor-in-Executive Committee power to utilise the money out of the Treasury, because the Accountant General or the Auditor General dare not, because we voted \$30,000, go and spend the unexpended balance on the things you now require, because when you came to us you did not require these things.

I would like the Minister of Agriculture to get it clear in his mind that he said then that he needed \$30,000 which the Legislature provided. There is now an unexpended balance which means that if the money had been expended on these items, the Hon. Minister could not come back here with a Resolution and say it was an abstract Resolution, because he would have to come for more money. I have no objection to the experiment, Mr. Speaker, but this is where the seriousness comes in; if you wanted to carry out an experiment and you did not know what the cost was supposed to be and you estimated for \$30,000, if you only spent \$20,000, you want to treat the Resolution so that we can only speak on it once because you are coming back for the unexpended balance of \$30,000 to carry out the scheme. That is not in truth and in essence what this Resolution says. This Resolution says you are carrying the experiment further because there is an amount left after buying these things. Here is what it says: "The items of equipment listed in the Addendum to that Resolution have been acquired at a cost of \$11,500 and it is desired to utilise the unexpended balance of \$18,500 to purchase additional equipment and beef type bulls, and to meet the cost of labour, fencing, installation of water and any other expenses necessary for the development of Pangola pastures and the investigation of the techniques of grassland establishment and cultivation."

That means, Sir, that if the \$30,000 was not enough to carry out these things, you could not say this was an abstract Resolution any more, because if you wanted \$1 in addition, it would be a new Resolution, while in essence you would be carrying out the same experiment. The reason why the Legislature must have these safeguards is for the obvious reason that if you come to us with an experiment and say what it costs, we have to put a check on you because if we give you \$30,000 to carry out an experiment, we might not be prepared to give you \$300,000 because we approved in principle of the experiment; we would do it provided it came within what could be regarded as a reasonable figure.

I want to say that the point I am raising is that the items listed by the Minister in the original Resolution were items which the Minister said the experts advised him they would require; so what they are saying in this Resolution is a little different from that. The items you have bought cost us less than you estimated for, and we now propose to spend the unexpended balance. The Hon. Minister is shaking his head; let him read the Addendum and see what it says:-

"The items of equipment listed in the Addendum to that Resolution have been acquired at a cost of \$11,500 and it is desired to utilise the unexpended balance."

You cannot say that you did not know you would need water, fencing and the other things which you now require; so what I am telling the hon. member is that he did not say that he would require these things. Why? I am saying that the things which you require were listed in the other Addendum; so I do not like the Minister saying that this is an abstract Resolution on the basis that we are not now approving \$18,500 for things we did not approve when we passed the last Resolution. That is why we have to do it this way. It is just like if you brought a Resolution for ten chairs for a building and after completing the building you want 1,000 chairs; you must tell the Legislature why you want the additional amount. Those are the necessary safeguards which the public must have in the expenditure of public money, and it is a very good thing. This can only be an abstract Resolution in the sense that it is different from the Resolution we have already passed. I am not particularly worried because I agreed in principle to give the scheme a trial, but when the hon. member says it is a matter we have already approved and that it is only carrying out the scheme, he must be prepared to see that the reason why the Accountant General could pass this is because he told the House that he wanted certain things done and that is the safeguard.

12.55 p.m.

Now he wants part of the money for the purpose of doing other things and he would like approval for that in a general way.

What I just want to say is that I know that there are

members of the Civil Service who would like, when you have things like this, that you should not worry to come back to the House of Assembly for approval because they consider it as a waste of time. I know that if we do not have things done in this manner we would have to hire a lot more jurymen because there are cases in which you would have to save people from themselves. As soon as you give people the opportunity where they can play with money without any safeguards they will bring themselves in trouble. Some people say that circumstances cause them to do these things, but I say that these are necessary safeguards against public extravagance not only in Barbados but in every part of the world because you get these things happening in all parts of the world.

That is why I say that when it comes to such matters as this, the Hon. Minister need not be afraid and he should not have said that what we are passing today is not anything new. It is something new because if these are items which you did not have in the previous Resolution they would have to be put before us now for our approval. This is not a revote; this is not revoting money; this is spending the remainder of money for something else. This is for the purpose of spending the unexpended balance from an amount which you stated you were using for a particular purpose. It is a different thing from a revote. It is not to say that the duty on something which you ordered has gone up or the cost of it has gone up. You are using the unexpended balance of something which you planned to do for other things which you did not calculate for, though they have something to do with the same matter.

Your Honour can clearly see that it is the same type of money resolution as the original one which came down for other items but we have to be specific and that is why I say we have to be precise. I hope the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not part of this philosophy of not being specific. As I have said, there is a feeling within the Public Service that when it comes to such things as this matter, they should not come before the Legislature with them. I repeat that this is a sort of system which is necessary because were it not for it, many a man would come before the Assizes for public fraud. You have to save people from themselves and when it comes to dealing with money you have to save them more from themselves. Some people are very nice but when it comes to their dealing with money you

have to save them from themselves.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, although I agree with this matter in principle; the whole reason for this Resolution is because of negligence - I would not say inefficiency - on the part of the staff of the Ministry, because the entire scheme calls for an expenditure of \$30,000 which has been voted under a previous Resolution.

This is what the Addendum says:-

"The sum of \$30,000 was provided under Supplementary Estimate No. 21, Part 11, Capital, - Head VII - Agriculture, Item 12, Grassland Development, for the purchase of equipment for the establishment of pastures of pangola grass. The items of equipment listed in the Addendum to that Resolution have been acquired at a cost of \$11,500 and it is desired to utilise the unexpended balance of \$18,500 to purchase additional equipment....."

The sum of \$11,500 has been spent but that is purely for part of the scheme. If the scheme is one for the growing of pangola grass, it is not possible to develop grassland unless by irrigation; so you can well see that the question of irrigation could not be an afterthought. Along with that you must of necessity need physical labour. I am just trying to point out why it is a case of gross neglect. You talk of having a high powered staff but they are very negligent. Wherever a scheme like this is implemented, not only equipment would have to be bought but you will need beef type bulls, you would need money to pay labour, you must have fencing and the installation of water. All of these are necessities but it is just a case of rampant negligence on the part of those high powered officials who get salaries almost as much as the Ministers themselves and who are not doing their work.

On the face of it, you have spent \$11,500 and you are asking for approval to spend the other \$18,500. Therefore, it is either a case of gross negligence or a case as outlined by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that you have over-estimated. I do know that it is not a case of over-estimation because it would not be a scheme unless these other items were included.

Sir, I am trying to re-open the debate because we have already agreed in principle to this Resolution; but although in reality we have voted the sum of \$30,000 for grassland development, not one cent of this \$18,500 can be spent unless we vote it all over again. Although this is not a money Resolution *de facto* or in its entirety, it is more or less one. As I have said already, this is all because of the inefficiency of the staff of the Ministry. The Hon. Minister is not to be blamed because he decides the policy. It is due to the first Resolution being badly worded. Because of that you have to bring down a Resolution saying that you want this money to purchase additional equipment, beef type bulls and so on. My advice to the Hon. Minister is that he sees that his staff do his work more carefully.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, it may be a coincidence that further evidence in this murder case appears today. Sir, I hope when this jury has debated this matter carefully that it will not be necessary as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has suggested for a jury to go into the matter but that those who are accountable will be made to account and that the public purse will no longer be mis-handled in this manner.

1.05 p.m.

It is either that Sir, or this Honourable House is being treated in a manner in which certain people seem to think it should be treated, that is to say, with a lack of information in Addenda such as these. Of course, it goes further than that; it is that Addenda such as these give little information and I heard an hon. member pounding when I suggested that speeches from this Hon. House be put over the radio. We can look forward perhaps to the public hearing through the means of the radio even if they do not hear through the means of the local daily newspaper.

Now, we have a Resolution which, in the first place, is Resolution No. 21 and not Resolution No. 73 as has been eventually ferreted out. I read that to mean that an official

of a Department has sat down and estimated that this Resolution No.21 called for the sum of \$30,000. That official, I take it, is subject to check by other officials and again subject to check in these matters by what I take it today would be the full Cabinet. So, as we go along the line, we see what this House has passed; we have this Resolution for \$30,000 and the Addendum says this:-

"Recent trials by the Department of Science and Agriculture have shown that the new Pangola grass which is suitable for grazing and which can also be made into hay will grow well in Barbados. The successful development of Pangola pastures will foster the development of the local livestock industry and it is proposed to utilize certain areas of Government land to investigate the techniques of establishment and cultivation of Pangola grass as well as the economics of grassland cultivation. The Government now has under consideration schemes for the development of the dairy industry, the rearing of beef cattle and the establishment of a sheep farm.

The establishment of pasture (including the making of hay) is a specialised form of cultivation which requires special machinery and funds are accordingly now being sought for the purchase of the following items of equipment. 1 Fergusson (medium) diesel tractor, 1 Mounted disc harrow, 1 chain harrow, 1 cambridge roller, 1 fertilizer distributor, 1 mid mounted cutter bar, 1 square baler, 1 side delivery rake."

At that time, in fact, I do not think that at any time, could any hon. member of this House think that this was not something in good faith when he agreed to the passing of the this Resolution for \$30,000, that this money was not for machinery as set out in the Addendum. Nowhere in this Addendum are we told that this \$30,000 was for the purpose of doing anything more than purchasing these items, and I take it that it would be a simple matter to find out from the agents what the cost of these various items would be. I can state categorically that the person who made this estimate would have been able to acquire from the agents the facts as to the cost of the machinery. What must this House believe when we, in good faith, in all good agreement, and with the explanation given us, voted \$30,000 of the taxpayers' money? Would we believe that it was other than in good faith for the purchase of these articles? That is where these supplementary estimates are going wild; that is where this Honourable House should insist on knowing what the items in every Resolution are about, and what the monies are expended on. I feel that before money can be expended, the official concerned must submit to those in authority a clear estimate as to the amount that is needed and it must be itemised; but it seems to be the wish of this House that on this occasion and on other occasions, no explanation is to be given whatsoever as to the expenditure of money.

Now when you ask questions, one is liable to be called a murderer! But, Sir, what could be a more classic example than what is stated in the Addendum to this Resolution? This is what it says:

"By Resolution 73/1958 of the Legislature, the sum of \$30,000 was provided under Supplementary Estimate No.21 Part 11 Capital....." And we now know that it is Resolution No.21. I wonder how these things are done! Did any member of the Cabinet see this Resolution before it came before this honourable House? Did it have No. 73 or No.21? I would like to know the procedure which is adopted at the present moment. Does the person who writes these Addenda submit them to a higher authority and does the higher authority scrutinise these Estimates and ask for a breakdown of them? These are very simple matters on which I have asked for information. The Addendum states that the sum of \$30,000 was provided under Supplementary Estimate No.21 Part 11 - Capital - Head VII - Agriculture, Item 12, Grassland Development for the purchase of equipment for the establishment of pastures of pangola grass. It says there that this \$30,000 was asked for in respect of the purchase of equipment for the establishment of pastures of this grass. It does not say anything else. The equipment has been set out in the original Resolution, and it is remarkable that

that equipment only costs \$11,500 out of the \$30,000. 1.15 p.m.

It is further remarkable and somewhat natural that the person concerned just goes on to say that the items listed in the Addendum to this Resolution have been acquired at a cost of \$11,500 and it is desired to utilise the unexpended balance. That is all it says, Sir. It does not seem necessary in this particular Addendum to say how it is desired to utilise the rest by stating exactly as in the first Addendum what is necessary. It goes on to say that it is desired to utilise the unexpended balance of \$18,500 to purchase additional equipment and beef type bulls, and to meet the cost of labour, fencing, installation of water and any other expenses necessary for the development of Pangola pastures. This, Sir, is a complete embodiment of anything that may occur, while in the first case, the items were listed. I was wondering, Sir, if the Hon. Minister could say if these two Addenda - one in my humble opinion a very correct Addendum on how to handle public money, and the other a very incorrect one as to how to handle public money - were written by one and the same individual. Perhaps the Minister can enlighten this House. Perhaps there is some need for accountability as to why these two should be so different.

Sir, I hope that we will be given some explanation as to what amounts are needed. How many beef type bulls are required? I think there are hon. members in this House who would be quite capable of estimating the cost of each bull, but it just says "beef type bulls and to meet the cost of labour, fencing etc." How many yards of fencing are there in this scheme? At how many places are you going to install water? I take it, Sir, that this has already been thrashed out at a higher level, and it is only considerate to this House to inform it of what has occurred.

I repeat, Sir, these Addenda are either suited to what certain persons think the intellect of this House needs, or this is just a lackadaisical method of preparing estimates. This is a classic example where in actual figures only \$11,500 were needed, but this House voted \$30,000. One cannot get away from the Addendum that is before this House.

Leaving that for the time being, Sir, I am wondering exactly what these proposals are. Does the Hon. Minister and his advisers envisage a beef industry in Barbados? Have his advisers informed him as to how many acres of grassland there are available in the island, and if so, what are the figures? Does the Hon. Minister agree that a beef type animal is more suitable for this island than a dual purpose animal? I, Sir, am not entirely in favour with bringing into this island purely and simply beef type animals. There are, Sir, a number of good animals which serve a dual purpose, that is, they supply both milk and beef. This Government, Sir, has committed itself to the furthering of the dairying industry in this island, and it seems to me that acquiring good bulls of a dual purpose type would be better than the beef type.

I hope, Sir, that we will also be given some details as to the success of this scheme so far. Has the Hon. Minister any indication as to whether or not Pangola grass is going to be a success on a small, medium or large scale in Barbados, or are the indications that this grass will need a large amount of water in order for it to be a success? I hope, Sir, that the Hon. Minister will be able to give us some indication of the scheme as it has gone so far. I think it is but courteous to this House that he should explain exactly what experiments have been carried out, what acreages have been reaped, what results have been gained and what are the possible indications up to now, because it does not necessarily mean that because this grass scheme has been successful in another West Indian island, it is going to be successful in Barbados. Those are the observations which I have to make, Sir, at the moment, and I do hope that the Minister will give us some information on the questions and the debate as a whole.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am not at all replying

on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, but you will recall that I said that this Resolution was not in the strict sense a money Resolution, but rather an abstract Resolution. When I said that, I did not know that I would have conveyed the impression to the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we wanted to do away with having these Resolutions done in the House and that we wanted to practise a system whereby money could be spent without coming into the House of Assembly.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never said so. I never said the Minister wanted that; I particularly said that I know for some time that there are some Civil Servants who do not like the idea of these things to be dealt with coming back to the House, and I said I hoped the Minister would never fall for that idea. I never said that the Minister wanted this idea, but I was only commenting on the hon. member's statement when he said that this was an abstract Resolution, and I said that in essence it was a money Resolution because we were spending the unexpended balance on something that was not stated in the original Resolution. I never abused the Minister.

Hon. M. E. COX: This is really a question of procedure. I was about to say from the time I happened to be a member of this House - I am sure the hon. senior member for St. Peter was here since 1945 and he knows that on many occasions even when he was a member of the Government - we brought down abstract Resolutions before this House and on all occasions abstract Resolutions were dealt with in the House proper and not in Committee. As long as it is an abstract Resolution, the procedure is to deal with that Resolution with Your Honour in the Chair in the whole House and not in Committee of Supply. The only difference is, as hon. members know, that when an item goes into Committee of Supply, a member can speak ten or forty times if he likes, whereas when Your Honour is in the Chair he can only speak once; that is the only difference of procedure, so I do not want it to be understood that we would like to have these things done without going through the usual and formal procedure of this Honourable House. That is all I have to say.

1.25 p.m.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very simple matter and I think that the hon. senior member for Christ Church has said something which is really factual. When I made my introductory speech when this scheme was first brought down to this House, I pointed out what was the scheme and that the items which hon. members saw in the Addendum to the Resolution were only part of the items needed at the time. If, perhaps, the Addendum had three additional words it would be quite in order but these words having been left out, you have all this confusion today. It was a slight error.

When I introduced the matter at the time I said that you would have to buy beef type bulls; you would have to get them from various islands. I was trying to get a copy of my speech on that occasion but I have been told that it is not available. I would have liked to read it back in order to show hon. members the many points which I made on that comprehensive scheme. Although the original addendum did not set out these things distinctly, it was always meant that these things were needed to carry out the scheme but those things which were mentioned in the addendum of the other Resolution were the things which were necessary at once to begin the pilot scheme. A mistake was made in not including all of the things in the original Resolution.

I think hon. members if they recall what was said at the time will remember that, although in the original Addendum there was no mention made of the purchase of beef type bulls or of the necessity of water or of fencing or of labour, I spoke of the need for such things because you cannot use a magic man to do these things. It is as simple as that. It does not need anybody getting up and saying that the Minister was trying to get around this. Why bring in all that sort of thing? Mistakes like this have happened before and they will happen again.

I do not agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church when he said that it was due to inefficiency because all human beings will make a slip at some time. As I have said, if three words had been added to the Addendum at the time, they would have made a whole world of difference. As I have said, the things which were mentioned in the Resolution were only part of the scheme. We wanted those things at the time in order to get on with the scheme at once. Now that we have got those things we cannot go any further until we get these things which are now listed. I am sure the House had the understanding at that time that there were many other things which had to be done. That is why I say that I am sorry I cannot get a copy of my original speech because it would be revealed to this Hon. House how exhaustive the scheme was.

When it comes to the question asked by the hon. senior member for St. George, I would just like to say that we have only just had the items which were needed at that time: so there is no real progress report. All I would like to say, if the hon. member wishes to see how it is done he can visit the Pine Agriculture Station where the scheme is being carried out. Let me repeat that we cannot go forward until we get some of these other items.

This is a development scheme which has something to do with agriculture and as such the House should be justly proud to vote money for agriculture. We are going to develop grasslands for the rearing of cattle for beef. From the time I came in here, I gave the House the assurance that instead of importing beef from hard currency areas, I felt we have the opportunity of rearing some of our own cattle in order to get beef. Having given the House that assurance I came back with that Resolution for \$30,000 in order to get the techniques to get ahead with that scheme. This House consented to that Resolution and I think that hon. members voted unanimously for it. Because of this slight error, we have to come back with this Resolution today. Of course, sometimes one word is left out of a man's will and because of that it changes the whole principle of the will. It is unfortunate that during the campaign for the local elections tempers may be somewhat frayed and everybody's equilibrium is not settled. I feel, Sir, that just as on the former occasion this scheme had the blessing of the House, even so today I feel that there are hon. members here along with members of the public and the planters especially who want to see this scheme carried on to a successful conclusion because everybody in this island knows that we have had sour grass planted and the experts who should know say that sour grass is nowhere in comparison to pangola grass. I am not an expert; I am not supposed to be one. I have technical advisers and if they tell me that it would be a good thing to plant pangola grass and that some of the other islands have already established the growth of pangola grass and have seen the effects of it, then I am quite willing to follow suit. The only thing I must admit is that there was an error in the Addendum of the former Resolution. That is all there was to it but so far as the elucidation of the speech on the entire scheme and the object of the scheme, I am sure I made it quite clear then.

I cannot tell the hon. senior member for Christ Church how many acres are already under cultivation of pangola grass but I can tell him that we have been able to cut some of the grass already and have made some into hay. How far they have got with that I do not know, but I do know that they cannot get any further until they get these other pieces of equipment, until they have prepared the land and begun to buy the cattle and until they instal water and begin to hire people so that they can try out all these little things.

1.35 p.m.

I think that is a good scheme. I am still wedded to it as a planter myself; I feel that it is something which will do good to Barbadians. If we can find out which type of bull will be better suited for beef purposes, if we can encourage people to get beef, if we can turn some of the pasture land which we now have into the cultivation of this grass and eventually produce more beef and increase the income of this colony - if we can do these things by this scheme, then

I think it is a good one. We cannot stay in the background while other people are going forward; I know that some Barbadians feel that we are unique in certain things and that even if other people go forward we should remain static. But there is no such thing as being static; if those experts who have been travelling throughout the length and breadth of the country give us their expert knowledge of this matter of grassland cultivation, if we discuss matters with them and we do not care to follow their advice and keep all this sour grass which has more fibre in it than anything else - if these people are trained people and they are of the opinion they expressed, then I think that this is a good scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I must apologise to the House for the small error which was made in the Addendum to the original Resolution. We did not include the entire scheme and only stipulated these things there and then; by no stretch of imagination was it intended to buy more than these things. I made it abundantly clear on the floor of the House when I explained these things and I do not think that the hon. senior member for St. George was in the Island when I made the explanation; I did explain everything, and if the hon. member was out of the House, I can assure him that on that occasion the House unanimously welcomed the idea because from what they have heard and read of what is happening in the other Islands, they were in agreement with the scheme. I would advise the hon. member to get in touch with the Agricultural Department at once and they will give him a small demonstration at his place.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of personal explanation. I already have it. (Laughter)

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

GRANT TO BARBADOS ARTS COUNCIL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I understand that hon. members are willing to allow the Hon. Minister of Social Services to proceed with his money Resolution for the sum of \$480. That being so, I am asking leave to take Order No.3 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 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Social Services:- To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution to approve the payment to the Barbados Arts Council of the amount of \$480 provided in the 1958-59 Estimates under Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants, Item 31, as a subvention to the Central Council of Drama.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution can be regarded as a very simple one. You will observe from the Addendum that the sum of \$480 was passed in the Estimates for 1958-59 for payment as a subvention to the Central Council of Drama. In the meantime, it was sometime during the middle of last year, we decided that we would form the Central Council of Arts and include the Drama Committee under the title of the Central Committee for Drama. Hence you will appreciate that it would not be reasonable to ask the Auditor General to release this money since the Organisation which was once known as the Central Council of Drama no longer exists. In the ordinary course of events, we should come to the House for this

money. It would be correct for the Legislature to decide that this money should be passed on to the Central Council of Arts for the use of the Drama Committee. Most of this money has already been committed; it has been in operation in connection with the theatre workshop. It is very important that we should get a decision on this matter today. If there is any request for further information, I would be very happy to pass it on to hon. members. With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. ST.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. M. E. COX: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have not got any more printed copies of the Business of the House for today, and, in the circumstances, there is nothing left for us to do but to adjourn. I take it that that is because, on the last occasion, you will remember that I had moved the suspension of the sitting for lunch but some hon. members thought that we should go home. (Mr. DOWDING: Let us go home.) The hon. member says that they want to go home.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: In moving the adjournment of the House I should like to inform hon. members that it is the intention of the Government to begin the consideration of the Estimates next Tuesday and it may be necessary, as has been the custom in the past, for us to sit more than once a week so as to get through the Estimates in time to be passed on to the Other Place. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 10th March, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, may I just point something out to the Minister before you put the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot speak on the adjournment.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have no objection to the adjournment, but I am just drawing something to the attention of the House as far as its business is concerned. As we are meeting next week to deal with the Estimates, I would have liked the Minister to indicate on what days he proposes to do business. The reason why I say that is because we have other business to do, and if we know in advance the days we are going to meet in the House, it would help us. We have met for half-day today for instance. Those of us who have appointments do not make them for Tuesday, so we do not want to be like spree boys walking about. I should therefore like the Minister to say, if we are going to meet next week to do the Estimates, whether we are going to meet Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday or Friday, so that we can arrange our business in advance.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say in reply to that that it would be my duty before I decide on anything like that to consult the Leader of the Opposition. I have not yet done so, but I will do so at a later stage and let the House know.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th March, at 12 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

2.00 p.m.