

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 1]

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
FIRST LEGISLATURE CONSTITUTED UNDER THE  
BRITISH GUIANA (CONSTITUTION)  
ORDER IN COUNCIL, 1961

23rd Sitting

Friday, 13th April, 1962

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

*The Assembly met at 2 p.m.*

*Prayers*

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

*Present :*

**His Honour the Speaker, Mr. R. B. Gajraj.**

*Members of the Government*

*People's Progressive Party*

*Ministers*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Dr. the Honourable C. B. Jagan</b>        | <i>—Premier and Minister of Development and Planning (Member for Corentyne—East)</i> |
| <b>The Honourable B. H. Benn</b>             | <i>—Minister of Natural Resources (Member for Demerara Coast—West)</i>               |
| <b>The Honourable Ram Karran</b>             | <i>—Minister of Works and Hydraulics (Member for Mahaica)</i>                        |
| <b>The Honourable B. S. Rai</b>              | <i>—Minister of Home Affairs (Member for Demerara Coast—East)</i>                    |
| <b>The Honourable R. Chandisingh</b>         | <i>—Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Member for Lower Demerara River)</i>     |
| <b>Dr. the Honourable Charles Jacob, Jr.</b> | <i>—Minister of Finance (Member for Vreed-en-Hoop)</i>                               |

**Dr. the Honourable F. H. W. Ramsahoye**—*Attorney-General (Member for Canals Polder)*

**The Honourable E. M. G. Wilson** —*Minister of Communications (Member for Boerasirie).*

*Parliamentary Secretaries*

**Mr. L. E. M. Mauw** —*Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics (Member for Mahaicony)*

*Other Members*

**Mr. S. M. Saffee** —*(Member for Berbice—West)*

**Mr. G. L. Robertson** —*(Member for Leonora)*

**Mr. M. Bhagwan** —*(Member for Essequibo Islands)*

**Mr. J. B. Caldeira** —*(Member for Pomeroon)*

**Mr. V. Downer** —*(Member for Berbice—East)*

**Mr. M. Hamid** —*(Member for Demerara—Central)*

**Mr. D. C. Jagan** —*(Member for Suddie)*

**Mr. H. Lall** —*(Member for Corentyne—West)*

**Mr. M. Shakoor** —*(Member for Corentyne River)*

*Members Constituting the Minority*

*(i) People's National Congress*

**Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, O.C.** —*(Member for Ruimveldt)*

**Mr. W. O. R. Kendall, Deputy Speaker**—*(Member for New Amsterdam)*

**Mr. J. Carter** —*(Member for Werk-en-Rust)*

**Mr. E. F. Correia** —*(Member for Mazaruni-Potaro)*

**Mr. N. J. Bissember** —*(Member for Campbellville)*

**Mr. W. A. Blair** —*(Member for Berbice River)*

**Mr. R. S. S. Hugh** —*(Member for Georgetown—South)*

**Mr. J. G. Joaquin** —*(Member for Kitty)*

**Mr. R. J. Jordan** —*(Member for Upper Demerara River)*

**Mr. C. A. Merriman** —*(Member for La Penitence—Lodge)*

**Mr. H. M. S. Wharton** —*(Member for Abary)*

*(ii) United Force*

**Mr. P. d'Aguiar** *(Member for Georgetown—Central)*

**Mr. S. Campbell** *(Member for North West)*

**Mr. R. E. Cheeks** *(Member for Georgetown—North)*

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

Mr. E. V. Viapree — Assistant Clerk of the Legislature.

ABSENT:

Mr. G. Bowman, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources (Member for Corentyne Central) — on leave

Mr. E. E. Melville (Rupununi) — on leave.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE  
SPEAKER

## SPEAKER'S RULING CHALLENGED

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members will have seen, no doubt, this morning's copy of the *Daily Chronicle*, on page 4 of which, under the caption "Budget Debate" is the headline "Speaker's Ruling Challenged." In fairness I must say that in another part of the newspaper they have endeavoured to print what appears to be the first instalment of the Speaker's ruling on the points raised by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar).

Communication to citizens of the country is necessary, indeed vital, so that all and sundry may know what is taking place in the country's Legislature, but I want to call your attention particularly to that part of the article which reads:

"The whole matter is of great public interest. The *Chronicle* invites opinion from its readers, particularly the legal fraternity."

In effect, it would seem to me that the *Chronicle* now wishes to run a sort of competition amongst its readers and, indeed, the general public, as to whether the Speaker's ruling is right or wrong. In this respect hon. Members will agree with me, I am sure, in saying that this action on the part of the *Chronicle* is not merely unusual but in extremely bad taste, and all parliamentary practices, traditions and customs would indicate that it is improper for any newspaper to take the view that they might invite their readers to state whether the Speaker's ruling is right or wrong. Members know that the action of a Speaker cannot be criticised in debate, or in any form of proceedings, except on a substantive Motion. Confidence in the impartiality of the Speaker is an indispensable condition to the successful working of procedure, and his rulings are accepted. Yet Members have the right to question them on a substantive Motion.

Such, hon Members, are the rights and privileges of a Member in a democratic parliamentary institution. It may be said—and I want to be very charitable in the way I look upon this—that the newspaper in question desired to educate the public, but in their attempt to do so they have undoubtedly trespassed upon the rights of hon. Members, which rights are theirs and theirs alone, to question the Speaker's ruling by way of bringing a substantive Motion before the House.

I said yesterday, when I had to deal with remarks of another hon. Member, that it is the Speaker's duty not merely to find the easiest solution to a problem which comes before the House, but it is his obligation to preserve the rights and privileges of the House. That is why I bring this before Members of the House, so that they may realize that we must not permit any infringement of our rights, any trespass. They must know where we stand. They must know that we are going to be firm in here, and I give an assurance that as long as I am the Speaker in the Chair I will see to it that where a wrong is done within this House, or outside of the House, I shall, as your Speaker, take care of your rights and your privileges.

May I hope and trust that the newspaper in question will make the necessary correction in their next issue.

Since I have assumed the Chair of this Legislature this is the first occasion on which I have had to call attention to actions by any newspaper. So, in the sense that it is a first offender, I just say that the penalty shall merely be that they correct and apologize, but if these things continue, then we all know what powers reside in the office of the Speaker, and I shall not hesitate, in the interest of upholding parliamentary democracy, to use those powers if it becomes necessary.

2.15 p.m.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILL

**BRITISH GUIANA CREDIT CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL**

**The Minister of Finance (Dr. Jacob):** Sir, on behalf of the Government, I present the British Guiana Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1962.

*Bill read the First time.*

## PUBLIC BUSINESS

**HIS HONOUR'S APPEAL FOR UNITY**

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members, we shall, shortly, resume the debate on the Motion for the Second Reading of a Bill intitled:

"An Ordinance to appropriate the supplies granted in the current session of the Legislature."

Before I call upon the next hon. Member to make his contribution, I think it is the proper time for me to remind the House that the last speaker before the adjournment last night was the hon. Minister of Home Affairs who, I am sorry to say, is not in his seat at the moment. But hon. Members will recall that the hon. Minister said, and I particularly quote the exact words from the record of *Hansard*:

"I have heard of "Double Delight" on the radio—"X.M. Rum and Pepsi-Cola." I saw another "Double Delight" on Friday, 16th February, 1962—arson and looting were rampant in this country."

Those are the words of the hon. Minister. Now, in my opinion, that was in extremely bad taste, for the reference has obviously, and in my view, infringed standing Order 35 (5) which reads:

"No Member shall impute improper motives to any Member of either Chamber of the Legislature."

It is obvious for the simple reason that everyone knows the hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar)

has been pressing for the removal of the Emergency Order. So for our hon. Minister to commence his remarks with the words:

"Some politicians are saying that we should not have had the Emergency Order."

and then to go on to link an advertising slogan of the business of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central with arson and looting — coupled with the several court charges still pending against the hon. Member — shows, in my view, quite clearly that the Minister's statement can be interpreted to impute improper motives.

Hon. Members will recall, again, that when the hon. Minister of Communications was speaking yesterday, I interrupted him also when, in the course of his speech, he attempted to throw blame on certain hon. Members of this House for the events of February 16. What I said then is applicable now. It is this: Since a Judicial Commission is to be appointed to investigate all of the aspects of what occurred on February 16, it is improper and, indeed, unfair for Members of this House to attempt to cast the blame on anyone before the Commission arrives in this country or the personnel even is announced.

In the circumstances, hon. Members, I want to appeal to all of you that in whatever remains to be said on this Budget—I know that there are several Members yet to speak—Members should refrain from giving their personal opinion by inference or otherwise as to the cause of the incidents or where the blame should be laid. I have heard, on both sides of the House, appeals being made to get together. I join in saying let us unite; let us try and forget those scars which have been created in the body politic in this country. How are we going to have these scars removed, if we continue digging into these scars and wounds?

My position here as Speaker is one whereby I have to try and hold a perfect balance. I, I think, more than any other Member in this House, have no axe to grind because I am the only one who has not been elected—elected directly by the people of this country. You, hon. Members, did me the extreme honour by unanimously asking me to preside over this Legislative Assembly. At the time of my election by both sides of the House high praise was showered on me—perhaps, more than I deserved—and since you have me here you must trust my judgment to see that the things which are said in this House will redound to the credit of the country, and lead on to that progress whereby we will achieve what we all agree on, the independence of the country.

May I now ask hon. Members to resume the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1962.

## APPROPRIATION BILL

### BUDGET DEBATE

**The Premier and Minister of Development and Planning (Dr. Jagan):** "Abolition of unearned income...the complete sequestration of all profits, nationalisation of all joint stock companies, participation in the profits of big concerns, establishment of a sound middle class, immediate municipalisation of the big department stores which shall be let to small tradesmen, the utmost regard for the latter in the allocation of government orders, the death penalty for usurers and profiteers."

One would have thought that what I have just read is a part of the P.P.P.'s manifesto but, believe me, it is part and parcel of the programme of the National Socialist German Workers' Party — the Nazi Party of Adolph Hitler. Hitler started out by being a Nationalist as well as a Socialist, mouthing slogans which, apparently, appealed to the working

people at that time. The intention was to get the working class behind his Fascist Party.

We saw not only in this debate, but outside of this House similar steps being taken as were taken by Hitler in order to get working — class people against the very party which has agitated, has fought and continues to fight on their behalf. The debate started off with the question of having confidence in the Government, and as it progressed we had little pin-pricks here and there. Hon. Members spoke of the incompetence on the part of the Government, not having enough land for the people, inadequate services and so on.

Yesterday an hon. Member attempted, in a very long speech, to give us what appeared to be a serious discussion on economics. Great play was made about all the ills in British Guiana. We are all aware of these facts. It was I and the P.P.P. who, several years ago from the inception of the Party, brought forward in very strong language to the people of this country the imbalance in our economy.

What do we find today? Primary production takes up 41 per cent of the gross domestic product. By primary production, I mean agriculture, fisheries, forestry, mining and the processing of these products. The manufacturing of these consumer foods accounts for only 31 per cent of the gross domestic product. The last category catering for personal service and entertainment amounts to 1 per cent only.

One hon. Member referred to the thousands of acres of land which we have in this country, no doubt referring to the serious land—hunger problem facing the country. But merely saying that is not an indication to show that the (P.P.P.) this Government, is responsible for such conditions. These hon. Members have not, unfortunately taken time off to observe what is taking place not

[THE PREMIER]

only in the whole world, but even around us. Let me just make reference to one area, Latin America, because we have a similar situation here: lack of industries, economic imbalance, land hunger and so on. Let me refer to some of these countries to show the situation there.

Tin	59%	of Bolivia's exports
Coffee	86%	of Colombia's exports
	61%	of Haiti's exports
	74%	of Brazil's exports
		of Nicaragua's exports
	84%	of El Salvador's exports
	82%	of Guatemala's exports.

2.30 p.m.

Most of these countries depend on coffee — one crop. Before the present Government, the Castro got into power, before the attempts at rapid industrialization which are now on foot, 85 per cent of Cuba's exports came from one produce—sugar. Take the Dominican Republic next door — 50 per cent of its income comes from sugar. Some Latin American countries are called "banana republics". Here they are: Ecuador — banana accounts for 56 per cent of that country's income; Honduras — 66 per cent; Uruguay — 52 per cent; Costa Rica — 59 per cent. Go down further south — Chile: 63 per cent of the country's income comes from one mineral, copper. In Venezuela, 97 per cent of the country's export comes from one product, oil. Oil employs only about 3 per cent of the total population of the country.

The hon. Member says the P.P.P. is responsible for the situation in British Guiana. It seems to me that if we are to follow this argument to its logical conclusion, then the P.P.P. bug must have been very active in the Latin American republics also where we have a similar situation; where we have unemployment today at a high level, where

we have the same attempts being made to improve the economy from its depression, from its state of stagnation.

Ten years ago and even before that, when the People's Progressive Party went to the street corners and said that there was need for land reform, that all the big holdings in the hands of sugar estates and others must be divided up and given to the people; when we talked about the need for industrialization; when we talked about planning; it was then said that we were Communists, that only Communists talked about land reform and about economic planning. I was fortunate to attend a conference of the Economic Commission for Latin America last May, and it was pleasing to hear that all the Latin American countries are now thinking about these same things — land reform, planning, industrialization.

Indeed, the position has deteriorated so badly that President Kennedy has said in his Alliance for Progress Programme that unless there is basic social and economic reform, fiscal reform, land reform, there will be no more aid coming. Yes, a lot of money went into Latin America, billions of dollars went in, but where did it go? My hon. Friend speaks about incentive, creating confidence, low taxation. Go into Latin America. What do you find? Taxes are low, but that is not all. No one bothers to collect the taxes because the people who are the collectors of taxes and the politicians own everything. There is no land reform because the politicians own most of the land. And when the money is given, it goes down the gutter — corruption, bribery, nepotism.

Foreign capital was invited. Conditions were certainly very favourable to the encouragement of private enterprise, of foreign investments. More capital has flown into Latin America in the im-

mediate post-war era from the United States than into any other area in the world. But where is Latin America today? In 1958, because of a fall in price of primary products, Latin America's income dropped by \$700 million. At the last conference, Dr. R. Prebitch, the Executive Secretary of E. C. L. A., pointed out that Latin America had to export larger quantities, in some cases as much as 40 per cent to 50 per cent in volume, in order to get the same income.

It is not for the want of confidence, for the want of encouragement, that Latin America is today in the doldrums. Today, this area of which we are a part is in the doldrums because of the basic economic philosophy which my hon. Friend is pleading for in this country. Capitalism is in serious trouble today, and its death pangs are having serious repercussions in the underdeveloped countries of the world. I will develop that point a little more in a little while when I talk about the need for industrialization. But the fact is that these countries—all of us, whether we are colonies or semi-colonies, politically dependent or politically independent—are economically subservient. Whatever the situation, we are the producers of raw materials which the manufacturing countries, the industrialized countries, need and we have been getting the raw end of the deal. President Kennedy, in a statement made not long ago, referred to this problem of the gap between the rich countries and the poor countries getting wider.

We do not have only two worlds today — the Communist world and the Capitalist world. We have three worlds, for inside the belly of the Capitalist world there is another world. This one is fighting for its deliverance. The world's population is estimated to be about three billion, of which one billion is today in the Socialist sector of the

world. One billion people are today living in the system wherein Socialism is the dominant economic creed. Two billion live where Capitalism is dominant. Of these two billion, we find that two-thirds live in the underdeveloped areas like Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East, Africa and Asia. The other one-third live in the rich countries.

Mr. Nehru, the Trade Commissioner for India, not the Prime Minister, at a recent conference — a World Trade conference—in Ronoake, Virginia, mentioned the fact that the underdeveloped countries in the capitalist orbit of the world make up 1,350 million of the 2 billion. Their people enjoy annually an income of \$190 billion. The two-thirds enjoy \$190 billion, but the one-third enjoys \$864 billion in national income. Such is the distribution of wealth in these areas. President Kennedy referred to the north and south relationship. By this he meant the industrialized metropolitan countries and the underdeveloped colonial and semi-colonial countries, whether in the south or the north.

This was certainly a misnomer, but for the purpose of ordinary conception it was probably a correct term to use. Let me just quote from *Labour Research*, a United Kingdom publication, an article from *Westminster Bank Review* quoting Sir Robert Hall, late Economic Adviser to the British Government. This article is called "Two sorts of nation"—not the Communist and the Capitalist, but the two sorts in the Capitalist world, what is regarded as this prosperous monolithic bloc but which, in fact, has one bloc which is desperately poor and one bloc which is very rich. The article states:

"The under-developed countries, like the poor, are always with us. But sometimes more so than others. In the last seven years the terms of trade have changed by 20 per cent. to their detriment. The prices of the goods they sell

## [THE PREMIER]

have fallen by one-fifth relatively to the prices of the goods they want to buy from developed areas. Sir Robert Hall, late Economic Adviser to the Government, writing of the relationship between the advanced industrial countries in the Northern Hemisphere and the under-developed countries most of which are near the tropics or in the southern half of the world, points out:

"Many of the outstanding political and economic problems of our time are connected with this North-South relationship. . . ."

2.45 p.m.

Another section of this article states:

"The U.K. is, as Sir Robert Hall says, a particularly acute example of the process. Between 1953 and 1961, the terms of trade have improved by 18 per cent. Import prices have dropped by 5 per cent. (to October 1961) and export prices risen by 11 per cent. Unit prices of exported engineering goods have risen by 22 per cent. This has provided a temporary hidden bonus to the economy."

No wonder that a few years ago the Tory Prime Minister said "You have never had it so good." Apparently time is catching up with them because, as this article points out, you cannot go on buying cheap and selling dear, and hope forever to get people to have money to buy from you. The time will come when the account will not balance up. If the people have no money they will not be able to buy from you. This is why today the U.K. is hustling to join the European Common Market. It is claimed that trade with the Commonwealth is falling for many reasons, one reason being the fall in total income as the result of the drop in prices — a lack of purchasing power. Another reason is the fact that from those countries there is a perpetual drain on wealth.

Churchill was able to boast, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, that income from investments amounted to £300 million per annum, and from other services like shipping and insur-

ance, about £65 million per annum. He was also able to say that this ~~is~~ accounted for the very high standard of living in the United Kingdom, comparatively higher at that time than in any other country in the world. Today the situation is more or less the same, especially from the directions of trade. The average annual income from dividends, profits and interest from 1955 to 1957 was £275 million, and from 1958 to 1960, £336 million per annum.

I give those figures to show that the poverty of British Guiana, indeed the poverty of the world today, is not due to the P.P.P. and the wicked communists, as we are led to believe. Indeed, if communists and socialists are winning power, making gains all over the world, it is because the basic wickedness and the inherent contradictions of the capitalist system are grinding out poverty on a wide scale. The results are inescapable, as we see them today. Let us look at Latin America. Has capital flowed in? Let the hon. Member who is the spokesman for capitalism and "people's capitalism" tell us about the drain from Latin America, and indeed the drain from British Guiana. In one year (1956) \$450 million was going out as payment for interest and capital, while an almost equal sum was coming in by way of loans to Government. In the period 1945 — 1955 a total sum of about \$7½ billion was made in Latin America, of which \$1 billion was re-invested, during which time a sum of \$2 billion was brought in which meant a net drain of \$3½ billion in one decade. It is not due to the wickedness of a few people as you see on this side of the House. Don't they look like reasonable men? [Laughter].

The fact is that we are living today in a world which has become closely knit together. We are not living in the days when communications were difficult, when countries were more or less economically content. We are living today

when international trusts, combines and cartels are devouring the world; the big giants are swallowing up the little giants, the sharks eating up the serpents. There is a book written by a former President of Guatemala which provides very interesting reading.

While on this point I would like to suggest to hon. Members that if they would like to get a complete grasp of the situation they should look at the bible, *The Political Economy of Growth*, by Professor Paul Baron.

**Mr. d'Aguiar:** That is the communist bible.

**The Premier:** The hon. Member will soon be seeing communists under his bed. I recall that a former U. S. Minister of Defence had to be sent to a mental home. He jumped through a window because he thought he saw some communists coming after him. I have heard that a lawyer of a very famous family in British Guiana is in the same condition. He is going around telling people "Jagan is taking away my property." I am seriously recommending this book to hon. Members because they will see the relationship I have been talking about. Whether it was written by a communist, a Marxist-Socialist, or what, does not matter. We do not read only books written by Marxists; we read books such as *Economic Growth*, by Rostov, *Must Men Starve?* by a Professor of Columbia University; we read Myrdal's work, *Rich Lands, Poor Lands, The Geography of Hunger*, by Dr. Jose de Castro, former Director General of F. A. O., and *Problems of Capital Formation*. We read everything, but believe me, after we have read them all we are still of the opinion that this is the master.

Let us come down to some specific details with respect to our own country. Take Agriculture, first of all. On one hand we are told that the Government is doing

nothing; that there is a lot of land, but Government is doing nothing about it, and people are land hungry. On the other hand we are told that the Government has squandered, wasted \$100 million and cannot account for it. We are told that Government has done nothing for the people at Black Bush Polder, and in the same breath we are told that Government has spent too much money at Black Bush, and nearly \$20 million on the Torani canal. Where are we going? I am not going to say who made the mistakes — why stop gates had to be put in the Torani canal. It was not this Government that formulated the programme dealing with the Torani canal, but I am not going to lay blame at this stage.

The point is that this Government is aware that agriculture must be put on a sound footing. Agriculture is basic, not only for development of this country but of any country. We have spent a great deal of money on agriculture, and indeed we need to spend much more on about a quarter of a million acres of land at Mahaicony-Abary, on half a million acres in the Greater Canje scheme, and on development schemes in the interior. The hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar) suggested that we should build a road into the interior. This Government has in its programme the construction of a road into the interior. It was I who got the Americans to come here to make a feasibility survey for a road to the interior.

3 p.m.

It was this Government who got the United States Government to send engineers here and spend a great deal of money on this project. To build a road requires about \$56 million. I suppose we will get it by giving away the land. We do not have money even to carry out the schemes which are right here on the coast. If we had money we would build the East Coast Road, build a new

[THE PREMIER]

hospital and so on. You are aware that we argued that the two projects which were initiated and started by the Interim Government should have been included in the \$110 million Development Plan.

Some hon. Members referred to the waste of money on the Torani Irrigation Scheme and at Boerasirie. We are not going to apologize for that, because those projects were neither conceived by us nor mainly executed by us. Those who criticize our agricultural policy must know that when Mr. Adler from the World Bank came here he said that he had a peep at the Government's Development Programme and was satisfied that the priorities were correctly assessed. I suppose that Mr. Adler will soon be called a Communist, too! It is quite simple to call people names, but it is not an objective way to look at the situation.

There is no doubt about it that the agricultural policy of this Government has paid off. [Mr. Kendall: "A lot of money is spent on rice."] We hear a lot of talk about Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad. Go to those places and ask the people about the cost of living. Ask those officers who have left here and gone to Jamaica—the officers who were attracted by the high salaries offered—what they think of the cost of living? Ask them how they find things after paying for rent, rice and so on?

Sir, we can supply the statistics. The Director of Agriculture has produced them to show what has resulted from the development of agriculture in British Guiana. This has been the pay-off for the present Government's policy. Commodities are available on the market not only in sufficient quantities, but also at cheap prices. Hon. Members must find out what is the price of rice in Trinidad and Jamaica. It is sold at 18c per pound in Jamaica—nearly twice as

much as the price of our rice. I understand that Trinidad's latest Budget indicates that the price of rice is going up.

The basic commodities in this country are rice, flour, oil, beef, fish and sugar. Practically all of these commodities have stood still for the last decade. That is why the cost of living in this country has remained fairly constant and has not moved forward very much. This explains why, even in the original Budget proposals before the taxes were withdrawn from some of the important commodities, the increase in the cost of living index figures would have gone up merely by about 1 per cent on imported articles. Why? Because the basic necessities are here. That is what this Government has done, despite the criticisms and insinuations that the Government was doing things only to please one section of the community. By the way, hon. Members did not tell us who operates the draglines, tractors and so on. They did not tell us that, had it not been for these schemes, the people in Georgetown would have had to pay more for certain commodities. They did not tell us of the indirect employment which is provided by way of transport, marketing and on the waterfront as a result of produce being produced in other parts of the country. It is not good to create strife by fooling the people and not telling them these things.

Quite recently we heard a great deal of noise about Trinidad. I do not want to criticize any Government because it is not in good taste to do so. But let it be known that four economists recently resigned—Hill is one of them. These are not supporters of the P.P.P. [Interruption.] Those who talk in racial terms are always thinking about race. They are not Indians; they resigned from the I.D.C. There was an article in the *Graphic*. And not one of those people has said that the course being pursued will lead to the salvation of the people in Trinidad. [Mr. d'Aguiar:

“Four years ago.”] It was not four years ago; it was two years ago; it was then that these resignations took place. Hon. Members should talk to the economists in Jamaica who sat on the Social and Economic Research Committee. Ask them what they think of the so-called plans for the West Indies, and they will tell you why many of them want to leave and come to work in British Guiana.

When a Trinidadian comes here to work, some of you keep shouting “Jack go home.” How do you expect them to come here with Fascist and people like that in this country? [Mr. Kendall: “You call the British Troops ‘Limeys’ and they still come.”]

Mr. Speaker, I will spend a few minutes in order to deal with what the hon. Member for Georgetown Central said when he tried to compare Trinidad and Surinam with British Guiana. He referred to the fact that those countries are making rapid strides while British Guiana remains static. I do not like to deal with exceptions to rules. That is why I have tried to give, first of all, a comprehensive view of what is happening in the world today. One can take examples which are not characteristic and which are exceptions to the rule. The hon. Member, for instance, could have referred to Puerto Rico, but I notice that he has not done so. I do not know whether it is because Governor Munoz Morin got into difficulties with the Catholic Church as a result of his education policy. [Mr. d’Aguiar: “Puerto Rico is not a neighbour, and it is not near enough to be used as a reasonable example.”] He referred to the national growth or national income in Trinidad and in British Guiana and, *ipso facto*, drew the conclusion that this was because Dr. Williams’ policy is different from Dr. Jagan’s. Good propagandist that he is, he said: “Look at oil. Trinidad is today a small producer of oil in this world, and yet Trinidad is far ahead. Look at British Guiana

which is a large producer of bauxite, the second producer in the world, but because of Dr. Jagan it has gone to third place.”

Sir, we hope that hon. Members will not argue in the Legislature as one argues at the street corners or in certain newspapers. We hope that one will debate things here logically, and put all of the facts before this House. What was the rate of growth in Trinidad before Dr. Williams took over? It was left to one hon. Member on this side of the Table to say how much was accruing by way of revenue from oil in Trinidad. Do not worry about whether it is 10 per cent or 100 per cent of the oil world, the important thing is how much is it contributing to the national income of the country.

Why are we slipping from second place to third place in the bauxite world? Because ore was discovered in Jamaica; because it is cheaper to transport ore from Jamaica to the United States of America and Canada—shorter distances—and it does not take a genius to recognize that. It was not because of Government’s policy. The Government gave all of the concessions that were demanded by those companies for the Alumina Plant. These concessions were given long before the P.P.P. came on the scene. We are dealing with the laws of economics; we are dealing with economic factors. One must take into account all of these facts.

3.15 p.m.

As regards industrialisation, surely it is basic that if people are going to set up industries, first of all, they must have certain common services. They must have water. They must have electricity. They must be able to have a market, whether internal or external. They must have good port facilities. Can we say that British Guiana has the same pre-condition as Trinidad? Can it be properly charged that it is be-

[THE PREMIER]

cause of the P.F.P. Government that we do not have these pre-conditions? Did we make the bar? It was this Government which went to the United Nations and got a Special Fund team to come and spend nearly one-third of a million dollars to do a research to find a solution to the problems of the bar. Is it this Government which was responsible for the fact that the Electricity Company did nothing, only extracted profits instead of doing what it was supposed to do by law, that is, to supply its franchise area with electricity to have sufficient power available for industrial development and so forth? The P.F.P. is to be blamed for this too! Arguing by simple analogy is not sound argument.

Let us take Surinam—again a neighbouring territory. By the way, Trinidad has a larger home population than British Guiana as regards being a market for industrialized goods. [Mr. d'Aguiar: "Surinam has less."]—We will deal with Surinam just now. Surinam is developed. Why? Incidentally, it is not industrialized. It was developed, but what are the factors involved in Surinam's development? Immediately after the War, the Dutch were kicked out of Indonesia. They were not as fortunately or unfortunately—whichever way you want to look at it—placed as the United Kingdom. They had only a few possessions.

Having been kicked out of the Far East—Sumatra, Java, Borneo—they had only the small islands of Bonaire, Curacao and Aruba in the West Indies, and Surinam next door. Therefore, they decided to be very generous and to hold on to these. [Mr. d'Aguiar: "The British were kicked out of India."]—The British were kicked out of India, but they had the whole of Africa and elsewhere to deal with. That is why when I went to them for loans they said, "Look at our responsibility. If we give you so

much, what about the other places?" Some people suffer from myopia. say we never had a plan. The Plan was formulated with the advice of a World Bank expert, Mr. Adler, Mr. Berrill of Cambridge University, and the blessings of the Treasury and the Colonial Office. But yet we hear we never had a plan. I do not know what one can do with people like these.

Surinam developed because the Dutch, having been left with these two small areas, decided to make a magnanimous gesture and poured money into it. One-third of the Development Programme of Surinam is by way of grants from the Netherlands. Let the hon. Member say that. He does not tell us these things. What is more, many of the Dutchmen who left Indonesia came to Surinam bringing a lot of capital know-how. They set up a big rice scheme. There was not such situation in this British colony. The British were not running away from anywhere. This was not their last outpost.

In addition to that, what kind of development has taken place there? The hon. Member referred to the \$60 million U.S. investment in hydro-electricity. What he has failed to understand is that that was not done primarily for Surinam. That was done because Alcoa wanted to have cheap hydro-electricity. The aluminium world has a few big monopolists—Alcoa, Aluminium Limited, which was formerly a blood relative, and now on the scene, Reynolds. Alcan is a holding of Aluminium Limited in Canada.

Aluminium Limited and Alcan have the cheapest source of power in Canada. In the United States of America, they have two disadvantages in competing in the aluminium world. Number one, they have very low grade ores, and number two, most of their power has to come from high-cost electricity for the smelting of bauxite into aluminium.

Some of the smelters are using electricity made from coal, and this is why, to put Alcoa in a relatively more competitive position, they have decided to develop hydro-electricity in Surinam. It is not a matter of encouragement. It is a matter of what was in their interest.

Alcan—with its subsidiary, Demba, here—does not have to set up plant because it has surplus capacity in hydro-electricity in Canada at the moment; more than it needs. It was thinking of doing so at one stage—you remember, it carried out investigations here—but gave up the idea because it was too costly, costly not in comparison with what electricity was being generated for by its competitors in the United States, but costly in relation to the cost in Canada. Developing electricity here would be no more costly than in Surinam, but it depends on who wants the electricity and why it is wanted. This is the point I am trying to make, but the hon. Member cannot comprehend this. In other words, it is left to the companies to decide when and where they are going to develop.

Indeed, right now, you see what is happening. A company is about to pull out. They say we are not encouraging companies. One is on the point of pulling out. I refer to Harvey Aluminium which has been spending several hundred thousands of dollars, more than a million, in trying to find bauxite here. But what do we find? Well, that company is trying to pull out. Other companies have ores which may last for a long number of years and which they are not working now—companies which have subsidiaries in other parts of the world. Reynolds has a subsidiary in Jamaica and in Haiti; Alcan has in Jamaica and elsewhere, and so it goes.

If I were to take away any of this, if the Government were to take away any of the large reserves held to give to another company which is prepared to

do a bigger scale of operation; which, if it had sufficient bauxite here, would have been prepared to set up an aluminium plant here, which company is now going to the Virgin Islands, you will find the mighty wrath of the big vested interests of the United States of America and Canada coming down on the Government, and people who say they are interested in the workers attacking the Government vigorously.

The bauxite which is buried down there may, in a few years' time, mean nothing to us. During the War, when resources in bauxite were regarded as being small because all the discoveries of bauxite deposits all over the world were not yet made, experiments were being carried out in the United States to develop technological processes which would smelt low-grade ores into ores from things like mud. The Arkansas mines, owned by Reynolds, are generally low-grade ores. Who knows what technological process will be developed in a few years' time as a result of which our ores might become valueless?

The hon. Members say that we by our policy, have driven away these people, that we have no industries. Tax holidays were on the statute books of British Guiana since 1951. The People's Progressive Party first came into office in 1953, but that was only for a short period. You cannot count that. Even though it came into office in 1957, it did not have power, nor did it do anything to hinder those companies from operating here. There is no change. The policy is a policy which was enacted into law in 1951.

What about Mr. Case? Mr. Case was talking about industries here before many of us were born. Why didn't they set them up then? Why weren't they established? In those days there were not even the tax incentives which have come in the West Indies. These are all new features. Why weren't they

[THE PREMIER]

established? It is all right to say that it is because of the P.P.P.'s policies there is no industrialization in British Guiana, but I can assure hon. Members that as long as we are in office, this country will be industrialized.

Surinam has moved forward because of a big influx of foreign capital from outside for a specific purpose, to develop one scheme, but that is not balanced development. A lot of capital flowed into Venezuela next door. A few years ago the hon. Member was praising the dictatorship of Jimenez and was saying what a wonderful, glorious place Venezuela was. Where is it today? [An hon. Member: "It is still there."] It is still there, but things are different. How many people are out of work, are living in the slums in the hills bordering beautiful Caracas?

3.30 p.m.

We do not want only segments of our economy developed and controlled by the imperialists outside. We want a balanced growth instead of an immediate short-term development, as in Surinam. That is not real development, and indeed one will find, after a few years, that more money will flow out of that country than is coming in. We have the classic example of our Electricity Corporation. I have cited that often enough, and I do not think I need say any more. Suffice it to say that the Electricity Corporation, with extension to the Georgetown environs and with rural electrification, is estimated to produce \$60 million profit in 20 years. This is what we want to hold in this country, not to allow the imperialists to decide when and where they must develop. For instance, in the case of our bauxite reserves we cannot even get another company to come and work them now, because the reserves are tied up. Must we wait forever on the com-

panies to decide where and when to choose their victims, and play one against another?

This plan has not borne any fruit in the under-developed countries of the world, and that is why the people in those countries today are in revolt. That is why today even from Right Wing politicians we hear talk of protection. In Venezuela and Brazil there are high tariff walls to protect native industries. That is why we hear today talk of planning so that the resources of a country can be mobilized. We cannot allow large sums of money to be frittered away which could be useful for development. That is the problem today in the backward countries. We intend to have such a programme. And remember that whatever the Government may be, it cannot do anything unless there are financial resources at its disposal. Whether money will come from outside or inside the country, it has to be found. Most of the experts who are now looking at this matter say that we must look increasingly to internal resources for development. We hear that \$500 million is going to come here for infrastructure development, and that another \$500 million will come as private investments—half a billion in loans and half a billion in investments. I do not know from which world these millions are going to come, whether from Mars. We should send some of our politicians to the moon in the next flight.

What did the Missions say when they came here before I went to the United States? The aid which the U.S. Government gives to other parts of the world amounts to \$5 per head of the population. So that if British Guiana were to get aid from the U.S. it will be entitled to five times 600,000 people—nearly \$3 million. That is what was told to us, but some people apparently

have the air—I do not know whose air they have but they are going to find these millions of dollars. They are going to encourage half a billion dollars of investments to come here. This country of half a million people is going to get half a billion dollars of investments. Brazil, with between 30 and 40 million people, cannot encourage half a billion dollars in private investments, but British Guiana is going to encourage it with a small home market.

Hon. Members are not facing the reality of our situation. If we do not produce for our home market where would we be producing for? What are we going to ship outside? We cannot produce sufficient rice even for the Cubans, but at least we have that market sewn up. [An hon. Member: "How long will Castro be there?"] Castro will be there for some time. Sugar—we see what is happening in the sugar world. At one time we said "Grow more coffee." Farmers grew coffee but now hon. Members are objecting because we are trying to protect our farmers by increasing the import duty on "Nescafe." The bottom has fallen from the coffee market in the world. Cocoa—when I was in Ghana it was fetching a good price, and our experts said "Let us grow cocoa." Now cocoa is in a state of flux.

When I was in Canada I was entertained by the Aluminum Company at dinner, and the high officials of the Canadian Company pointed out that there is at present a surplus (existing capacity and what is planned) of 2½ million tons of aluminum. Is it being suggested that the capitalists outside are going to come and set up aluminium plants here for markets which are flooded with aluminium? If people think so they need to have their heads examined. Harvey is a small company which has no bauxite reserves of its own. I am talking about the giants who control the bauxite world—the

monopolies. Our bauxite reserves are controlled by two Companies, Reynolds and Demba. Both of these Companies have surplus capacity at the moment. I do not know if the hon. Member intends that Government should take those reserves away from them and give them to somebody else.

3.40 p.m.

I would like to hear him on that point. [Mr. d'Aguiar: "I said that there was a world surplus and nobody wanted it."] Let us take either of the fields of activity. We have iron ore, and it is said to be of low grade. We are advised that it cannot be worked economically, and that ore of this grade is not being worked in the developed countries which are readily accessible. We have not found oil yet.

With regard to timber, the markets are also glutted. I will show you how things can be produced and marketed later on. Reference was made yesterday to the 'package deal' arrangements. Criticisms were levelled at these arrangements. What were we told? We were told that we have to pay dear for equipment that is unsatisfactory and so on. But the fact is that this country will not be developed unless it moves forward in the industrial sector simultaneously with agricultural development. We must have a balanced growth, industrially and agriculturally.

Thus far we have concentrated on the agricultural sector. This is bearing fruit as I have pointed out, but it must be noted that, unlike most agricultural countries, British Guiana is a high-cost agricultural producer. In most countries unemployment problems are solved by putting people to work on the land for cheap wages. Putting people to do agricultural work is generally regarded as the cheapest form in solving unemployment, but it is not so in British Guiana because of the very high cost of drainage and irrigation and so on. We have

## [THE PREMIER]

done it, and we will continue to do it, but the economy will never be able to stand if it is restricted only to a certain sector. That is responsible for our present position.

One hon. Member said that we should build more roads. Should we take all of the money which we are putting into agriculture today and divert it to the building of roads? We need both; if we had the money we would build more roads, but when one has limited financial resources one must decide on priorities. If it is a question of drainage and irrigation, then I say that we have, *perforê*, to look after drainage and agriculture first because the rate of economic growth from agriculture is far greater than from the development of roads. It must not be understood that we do not want to build roads. As I have mentioned already roads are costly, and people who have constructed monuments, highways and roads—Venezuela is an example—have found out bitterly that the mere construction of these is not sound development.

The capitalists have had a field day in this country and they have not taken advantage of it. It is no use complaining that it is the fault of the P.P.P. There was incentive legislation here on the same scale as in other places, and nothing was done to take advantage of it. It is absolutely necessary for us to have industrial development. It was not done, and I say it will not be done in the future—not because of our philosophy, but because of the general trend of things in the world today. Private investors are running away from underdeveloped countries to the developed ones.

I see in a paper here called the *Sun* an article headed "Jagan Talks from Lord Rootes' Belly." This paper is dated Saturday, 7th April, and it is published by Mr. d'Aguiar. I quote:

'It is impertinent for the author of this statement to palm it off as having been issued jointly by Lord Rootes and Jagan. Jagan is trying to make the public believe that Rootes shares his ideological beliefs.'

The *Sun* goes on to state:

"The mission agreed that with the smallness of the British Guiana market there is little immediate prospects of fresh large-scale private investment."

Lord Rootes and this Mission share the same economic and political beliefs as the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, but, because Lord Rootes has contradicted the nonsense that he is peddling around here regarding private investments, he says that I am lying. The fact is that Lord Rootes and two of his colleagues spent hours with me before this statement was made, and Lord Rootes not only agreed with but congratulated me before his departure. Yet we read these lies and mis-statements in this paper. I will refer to these statements in a moment.

The point is that this country must have industrial growth. That has not been done by private investors in this country or from outside before, and I say it will not be done in the future for many reasons. The present stage of recession in the capitalist world will not permit certain things to be done, though it is in the interest of capitalists to continue investing money. I am talking in terms of retail industrial development and manufacturing industries, and not merely of a few small industries for producing things for the home market.

The hon. Member referred to Jamaica. Yesterday it did not suit him to refer to Jamaica so he referred to Surinam and Trinidad. He did not refer to Puerto Rico because Governor Marin fought very vigorously Church interests because of his education policy which, incidentally, is the same as this Government's. In Jamaica there is also a tremendous growth in industry. The other day we were given the figures,

but today they have not been cited. Why? Because Mr. Manley was defeated at the recent Election!

3.50 p.m.

It just shows that all these nancy stories we are hearing are not true, that these superficial statements which are made as being pointers to real development have not got any substance in fact. [Mr. d'Aguiar: "Give an instance of real development or a provision for real development."]—I will give an instance.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the two hon. Members wish to have a discussion by themselves, they may do so. But if they wish to have the attention of the Chair they will have to refrain from this cross-talk.

**The Premier:** Sir, I regret the interruption.

I would like to deal with what was referred to yesterday as package-deal arrangements. I say that this country will be industrialized and that the Government will take a leading hand in industrialization. We have set one example which is now proving to be successful. This is the Electricity Corporation. [An hon. Member: "The Rice Development Company."] Let us not keep referring to the Rice Development Company. The Rice Development Company, first of all, was badly conceived. Equipment much bigger in capacity than the padi available in the area was first established. Now, the milling capacity is adequate, but the drying, milling and cleaning facilities are inadequate. That is the kind of planning which went on in this country before.

We see the necessity to integrate this, but it requires money. As you know, we have tried to get money. Last year May, I took the requirements to the Import/Export Bank, an agency of the

United States of America. We pointed out the urgency; we pointed out that the equipment was required for the last crop. Up to now, unfortunately, we have got no word about this equipment. We have got some offers from East Germany which are now being examined, and I hope that very soon we will be in a position to establish these mills and demonstrate that they will pay.

One of the main reasons why these mills are losing money, apart from the fact that they were badly planned, is the amount of money that is paid out in interest each year. You are aware of this, sir. It is a fact that the high interest rate charged by the Colonial Development Corporation is putting a heavy burden on this enterprise, and this is one of the main reasons why it is losing money. If it had a 2½ per cent interest rate which one can get from the Soviet bloc, if it could get the easy terms, then certainly, it would not have been in the position in which it has found itself today. We do not want to set up plants which are going to lose money. These package deal plants are going to be examined critically and carefully. Only when they are found to be feasible, economically sound, will they be embarked upon.

The hon. Member said, "Tell us which country has developed." I remember when I was in the United States I was told, "Why don't you criticize the Russians for imperialism in the so-called satellites?" I said so far as I was concerned, imperialism was an economic relationship. This relationship inevitably meant lack of industrialization. Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria — all these countries before the War were colonies of Germany. They were free, but they were no more than economic nerves and colonies of Greater Germany. Today, these countries are in a position to sell complete plants, complete factories. United Nations statistics have shown

[THE PREMIER]

that they have moved forward industrially at a comparatively greater rate than any other country in any other sector of the world.

The hon. Member referred to the high prices of these goods. Let me refer to the glass factory which he mentioned. We did not make the negotiations. A previous Member of Parliament, Mr. Ian Mikardo, who was an industrial consultant, approached several countries. Finally, from West Germany, from England, from the United States, and from Hungary, quotations came for a complete glass plant. It was found, on comparison, that the Hungarian plant was the cheapest. [Mr. d'Aguiar: "It is the smallest."]—The cheapest — [Mr. Kendall: "Answer that. It was the smallest."] —I have already been advised not to —

**Mr. Speaker:** We cannot have question time at this stage. We are in the midst of a debate.

**The Premier:** Some little noise was made that it was the smallest. I am talking about comparative figures, which took size into consideration.

Why was it not established? This is another matter: because of the set-up that we had in this country; because of the kind of advisers we were getting here who clearly saw some other policy, so that they did not want countries like ours to be industrialized. I would like to quote from a speech which I made at Howard University during my recent visit:

"Mr. Albert Powers, the leader of the U.S. delegation to the International Industrial Exposition in Bogota in 1955 gave this answer on behalf of the U.S. Government: 'It is the policy of my government not to intervene in the financing of activity which should properly be promoted by private enterprise. It is up to you people to create business and industrial opportunities which will attract investment capital

from the United States. Remember too, that you must offer the possibilities of greater profits than can be obtained at home."

Greater profits! What does it mean? The average profit on U.S. foreign investments abroad is 17 per cent. I am not speaking of the 40 per cent that is paid by people like Bank Breweries. You have this freak in Africa—220 per cent and 300 per cent in the copper mines. I am talking of average. At an average profit of between 17 per cent and 20 per cent per year, a factory can pay for itself between five to eight years. It means that the factory will be self-liquidating in a short time.

That is the kind of assistance that we need, not for people to come and tell us, "Do the infrastructure only. Build roads only." When we went to the United States of America on the mission, we drew up a list of projects, an expanded list. Adding this to the present Programme, it came up to \$413 million. Build a road to the Interior: start drainage and irrigation schemes, a small hydro-electric scheme. Of that \$413 million, only \$60 million was devoted to industries. Another \$40 million was for a hydro-electric scheme. Subtract that from \$413 million. That leaves \$313 million merely for infrastructure development here, which economists will tell you does not bring money back quickly.

How much does one have to pay? I do not know if Members are aware of the debt burden. One Member has said that nobody must develop his country from taxes, but from loans.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the point of loans, may we now suspend the sitting for tea.

*Sitting suspended from 4 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.*

*4.30 p.m.*

*On resumption —*

**The Premier:** Before the adjournment I was dealing with the question of an expanded Development Programme which all hon. Members of this House desire. I mentioned the fact that a sum of about \$400 million is required, of which about \$300 million is required for infrastructure development. Whether we have industrialization by private enterprise, by the Government, or by a combination of Government and private enterprise, it is necessary to do all that is required to lay the basis for the take-off, to use Mr. Rostov's term. But Members must appreciate that if we are to get funds of this magnitude in this country, if they can be found at all, this country will be faced with a colossal burden if loans have to be raised at conventional rates of interest. When Mr. Berrill came here he made a simple calculation to illustrate what the debt burden on the country would be like if British Guiana undertook a large Development Programme. Taking the then current rate of interest of 6 per cent he pointed out that if we embarked on a \$200 million Development Programme instead of the \$110 million, our debt charges would be increased from 12 per cent of our revenues, which was the figure from 1955 to 1959, to a figure of 31 per cent by 1970-1974.

It should be appreciated that no country can face such a fantastic burden on its recurrent revenues. Even a limited programme of \$200 million, which cannot even be regarded as being adequate, would have imposed a fantastic burden on this country at the then prevailing rate of interest. Fortunately, since that time, because of East-West competition because Russia began to give loans particularly to countries like Egypt and India at nominal rates of interest — I recall the loan for the Aswan Dam which was given free of interest — because of these factors we now see that the U.S. Government has also embarked on procedures by which loans can be made available at very nominal rates of

interest, as low as  $\frac{3}{4}$  of one per cent. Under the Alliance For Progress Programme interest rates vary, depending on the scheme, but there again, for social development, for the building of schools and other infrastructure development, the rates of interest are also very low.

This, therefore, brings us to the point that if we are to have bigger and bigger development programmes this country must inevitably depend on mobilizing its own resources, whether the P.N.C. or the P.P.P. is in office.

**Mr. Burnham:** What about the U.F.?

**The Premier:** No hope of that. [Laughter]. The fact remains that no one is going to give away money, and even if we got loans interest free, those loans would have to be paid back. The debt burden is not only on the basis of the interest charge but also on the principal, the capital which has to be paid back over a period of years. Whether a loan is for 12, 20 or 40 years it has to be repaid. This also contributes to the debt burden. Indeed, one can say it is the greater factor. So that all countries are now being advised, whether the adviser is a communist or a middle-of-the-road economist, or a Right Wing socialist or a capitalist sympathizer, the advice from every quarter is that every Government must try to mobilize as much of its resources as it possibly can within its own territory.

This is the reason why this Government has attempted to mobilize its resources (1) by taxation, and (2) by savings. Persons may say that those measures will impose severe hardship. That is a matter for debate. The quantum of hardship has to be measured carefully. The Government has taken due care in proposing taxation measures, that the higher incidence will fall on those who can afford to pay. It was most unfortunate that many people

[THE PREMIER]

began demonstrating against the Budget even before reading what the Budget proposals were, or even before being aware of the incidence of the burden, if burden there was, on what categories they would fall, and so forth.

Hon. Members of this House must begin to face realities. This country is on the threshold of Independence and we cannot continually assume the role of being a subservient people, always looking to a godfather to give us doles and hand-outs. Even the mighty United States of America has not got enough money to give the kind of hand-outs which we are told can be given to this country.

4.45 p.m.

Who have been getting money? Quite recently high-ranking U.S. Officials went to Africa. The Africans were asked: What do you need? Please let me know your requirements. One of the African leaders retorted: "Please send us a few Communists." It is quite clear from what has transpired in recent times that the States that are under the control of Imperialists get little or nothing. We are always told: "Say whether or not you are a Communist?" I will go into that in a moment.

Has Dr. Williams, Mr. Manley, or Sir Grantley Adams either individually or collectively received more financial assistance for their respective countries than British Guiana? No. They have toed the line; the latter two had a lot to do with the Caribbean Labour Congress; they collaborated in the breaking up of the militant, strong, working-class Caribbean Labour Congress. No doubt, that is why they are now reaping the bitter fruits. Sir Grantley Adams has lost the Federation and the Election in his own home. Bustamante has won the Jamaica Elections. The Right Wing

has won against Socialism, but there is no fear of that in British Guiana. [Interruption.] It is no use rapping Table.

The point is that assistance from the United States of America has been going to countries where Right Wing Governments—Capitalists, Fascists and so on — are being threatened by people in working-class movements which are referred to as Socialist or Communist dominated. They talk about Sigmund Rhee, Salazar, Franco and so on. They have created a strong working-class movement. Put things under the leadership of the Right Wing and then, possibly, we will get assistance. In fact one hon. Member suggested that we should take turns over here. He would take one term and frighten one side while we get aid from one side, and then we would reverse things and get more aid from the other side. [Laughter.]

Sir, let us be realistic. Every country which is now preparing a development programme — India, Ghana and so on — has to grapple with the economic question which we have been talking about for the last 10 years. We have been talking merely in political terms, but those countries are, today, doing precisely what we have been saying should be done. Some of my hon. Friends on the opposite side of the Table used to hold Ghana's Day Celebrations. I notice that they have stopped it, because Dr. Nkrumah is now doing, in his economic and foreign policy, precisely what the P.P.P. has been advocating during the last 10 years.

Every country must mobilize its resources. If the P.N.C. were in office for one year with the P.P.P. in the opposition, the P.P.P. would be in office forever because of this talk about \$10 a day. This talk about increased wages and aid coming from "heaven" would disappear, and some of the same

working-class people who have been fooled and misled would be marching under the banner of the P.P.P.

Loans are not going to be forthcoming because money is not available in sufficient quantities. This is what the U.S. Mission experts have said: If they give us loans they will have to give other people. That is the clear logic of their position. If they give us more than \$5 per head or the vast sums of money we need, then other territories would make the same claim and they would be in an embarrassing position for they could not find the money to give them.

Secondly, we must realize that, if we were able to borrow the money, we have to repay the loan even if we got it at a reduced rate of interest. Mr. Ber-rill's figures will show that this country will not be able to pay back large loans. We will only be able to repay loans if we have industrial development simultaneously with infrastructure development at a cost of at least \$300 million. The hon. Member for Georgetown Central said during the recent Election Campaign that he was thinking of \$500 million. Even if we were able to get this sum, we will not be able to pay it back unless we had industrial development which will be able to generate income so that the economy of the country will be able to afford the repayment of its debts as a result of going in for a big Development Programme.

I have said that private industrial development alone cannot succeed because of the present state of things in the world today; because of recessions and depressions; because factories are idle; the steel industry, the barometer of industrial health, is now working at nearly half of its full capacity in the United States of America. In Canada 10 per cent of the people are unemployed. In England you have similar unemployment. In the United States of America five million to six million

are unemployed, and the economies of the countries are practically at a standstill. Even West Germany, which had a fantastic growth in economy, is now slowing down.

The hon. Member for Georgetown Central says that we must not believe people like Lord Rootes. The newspaper said that I was lying. Let us hear what the people from the United Nations have said. The Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, Mr. Phillippe De Seynes, addressing a Conference of the Economic Commission for Latin America in 1961 said:

"In whatever direction the present combination of circumstances may swing, there are serious grounds for believing that the principal forces which for many years have generated and maintained a noteworthy expansion of the Latin American economies are now partly dissipated. To whatever extent certain forecasts may be ventured, there is little reason to expect that exports of raw materials, whether agricultural or industrial — even if a systematic effort were made to secure a foothold in markets hitherto outside Latin America's trade orbit — can possibly develop a pace approaching the predictable rate of increase of the population. Any attempt to conjecture the future movements of foreign capital is clearly the merest speculation; the least that can be said is that the considerable inflow in recent years has probably largely absorbed the most obvious and safest investment possibilities, and that at the present juncture there is no trace of any likelihood of a further contribution on the same scale".

The rate of growth in the postwar period was 2½ per cent per annum. That was recorded as a remarkable rate of growth. But 2½ per cent is relatively small considering what is needed in under-developed countries where you have a population increase amounting to 2½ per cent to 3 per cent a year, and even that small rate is not likely to be achieved at this time. Hon. Members must face these realities. As I see it the time has come for us to grow up. There must be a Budget and there must be money to run a country.

[THE PREMIER]

The hon. Members on this side or that side cannot run this country without money — manna is not going to come from heaven. How are we going to run it? We need industries to generate wealth as well as infrastructure development. I agree with hon. Members that without infrastructure development you cannot have full industrialisation. But one beer factory alone is not industrial development! [Mr. Burnham: "You used some of the beer."] I drank one or two when the beer factory was opened.

Sir, it means that Government must take the bull by the horns and develop industries. The reason why this country has not been developed has nothing to do with the ideological belief of the party in power. It has nothing to do with remarks made by the Members of the Government. From time immemorial this country was underdeveloped. We are faced with a difficult problem. If we are to get aid or loans for industrial development we are told: "Leave it for private enterprise to do." What is left for us to do? We must explore all possible sources not only for equipment and money, but also for markets.

5 p.m.

Indeed, markets are the first prerequisite today for industrialization. It is no use setting up a factory unless you have the market. We can protect the local market by tariff barriers as we have protected some goods already, and we will go ahead with this. Mr. Tenenbaum gave us a list of industries and said that private enterprise should have established at least twelve of them by the end of 1960. We are already in 1962 and we have not seen private enterprise coming forward.

The Government is now considering offers which have been made by the Governments of some countries—Poland, Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

We have been told that not only will we get these factories on favourable credit terms but that a trade agreement will be signed and payment can be made for materials from this country. The Poles have indicated that they want 20,000 tons of rice. The Czechoslovakians have told us they want a similar quantity. Cuba imports nearly 200,000 tons of rice a year. We are producing merely 125,000 tons, but we are now increasing that quantity.

What have we done in the past? We knocked at the World Bank for assistance since 1958. All we got was about \$200 million for agricultural equipment. The money is taken and given to the Credit Corporation. If a farmer requires a tractor or a dragline, he goes to Bookers or Sandbach Parker or Sprostons or one of the other merchants and the money is passed to them. We have been told that we will get equipment on credit to develop not only industries but agricultural schemes. The Poles have said they want peanuts, castor beans, and the Director of Agriculture is now busy working on this. They will give us the necessary equipment, and will take their payment in the products which will be produced by that equipment, whether they be rice, peanuts, castor beans or fibre.

Let us face the reality of our situation. We go to the West, and we get promises and "pushing-around." We do not get markets. When I went to Canada, I said to the officials: Can you buy some more rice from us? Can you buy some more sugar? Can you buy molasses? Can you buy rum? Can you tell us whether you can buy any other thing so that we can begin planning our production? They said: Sorry, we do not make bilateral trade agreements; we will buy in the open markets of the world; we believe in free trade. As Gunnar Myrdal said in his book, free trade is good for those who had a start. It is like telling a

like two-by-four sweet drink shop to compete with d'Aguiar Brothers, which is highly integrated.

Small countries cannot compete in the free markets of the world. To break into the United States with one product costs millions of dollars merely to carry out the advertising campaign. The honourable Senator, Mr. Tasker, told me that before he came here he was associated with a tea company which was trying to break into the United States market with a new brand and of the fantastic sums of money this company had to spend to carry out such a campaign.

The only way a country like ours can develop is to secure the markets in advance by tying the markets up in a long-term trade agreement and being able to get the necessary equipment, either in the agricultural or industrial sector, to carry out that development. This trend has begun and is continuing. One hon. Member said that this will be to our great disadvantage; that we will have to pay high prices and will get defective equipment, and so on and so forth; that we will be paid low prices for what we sell in return. Experience has taught us otherwise.

When I came back here in 1959 and announced that the Cubans were interested in buying rice, what were we told? We were told, "No deal with Cuba". Secondly, we were told that they would not pay; thirdly, that Cuba was now buying rice from China dirt cheap. We have learnt from experience that the rice deal with Cuba has really been a blessing for this country. It has given us a price which is higher, and the fears which were generated have dissipated, have disappeared. Moneys are coming here long before the rice is taken out.

This is the atmosphere, unfortunately, in which we have to work, even though a deal is good and experience

has shown that these deals are good. How is it that these capitalists in Water Street who criticize us are importing shoes, furniture and everything else and making fabulous profits? Yet, they are criticizing the Government for wanting to enter into such barter deals. I can assure you that these capitalists will not trade with those countries unless it had been for the fact that these commodities are being sold at a cheaper price. Why is it they can sell at a lower price? Some may say it is for politics. Some may say it is because they need foreign exchange. I do not care what the reason is. I want the best deal for this country. This is what my party and my Government want—the best deal for this country.

If the private capitalists can import "cebu" shoes and make fortunes out of Czechoslovakia and also Polish furniture simply because they are interested in profits; if they can import textiles which are cheap, why can't we import factories and tractor if they are going to be cheap and provide employment for the people of this country, and if the deal is going to be as favourable as the Cuban deal? But no, we must not do it because this is entering the Cold War.

Let me read a statement by a high-ranking, well-respected Economist, Mr. Thoma Balogh, Fellow of the Balliol College, Oxford. Incidentally, he is not a Communist. In fact, he is just the opposite — an anti-Communist. In a paper entitled *The Economics of World Tension*, this is what he says about trade between Russia and the Communist bloc, and the underdeveloped territories. He talks about the increasing trade which has been developed with all parts of the underdeveloped world, and concludes thus:

"If Russia were to make use of her superior industrial productive capacity to obtain raw materials and food by exchanging them for industrial products, the terms of trade of the primary countries would violently shift in their fav-

## [THE PREMIER]

our, and these countries would have considerable benefit by trading with Russia. At the same time, Russia, far from suffering a disadvantage from such exchanges, would also benefit as she would obtain food and raw materials on far more favourable terms, by concentrating her own efforts on industrial expansion, than she is capable of doing at present. Thus, Russian self-interest and the interest of the poor countries would coincide. This is an extremely menacing prospect for the industrial countries of western Europe which depend on the import of primary products and export manufactures."

This is not a Communist speaking, but he speaks of reality. He is facing reality. But some in our country who call themselves Guianese, who call themselves Christians, are not interested in the people of this country. Not all those who cry, "Lord, Lord," shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven. [Laughter.] But many of them did, and they continue to do so.

It is being demonstrated on all sides that this is the only way that we can move forward. Mr. Dudley Sears, an Economist who was with the Barbados Government for a little while, who went to E.C.L.A. in Chile, gave a lecture here once at the Public Free Library. Some hon. Members might have heard him. What did he say? He pointed out that in industrialized countries, production of substitute synthetics was causing a drop in demand for goods from primary producing countries. Right after the War, production of synthetic rubber in the United States dislocated the economy in Malaya, in Ceylon, in the Far East, so much so that one of the best friends of the West — so anti-communist was he that he refused to allow the leader of the P.N.C. and I to set foot in Ceylon in 1953 — was forced to make a deal with Communist China to exchange rubber, which he could not sell because of synthetic rubber production, for rice. The same thing happened to Nasser and to others.

The economic contraction of the capitalist system has forced even their allies to go and make trade deals with the socialist sector of the world.

5.15 p.m.

This has now become not a question of ideology. We who see ten years ahead know what is going to happen, but there are some leaders who want to hide their heads in the sand. Some think only pragmatically, but this is the time to combine theory with practice. Those countries which have had dealings with socialist countries are increasingly coming to the realization that it is to their interest. I refer to countries like India and Ghana. One steel mill from the Soviet Union in India started aid coming in from other places — from Germany, from England. Now I understand the Americans are willing to give one even though it is not required. Competition in this sector is good for the underdeveloped countries.

I submit that we will not be able to industrialize in the conventional way; our home market is too small. We are not Brazil, we are not China. No capitalist is going to come here and establish large factories, and Lord Rootes has said so. He said so in a statement he issued, and he also said that he saw nothing wrong with trading with the Soviet bloc; England does it and other countries are doing it. This was the reason for the launching of an attack by a certain group in this country, who attack us not on the realities of the present situation but merely on fears which they are generating in the minds of the people by saying that this Government is going to take away people's rights, destroy freedoms, and so forth. For example, look at this statement which appeared in the *Sun* recently:

"CHILDREN MAY BE SENT INTO FACTORIES—VICIOUS PLAN BARED. — The Government plans to take children from the Upper Division of

primary schools and put them to work in communist factories. This revelation was made by a source close to the Government. It is said that the Ministry of Education has plans in the draft to empower the Government to take children who have failed their examinations twice in the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Standards and put them to work in factories to be built here ...”

This disgraceful propaganda is being spread throughout this country. This is why some countries, like Ceylon and Ghana, have had to close down rags like this, because they see that such organs do great harm to the people of their respective countries. They cause fear in the country itself, and cause a lack of confidence in the country by people outside. I am not talking merely of investors but of people who trade and give 90 days' credit, and things like that. It is a disgrace, and I hope the public will keep these factors in mind. Let us hear from the Opposition how they will set up these industries, and who will set them up. If they have friends who are private investors they should encourage them to come here. But why did they not encourage them before?

I say that the only way this country will be able to move forward, taking all the factors into consideration — smallness, the size of its consumer population, the relative state of depression and recession in our traditional markets — is to make approaches to other quarters, in the East and West. If markets can be found and loans can be had, we should accept loans so long as the terms are favourable and conditions are satisfactory. The hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar) said “Let us imitate those who succeed.” By that remark he obviously meant the United States of America. I have a statement here which I copied from a book which was written on the West Indies Federation while it was coming into being. One writer was dealing with the obstacles which would be in the way, and the difficulties which would be faced by the new Federation. This is what he wrote:

**Mr. Speaker:** Can you identify the author?

**The Premier:** I am sorry I have not the name of the author of the book with me.

**Mr. Burnham (Ruimveldt):** Quote, and I will tell you where you got it.

**The Premier:** The article states:

“The technological gap between pre-industrial America and Western Europe in the late 18th century was insignificant in comparison with the gap between the pre-industrial Caribbean and the Western World today. It was not so difficult for the U.S. to catch up, when capitalism and industrial development was everywhere rudimentary, and material resources were largely unexploited by powerful companies.”

**Mr. Burnham :** You got that from *Social and Economic Studies* of the University College of the West Indies.

**The Premier:** I am glad to see the leader of the Opposition is keeping up to date. [*Laughter.*] I have quoted that merely to show that one cannot argue by simple analogy — that what caused America to develop several years ago will *ipso facto* cause British Guiana to develop under today's conditions. America had a large population, tremendous resources and a great deal of technical know-how. People had run away from Europe and settled there. But I need not go into all the argument. Even in that wonderful country let us not think that everything is heaven on earth there. That is what the hon. Member would like us to believe.

Let us look at the distribution of income in the mighty United States of America. We find that 5 per cent of the people at the top in the U. S. A. earn 19 per cent of the total income, as compared with 40 per cent of those at the bottom who earn the same income. I am quoting from statistics which have been produced by the U. S. Chambers of

[**THE PREMIER**]

Commerce and other organisations. We also find that 61 per cent at the bottom earn 34 per cent of the total income as compared with 13 per cent of the people at the top who earn the same 34 per cent of income.

**Mr. Speaker :** In the absence of a specific report, those references will be regarded as the views of the speaker.

**The Premier:** I never quote figures unless they have some substance.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not a question of substance but a question of the source.

**The Premier:** Let us look at the distribution of income and savings. We are told that in the U. S. A. everybody is well off. That is the kind of "nancy story" which is peddled in this country. The University of Michigan Research Centre conducted a study some time ago, and this is what was discovered: With regard to liquid savings, the top 10 per cent of families in the U.S. had \$64 billion, or 66 per cent of liquidated savings. There is a book entitled *Four Hundred Families In America* which I would recommend to hon. Members. The next 10 per cent from the top saved 17 per cent, the next 30 per cent saved 16 per cent, while 50 per cent at the bottom saved only \$1 billion, which was equivalent to one per cent. So that America is really owned by a few hundred families under "people's capitalism."

**Mr. d'Aguiar:** Mr. Speaker, on the 20th October, 1961, the following Circular was sent to Members of the Legislative Assembly:

"Honourable Members of the  
Legislative Assembly:

Whenever it is necessary for you to quote from a document (either official or unofficial) in the Assembly, you are requested to observe the following rules:

(i) state clearly the title of the document from which you propose to quote, then the number of the page and paragraph: and

(ii) make the document available to the Official Reporters either during or immediately after the sitting.

I. CRUM EWING,  
Clerk of the Legislature."

I am in complete darkness as to what the hon. Premier is quoting from, and I have been in that darkness all along. He shifts from one quotation to another with extreme rapidity, and to the confusion of us all.

**Mr. Speaker :** As I understand it, the Premier said that this study was conducted by someone of the University of Michigan. It is true that he has not given the date, the name, etc. As I have indicated to him earlier, when such a position is reached that he cannot give us the full details of the quotations, they will be recorded in *Hansard* as statements by the Premier. In other words, he takes full responsibility for the quotations in the absence of proper references. The hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr d'Aguiar) will recall that some time ago I gave a similar ruling when he made some quotations. These rulings become part and parcel of the procedure in the House and need not, of course, be challenged every time.

**The Premier:** I have given the figures as they relate to liquid savings, to show that the myth about everyone in the United States of America having two chickens in the pot and two motor cars in the garage is not necessarily true.

5.30 p. m.

One-tenth of the people in family units receive less than \$1,000 a year, and 52 per cent of all families receives less than \$4,000 a year. This \$4,000 a year is regarded by the Bureau of Labour Statistics as the minimum family budget. In other words, even in the mighty United States of America we can see large numbers of people who

are still living under sub-standard conditions. The position has deteriorated over the past few years.

Since 1951 the United States of America had three depressions. The position today is worse than before. I can give the House more figures, but if I do so it will take up the whole evening. I have used these figures not as an attack on the United States of America, but merely to show the facts. I want that to be clearly understood, because reference is constantly being made to the United States as the ideal country we must follow slavishly whether the conditions there are applicable to this country or otherwise. I have, perforce, to point out these factors in order to give a clear picture to this House.

Sir, I will quote from what Mr. Leon Keyserling, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, wrote in *The New Republic* dated January 13, 1958, on "The Economy in '58":

"But this recession of today . . . is only the inevitable outcome of a much longer . . . adverse trend. An overall economic expansion of about 4.5 percent a year is essential in the American economy, to make new jobs for the growing labour force plus those displaced by technological progress. On the average during the period 1947-1953, we exceeded this annual growth rate. But the average annual growth rate in real terms slowed down to little better than 2.5% in 1953/57, to only about 2 percent in 1957 . . . . The result is that the annual rate of our total production is now more than \$32 billion below full production. During the past five years as a whole, we have lost more than \$78 billion worth of potential production through departures from full production, and lost about 8.5 million man-years of potential job opportunity through departures from full employment."

I shall give the figures for April, 1955, in order to show how the position has deteriorated since then because of the slow rate of economic growth from an average of 4.5 per cent to 2.5 per cent. On second thought I do not want to tire hon. Members with these figures. I will say merely that production in many key-productive fields has been reduced.

Let us take things like autos, steel, cotton, TV sets, refrigerators, the figures show that the rate of the productive capacity of the United States of America is far in excess of what is being produced from the mills at the present moment.

As hon. Members may be aware, the United States of America has developed a soil bank with a view to withdrawing land from production and to give farmers a bonus for keeping certain land idle. It pays billions of dollars in subsidies merely to collect agricultural produce and store the items away. Therefore something must be fundamentally wrong for people who have the capacity to produce things and yet have people living a sub-standard life. You will find people in the United States of America living a sub-standard life, but the United States Government is still trying to help people in underdeveloped countries. Surely something is wrong with this system. This is a system which is being defended by certain hon. Members in this House, and we are told to follow it slavishly.

In 1959 I said that this Government must adopt a neutralist approach; the Government must be on friendly terms with all countries; it must negotiate with all countries as long as it is in the interest of British Guiana and our people. A British writer by the name of Patrick O'Donovan writing in the *Observer* newspaper in London, and I think it was reproduced in the *Argosy* of the 31st March, 1958, stated:

"But it is true that since the end of World War II the rate of growth of the American economy has been declining. From 1947 to 1953 it increased on a national average by 4.7% a year; from 1953/56 by 2.7% and from 1956/57 by less than 1%. And all this at a time the Russian economy has been increasing at a rate of from 7 to 10% a year."

Because we mention these things, we are told that we are trying to impose a new form of slavery in British Guiana; that we do not believe in God; that we want

[THE PREMIER]

to take away the rights of the people; that we do not believe in heaven and earth; that we believe in fantastic slave camps and the horrors of the other side. We are not told the truth, but the truth will come out as it is coming out in the United States of America today.

Sir, in the United States of America the oil billionaires and millionaires have been called before the courts. Here is a clipping from *The New York Times* of the 9th December, 1960. It is headed:

**"2 BIG OIL CONCERNS CITED IN U.S. SUIT."**

A few months ago the manufactures of electrical equipment were sent to gaol for price-fixing and breaking the laws of the United States of America. A few days ago we heard that President Kennedy has arranged for a Grand Jury investigation into the latest increase in the price of steel by the steel barons who are determined, according to President Kennedy, to wreck the United States economy and the chance for the United States Government to survive in the jungle of international trade. Those are the people we are told to follow! The Government of the United States today is battling to survive, but the capitalists, the powerful elite, want to frustrate President Kennedy's plans. The new administration has a group of enlightened people around it who are willing to face the realities of the international situation. These people are bent on saving the system which is dominant today. But while certain people are trying to make progress, others can be found in their midst who are sabotaging the efforts of the administration.

Sir, it is no wonder that Professor Wright Mills in his book *Causes of World War Three* — he died last week,

but he was a Professor at Columbia University — said:

"The United States is an over-developed society full of ugly waste and the deadening of human sensitivity, honouring ignorance and the cheerful robot, pronouncing the barren doctrine and submitting gladly, even with eagerness to the uneasy flow of a leisureless and emptying existence".

Not only Professor Mills, but many other new writers and scientists are giving a proper analysis of the American scene today. Hon. Members should read books such as *Status Seekers*, *Power Elite* and so on which are now coming out as best sellers and are very critical of this system which is so heavily being defended in this country.

What about the other side? We are told that this Government is going to take the people of this country into slave camps; that the people will lose all of their rights; that there will be no more salvation or liberty for the people and they may as well run away from this country.

5.45 p.m.

What is alarming is the extent to which some people can try to deceive themselves. For a long time all that was being done in the Socialist bloc was pooh-poohed, was laughed and sneered at. Let this be clear; I am not defending the Russian system or what prevails in Cuba, but I am defending Socialism because my Government and my party believe in Socialism. When Socialism succeeds, even if others do not want to do so although they call themselves socialists, I will stand up and cheer because socialist gains in any country are gains for the working class everywhere else in the world.

Lest the Guianese people be fooled, let me quote from an inveterate enemy of the Soviet Union and its Socialist

system. I refer to Mr. Edward Crankshaw who writes for the *Observer* and whose articles are generally reproduced here. In his latest book, a Penguin Special, called *Khrushchev's Russia*, on page 29 he said that in the field of agriculture —

“..the foundations have at last been laid for a decent and flourishing agriculture in a land where the winter cold and summer droughts make high farming, even in favoured areas, very difficult and chancy indeed.”

Then he deals with the social side. He says:

“Life in every conceivable way has changed much for the better, and it continues to change for the better, regardless of intermittent checks here and there which have been especially noticeable in the sphere of literature and drama: it is not merely better in degree; it is different in kind.”

He went on to say that the younger generation almost inspired him; that the youth “are so well behaved”; “at twenty-one, you are well-fed, well-dressed, well-educated, in some ways well entertained” Among the younger generation he found many “well-turned-out young men in their thirties, usually Party members, relaxed and easy in manner, often with a pleasantly ironical approach to life, and very much in touch with realities of every kind....These confident and unfrightened young men are springing up like grass.”

I am sorry that I have to repeat some of these observations, but, apparently, since lies are being repeated over and over again, the truth has to be repeated over and over again. Mr. Reginald Maudling, when he was President of the Board of Trade—now he is Secretary of State for the Colonies—had this to say:

“The rate of the Soviet Union's economic growth which was higher than the rate in Western Europe or the United States ‘was a matter of very great con-

cern’; the West also would ignore at its peril the rate at which the Soviet Union was training scientists and technicians.’

A writer by the name of Fletcher, writing in the *Tribune*, June 17, 1960, said that —

“..the Soviet Union has increased and is increasing its capacity to produce goods at a rate higher than any recorded in history . . . . the dynamic factor in world politics is neither the sputnik nor the I. C. B. M. It is the Soviet economy.’

If the Soviet economy is producing factories, complete plants, if former colonies which were in the same backward condition as countries like ours—Poland, Rumania, Hungary—are today in a position to develop rapidly in the industrial sector, are we to close our eyes to developments in this sector of the world? If favourable offers of trade and aid are made, must we not accept them?

A point, incidentally, to be noted is the criticism which was made yesterday about Soviet aid. It was said that aid from the West comes in large quantities. I do admit that the West is very wealthy. Certainly, I have admitted that the West is very wealthy, but I did not stop there. I pointed out where the wealth came from and where the looting and plunder took place, and said that this looting and plunder must stop otherwise we will never get out of the rut in which we find ourselves. I also said, and I say it now, that what is important is not only the quantity of money. What is more important is the quality of aid.

By all means we want aid, large quantities if we can get it, but, above all, what we want is aid to be used in a particular sector, in the industrial sector, because we know that a lot of aid has been given out with strings attached. You can have aid as Mr. Powers said if

[THE PREMIER]

you are going to build harbours, roads and infrastructure development which have no profits.

Indeed, aid such as this can be very embarrassing as the Latin Americans have found and are finding today to their regret. What they want is aid without strings, aid to develop industries, particularly their natural resources such as oil, bauxite, copper, tin — their mineral wealth which has been dug out and taken out of their countries. A great deal of noise is made about Trinidad. We are not told that Trinidad's oil reserves are not very large. This is a source of concern. I wonder what will happen to Trinidad when the oil reserves are gone.

The hon. Member asked, Why don't you invite Indians or sound economists here; why only Bettelheim and Kaldor? We are bringing people who have got a wealth of experience both in the West and in the East. We have brought people here because we feel that from the breadth of their experience, they will be able to advise us on the best road to follow. Many have cursed Mr. Kaldor. It should be noted he has also been called a Communist. He is far, indeed, from being a Left-Wing Socialist. As an expert in his own field, in taxation, there can be no doubt about it that he is fully qualified. What has hurt the reactionaries in this country is the fact that he has stepped on their toes with the capital gains tax, the net property tax, the gift tax and the plugging of the loopholes through which evasion has been taking place. It is not the quantity of money which will come out of it right away, but the principle involved. That is what has hurt them.

Let me wind up by saying we must not be bigotted. We must not do as some people are doing today and adopt Fascist techniques by cursing foreigners

and making scapegoats of them; by perpetrating deeds and attacking of people, innocent people. Reference made yesterday to a circular where the poor Cubans, as if they have not got enough worry from the United States, are being attacked, people who have come here to help us. Such tactics were good enough for Hitler and Mussolini. They may be good for Salazar, but let us not allow these tactics to do the kind of harm here as they have done in those countries.

The late Aneurin Bevan, in his book, *In Place of Fear*, said this:

"The fear of communism has led the United States and those who follow her lead to take a distorted view of the world situation and of the forces at work in modern society."

I say "Amen". Again, let me say that Aneurin Bevan was not a Communist. He was an anti-Communist.

Today, it is fashionable in certain quarters to call everyone a Communist as long as you do not agree with him and his views. That was the old technique long before Communism was ever thought of, before Marx came on the scene. In the days when the United States was fighting for Independence, the Republicans were called dirty names. To have been called a Republican then is to be called a Communist today. Let us not be obsessed with this fear. People talk of fear and confidence. We must ask ourselves whose confidence we are talking about—the confidence of the working class or the confidence of the sharks: whose confidence, whose freedom, and who is generating this fear.

Our country is passing through serious times. The great President Roosevelt of the United States, in the midst of a depression, had to fight against the monopolists, against the cartellists, against the robber-barons, and against those who did not want to recognize trade unions.

6 p.m.

He had to pass laws for the compulsory recognition of trade unions. He had to pass laws to provide that company unions shall not exist. What did he say? He said that the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to the point where it became stronger than the State itself. That, he said, was the essence of Fascism.

That is the concentration of power we had here. We have broken to some extent the back of that concentration of power, and we are dedicated to its destruction. But certain elements in our country are prepared to hold on to their privileged positions even if it means the downfall of this country; even if it means wrecking the economy of this country. Everyone knows who started it all. Everyone knows who are today trying to hold back the clock of progress, but whether they like it or not, we of this country are prepared to face what is happening in the world. The world will move on.

Take a look and see what is happening in Venezuela, Brazil, Chile and Argentina. Fascists and reactionary elements have just cancelled elections in Argentina. First they used force to smash it, *a la* Guatemala in 1954, and the P.P.P. Government in 1953, and Mossadeq Government in 1951. Send force and smash it, they say. They tried it in Suez, but little Nasser turned them back. They tried in Cuba. They said "The Cubans are all opposed to Castro. Let us send a handful of men, the Cuban people will turn out in an uprising against the regime." But where are they today? I am asking hon. Members to face the realities of our situation. To some people British Guiana is the world; they do not comprehend what is happening around and about them. There are others outside of this country who, unfortunately, as the result of the

activities of some people in this country, adopt a megalomaniac approach which is just hostile. They say that this country will be a base for international communism; that this country will be the route to invade the whole of Latin America. They do not know what is happening in Venezuela—that if there were elections tomorrow the Left Coalition Front would win; that in Chile the Left Coalition Front lost the last election, a corrupt and rigged election by 80,000 votes. The reactionaries tried to oust Quadros but did not succeed. His successor has taken office with reduced powers, but Quadros is back there and elections are to be held again this year. Are they going to cancel out all elections? That will succeed up to a point; it will not succeed all the time.

With those who are interested in this country and in its stability I plead not to take our country down into the mire. This country and its people are relatively poor at the present stage. There is no doubt that we have tremendous prospects, but we cannot devote our energies to fighting battles which will bear no fruit. There must be agreement on certain broad issues—what is in the interest of the country, what is the best economic approach. If you have sound proposals Government is at all times prepared to listen to them and, if need be, to adopt them. But they must be sound and not based on airy fairy tales. Let us grasp the opportunities that are before us. As Mr. Dell said, the world is willing to help. British Guiana has goodwill outside, except in a few crank quarters. Let us mobilize that goodwill by showing first of all that we can help ourselves, and that we can establish real order and democracy in this country. [*Applause*].

**Mr. Burnham:** It is true that this discussion in theory centres around the Motion for the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, and it is true that the Appropriation Bill does little more than

[MR. BURNHAM]

set out certain proposals for expenditure on various Departments and services, but both tradition and good sense suggest and demand that this opportunity be used to congratulate the Government or to criticize the Government, to commend the Government or to castigate the Government, and I propose to take full advantage of this *carte blanche* which is given to us at this period.

6.10 p.m.

The hon. Minister of Finance when, in almost mock heroic terms, he introduced his Budget on the 31st January, 1962, observed that the occasion was historic. Let me immediately concede that, indeed, it was historic from the point of view, as he said, that it was the first time an Elected Minister was presenting the Budget. But it is not enough to take pride in such a trifling accident of history. Many events are historic. When Caligula made his two horses consuls of Rome that was an historic event. But I had hoped that the presentation of our Budget for the first time by an Elected Minister would have been historic in that we would have seen more foresight than we have hitherto experienced; a greater willingness to break away from the old pattern; a greater willingness to smash the old order and to remove these unsavoury and disgusting parts of the Budget against which the P.P.P. has been most vocal in the past in its opposition.

So far as this Budget is concerned, I would say that in spite of the trumpeting; in spite of the long lectures we have had from hon. Members on the other side, there has been no imagination displayed by the Government and it has shown a marked inability to grapple with the most serious situation in this country. When one looks at the Budget, as I understand it, there are two criteria to be taken into consideration: (1) The ideology behind the framing of the

Budget; (2) The competence of the Government in executing or giving practical effect to its ideology. Perhaps it is apposite for us to start from the first criterion, that of the ideology of the Government, as I understand the words uttered by Members of the Government. I emphasize the words, because so often when I hear Members of the Government speaking I am reminded of a passage I used to do in an examination paper—I think it was said about Hamlet— [Interruption.]

Sir, on many occasions it seems to me that we have on the Government Benches, and this includes the hon. Minister of Works, Hydraulics and "Humour", the lineal descendants of Hamlet—they are full of words. How are they running the Government? Only last week the Government was able to complete its payments to its employees for the month of March. Now let us take the words of the hon. Members of this Government; let us try to make some sense of their words; let us look at the Budget presented to this House. The party in the Government calls itself a Socialist Party. I am not an obeah man; I am not *au fait* with the writings of all of the authors referred to; I do not know all of these professors; I am a very simple man with a limited intelligence and intellect. I am no psychiatrist and, like so many people in British Guiana, I do not know what is in other people's mind. But, as I understand socialism, it means the organization of society where, instead of putting the emphasis on profits for a few, the emphasis is placed on production to meet the needs of the community.

One of the tenets of socialism, as I understand it, is that you should seek—if you say you are a Socialist, and if you enjoy the following that the P.P.P. enjoys at the moment—to organize the production and the economy of the country so that there will be a proper distribution of what the country

produces; the working class would come in of its own, and there would be the end of discrimination. *[Interruption.]*

It is significant that the hon. Minister of Works should refer to me. But up to a few days ago his Premier—perhaps he hopes to join the long list of defeated Premiers—

**Mr. Speaker:** Let us keep to the point.

**Mr. Burnham :** As I further understand socialism, it is sometimes succinctly expressed in the statement: 'From each according to his ability; to each according to his need'. Starting with this definition—it is not my definition; I do not claim to be some little fellow raised to heights of which I did not dream and has suddenly become intellectual overnight—one would have expected that in a Budget proposed by a Socialist Party, and in this case I am referring to the Budget of the 31st January, the distribution of taxation would have been such as to take care of those who have the ability to pay rather than to include those who have been aptly described as the disinherited of our society whose faces have been ground for so many years. One would have expected that, of course, this Socialist Party would have discarded the Imperialist and Colonialist emphasis on the raising of taxation on widely used commodities in order to get revenue. The definition for which I claim no originality—not being a plagiarist, I will confess I got from the hon. the Premier. In keeping with that definition any taxation on widely used commodities means taxation on the working class. **[Mr. Benn :** "Lipstick!"

6.20 p.m.

Of course, I cannot blame the hon. Minister of Natural Resources for his inability to have a finer aesthetic sense

when he thinks that lipstick is a luxury. I would tell you that I would be most disgusted if our womenfolk were to give up the use of lipstick, for to my mind socialism is not synonymous with dowdyism. But as I was saying, one would have expected that a Socialist Government would have changed the emphasis and incidence of taxation.

But what do we find in the original proposals of the Budget? The hon. Minister of Finance, who I know did not do mathematics at school, said that customs—**[Mr. Wilson: "Personal."]**—If it is personal, I immediately apologize, but I thought it was a statement of fact which could have been contradicted by the Minister in his reply. But as I was saying, he said that customs and excise account for about one-third of the revenue—**[Dr. Jacob :** "Where?"]—

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, this is where the problem arises. This problem has arisen all through this evening. It is one of the problems of the House that certain Members keep interjecting questions or making remarks while an hon. Member is on his feet. Then, the hon. Member on his feet endeavours to answer every single question interjected or every remark made. All this is heard by those who are sitting at the Table, and we understand clearly what has happened. When it is reduced to writing and appears in *Hansard*, we see reports that cannot carry the full impact of what has occurred. So I would ask hon. Members to desist from these interjections. They were given an opportunity of dealing with the question, and the hon. Member has earned his right by virtue of waiting all this time and by virtue of agreement between leaders in the House. Therefore, he is entitled to be heard just as I have endeavoured to have other hon. Members, who have spoken, heard in as much silence as possible.

**Mr. Burnham :** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for your protection, but, with all due respect to your ruling, I assume that the hon. Minister did honestly seek this information and I am prepared to give it by referring—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Finance could also have said, in his reply, that, in paragraph so and so of my statement, I do not see what the hon. Member for Ruimveldt referred to, therefore, his statement is inaccurate. You do not have to keep interjecting things all the time.

**Mr. Burnham :** On page 4 of the original Budget statement of the 31st January 1962, paragraph 10, in the second sentence, one finds this:

“Unfortunately, similar tribute cannot be paid in respect of import and excise duties, but I give notice that maladministration and irregularities will no longer be tolerated in the Customs and Excise Department, which is now responsible for about one-third of our total revenue.”

As I understand it, if the Customs and Excise Department is responsible for one-third of our total revenue, the picture which the Minister intended to paint was that customs and excise duties are responsible for one-third of our revenue. But, of course, I may be mistaken, and I have learnt sufficient humility to be prepared to be corrected.

May I observe that on the proposal which is contained in these Estimates, one finds that out of a total revenue anticipated of \$58,459,675, customs and excise are supposed to bring \$27,882,000, and, subject to the assistance which I may get from an adding or calculating machine, that, I say, is 47.69 per cent of the revenue. It therefore seems that the first things that we would have expected from a Socialist party with respect to this Budget was absolutely missing on the 31st January.

It is true that there were taxes like the capital gains tax, the net property tax

and the gift tax, and a great hue and cry was made about those taxes — that they were intended to equalize, they were intended to soak the rich to help the poor. But they were to be responsible for a miserly \$1 million, approximately, out of an additional \$10.5 million, whereas customs and excise were to be responsible for \$5.5 million of the additional revenue of \$10.5 million. It seems to me, therefore, that on its very protestations and professions, the People's Progressive Party Government has shown that either it is not Socialist or it is incompetent to adapt Socialism to our circumstances, or adopt Socialism for the purpose of our Budget.

The People's National Congress has been greatly maligned in that it was, at one time, suggested — I note, with interest, the more conciliatory attitude which is being displayed now — that the People's National Congress opposed the Budget because it was a Budget that hit the rich. A lot has been said here about false accusations, and I note the sensitivity of the Leader of the People's Progressive Party when, according to him, he is falsely accused. But nothing could have been further from the truth than to have suggested that the People's National Congress opposed the original Budget of the 31st January because of the taxation introduced on the rich.

We do not oppose the gift tax. We do not and have never opposed it. We do not and have never opposed the capital gains tax *per se*. As the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River (Mr. Jordan) remarked during the course of his contribution, we feel that it would be much more sensible and easier to operate if the capital gains tax were to be a fixed tax rather than being sort of absorbed into income tax. We do not and have never opposed, as it stands at the moment, the tax on net property.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members, before we actually suspend the sitting of the House, I am sure that hon. Members

would wish to join me in saying how pleased we are to see a visitor in the House today, one whose father gave many years of distinguished service to the Legislature of this country. The late hon. Joseph Eleazar was a doyen amongst legislators; and in his day and in his time, he did a considerable amount for the country. I think it is very nice indeed to have his daughter with us this evening, and, perhaps, it is an indication of things to come in a new Guiana under Independence.

*Sitting suspended from 6.30 p.m. to 8 p.m.*

8 p.m.

*On resumption—*

**Mr. Burnham:** If I remember correctly, when the House rose at 6.30 p.m. today I was making the observation that the People's National Congress did not oppose the Capital Gains Tax nor the Gift Tax, nor in principle do we oppose the tax on net property. Our opposition was mainly directed to those Customs duties, the imposition of which resulted in the increased cost of widely used commodities, and this increased cost would have meant the lowering of the already low standards of the working class. And I would say that our party was rather concerned that a so-called socialist party could seek to raise the bulk of the new extra revenue from the pockets of the poor. But what was most interesting was the temerity and transparent sophistry of the Government which, in those circumstances, sought to convince the world that this was a revolutionary Budget which was seeking to distribute income,—to tax the rich to aid the poor. They would have had the world believe that they were Robinhood come to life in the 20th century.

But the People's National Congress also opposed and was most critical too of the Compulsory Savings Scheme, not because we do not concede that a country must contribute to its development,

not because we think there should be no contribution from the Guianese people to the development finance, but for two particular reasons. The first was that it was psychologically bad to make the savings compulsory. Perhaps the preponderance of academicians in the People's Progressive Party is responsible for these awful mistakes they make from time to time. Kaldor, to my mind, was merely supplementing the list of theorists and theoreticians who seem to live and have their being several feet above the ground.

The hon. the Premier was so kind to us this afternoon to regale us with an account of the growth of the economy of the Soviet Union, but even the Soviet Union, his intellectual, ideological and philosophical home, does not have compulsory saving. Mr. Kaldor, apparently, did persuade the Government of Ghana to levy compulsory savings. That, of course, resulted in certain strikes, if not disturbances, in the Takoradi area, but, unfortunately, the Premier does not have that predominant support; he does not have that personality to command the workers to return, as did Nkrumah; nor does he have the power and influence to throw trade union leaders into gaol because they object to certain forms of taxation or compulsory saving. It is, of course, the sorry end to which this Government has been brought, that it should have thought it necessary to make savings compulsory. Perhaps, looking at it objectively, one could well sympathize, without agreeing with the Government, for if during the past few years there has been a flight of capital, if last year a loan of \$2½ million caused so much difficulty so far as subscription was concerned, perhaps it was logical for the Government to assume that if those savings were to be optional rather than compulsory, the response would have been most embarrassing to the prestige of the Government and its ability to find funds for development.

[MR. BURNHAM]

I remarked that we opposed primarily those taxes which weighed heavily on the poor workers. I am not a statistician, but I have reason to doubt the expertise of the Premier who says that those taxes which had been introduced and subsequently withdrawn would have been responsible for a rise of only one point in the Cost of Living Index. Apart from the fact that the Premier has for years advertized the inaccuracy of the Cost of Living Index figures, practical experience since the imposition of the new duties, or at least during the period that those new duties were collectible, leads me to believe that it cannot be accurate, or perhaps one point in the Cost of Living Index, with which I have no familiarity, represents about 25 per cent on the budget of the ordinary housewife who has to provide for her home. For instance, take a simple article like salmon which, under the former specific rate of duty, paid a duty of \$18, but under the proposals of the Minister of Finance, as adumbrated to this House on the 31st January, paid a duty of \$170.

Indeed the Budget was historic. Indeed the period was historic, but it was historic not for the reasons given by the Minister of Finance but for other reasons. For instance, never before has the working class as a group, regardless of differences of scale and categories of occupation, shown such vitality in its opposition to what I still contend was a most wicked and disgusting Budget.

8.15 p.m.

I admire the skill with which the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics sought to explain the situation when he said that, a Government of this sort could not afford to have such a large section of the working class demonstrating against it, no matter how unjusti-

fiable the demonstration might have been. As far as I am concerned, the demonstration was eminently justified and justifiable because, as I think most people have had to concede, the proposals in the Budget would have meant an unbearable burden upon the shoulders of the working class whom this Government would have us believe is its special ward.

It was also in this period of historic acts that, for the first time in the history of this country, a substantial part of the Budget has had to be withdrawn. So far as my recollection goes, it was only in 1952 where we saw a minor item, the tax on soft drinks, withdrawn from the Budget. It is historic, I repeat, because for the first time in the history of this country the main and important proposals in a Budget were withdrawn by the Government as a consequence of spontaneous organization and opposition on the part of the working class.

It serves no useful purpose in these circumstances for this Government to accuse A, B or C with being responsible for organizing the workers or organizing their opposition to the Budget, for I recall most vividly in 1954 when a certain gentleman said that the workers of British Guiana would never come out on strike for political reasons but only when conditions of work and labour etc. become unbearable. What was true in 1954 is also true in 1962. It seems to me that this Government either misjudged the attitude and feelings of the workers, or acted ruthlessly and callously.

However, certain portions of the Budget have been withdrawn, and the only congratulations I propose to shower at this moment will be showered not upon the incompetent, shortsighted Government, but upon the workers for marching as one to defend their rights against a callous, unconscionable

Government. This Government or the Party in the Government claims to be Socialist, but I recall last year when the hon. Premier went to the United States of America, he was overheard by me to say that he was a Socialist but would not allow that fact to impede the development of this country. Those words, thought and expression seem strange to me for, Socialist that I am, I cannot myself see in what way socialism can impede the development of an emerging country like British Guiana. One wonders what the Premier really means by "Socialist".

The taxes introduced and the other proposals in the Budget, as I said before, do not weigh particularly heavily on the rich and those who own property. But it seems to me that those who own property in this country were frightened; they were frightened because of the attitude of the Government and the political statements made by its leaders from time to time. As in law, one has to depend on the actions, acts and statements of the Members of the Government to find out what they have in mind. The statements made by the Members of this Government over the years have been such as to lead people to believe, whether they are rich or poor, that the socialism of which the P.P.P. speaks is the socialism which we find expressed in the confiscation of property, and the curtailment of what is called the formal democratic right of the people.

Mr. Speaker, if one of the fairer sex here were to so conduct herself as to give one the impression that she is a demimonde, then she has only herself to blame if other members of the community assume the absence of chastity on her part. If the Government or a party goes around singing the praise of one section of the world, and making itself an apologist for what Khrushchev says and the dictatorial acts of Stalin, what impression will it convey? Is it surprising that many people in Guiana

and out of Guiana assume that the technique used in the Soviet Union where there is one party; where elections are but a farce because you can vote only for one party; where Stalin sent people to Siberia, is what the P.P.P. would adopt. Why do the Members of this Government quarrel, if people assume that this is the system which they would introduce into British Guiana if they had the opportunity? I am not categorising, but, like so many people in British Guiana, I can judge only from the utterances of the Members of this Government.

I agree that there were many who, having a vested interest in the perpetuation of their privileged positions, were opposed to these new taxes, but the Government by its previous action had given their arguments some plausibility. **[Mr. Wilson:** "Join hands."] Indeed the P.N.C. had to join hands in opposing the ill-advised and dictatorial Proclamation of Thursday, 15th February, 1962. The P.N.C. was following in the footsteps of the erstwhile Socialists in the P.P.P. who were more interested in defeating the P.N.C. at the recent Election than in keeping out the alleged capitalist blood-suckers who now grace this Chamber. We are aware of what happened when they sought their votes in Georgetown — the members of the P.P.P. were told how to vote in Georgetown. **[An hon. Member:** "A marriage."]

It is no use talking about any marriage. The P.P.P. and its Ministers should re-think their position. I have already remarked on the conciliatory attitude of this Government, the benevolence and sincerity of which I am not in a position to vouch for. Does this talk of co-operation by the P.P.P. mean that it will desist from abusing everyone who disagrees with its policy? Almost with tears in his eyes and a sob in his throat the hon. Premier bemoaned the fact that in these days as soon as you

[MR. BURNHAM]

disagree with someone you are called a Communist. It is only the appellation that is changed, because as soon as you disagree with the P.P.P. you are either an Imperialist stooge or a Capitalist stooge, or a Fascist. Of course once before, the Communist and the Fascist got together in 1939 when Hitler signed a pact with Stalin. Once in British Guiana, in 1962, the Communist and the Fascist got together in Georgetown Central.

In governing a country like British Guiana, the economic position of which it is conceded by the hon. Premier is far from attractive, one has to adopt a realistic attitude. What sense does it make, when one is going to the United States of America to seek financial aid, to have the wife of the hon. Premier and Secretary to the Government Party in Havana attending an anti-U.S. demonstration? That is not neutrality. It was not the P.P.P. that first adumbrated the policy of neutrality for British Guiana.

Sir, in October, 1960, when the Leader of the P.N.C. was speaking to the T.U.C. he said that so far as his party was concerned it would not be the pawn of neither the East nor West. But, perhaps, a little reflection on the part of the hon. Premier will show him that his declarations have not been those of one who would be objectively considered a neutralist.

I am prepared to make no apology for the American economy. I heard a lot about figures this evening. Maybe they are accurate; maybe all of the observations are apposite and timely, but are they relevant to our situation?

8.30 p.m.

So far as the People's National Congress is concerned, we do not, whoever

else may, suggest for one moment that British Guiana and the Government of British Guiana should become the servants of the United States and should become the sycophantic admirers of the United States economy. Indeed, I am convinced that British Guiana cannot be developed successfully. I am convinced that we shall be unable to give to the people of this country their just deserts if we were to attempt to use the American economy as our prototype.

But without saying whether or not this Government should seek aid from America, I merely observe that it is the epitome of unrealism to be abusing America, criticizing America, and never the other bloc, and going to America and asking for aid. To gain aid, one does not have to crawl on one's belly, but one must be sufficiently politically astute to understand that perhaps Jesus was the only man yet created who would have taken a lambasting and still be prepared to help. It was Jesus who spoke about turning the left cheek if you are struck on the right, not the United States or the Soviet Union.

The criticism has been made that the fact that our economy is not as buoyant as it should have been is attributable to the present Government. It is the conviction of the People's National Congress that if the People's Progressive Party, which is the Government, had a more intelligent approach, things would not have been as bad as they are now, and I shall deal with that aspect a little later.

Perhaps, this is the point at which one may make reference to certain poses and attitudes current among the Ministers of the Government. As soon as a criticism is made, these political Eves of the second half of the twentieth century say, "Not me! It is the Interim Government. Not me! It is imperialism." Now the latest is, "Not me! It is the

looting and incendiarism of Friday, 16th January.” As I understand it, when a party goes to the polls and seeks the suffrage of the electorate, it sets itself up as being competent to change the sorry scheme of things entire. That is what the people vote for a party for: a belief in the competence of the party to correct the wrongs of the past; a belief in the ability of the party to change these things which were wrong.

So, after five years, to come here and merely say, “It is imperialism” is all nonsense, if that is a parliamentary term. If you knew that the legacies of imperialism were so terrible, so long-lasting, that you could not make the slightest change; if you knew it was so hard that you could not even scratch it, why didn’t you tell the people? Didn’t you know that the legacies of imperialism and the incompetence of the Interim Government were all so terrible that five years after you would have been just where you started?

The Government must understand this: it was put in to govern; it was put in to improve the economy of the country; it was put in to make things better, not to make excuses. When you want a person to make excuses, you brief a lawyer, you don’t vote for a politician. Historic indeed! They present a Budget. They withdraw the Budget virtually, and have not yet been able to justify the first Budget because if they attempt to justify the first Budget, it means that they were fools to withdraw it. **[Mr. Ram Karran :** “How clever!”]—Cleverness is not necessary. The hon. Minister of Works and Hydraulics is overestimating the amount of cleverness necessary to see something that hits a blind man in his eye.

It is the conviction of the People’s National Congress that though the People’s Progressive Party could not have worked miracles during its term of office from 1957 to 1962, it could have

done much better. It could have done much better if it had pursued a realistic attitude with respect to foreign assistance. Foreign assistance alone cannot develop this country. That is agreed. You talk about getting this and that from the Eastern bloc. Where is it? You were talking about that since 1957. And rest assured, you need have no fear so far as the Eastern bloc is concerned. If you get a sound, attractive offer from the Eastern bloc, the People’s National Congress is not going to oppose it. The P.N.C. does not oppose trade on the basis of ideology. The P.N.C. will not support any offer or deal or what have you, on the basis that it is not to the advantage of the country. It has nothing to do with ideology.

It seems to me that like their friend, Castro, the members of the Government overestimated the amount of assistance that was forthcoming from the Eastern bloc. I have been hearing about this glass factory since 1959, and these package deals, I have heard rumours about them for years. But we cannot see them; up to now they are not here. And the Government knew that the only Party in this country that could give them a fight at the polls, the People’s National Congress, had publicly said, “Trade where you want, provided each deal is to the advantage of the country, not necessarily to the disadvantage of the other party to the particular trade deal” May I *en passant*, ask the hon. Minister of Finance, who, I understand, is the only speaker from the Government Benches after I have spoken, what happened to the Cuban timber deal?

Let us, before we consider some of the irrelevancies and *non sequiturs* with which we have been entertained by the hon. the Premier, consider the historic Budget as amended. In other countries, the Government would have resigned. Was the People’s Progressive Party so

[MR. BURNHAM]

solicitous of the expenditure of funds for elections that it did not want to engulf the country in new expenses for elections or was it afraid to go to the polls? Of course, when all the tumult and shouting had died, when the "limey" bayonets had arrived, I heard the Premier coming out and saying, "I will not resign. You can underscore that." I wonder why he did not say it on Wednesday, the 14th, or Thursday, the 15th, or Friday, the 16th, or even Saturday, the 17th February, before the Government workers went back out and the strike ended.

But let us consider some of these tax proposals as set out here. Income tax: all right, no particular objection except that I will say the income tax personal allowance of \$800 is unreasonable in that it makes taxable the ordinary worker who draws a \$3.04 minimum. One objects, and these things must be stated because the pastmasters of misrepresentation are to be found across the Table. No one from the People's National Congress objects to the extra income tax for the higher brackets. No one objects to the tightening of the legislation to prevent subsidiaries from understating the prices of their products when sold to the parent bodies. No one objects to a tightening of the legislation so far as tax holidays are concerned. But what we object to is the elasticity of the proposals with respect to the tightening up of the provisions that relate to tax holiday for new and pioneer industries.

Unless my learned friend, the hon. the Attorney-General, reduces to precision the Government's proposals, these proposals leave the position unpredictable so far as the Government is concerned. Says the Minister of Finance:

"The tax holiday legislation will be repealed but incentives to industrial development will be provided through tariff concessions to manufacture for the home market, through accelerated write-

off of capital expenditure for tax purposes (as proposed in this section of the Budget Speech) and through negotiated concessions, if necessary, to industries producing for the export market. Private investors will be invited to participate in Government industrial enterprises."

It seems to me here, if I understand the proposals as contained on page 2 of the amended Budget statement, that a large area of administrative discretion will be left to the Government, which is undesirable and certainly not such as to be conducive to attracting investors and *entrepreneurs*. Mind you, this is the Government that says it wants private investors, though I understand a certain gentleman in this Government frowns on private enterprise. I am not discussing whether having private enterprise is good or bad. I am judging them on their own word.

Since the Members of the Government say they want private enterprise — so they say — it seems to me, if they mean what they say that it is necessary and desirable to attract private investors into the manufacturing and entrepreneurial fields, either on their own or as partners with Government, that they have got to be more precise in their legislation and their policy, and the area of discretion should be clearly known. It should perhaps be an area of percentage, but certainly not left as vague as adumbrated by the hon. Minister of Finance here.

8.45 p.m.

The Capital Gains Tax and Gift Tax we do not oppose. I have already observed that you cannot blame those who think this is the thin edge of the wedge, and remember that mere asseveration at Budget time in the House cannot create confidence in your intentions, because while you are saying one thing you have your satellites and lieutenants in the country saying another thing. Let us be frank about it, that the P.P.P., like all democratic parties, supported Castro in his

revolution against Batista. The P.P.P., after Castro was successful, went on to say he was the greatest liberator of the century. The People's Progressive Party has at all times until today accepted and supported everything that has happened in Cuba. Without attempting on our part a qualitative judgment, I put it this way: Castro is the hero of the P.P.P., though I hope the leader of the P.P.P. does not share the thought of being pushed further into the background by his colleagues.

Castro, after his successful revolution, said he was pledged to maintain free elections and what are called the formal democratic freedoms. Afterwards he gave a reason why it was not necessary to have free elections, a reason which does not persuade me. It may persuade others. Well, people object to this and say "If these people are worshippers of Castro, and Castro said one thing and later on said something else, is it not reasonable to believe that they are merely being astute in the particular circumstances when they say they will not do this and will not do that"? I am a Guianese, I am opposed to the P.P.P., but, after all, since they are in office I think it my bounden duty as a Guianese to explain to them why people do not believe them when they come here and say "We will not do this." When we find Guianese leaving their country it is no answer to say they are leaving because of the United Force fear campaign. Accepting your proposition, it means that the United Force, by its fear campaign, is succeeding where you have failed. *[Interruption]*. Mr. Speaker, I must —

**Mr. Speaker:** I think it is time I call attention of hon. Members to the Standing Orders and ask them if they are so blissfully unaware of the provisions. I have endeavoured all this afternoon to explain to hon. Members that we have five full days and nights of sitting, and

if they are not tired I am physically tired. If they want to continue to indulge in cross-talk across the Table and keep us here until midnight they can find the Deputy Speaker. He is an elected Member. I am here at your election. Now, hon. Members, make your choice. Either we follow Standing Order No. 34 in so far as interruptions are concerned, and let the hon. Member finish his speech, or you continue interrupting and let us go on until midnight or thereafter. It is as simple as that.

**Mr. Burnham :** As I was saying, that would be a confession by the P.P.P. Government that the United Force has a much more effective propaganda machine so far as reaching the minds of the community is concerned. And it is no answer to say, as did the hon. Premier two weeks ago at a Press Conference, that people are leaving the country because of unemployment. It has been shown for some time now that the immigrants to the United Kingdom from the West Indies and British Guiana are not primarily from the ranks of the unemployed. They are skilled people, many of them. Many of them are semi-skilled; many of them with a little more, shall we say — to use a word which would be easily understood but I do not think accurately describe the situation — ambition than others. That is the type of person who has been migrating from this country and the other Caribbean territories.

So that unemployment is a facile but unsatisfactory answer. The question is whether those people see a future in British Guiana. For myself I think anyone who migrates is a coward. How can you expect to go to other people's country to enjoy what they have built up if you are not prepared to stay here and fight, if necessary? I think such people are despicable cowards and they are less than men. But then the world is made of men and mice, and if you know

[MR. BURNHAM]

by your acts, by your faults you are going to cause more cowards or less courageous ones to run away, and you know that you need all the human resources you can possibly get to build this country, it is time you start some re-thinking and reconsideration of your attitudes and your policies.

The Budget is replete with lots of fine phrases, but fine phrases cannot run a country; they cannot improve economic conditions. Let us examine for a moment, now that we have considered for a while the ideology, the competence, the other criterion—of this Government. How intelligent is this Government? I heard the Premier to say that his Government has been accused of incompetence. First of all, the price one pays for entering into public life is the privilege of being criticized publicly. The price a party pays for being in Government is to be criticized for everything, including incompetence, and it is nothing short of childish, puerile, to come into this Chamber and to get annoyed because you are accused of incompetence. What you should do is to show that you are not incompetent if you can succeed in proving it, or be men enough to admit that a mistake has been made, and try to do better.

Instead, Members of the Government come here with long quotations about Latin America. A certain gentleman, not an elected Member of the House but a Member of the House, knows that we have heard most of those quotations before, during the last four or five years—quotations of what Dr. Castro and Nehru have said. Quotations do not do anything; they do not gloss over incompetence. I share the view of my English Master that prolonged quotation is not an ostentatious display of learning, but clear evidence of the absence of absorptive capacity. You cannot absorb what you read, so you come here with a lot of papers and say

that Mr. X says this and Mr. Y or Professor X says this. It is a wonder we do not now hear of what Lord Trefgarne said. Apart from the fact that I think it is proof of little or no absorptive capacity, I think it is irrelevant to our present situation.

We agree with you that there has been exploitation in Latin America. We do not want to hear those facts and figures again. We want this Government to so guide our destinies and the economy of this country that British Guiana will not be another Brazil, or another Latin American country. No academic learning or quotation of figures to show how many millions or billions were made by exploiters in other countries will help the situation in this country. This Government has been palpably incompetent, I say. We hear from the Premier that the P.P.P. was the first party to talk about economic planning, and for his talk about it he was dubbed a communist. I do not know. That is history, but in 1957 the P.P.P. went into office. In 1962, five years after, the party, whose leader claims that when he was in the Opposition in the period 1947—1953, he was the first person to talk about economic planning, is still saying "We are planning to have an economic planning unit." He went to England with the Governor and said he wanted \$200 million, but the Governor said "You cannot get anything on 'guesstimates.'"

You come here with a Budget after the Ministries had submitted their proposals. How long can Ministries submit proposals for development plans? The Political head cannot submit it, and a civil servant in the ordinary clerical and administrative service cannot submit it. It is a matter for proper investigation, a matter for proper assessment and collation of data. You do not draft a Development Programme by using your skill at adding figures. That is the first evidence of this Government's

incompetence. We hear of Professor Bettelheim. At last they have been able to get him—the same Professor Bettelheim whose Development Programme Sekou Toure rejected, and in *Monthly Review*, a Left Wing American periodical, subscribed to by the P.P.P., he is castigated by another Marxist economist for being backward, unprogressive and unimaginative. It is not without significance that even amongst the Marxist economists the P.P.P. has to find the most backward, unimaginative and incompetent.

9 *v.m.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Standing Order No. 62 (2) which deals with the presentation and Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill states:

“ . . . At 9 o'clock on the last day, unless the debate is concluded earlier, the Speaker shall put any question necessary to bring the proceedings on second reading to a conclusion.”

I understand that there has been an arrangement among the three Leaders of the House which was put before me for my agreement. I have agreed that, subject to the House passing a Motion for the suspension of the relative Standing Order, we may go on until twelve o'clock tonight, the latest.

**The Minister of Works and Hydraulics (Mr. Ram Karran):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of the relevant Standing Order to permit the debate to continue until twelve o'clock.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Burnham :** I was speaking of the Government's inability to set up an economic planning unit, although it was in office for five years. I have already referred to this Government's approach to agriculture. The production of rice has increased, and drainage as well as irrigation have been improved for the production of more rice. Now the

Government wants to tax foodstuffs. The hon. Minister of Finance says that one of the purposes of this new tax proposal is to protect or encourage local production. But what have we seen?

In the 1940's when the hon. Premier entered into the field of politics, he remarked that in British Guiana one ate everything out of a can; everything was canned, and he used to make a pun, when we were in England in 1954, that our food was canned and our music was canned. Up to 1962 that is still true. If one wants peas, one takes it out of a can; if one wants tomato juice, one gets it in a can; if one wants pineapple when it is out of season, one can get it in a can. We are eating almost everything out of a can and the can is not even made here. They have not yet canned cassava here or elsewhere, but they have canned milk elsewhere and not here.

It seems to me to be elementary that, so far as our agricultural policy is concerned, there should have been an emphasis on the diversification of our produce so as to satisfy our own needs. That, as the hon. Minister of Finance recognizes, would result in our saving foreign exchange which can be used for the purchase of capital goods and starting developmental schemes. There is a glut in oranges here periodically; there is a glut in pineapples periodically, but nothing has been done to set up the necessary canning facilities. I know that because I have had clients who have been considering this matter. To set up the necessary facilities for canning the orange juice that is extracted from oranges will cost about \$80,000. Where do we see evidence of that in Government's agricultural policy? All we can see is rice, rice.

After 5 years in office the Members of the Government are still saying that they cannot get capitalists to come in and establish a canning factory. If the

[MR. BURNHAM]

Members of the Government believe in State enterprises, why can't they start State enterprises in these fields? The P.N.C. is not going to oppose it. I cannot understand why the P.P.P. continues to make these mistakes. I cannot understand why it does not do the obvious. It is taxing salmon, but it does nothing about fisheries. I am a member of the *Ad hoc* Fisheries Committee, and I say that nothing has been done by way of preserving and/or storing fish. At one time one sees thousands of tons of fish being thrown away in this country, and yet one has to buy saltfish not because of one's taste, but because fresh fish is not available.

We have heard a lot about infrastructure, but I can only think of infra-red. Those things are for the economists. There are so many things we can do if we had the will, courage and foresight. I understand from the hon. Premier that there is a lot of good will for British Guiana outside of this country. Then let that good will be translated into the establishment of the infrastructure or the infra-red structure or what have you while we use the facilities we have in diversifying our agriculture. Be a little more sensible in our distribution, marketing and transport. It is not beyond the competence of this Government to provide refrigeration for the fish. The Government can then tax mere heavily commodities like imported milk and salmon etc., but it should produce the alternative items before introducing such taxation.

Another indication of incompetence is the sort of haughty, inconsiderate attitude of this Government to its employees. Of course we heard from the hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech on January 31 that Government recognized the need for an

efficient Civil Service. But what is needed in British Guiana today is not only an efficient, but an enthusiastic Civil Service. Efficiency is easy to come by; efficiency is merely doing exactly what you are supposed to do in a given time. This Government does not have the enthusiastic support of the Civil Service because it has been prodigal of such potential support. First of all, we start off with the cliché of the Civil Service being the "stooges" of our Imperialist masters. Secondly, we hear "not a cent more in 1959." Thirdly, we hear cajolery, abuse, and then of strike. There is no doubt about these facts.

In the past the civil servants have looked to the Colonial power for preferment and promotion. An efficient civil servant always shows that he can keep well with the powers that be. But we are moving to Independence, and, in the same way as certain ex-members of the Interim Government have been accommodated by the P.P.P. on the assumption that they have changed, it is necessary for the Government by its attitude to ensure that a change takes place amongst the civil servants.

In India Sir Maharaj Singh was a valuable servant to the British Imperialist, but he was accommodated into the new system and became the Governor of Bombay. The same may be said of the top-brass of the Indian Civil Service, but the trouble about this Government is that it is too doctrinaire in its approach and too haughty in its attitude. The civil servants should have been inspired from the time this Government came into office, because 1957 was the beginning of the end of the Colonial system. From the time this Government came into office it should have, by its pronouncements and its attitudes, taken the civil servants into its confidence and should have made it clear to them that they were an integral part of the new order which was

to be established. This Government has failed palpably in its relations with the Civil Service, and only God knows whether this relationship which has deteriorated can ever be improved.

Look at the enthusiasm one finds in the Civil Service in Trinidad and Jamaica, and compare it with the enthusiasm or absence of enthusiasm in the Civil Service in British Guiana! It makes no sense to blame the Civil Service in British Guiana for this state of affairs. It is for the Government to make the wrong right. Some hon. Members say: Let the civil servants go; we can always find people to take their places; we have a lot of people unemployed. Other hon. Members say: Do not worry about ability and qualifications—those are old Imperialist methods of giving preference and preferment to the privileged class. Where are we going to at this rate?

With reference to Guianization, what are we doing about it? A foreigner has been brought here to be the Commissioner of Police even before the retirement of the first Guianese Commissioner of Police. Can you imagine this Nationalist Government, this Socialist Government, this Revolutionary Government importing a foreigner to be the new Commissioner of Police?

“We want Independence,” says the Government. I do not know whether I am myopic. I have searched the Estimates in vain for provision for the training of the necessary personnel to man our Foreign Services. If I were myopic, I would have sought the good offices of the hon. Minister of Finance in his professional as distinct from his political capacity. I am told that when we are independent we can ask Britain to represent us, and if it happens that Britain's principles are different from ours we can ask somebody else to represent us. Can't we be realistic? Can't we see that the centre of power is shifted

to British Guiana? Can't we see that the responsibility is ours, if we want to make a reality of Independence? Government must have confidence in its administration. I suppose the Members of the Government will learn in time. However, it will be necessary to have the basic staff to represent us overseas, and people must be trained and qualified to do that.

9.15 p.m.

Another indication of incompetence is to be found in education. The hon. Member for Abary has already observed that it is indicative of the Government's disregard for education and the low priority that it has not seen fit to appoint a Member of this, the more important House, as Minister of Education and, furthermore, has not even done this House the courtesy of appointing a Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education in this House; so there is no one here to speak with authority. There may be some who speak with the tongue of Pharisees and Scribes, but no one to speak here with authority on the question of education.

We are going to have, we are told, an accelerated programme of training. We are going to send more people into the Government Training College because there is a paucity of trained teacher and too great a preponderance of untrained teachers. The difference between a trained teacher and an untrained teacher can be appreciated, I believe, by the hon. Minister of Communications (Mr. Wilson), but when they are making provision for courses for teachers, they just up it by \$2,500—from \$6,000 to \$8,500—this year. But you get some new set of jobs for the boys—this is how education suffers—88 village workers—\$103,200—not for more trained teachers, but for jobs for the boys euphemistically described as village workers.

Private secondary schools: We heard an exchange between one Minister and the hon. Member for **Georgetown**

[MR. BURNHAM]

North as to why Government is not prepared to give more money. The Minister said that it was because these schools were privately run and the money would be put into the pockets of those who owned the schools. Probably, that was an attempt to be humorous, but the Minister should be reminded that it was, not upon his ability as a humorist that he was elected a Minister.

The private secondary schools operating in this country are providing a service, a service which Government ought to have provided and a service which Government will, we hope in the not too distant future, provide directly. It seems to me that it is only reasonable that private secondary schools should be further assisted by the Government if there is to be an improvement of our educational system and facilities, and if there is to be an integration of our educational system, because you cannot compel an integration unless you have a part in it and pay the piper.

If, perchance, there are some Principals of private secondary schools who like to pocket the money, there is the Attorney-General, one of the finest of our lawyers, very competent, and he can draft the necessary legislation and regulations to prevent school Principals from stealing the money. Certainly, the Minister who made that observation must have intended to be facetious or to insult our intelligence. It is the same hon. Minister who said that the Government could not vote \$100 a month to pay a rural letter-carrier to deliver the people's letters in Wismar, but it can pay the Premier \$200 a month to entertain whom I don't know—Mr. Regier? Mr. Endicott? [Mr. Ram Karrao: "The Leader of the Opposition."] The Leader of the Opposition has always been personally responsible for his own entertainment.

Where in this Budget statement, where in these Estimates do we find appreciation by the Government of importance of the educational system, the attempt to integrate it, the attempt to make it relevant to our circumstances, the attempt even to promise that there will be free secondary education? And this a Socialist Government, a Nationalist Government. [An hon. Member: "College of Liberal Arts."] —Yes, the College of Liberal Arts with which I was just about to deal.

A provision of \$25,000 is made for a College of Liberal Arts. When it ventures into these fields, the Government always shows its further incompetence. First of all, most improperly the Minister of Education — and, unlike the civil servant, he enjoys no immunity here because he ought to have been in here — takes himself up and goes to Jamaica and says, "We are withdrawing from the University College of the West Indies. We are setting up a College of Liberal Arts." My mother used to say, "Fools never raise their thoughts so high." Is a College of Liberal Arts an alternative to sharing in a university? Any of the university men over there on the Government side would understand what I am talking about, and you don't have to be a university man to understand.

Of course, we welcome the establishment of a College of Liberal Arts, but this is not to the exclusion of our participation in a university service. Has the Government got the means to set up immediately a University of Guiana? And even if you have the means to set up a University of Guiana, do you think, really, that the fullest education in its widest and truest sense can be got at a university based on a population of half a million only? I suppose the hon. Minister of Communications will say, yes. Jesus said, "Father forgive them." Have you got the staff for a College of Liberal Arts?

It is an excellent idea. The P.N.C. agrees with that. The P.N.C. agrees that in your College of Liberal Arts there should be an emphasis upon a broader type of education and a more relevant curriculum. We agree with all that. But why be so foolish as to think that because you vote \$25,000 for a College of Liberal Arts you do not need the University? Where are you going to go? Throughout the world, institutions of higher learning are crammed to the hilt. We have an opportunity of participating so far as the running of this institution is concerned, an institution which has just got university status.

If there are criticisms of the University College of the West Indies—and there are justified criticisms, certainly, a contributory Government like ours can and should make those criticisms heard. And I have good reason to believe that the old fogeys who, in the past, dominated the policy of the Council, will find themselves replaced by young, energetic, progressive and intelligent Council members. It would be and it is well within the bounds of possibility, if not probability, that you will be able to change the emphasis of the University College of the West Indies.

This Government and the Minister are not Columbuses when they say that the University College of the West Indies is an English enclave on West Indian soil. That is a criticism which those of us who were there in England made at the time when the University College was being set up and Dr. Irvine was walking around lecturing. This criticism was made then that an attempt was about to be made to transfer Oxford to Mona, which we thought was bad. But the fact is: isn't it better to attempt to change the emphasis, attempt to bring pressure to bear? Formerly, you produced only one B.G. politician from the University College of the West Indies; where are you going to produce them from now — the University of Havana or the University of Heidelberg?

It seems to me that the Government's approach in this matter smacks of — I don't really want to say ignorance; I prefer to use a more parliamentary term. It smacks of an inability to appreciate the realities, and we are offering this criticism quite seriously. I conceded from the very beginning that conditions, economic particularly in British Guiana are bad. I conceded that whichever Government was in office would have found it difficult. The People's National Congress does not for one moment claim occult abilities. It does not suggest that you can wave a wand and all will be fair in the garden of Guiana.

But it seems to me, on the other hand, that the present Government is perhaps the worst Government that we can possibly have had in office at the present time. I say this not merely because of its ideology. I say this also because of its inability to grasp and grapple with the problems of the day, its inability to understand the world in which we live and the necessity that arises from time to time to do rather than to talk. Says the hon. the Premier: "We have a great deal of goodwill." What has he done with that goodwill over the past five years? Says the hon. the Premier: "We have to contribute to our own development." Agreed. But at the same time, by his policies, his attitude and the incompetence of his Government, he has not made it possible for there to be further taxable capital and income in the country for the purpose of making a contribution to the Development Programme. Instead, what happens? His best supporters have exported their capital. One of them asked me if I would be prepared to take money out of the country. I said no, I would not agree. [Mr. Ram Karran: "Why did he ask you?"] He heard I was leaving the country and he thought that I would be as disloyal as he and the other P.P.P. supporters and members.

[MR. BURNHAM]

This Government will obviously have to change its ways, and, if it has any sense of nationalism and patriotism left, if it does not want to change its ways, it should get out and make way for a more competent Government. To come here and ask for co-operation is easy, but how do the Members of the Government co-operate? Says the hon. the Premier: "If you come with sound propositions——". Now, who is the judge of the soundness of the propositions? A man who for five years has not yet been able to set up an economic planning unit; a man who has as his colleague an hon. Minister who thinks that education is a social and unproductive service; a Premier who spends 50 per cent of development on agriculture and 80 per cent of that on rice — he is going to judge of the soundness of proposals from this side.

9.30 p.m.

But if indeed his call for co-operation is a call for suggestions, we are prepared to give them. Many of them can be recognized from the criticism we have made of the administration of the programme. The P.N.C. is very anxious that this country should get on. It is very anxious that the sharp division in our community today should be healed, but the P.N.C. would like to emphasize this: that the way to heal this division is not for Government self-righteously to accuse other persons of being either thieves or racialists.

In the first place may I observe that the P.N.C., which is not made up of illiterates and ignoramuses, has nothing to gain from racialism. Ask yourselves which party has something to gain — not the P.N.C. nor the United Force. Therefore, if the People's Progressive Party, which is the Government, wants to talk about healing the breaches it must first do something to impress upon its supporters, satellites and lieutenants that although the particular

ethnic group which supports the party in the majority has more numbers, ~~the~~ more numbers cannot ride roughshod over the P.N.C. numbers. I have said it privately and I say it publicly, that if 70 per cent Greeks in Cyprus could not liquidate 30 per cent Turks—do I need to continue?

The People's Progressive Party must also learn that we are so short of competent personnel that an effort must be made by the Government to employ the services of all Guianese in the fields in which they have ability or expertise. Do not spend your time abusing the businessmen. You can control them; you are the Government. When you are in power you do not have to abuse. Abuse is for the helpless, the weak. Businessmen cannot milk this country any more. You are in office and you say you do not want the businessmen to milk this country any more, and it shall be so. Why cannot some encouragement be given to them to give their services and ability in the various State industries you propose to establish, and the various corporations you propose to set up, where they would be particularly useful? We are sufficiently short of good material for the Government at this stage to be so disinterested in making use of all the material we have available.

Finally, Bustamante, for whose politics I have no admiration, between whom and myself ideologically there is no bond, but whose commonsense and down-to-earthedness is worthy of admiration, once said at a meeting of West Indies Students which I attended in London, when told about someone's brilliant qualifications in economics, "Economics don't grow plantains." He may have over-stated the proposition, but I think what this Government has to do is to stop being academic and get down to work. There are only three Ministers over there who

show that they understand their portfolios, and whose ability is reflected in the competence and smooth running of their Departments. Of course we do not agree with one particular one, the Minister of Home Affairs. We feel that he is too active [*Laughter.*] But apart from those three Ministers, what do we have? We are regaled by all sorts of theories—what is socialism and what is happening in fields of which some Ministers know nothing. It seems to me that they must spend most of their time reading books when they should be getting on with their work. I do wish they would take a leaf out of the book of the Attorney-General, the Minister of Home Affairs, and the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing. We pay them fat salaries not to lecture on subjects they know nothing about, but to get on with the administration of this country. This Government must either mend its ways or yield to the inevitable.

There is a great deal of talking about the people finding out. It is said of some people that they are the only persons fit to be the wives of Caesar. The P.P.P. has always told us over here "One day the people will find out." It seems to me that one day the people are going to find out that the P.P.P. is all mouth and nothing else. The leaders of that party promise the moon and the stars, but when they get in they cannot even pay the settlers at Black Bush Polder for the padi they produce and send to the central mills.

This Appropriation Bill, in spite of my remarks and observations, will be passed. In any case they have numbers, but even if they did not have numbers we do not want to embarrass them any further by preventing them from being able to get on with the work of Government. But passing the Appropriation Bill is not the be-all and-end-all. I am not a schoolmaster by inclination or profession, but for five years we have been

talking to them, and I hope that now that British Guiana is moving towards Independence they will hearken and understand (1) that they are not the only patriots, (2) that they have no monopoly of intelligence, and (3) that Independence means hard work and less airy politiking [*Applause.*]

9.40 p.m.

**The Minister of Finance** (Dr. Jacob) (replying) : Your Honour, before I attempt to reply to the remarks made on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1962, there is just one observation I cannot resist making at this time. The hon. Member for Ruimveldt claims that he is a Socialist, but this gentleman while claiming to be a Socialist is simultaneously siding with the reactionaries. I know for a fact, from the iron logic of events, that he has been led to a point where there is nothing left of his former militancy, that is, when he was a member of the P.P.P., than false pretences. He is falsely pretending to be a Socialist. I shall deal with this question of Socialism and the socialism of the main Opposition Party a little later on.

In replying to the remarks made on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, I straightway want to express my disappointment. When I moved the Second Reading of this Bill and announced the Government's budgetary policy, including the proposals to increase revenue for recurrent and development expenditure, I made it quite clear that, if any hon. Member on the other side wanted to criticize any of these proposals for raising revenue, he should come forward with constructive alternatives which would produce the equivalent amount of revenue.

What has been done? What is the position? For the past four days and the greater part of today, we have listened to speaker after speaker on the

[DR. JACOB]

Opposition side indulging in certain scurrilous attacks upon the Government without putting forward anything constructive. The scurrility is unequalled even by the yellow journalism of one of the capitalist newspaper, *The Daily Chronicle*.

Your Honour, the primary purpose of the Opposition, as far as I am aware, is not merely to oppose for the sake of opposing; it must do more than that; that is to say, it must act responsibly. Nothing constructive has been put forward. All that the hon. Members of the Opposition have done is to confuse and to misrepresent the reasons for, as well as the objectives of the Government's budgetary policy. Even political partisanship has certain limits but, apparently, the hon. Members of the Opposition are unaware of this. All they seem to be bent on doing is to create as much confusion as possible, to use all mean tactics, some of which are highly questionable and despicable, in order to achieve their selfish ends. In the meantime it means nothing to them whether the whole country suffers, or whether economic progress is held back. They seem to be saying to themselves: We must do all we can, regardless of the consequences, to bring about the downfall of the P.P.P. and the Government.

Now, sir, they have been claiming that two Budgets were presented to the Legislature. They have referred to them as the new Budget and the old or revised Budget. Of course this was the propaganda carried by the Press. The Press, the owners of the Press, as well as the hon. Members of the Opposition, felt that the Government was going to jettison the Budget submitted on the 31st January. All that the Government has done is to make certain modifications to the Budget presented on January 31, and these modifications are only in relation to the revenue proposals. In order to make these modifications, I requested

and received the permission of the House. The Press, the owners of the Press and hon. Members of the Opposition wanted us to present a second Budget in order that they might be able to point to some unusual procedure and, perhaps, have the opportunity of using a great deal of propaganda as well, in urging that the Government should resign.

Your Honour, we have no intention of resigning, and those people who have sought by means of force and violence to overthrow this Government; those people who have used every unconstitutional means to get into power, will have to learn that they must contest and win Elections democratically. Only by doing that will they be able to sit on this side of the House. They have been talking a lot about democracy and freedom, but they tried every illegal means to bring about the downfall of the elected Government. I notice that the hon. Member for Ruimveldt, the Leader of the P.N.C., and the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, the Leader of the U.F., have been very subdued in their criticisms of the Budget. Of course, the reason for this is quite obvious. Certain events have taken place and there will be an inquiry, so I will say no more on that matter at the moment.

The fiscal measures proposed in the Budget and the modifications were very challenging. Because of that I asked the House on January 31 for permission to defer the debate until February 12, so that hon. Members would have an opportunity of studying the proposals very carefully and of returning to the House with any criticisms that were constructive.

[*Interruption from the Public Gallery.*]

9.50 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** Will those citizens who are in the Public Gallery and who wish to leave, please do so quietly? Remember, you are disturbing the hon.

Minister of Finance who is speaking. Please leave quietly and don't all go at the same time.

**Dr. Jacob :** During this time, steps were taken by the political opposition to generate hatred for and contempt of this Government and to intensify the campaign which was in force for some time to bring about the overthrow of the Government. But even before the outbreak of violence, murder, arson and looting, the Government had announced that, because of the large number of representations received and the need to give them careful thought, it had agreed to defer to a later date the consideration of the Budget by this House, and that date, as Your Honour knows, was April 3.

Another fact which we have to bear in mind is that all of these proposals announced in the Budget statement were aimed at getting everyone in this country to make some contribution, according to his capacity to bear taxation, to the cost of the recurrent and development expenditure of the country. Of course, this called for a certain amount of sacrifice which eventually would have been for the benefit not only of the present, but of succeeding generations. The privileged, however, and their political allies inside and outside of this House, were only prepared to pay lipservice to the need for development.

Of course, we meant what we have always said, and because of this, because we meant to proceed with the Development Programme, the Opposition thought that this was a good opportunity of using the Budget as a means of overthrowing the Government. It is, indeed, a sad commentary on the whole shameful episode which took place in February last and which had for its purpose the violent overthrow of the Government —

**Mr. Speaker:** You keep referring to the "violent overthrow of the Government". This is one of the things which the Commission of Inquiry would be required to look into. As far as I know, that is a matter which is still *sub-judice*. I have allowed you to use it once or twice, but I do not think you should keep pressing on with that.

**Dr. Jacob:** Because we wanted to raise \$10½ million in revenue to meet recurrent and development needs, the activities of this minority, led, of course, by the Fascists, have resulted in a national loss of between \$30 million and \$40 million. This is the result of the shameful events prior to and after February 16th last.

I want to recall, very briefly, for the benefit of the House, the objectives of the budgetary policy of the Government announced on January 31 and modified thereafter. First, the main objective was to prevent avoidance and evasion of tax in this country. This naturally incurred the wrath of the avoiders and evaders, and that is why they sought to bring about our overthrow. Secondly, it was to mobilize or to harness internal resources for development by the accumulation of capital. Thirdly, it was to guarantee the continuation of the 1960/1964 Development Programme. Fourthly, it was aimed at redistributing the wealth and the income of the country towards a greater degree of equality. Fifthly, it was to make the system of taxation more equitable and efficient. Sixthly, it was to prevent the loss of revenue by over-generous tax concessions which did not really, in the past, stimulate any foreign investment. Seventhly, it was to curb undesirable consumption of imports and therefore assist in our 'balance-of-payments' problem. It was also to stimulate economic activity by the production of more local goods which are, at present, being imported.

[DR. JACOB]

All in all, it was to place the burden of taxation on the backs of the people who could afford to pay; but in order that there should have been some equity or fairness in allocating this burden, a small portion of it fell on the low-income groups, and the extent of this weight on the low-income groups, upon calculation by the statisticians in the Ministry of Finance, was an increase in the cost of living of the working class of about one per cent. Of course, this has been misrepresented by the Press and also by the Opposition.

10 p.m.

Those criticisms made by the Opposition will be dealt with in the order in which they were made. The first Member of the Opposition who spoke was the hon. Member for Werk-en-Rust (Mr. Carter). This hon. Member told the House that we were passing through the darkest hour in the history of the country; that the country was divided, torn by racial strife and dissensions. Unfortunately, the country is divided and, indeed, there is a certain degree of racial strife. But why is the country divided? In 1953 the working-class people of this country were so united that in spite of the opposition of the wealthy, with their Press and other media of propaganda, the working-class people won a tremendous victory at the polls. That Government was removed from office without justification, because it was committed to serve the working-class people of this country.

Imperialism then set to work, and the blame for the division in this country, which today has assumed racial proportions, must be laid squarely on the imperialists and the Colonial Office. This was their work. But in order to divide the country they had to depend on Guianese who could be used as the tools and instruments of division, and

they found them. That is why today the hon. Member for Werk-en-Rust can stand up here, and with an air of innocence say there is racial strife in this country. They have capitalized on the racial division in this country. We, as a Socialist party, realize that Socialism has nothing to do with race. It is an international question; it cuts across racial, religious and other lines. One cannot be a racist and a Socialist at the same time, but there are phoney or pseudo-socialists — “social democrats” I think they call themselves — who think it is possible to be a Socialist and also a racist.

That is why we have always pleaded for the reunification of the major race groups, indeed of all the race groups in this country, as long as they belong to the working class; and until we can recapture that unity which we knew in 1953, progress in this country will be very difficult. We have always pleaded for the reunification of all the races. This is not a struggle between race and race, or religion and religion, but a struggle against the exploiters of the working class. That is the issue facing us. But the master class is able to divide the working class by using race and religion and other means, and they have succeeded, unfortunately. So when hon. Members talk about racism and the country being divided and experiencing its darkest hour, they must ask themselves who were the instruments used by the imperialists to divide this country?

Of course the party system is established, but how is it established? The main Opposition parties make their appeals to the public on the basis of race. “There is a total lack of confidence in the Government,” says the hon. Member for Werk-en-Rust. Lack of confidence by whom? Who lacks confidence in the Government — the majority of the Guianese people? And who is responsible for the lack of confi-

dence? The yellow Press that smears the Government, that sends false propaganda abroad; the yellow Press that is a subversive agent in this country, a segment of which is bossed by the hon. Member who also bosses a group called the United Force. "Aid from the Socialist bloc", says the same hon. Member. "Government has spoken about aid from the Socialist bloc, but none has come so far". The hon. Member knows as well as I do that unless a country is politically free it is difficult for it to take advantage of such aid, and that is why the Opposition sabotaged the last Constitutional talks.

They say, on the question of Independence, that there are fears and doubts in the minds of the people. Who created those fears and doubts? We had the shameful events of February 16. Ministers of this Government have had their lives threatened; they have been stoned and their houses have been damaged. Who are responsible for those things? Members of the Government have had to evacuate their families lest they be injured, if not killed. Those are the forces stalking the land. The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mr. Chandisingh) dealt with the matter of fear, and I am sorry that the hon. Members of the Opposition are not here at this moment, but perhaps they knew what might have been coming.

I have here in my hand a letter, anonymous of course, which I found on my desk on April 11, at 8.15 a.m. I found this on my desk at the Ministry on Wednesday. I want it to go into the records of the House, and that is why I am bringing it to Your Honour's notice. There are plotters, would-be assassins, arsonists and all kind of evil-doer in our country today. Enclosed in this letter are two bullets (*exhibited and passed to Mr. Speaker through the Clerk*) wrapped in what is commonly called shop paper. In addition there is a

note, written not in script but "printed." Your Honour, I propose to read the note very slowly. It reads:

"Doc, take these two bullets else I will give you the other four myself. I have you a perfect target every day. Don't worry with bodyguard. If he stands in my way I shall take both of you. My advice is to relax from the Budget.

Your Watch Dog."

The envelope is addressed to me, and in the top right hand corner where the postage stamp is usually placed, there is a drawing of a Crucifix. I intend to hand over the envelope and its contents to the Police for investigation of the matter.

There we have it! Hon. Members on the other side of the Table who talk about fear do not know what they are talking about. I told the P.N.C. supporters at Vreced-en-Hoop a few days before polling day, when they waved brooms in our faces, molested the crowd and stoned my car, "You may kill the leaders of the P.P.P., but the P.P.P. will live on." I told them that.

10.15 p.m.

Everything was calm for a while, and then the turmoil began all over again. I say here again tonight that, whatever they do, whatever illegal means they adopt, whatever outside force they may get to assist them, the working-class movement in this country is here to stay, and stay it will until this country is cleared of all the exploiters, Fascists and those who want to grind the poor humble people into the dust and to continue living off their toil and sweat. All of this has been done not merely to destroy the Government, but to delay the granting of Independence to this country. They pay lip-service to Independence, but they do not really want it. The longer the *status quo* remains, the better it will be for these so-called socialists.

[Dr. JACOB]

The hon. Member for North West — I am glad to see him here, because I want to say that he has shown the proper spirit when he said that he would not leave this country even though I know that the hon. Members of his party think otherwise. He said that he would not run away as many others are doing. It is true that many people are encouraged by the activity of the party to which he belongs, as well as by the activity of the newspaper which is bossed by the Leader of his party, to leave this country. I am pleased to see that he has shown some courage and intends to stick it out here instead of running away like some other cowards. He also made the remark that the tax proposals have "hooks". That is a rather humorous remark, but perhaps the hooks are there to catch the crooks.

**Mr. Campbell** (North West): On a point of order or correction. I never used the word "hooks" in this House.

**Dr. Jacob:** I made a note of what the hon. Member said, but if he says that he did not say so, I am sorry.

The hon. Member for Upper Demerara River talks about the personal income tax allowance. He seems to think, and I believe he is the financial wizard of the P.N.C., that the personal income tax allowance is meant to be the amount which is supposed to be capable of maintaining a taxpayer. If this hon. Member had the faintest idea of what is meant by the personal income tax allowance, I do not think he would have compared this allowance with the allowance which is provided for a Police dog. He tried to make the point that the Police dog is regarded more highly than a human being. That just shows the lack of knowledge or the ignorance of the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River.

He also said that the allowance for dependent relatives was restricted to four persons. If he had used his head, he would have realized why the Government restricted it to four persons. It is merely because the taxpayers in the lower income brackets would not be earning enough to take advantage of the allowance if it were made for an unlimited number of people. That is why the Government limited the number to four persons. The Government has made it impossible for the people in the higher income brackets to take advantage of this allowance because they can afford to pay tax without getting the allowance. The Government is attempting to avoid penalizing the people in the lower income group.

Of course, the hon. Member said that the Government was doing what Mussolini had done in Italy. He was referring, I think, to the National Development Savings Scheme. There has been mention of the word "Fascism" in this House. Again I must state my regret that the hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar) is not here. However, one of his colleagues is now in the House and, for his benefit as well as the benefit of other hon. Members, I want to quote a definition of the word "Fascism". I propose to quote from a publication entitled *What is Socialism?* It was published by the *New York Labour News Company* in October, 1958. I quote:

"Fascism, or totalitarianism, is an instrument for perpetuating capitalist rule and for prolonging the privileges of the capitalist class. Wherever it has raised its ugly head it has had the support of the big bankers, big merchants and big industrialists. The records of profit, etc., in Fascist countries show that the big capitalists have been its main beneficiaries. Their business has been "controlled" and their gluttony curbed in some cases, but these measures are designed to protect capitalists' property from the excesses of the capitalist class, not to destroy it.

“Fascism is a form of decadent capitalism. It is capitalism without the mask of democracy. It is an attempt to save capitalism from its own internal contradictions through economic controls. It is a despotic instrument for effecting the total subjugation of the working class.”

**Mr. Campbell:** On a point of order. Are we dealing with a treatise on Fascism, or with the Budget?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is in reply to the points raised by other hon. Members.

[*At this stage a few hon. Members of the Opposition left the Chamber and went to the Lobby.*]

**Dr. Jacob:** I am sorry that the cowardice of certain hon. Members has caused them to leave their seats before I have completed my reply. According to the hon. Member for Georgetown Central and the group known as the U.F., they have the cheek to say that they speak in behalf of the working class. [**Mr. Burnham:** “On behalf”.] I say in behalf. [**Mr. Burnham:** “English is English”.] That is pedantic. If the hon. Member will not interrupt, I will be able to get on.

Sir, the financial wizard, the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River, wanted to know what was meant by prestige advertising. This will be spelt out in the legislation to come before this House. But, for the benefit of hon. Members opposite, I shall say that prestige advertising means any type of advertisement which does not promote the sale of any product or service. The hon. Member wants to know why the Government has disallowed entertainment expenses, and he says that this is a question of discrimination. It is known that the provision of entertainment allowances by these big firms gives them an opportunity to dodge taxation, and that the entertainment expenses are meant for doing other things and securing other purposes. In the circum-

stances, the Government feels that entertainment expenses should be disallowed because their present treatment tends to lead to many evils.

Another member of the P.N.C., the hon. Member for Georgetown South — in fairness to him I must say that of all the contributions made from the other side of the House his was, probably the only one which contained one or two constructive criticisms, and those in regard to import duties. I have made a note of his suggestions. Of course, he descended to the same level of vilification as some of the other hon. Members. I shall pass on and leave that alone for the moment.

The hon. Member for Campbellville said he read in the papers that the Minister of Finance in India had resigned after presenting a Budget allegedly prepared by Mr. Nicholas Kaldor. I would like to assure the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues that the Minister of Finance in this Government has absolutely no intention of resigning, regardless of their threats and intimidation and their attempt to violently overthrow the Government.

*10.30 p.m.*

Certain criticisms were made of Mr. Kaldor. I think it was the same hon. Member for Upper Demerara River who said he was a mere theorist. The shallow and superficial criticisms which came from the hon. Gentleman who is the shadow Minister of Finance in the People's National Congress are not deserving of a reply. However, since he took it upon himself to refer to Mr. Kaldor, I merely want to bring this to the attention of the House. I have in my hand a copy of the London *Times* dated Friday, 23rd March, 1962, and on page 14 there is a news item which states

[DR. JACOB]

"Mr. Gaitskell yesterday named 11 people who have accepted his invitation to sit on a commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Reith, to consider, for the Labour Party, 'the role of commercial advertising in present-day society and to recommend whether reforms are required, and if so, what.'"

Even the Labour Party is considering the whole question of advertising, and on this Commission, there are such people as Mr. Mark Abrams, head of the research division of the London Press Exchange; Miss Elaine Burton, former Labour M.P.; Mr. Brian Copland, research director; Mr. Lan Day, an economist at Somerville College, Oxford; Mr. Nicholas Kaldor, Reader in Economics at Cambridge and a Fellow of King's College; and various other eminent people from the fields of education, business and industry. I am not here to defend Mr. Kaldor or give him any build-up because he is sufficiently eminent in the United Kingdom and internationally, but the type of criticism we get from the other side shows the low level to which some people will go in order to cast aspersions on their superiors.

"The vicious tax proposals" says the hon. Member for Campbellville (Mr. Bissember), "created the events of February 16". I do not want to comment any further in view of the inquiry.

The hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar) reminded the House that a certain Fascist organization in the country and a newspaper connected with it had posed the question to the hon. Premier of this country, "Are you a Communist?" This question has been treated with the contempt which it deserves. I do not wish to waste time — the hon. Member is not back in his seat — but he does not have to say

whether he is Fascist, neither does a large segment of the Guianese people have to ask the question, for this is well known by his deeds.

Why has the *Daily Chronicle* been banned? "Because the Government cannot stand criticisms" — the hon. Member for Georgetown North (Mr. Cheeks) speaking. A newspaper that is openly engaging in subversive activities in this country, that is peddling falsehoods abroad, has no right to have its representatives — I do not know if that is the right term — in this House posing questions like these. In other countries, it would not have been in existence today, but we believe in certain fundamental freedoms and it will be allowed. However, there is a limit and they had better watch their steps.

Both the hon. Member for Georgetown North and the hon. Member for Abary (Mr. Wharton) spoke about the educational system. One of them referred to it as being imperialist controlled. They talked about the imperialist method of education. That is exactly what this Government wants to change. They are schoolmasters. They should know what we want to change and that all this is bound up with the question of education by the Church and the State.

I did a little research and I came upon this book. This deals with the system of education in Britain and, with your permission, sir, I should like to quote from this book which is entitled *Imperialism*. It was written by a liberal economist about 60 years ago. His name is John A. Hobson and on page 217 of this book he writes as follows — this is what obtains in Britain —

"Most serious of all is the persistent attempt to seize the school system for Imperialism masquerading as patriotism. To capture the childhood of the country, to mechanize its free play into the routine of military drill, to cultivate the

savage survivals of combativeness, to poison its early understanding of history by false ideals and pseudo-heroes, and by a consequent disparagement and neglect of the really vital and elevating lessons of the past, to establish a "geocentric" view of the moral universe in which the interests of humanity are subordinated to that of the "country" (and so, by easy, early, natural inference, that of the "country" to that of the "self"), to feed the always overweening pride of race at an age when self-confidence most commonly prevails, and by necessary implication to disparage other nations, so starting children in the world with false measures of value and an unwillingness to learn from foreign sources—to fasten this base insularity of mind and morals upon the little children of a nation and to call it patriotism is as foul an abuse of education as it is possible to conceive. Yet the power of Church and State over primary education is being bent consistently to this purpose, while the blend of clericalism and autocratic academicism which dominates the secondary education of this country pours its enthusiasm into the same evil channel. Finally, our centres of highest culture, the universities, are in peril of a new perversion from the path of free inquiry and expression, which is the true path of intellectual life."

Then it goes on to say:

"The real determinants in education are given in these three questions: "Who shall teach? What shall they teach? How shall they teach?" Where universities are dependent for endowments and incomes upon the favour of the rich, upon the charity of millionaires, the following answers will of necessity be given: "Safe teachers. Safe studies. Sound (i.e. orthodox) methods." The coarse proverb which tells us that "he who pays the piper calls the tune" is quite as applicable here as elsewhere, and no bluff regarding academic dignity and intellectual honesty must blind us to the fact."

In this country, the school system has been seized by these people and they do not want to give up control of it. The privileged want to continue to poison the minds of the young, to make them emulate their thoughts. They think along certain channels, and this, indeed, is the evil system which we wish

to remove. To remove this system, we have to abolish clerical control of education in this country, and I think it is well known that it is the policy of this Government to abolish this control which chains the minds of young people, makes them subservient to certain interests and retards progress, and all for what? For the preservation of a rotten, out-worn system, a system which the propagandists tell us is the terminal, the end, stage of society; there is nothing better to succeed it.

We do not believe that kind of — rot, shall I say. We do not believe that, but we feel that human progress will continue and mankind will achieve greater dignity the sooner this wicked system is changed — this free enterprise system which has done nothing for humanity but bred wars and suffering and brought untold misery—[**Mr. Campbell:** "It educated you!"] — That is true; the hon. Member is right. I have been educated by this system, in this environment, but I have been able to discover the injustice of this system, and all of the members of the Government and of my party have been able to do this. So we do not have to pose. We do not have to take up different postures every week, every month or every year. We have been consistent.

10.45 p.m.

"An affluent society", says the hon. Member for Georgetown Central. What does he mean by "affluent society"? We, too, believe in an affluent society, but it is an affluent society of the working class — not of the parasitic. They talk about an affluent society in America. We think of a different kind of affluent society, and that is what we intend to have in this country.

The hon. Member does not seem to understand that there are all kinds of economists. Economists have opinions which are poles apart. We have

[DR. JACOB]

*bourgeois* and socialist economists. What kind of economists was he talking about?

We were supposed to imitate the private-enterprise countries. The Premier dealt with this question of imitation, so I will pass on. The hon. Member has criticized all of the taxation proposals, but he does not disclose to the House, so that it can get into the record, that he has a personal interest in rum and beer, on which the Excise duties have been increased. This may be known, but it should be in the record. He is also opposed to the Capital Taxes: the Capital Gains Tax, the Gift Tax and the tax on wealthy undertakings—Bank Breweries, D'Aguiar Bros., Ltd., and Pawnbrokerages. The same servile Press has built up the hon. Member into an industrialist. Most people like beer; anybody could have started a brewery, and anybody can bottle Pepsi Cola. But because the hon. Member has organized a successful brewery we are told he is an industrialist. I do not think that this hon. gentleman is deserving of that appellation. The Government has given him protection. What he has done could have been done by any person who had accumulated capital.

The hon. Member told us that the distribution of wealth helps the redistribution of income. If we leave it to the rich man and we have none of these taxes, all that happens is that wealth is distributed among one family. From our point of view that is not good enough, but that is the kind of redistribution the hon. Member is speaking about. We have introduced all these new taxes in order to ensure that there is an equitable redistribution. Naturally, the hon. Member takes up arms against the Government; he does not want these things. He does not want the Gift Tax or the Capital Gains

Tax. He wants us to leave all the loopholes in the existing tax laws open. We are not prepared to do this. I shall give an example of why the men of property in this country are so antagonistic towards this Government; and remember, too, that men of property have never liked democracy. It was those men of property who opposed universal adult suffrage. It was they, who, when they found that their little empires were threatened, resorted to Fascism, according to the definition here. It was those same men of property who made Hitler and Mussolini do their work.

To give an example why the hon. Member is afraid of the Capital Gains Tax, I have here an extract from the records at the Deeds Registry. It refers to the purchase, on the 14th April, 1956, by Messrs D'Aguiar Bros., Ltd. of 6.9 acres of land on lots A and B, Ruimveldt, for the sum of \$27,500, that is \$4,515 per acre. On the same day, not 6.9 acres but 4.3 acres of that land were sold to a Company called Bank Breweries Ltd., for, not \$27,500, the purchase price of the much larger area, but \$40,000.

**Mr. d'Aguiar:** To a point of correction! First of all the hon. the Premier made this statement, and I would like to give the facts which are indisputable. In 1950 my Company approached Messrs. Sandbach, Parker & Co. to purchase land for a rum bond, because we purchase rum from them exclusively. For that reason they agreed to sell us land at a special price of \$5,000 an acre, and that deal was negotiated before Bank Breweries came into existence.

**Dr. Jacob** rose —

**Mr. Speaker:** It is a very serious charge. The hon. Minister sat down, thus indicating that he gave way to the

hon. Member's point of correction. I do not think the Minister can now rise to object to the hon. Member's point of correction being heard. The hon. Member for Georgetown Central will proceed to make his point of correction.

**Mr. d'Aguiar:** The deal with Sandbach, Parker was concluded long before Bank Breweries came into existence. Its prospectus was issued in September, 1955, and long before Bank Breweries came into existence I approached Sandbach, Parker again and said: "You have agreed to sell me land for a rum bond. Would you be good enough to sell some land for the brewery at the same reasonable price?" This was agreed.

**Mr. Jagan (Suddie):** To a point of order!

**Mr. Speaker:** Let us hear your point of order.

**Mr. Jagan:** Standing Order 34 says:

34. Interruptions.—  
 No Member shall interrupt another Member except —
- (a) by rising to a point of order, when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and the Member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision; or
  - (b) to elucidate some matter raised by that Member in the course of his speech, provided that the Member speaking is willing to give way and resumes his seat and that the Member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair."

I submit that what the hon. Member is trying to do now is not to elucidate anything said in the course of his speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member for Suddie has raised a point, and from what he has quoted there is merit in what he says. On the other hand, the hon. Minister of Finance is replying to the debate on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. We have been here day and night for five days, and one must feel tired. I have given the Minister full opportunity and he has introduced a lot of new matter in his reply to the debate. A Member normally takes notes of the points raised, and in the course of his reply to the debate he deals with those points as succinctly as possible. If the Minister is now trying to show why it is that the hon. Member for Georgetown Central is opposing, or has opposed, the Gift Tax, and brings into the question not arguments which we would normally expect to hear, but brings in details which he has not referred to in the course of his original speech, I would be quite prepared to stop the hon. Member from saying anything more, provided also the Minister does not pursue what he is doing, because that is just as palpably wrong as the point which the hon. Member for Suddie has raised in connection with the interruption by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central.

**Mr. d'Aguiar:** I think the House should hear the truth.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think so, but at the same time it would be unfair not to allow you to explain your side of it because, after all, it is going into the records of the House. I do not know what the explanation is. I would like to hear what the Minister of Finance intends to do.

**Dr. Jacob :** I will leave it out.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then let us continue with the debate on the Budget.

11 p.m.

**Dr. Jacob :** I shall merely give an example to show how the hon. Member is trying to oppose the proposals in the Budget. The hon. Member also said that we could have for industrialisation, foreign, private capital and we would have to repay the money. He meant that if the Government borrowed money for public investment it would have to pay back the money. That is quite true. But although the Government may not have to pay for private, foreign investments in cash in the normal way, it still has to pay because all underdeveloped countries throughout the world have been paying back over the centuries — paying back in the genuine poverty of their people, in backwardness and so on. That is what they have been paying back with, and that is what this free-enterpriser, this believer in people's capitalism, as he calls it, wants to continue in our country. We are not prepared to have this type of development. We have seen the misery the hon. Premier referred to in Latin America and the Middle East, which are startling examples of the exploitation, plundering and looting of these underdeveloped countries by big Imperialist, Metropolitan territories. How can a party like the one to which the hon. Member belongs claim that it can bring economic salvation to the working people of this country?

Sir, these baits which the hon. Member has been dangling before the people, if swallowed, will only result in the perpetuation of poverty and misery in our country. I shall expose at all times and on every occasion these advocates of an economic system that will do us no good. The Members of the Government say that the new capital taxes — the capital gains tax, the net property tax and the gift tax — will play an important role in harnessing resources locally for the purpose of public investment. These new taxes will also make

our system of taxation much more equitable. That is why we have decided to include these new taxes in our fiscal system.

The hon. Member for Ruimveldt is very fond of the word "incompetent". I believe he will have it copyrighted. But what contribution has he made to the debate on this most important measure, the Appropriation Bill? [**Mr. Bissember:** "Were you sleeping at the time?"] He speaks about Socialism, but all of his utterances lack conviction, and the majority of the people in this country knows it. He has been changing his position and somersaulting from the time he left the P.P.P. [**Mr. Burnham:** "I did not come here on Jagan's back."] He is a great actor, but in all of his utterances and pretences one finds a deceptive quality that will not deceive people much longer. Every day they are discovering him. In his own party he is a prisoner. [**Mr. Burnham:** "Like Jagan and Benn."]

**Mr. Speaker:** I really cannot see what that has to do with the debate. There seems to be a comparison of policy. Anyway, please carry on.

**Dr. Jacob:** Your Honour, he has claimed — I do not know where he got the idea from — that the Budget is revolutionary. We have never claimed that this is a Socialist Budget. Some hon. Members seem to think that Socialism can be established at one stroke. These very people who temporize with the capitalists, who are the mouthpieces of the master class in a certain party, think we can introduce Socialism overnight. We want to introduce a system of equality; we want to make things equitable; and we want to introduce certain measures to make the fiscal instrument a little more effective.

They seem to think that, with a Constitution which does not give us the power to handle external affairs, with

raid agents of the exploiters creating racial tensions in the country, on which some parties have capitalized, they can make things very difficult for us. That is why we have been pleading for co-operation since the split — since the sell-out. We have been trying to get unity of the working class, but all the hon. Members of the Opposition have been doing in this debate is to use the floor of this House as a means of creating further disunity and racial animosity. They, too, have been speaking in conciliatory tones, but they know who are behind the division that exists in this country. It operates in their interest, and they cannot deny that. He speaks here with a straight face but, secretly, he and his friends are the people behind everything. We are prepared, for the further progress of this country, to co-operate with any reasonable set of people, and we hope that good sense and sanity will return to the community. I believe that there is nothing else worthy of reply.

I wish to reiterate that the Recurrent Budget, as presented, is barely in balance. It is the intention of the Government, during this year, to exercise the strictest control of expenditure to ensure that the disbursements this year on the Recurrent Services of the Government are kept well below the figures budgeted for, so that the budgeted surplus may be used to augment development work.

I think it would be the height of financial folly to spend all of the funds we have in sight and thus risk the consequences of so precarious a balance between revenue and expenditure, when the financial resources which are at the disposal of the Government are almost negligible. The Government is determined that the increased resources to be collected from taxation should be devoted to the maximum possible expenditure on development works, and it

intends to control expenditure both in the Recurrent and Development Accounts so as to ensure that, at the worst, the disbursements will be covered by receipts. It is expected that there will be a surplus to strengthen the financial position of the country.

*11.15 p.m.*

We have had a long and perhaps tedious session on this Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, but I do want to say that in spite of the difficulties we face, some of which have been deliberately created, this Government will continue to give of its best for the future welfare of this country. We hope that the Opposition will in the future try to behave or conduct itself properly; try to contribute to future discussions, to act responsibly, to be constructive. The interests of everyone will then be served, not only by the Government but with the assistance of the people's representatives who sit in the Opposition.

We believe in the transforming of the economy of this country. We believe in a society which is based upon the fundamental freedoms, a society which is not based on competition and struggle. In other words, we believe that a co-operative society is the one that will best serve the interests of the Guianese people, and that co-operative society is the one which people who call themselves Socialists, *bona fide* Socialists, believe in. I express the hope that the "socialists" on the other side of the Table will come around to the idea that falsely pretending to be what they are not will not serve the interests of the people of this country. Only a genuine Socialist Government will contribute to the improvement of the lot of the people of this country and make possible what we have tried to do in this Budget — a just and peaceful society. [*Applause.*]

*Question put.*

*Assembly divided: Ayes 17, Noes 11, as follows:*

*Ayes*

Mr. Shakoob  
Mr. Lall  
Mr. Jagan  
Mr. Hamid  
Mr. Downer  
Mr. Caldeira Mr.  
Bhagwan Mr.  
Robertson Mr.  
Saffee  
Mr. Mann  
Mr. Wilson  
Dr. Ramsahoye  
Dr. Jacob  
Mr. Chandisingh  
Mr. Ram Karran  
Mr. Benn  
Dr. Jagan —17.

*Noes*

Mr. Cheeks  
Mr. Campbell  
Mr. d'Aguiar  
Mr. Wharton  
Mr. Merriman  
Mr. Jordan  
Mr. Joaquin  
Mr. Bissember  
Mr. Correia  
Mr. Kendall  
Mr. Burnham—11.

*Motion carried.*

*Bill read a Second time.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member  
Standing Order 63 (2) states.

“The Estimate shall upon presentation to the Assembly stand referred to the Committee of Supply and the Appropriation Bill upon being read a second time shall stand committed to that Committee.”

I order now that the Appropriation Bill should stand committed to the Committee of Supply.

This is Friday night. I think the earliest we can meet would be Monday so that I will now proceed to adjourn the Assembly until Monday at 2 p.m.

*Adjourned accordingly at 11.28 p.m.*