

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

(Constituted under the British Guiana (Constitution) (Temporary Provisions) Orders
in Council, 1953 and 1956)

Wednesday, 28th December, 1960

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. D. M. Hedges

Attorney-General, Hon. A. M. I. Austin, Q.C.

ex officio

Financial Secretary, Hon. W. P. D'Andrade.

The Honourable Dr. C. B. Jagan	—Member for Eastern Berbice (Minister of Trade and Industry)
” ” B. H. Benn	—Member for Essequibo River (Minister of Natural Resources)
” ” Janet Jagan	—Member for Western Essequibo (Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)
” ” Ram Karran	—Member for Demerara-Essequibo (Minister of Communications and Works)
” ” B. S. Rai	—Member for Central Demerara (Minister of Community Development and Education).
Mr. R. B. Gajraj	—Nominated Member
” W. O. R. Kendall	—Member for New Amsterdam
” R. C. Tello	—Nominated Member
” F. Bowman	—Member for Demerara River
” L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.	—Member for Georgetown Central
” S. Campbell	—Member for North Western District
” A. I. Jackson	—Member for Georgetown North
” S. M. Saffee	—Member for Western Berbice
” Jai Narine Singh	—Member for Georgetown South
” R. E. Davis	—Nominated Member
” A. M. Fredericks	—Nominated Member
” H. J. M. Hubbard	—Nominated Member.

Mr. I. Crum Ewing—Clerk of the Legislature

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

ABSENT :

Mr. Ajodha Singh — Member for Berbice River

Mr. E. B. Beharry — Member for Eastern Demerara

Mr. A. G. Tasker, O.B.E. — Nominated Member—on leave.

The Clerk read prayers.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Friday, 23rd December, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

The Financial Secretary (Mr. D'Andrade): I beg to lay on the Table:

- (i) Report of the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council on its consideration of the 1961 Draft Recurrent and Development Estimates (laid in the Legislative Council on 9th December, 1960), together with the Minutes of the Meetings of the Finance Committee thereon.
- (ii) Report of the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on 20th December, 1960.

Mr. Speaker: The Question is, "That the Report of the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on 20th December, 1960, be adopted".

Agreed to.

Report adopted.

The Financial Secretary: I also beg to lay on the Table:

- (iii) Order in Council No. 97 of 1960 made under section 8 of the Customs Ordinance, Chapter 309, on the 7th day of December, 1960, and published in the Gazette on the 17th of December, 1960.
- (iv) Order in Council No. 98 of 1960 made under section 8 of the Customs Ordinance, Chapter 309, on the 9th day of November, 1960, and published in the Gazette on the 17th of December, 1960.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn): I beg to lay on the Table:

Report of the Lands and Mines Department for the year 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

MOTIONS

DEVELOPMENT ESTIMATES

The Financial Secretary: I beg to give notice of the Motions standing in my name on the Order Paper:

(a) Be it resolved: That this Council approves of the Estimates of Development Expenditure for the year 1961 which have been laid on the Table and recommended in the Report of the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council dated 23rd December, 1960, totalling Twenty-three Million, Nine Hundred and Eighty-eight Thousand, Four Hundred and One Dollars as detailed by Heads in the undermentioned Schedule and of the projects therein being financed from the Development Fund established under the Development Fund Ordinance, 1954.

SCHEDULE

Head No.	Head of Estimate	Estimate in 1961
		\$
I.	Agriculture	1,346,276
II.	Civil Aviation	314,000
III.	Drainage and Irrigation	6,046,550
IV.	Education	1,032,638
V.	Industry and Credits	1,250,000
VI.	Geological Surveys	517,133
VII.	Health	426,000
VIII.	Housing	1,000,000
IX.	Lands and Mines	160,000
X.	Land Development	1,242,474
XI.	Post Office	1,050,000
XII.	Public Works	5,683,720
XIII.	Transport and Harbours	2,141,000
XIV.	Miscellaneous	61,510
XV.	Rural Self-Help	100,000
XVI.	Social Welfare	175,000
XVII.	Local Government	150,000
XVIII.	Amerindian Development	247,000
XIX.	Tourism	45,000
XX.	Electricity Development	1,000,000
XXI.	Forests	100
		\$23,988,401

(b) Be it resolved: That this Council in terms of section 9 of the Customs Ordinance, Chapter 309, confirms Order in Council No. 97 of 1960,

which was made on the 7th day of December, 1960, and published in the Gazette on the 17th of December, 1960.

(c) Be it resolved: That this Council in terms of section 9 of the Customs Ordinance, Chapter 309, confirms Order in Council No. 98 of 1960, which was made on the 9th day of November, 1960 and published in the Gazette on the 17th of December, 1960.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. Davis: I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the following Bill:

Christian Catholic Church (Incorporation) Bill, 1960.

ORDER OF THE DAY

BILL — FIRST READING

The following Bill was read the First time:

A Bill intituled: "An Ordinance to repeal and re-enact the Christian Catholic Church (Incorporation) Ordinance."

APPROPRIATION (1961) BILL BUDGET DEBATE

The Financial Secretary: Sir, I beg to report that the Draft Estimates were considered in Finance Committee in accordance with the Standing Orders; the Report of Finance Committee has been laid today, and I now move that the Council resume the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill intituled:

"An Ordinance to appropriate the supply granted in the current session of the Legislative Council".

Mr. Davis: Are we dealing with the Appropriation Bill now?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, now is the time to debate the Budget. Hon. Members will recall that the hon. The Financial Secretary has already made his Budget Address. We will now continue the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill. Does any other Member wish to speak?

Mr. Jackson: Several changes are taking place in our midst and perhaps some of them are taking place almost imperceptibly, so that many of us may not have caught sight of them. Ever since our entry into this Council, Speeches from the Throne were delivered up to 1959 while the Governor delivering them stood on his feet. At the recent opening of the current Session His Excellency the Governor, Sir Ralph Grey, delivered the Address from the Throne sitting, and one is left to conclude that on that occasion the speech was delivered in a fashion typical of that which is practised in the House of Commons when Her Majesty the Queen delivers the Speech of the British Prime Minister. It does appear that this was one of the occasions when it could be concluded that Sir Ralph Grey acted as Her Majesty's representative, indicating no doubt that the Throne is separate from politics.

In order to support this point of view, I will allude to the occasion when investitures were held at Government House and not within the Chamber as has been the custom and practice for a number of years. One other point which should be made in support of this conclusion is the fact that when the Clerk of this Council approached Sir Ralph Grey to relieve him of his headwear, that was not permitted. Therefore, if the conclusion is wrong that on this occasion the Speech from the Throne was delivered in a fashion typical of what takes place in the House of Commons, then one would have to find another conclusion—one which would not be as kind as the one which I have already arrived at, and to which I have made reference. If my assumption and conclusion are correct, then it follows logically that the Speech delivered was one prepared for, and read by, Sir Ralph Grey in his capacity as the Queen's representative, and somewhere in that Speech, which

[MR. JACKSON]

could be argued perhaps as a further point in support of my conclusion, reference is made to consultation with Ministers. In the circumstances one is entitled, therefore, to offer criticisms of the Speech delivered from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think so. At the present moment we are dealing with the Estimates. There is an annexure to the Governors Speech which gives the views of the individual Ministers.

Mr. Jackson: Thank you, Your Honour, but in that Speech also will be found reference to the Financial Secretary's portfolio.

Mr. Speaker: You are treading on very tender ground. If there is any criticism which will affect His Excellency the Governor, according to the Standing Orders it cannot be permitted. If you have forgotten the Standing Orders I shall refer you to them. They are very clear. You will have to confine your criticisms to the Motion which is the subject of the debate. You know the Rule, don't you?

Mr. Jackson: Yes, Your Honour, I am quite familiar with the Rule, but you will forgive me if I say this: that one is tempted to the course of action —

Mr. Speaker: Yield not to temptation, for yielding is sin.

Mr. Jackson: I thank Your Honour for having referred me back to, perhaps, my childhood, and to the point which I have nearly always in my life kept before my mind.

Mr. Speaker: Well, don't honour it in the breach now. You must not depart from the ways of rectitude, otherwise you will be travelling on the broad road which leadeth to destruction.

Mr. Jackson: I hope, Your Honour, to pursue my course without reaching the stage where there will be destruction — at least in this Council. Whatever can be said of me, I do not think it can be said that I have ever taken a course which could lead to destruction.

Mr. Speaker: I shall always try to keep you on the straight and narrow path, because I hope that in the days to come we shall meet —

Mr. Jackson: I suppose in heaven, Sir. I have read with interest the Budget Speech delivered by the hon. the Financial Secretary, and in spite of my conclusion that it dovetails with the one to which I was referring just now, I shall endeavour to make several criticisms of the Financial Secretary and his proposals in his Budget Speech. We have been asked on several occasions in this Council to vote large sums of money for the Government to spend on several aspects of its activities. We have had cause on more than one occasion to indicate that, while in a broad sense the allocations made may have been in favour of Government's policy, there are lots of other ways in which allocations could have been readjusted to meet better circumstances and conditions.

For example, we have criticized Government's attitude towards its employees. We have said on more than one occasion that Government has not been dealing fairly with its employees. We have indicated that, because of a desire to economize, Government has not been filling vacancies. We have indicated also — and this has been admitted by the Government — that salaries are inadequate to the needs of the people: that salaries attached to certain posts are unattractive, and because of the unattractiveness of those salaries Government finds it difficult, if not impossible, to recruit persons into the Service. That is

one of the reasons which the Government has given for the present position where, in several Departments, there are vacancies which cannot be filled.

The Public Works Department and the Department of Agriculture are two of the most important Departments for the moment in this country, bearing in mind the Development Programme and the need to advance this country towards independence. In spite of the fact that the Government has admitted that salary scales are unattractive to persons with qualifications, the policy is still pursued—the policy of maintaining a salary structure which cannot offer any inducement to any person who has the right type of qualification which we need at the moment. In spite of the fact that there are Guianese who have been acting in higher posts for years, and in spite of the fact that the Government has refused to improve and enhance its salaries structure so as to encourage persons with the right qualifications to come to this country, we find the accusation being levelled that there are to be found in our Public Service persons who are not pulling their fair share of the weight or burden.

In the Public Service today there is a great deal of frustration. We are dealing with the human element and not with machines. We are dealing with human beings who are able to understand problems and able to decide when they are being dealt with fairly or unjustly — human beings who can never always remain in a state of happiness and contentment. What is the reason for the Government refusing to fill vacancies in the higher brackets while it has juniors acting in those vacant posts?

Can the Government ever believe that, whether we are Guianese or otherwise; whether we are devoted to this country or otherwise; whether we love this country or otherwise, we will lose sight of our individual needs and the

needs of our families? Can the Government ever believe that the people who are in the Service are losing sight of moral principles; and if they are losing sight of moral principles, is it not because the Government has allowed people in junior posts to fill higher posts and not remunerate them for the posts they fill? I have indicated that with the Agriculture Department and, I think, the Medical Department, we are seeing almost every day in our newspapers that officers and doctors of high reputation are leaving the Service. What is the position?

Last year I accused the Government of the intention to retrench, because of the fact that the then Financial Secretary had indicated that increases which were offered to the wage earners employed by the Government would be made by economies in the several departments. With your permission, Sir, I should like to refresh my memory and the memories of Members of the Council who have been here at the time and, perhaps, have not referred to the speech delivered on the 7th January, 1960, by the Financial Secretary. I shall ask your permission to read my comments from the *Hansard* and what was the reply given to them by the then Financial Secretary. On page 12 of the Budget Speech we find, first of all, this:

“The figures which are put before Members are based for the most part on the rates of salaries and wages which were current when the 1959 estimates were prepared. As Members know the Government has already agreed to pay a minimum wage of \$2.75 a day as against the former \$2.52 and to make adjustments in related daily and weekly wage rates and related “B” and “C” scales. It is hoped to be able to make economies in most of the departments to accommodate this rise within the figures which are being presented to Members”.

Economies within the departments: That, I submit, is one of the reasons, if not the principal reason, why these posts in the higher brackets of some of these depart-

[MR. JACKSON]

ments are not being filled and why junior members or members beneath the status of the vacancy existing are called upon to assume greater responsibility without the proper remuneration being paid to them. This is more than an unwise pattern and policy, and will forever lead to the state of dissatisfaction of which we have heard much of late and of which we expect to hear in the near future.

Not only was it said then, but it has been repeated this year by the Financial Secretary. He, also, said that in order to meet increases, there will be economies in the several departments. In my comments last year—and I shall ask your permission to read from the *Hansard* of the 18th January, Columns 139 and 140—I said:

"I go further and accuse Government of attempting to bring about further confusion and greater conflict. One of the things agreed upon by the Government and the Federation of Unions of Government Employees was that the provisional figure of \$2.75 per day should be accepted as the minimum wage—and among the signatories to that were the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Trade and Industry, and Union officials. Disagreement over the word "provisional" was one of the reasons which prolonged the strike to the 16th December: it could have ended on 13th December, but Government remained foolhardy in its attitude and this brought about the prolongation of the strike.

We find the Financial Secretary making no mention of the fact that the figure of \$2.75 was provisional. Anyone reading the Budget Speech would conclude that in spite of the agreement to which I referred, Government seems to have changed its attitude. It is clear that Government either intends to force members of the Organizations concerned into another conflict very shortly, or to maintain the attitude of the Minister of Trade and Industry who was reported to have said, even before Government met the Organizations concerned "No, a penny more will be added to the wages and salaries of Government employees".

I accused the Government of pursuing a policy which was going to bring about more confusion and more conflict; and I remember that when the Officer Administering the Government delivered a speech on that occasion reference was made to the onerous situation which existed then, and he expressed the hope that peace would prevail and harmony would continue to exist between Government and its employees.

The Financial Secretary, in reply to my comments, made the following observation which will be found in the *Hansard* of the 21st January 1960, Columns 362 and 363.

"I would like to start, and I can do very little more than start with the innings which the hon Member for Georgetown North

assume that his successor will take the same stand when he rises this afternoon, because I happened to be the first speaker on that occasion, and I am today. I quote:

"I feel very strongly about this deed, because, in a sense, it has imputed bad motives both to the Government and to myself, because I was the Member of this Council who delivered the Budget Speech. It is this allegation that the Government has obviously decided not to do anything more for the workers because the Financial Secretary said in his Budget Speech that the Government had agreed to pay \$2.75 per day and to make adjustments in the related daily and weekly wage rates and related "B" and "C" scales, and that this had not been reflected in the Estimates. I cannot for the life of me, understand how anyone can say that that was an indication that the Government was prejudiced and had made up its mind on what it was going to do despite its solemn agreement. I was dealing with the facts, and the fact is that whatever

agreed that \$2.75 per day
be and that is
responsibility for saying so, and
to

gard the agreement
one

Subsequent to that Finance Committee was asked to approve expenditure to meet the improvement in salary scales and wage scales to which reference has been made.

At paragraph 4 of the Memorandum, No. 15 of 1960, we read:

"As stated in the 1960 Budget Speech it is hoped to be able to make economies in most of the Departments to accommodate the increase in expenditure resulting from the agreed adjustments in wage rates and the related salary scales".

These points are tied up with the conclusion which I expressed last year and which I will now repeat. The Government has adopted a policy which has given rise to the attitude of its employees. It has adopted a policy which is going to create further confusion. No matter from what level a man speaks, it must be recognized that Government workers are entitled to expect just rewards for their labour. If that is not done, you are bound to have trouble.

I was asked why I begun my address on this point. I have done so because I have full knowledge of what transpired in 1959. The Government knows what transpired in 1959, and I observe that the Financial Secretary has made reference to the payment of final rates as from a current date. Agreements as to the payment of wages and salaries and the dates of implementation are not the prerogative of the Government alone. Despite the fact that the Government has the power to do everything or anything, in this modern age Government has to realize that agreements are reached between two sides or two persons, and not by a decision handed down by one side or one person.

The decision of the Government to make the payment of these scales effective as from a current date — I do not know when will be the current date — is a violation of the Agreement made in

1959. If the amount of \$2.75 is a provisional one, then it must be conclusive that when the final figure is reached it should be effective from the date of the introduction of the interim payment. If the Government believes that it can decide on its own to say when will be the current date, then I would say that Government is acting on a very weak premise.

I admit that Government has a difficult problem to deal with. I expect to hear from the Financial Secretary that the "cake" has to be shared among everybody. But even if he says that, the fact remains that such an answer would not remove the responsibility of the Government in so far as its agreement with an organization is concerned. The Agreement to which I refer was signed by the hon. the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Trade and Industry on behalf of the Government. I invite Government to re-examine the situation, for I believe that very many evil consequences may follow if the situation is not reviewed.

I wish to say that because the workers to whom I refer are not making a noise, it does not necessarily follow that they are satisfied. Perhaps they are acting different from previous occasions and are thinking more seriously than they ever did before. If the Government does not reconsider its attitude to the workers, it may find itself locked very seriously in problems of which the Members of the Government are unmindful at the moment.

I would ask the Members of the Government to remember that it is not for them to decide things as dictators. I repeat that it is not for Government alone to decide the date of the implementation of the new rates of wages; the decision on the date of implementation should be a matter for discussion and agreement between the parties concerned who met in December, 1959, and jointly signed the document.

Mr. JACKSON

Perhaps the present Financial Secretary is not fully aware of the implications of the Agreement, because he was not then in charge of the Finance Secretariat. I am inclined to be sympathetic with him, and I would ask him to review the matter in the light of the atmosphere which existed at the time the Agreement was signed. He may then conclude that there is no other course of action to adopt than to comply with the terms of the Agreement made in 1959. If that is not done the Public Service would be open to a lot of condemnation -- condemnation not only because of frustration, but because there would be a loss of faith in the Government. I want to feel that the Government is not unmindful of the point of view I have just made. It was because of the loss of faith in the Government that certain references were made in the Speech delivered from the Throne in December, 1959.

I would like to know that we have a satisfied Public Service. I would like to know that the members of the Public Service have confidence in the Government; I would like to know that the salaries paid to the members of the Public Service are such as would encourage them to put all of their time and energy into their work. I would like to know that the employer and employee are satisfied with each other, and it is for those reasons that I have made these points. The time has come when the Government must realize that it cannot and should not try to push things down people's throats, otherwise the people will rebel against that type of attitude.

I agree that when the members of the Public Service are not pulling their weight they should be criticized, I agree that when lapses occur the person at fault should be pulled up, because we are going on to a stage of independence in the next year or two. If the members of our Public Service are not prepared to work for the progress of an independent

British Guiana, then the situation will be such that Guianese will be very sorry. This reminds me that the Government, in its preparation of financial allocations in the Estimates, has not taken any step to prepare the Public Service for the advanced constitution in 1961 and subsequent independence of which most of us speak so freely.

I admit that steps are being taken to make certain adjustments; I admit that in the Estimates for next year provision has been made for a few persons to be offered cadetships in the field of Administration. But what is that? We have taken over the Demerara Electric Company and we have no Guianese trained in advance to run the Corporation. It is difficult to understand how Government could have allowed three or four years to pass without anticipating what it was aiming at or preparing for.

It is true that we are taking over the Demerara Electric Company. At one time we were told that we were buying a lot of junk. Even at that stage we were preparing for Guianization in all fields of the Public Service, and it ought to have been apparent to Government that Guianese should be sent for a course of training in every field. Jamaica has pursued that course of action long ago. Ghana took that course of action long before it received its independence, and when independence came it had the people to run its Public Service. Ghana had its diplomats trained long before it was ready for them.

What do we find provided in the Draft Estimates for 1961? We will not find any serious attempt being made to prepare the Public Service for the advanced constitution with its increasing responsibilities. Things will be worse when independence comes in 1962 or 1963, if something is not done in this matter. We cannot make diplomats overnight. The Government is pursuing a short-sighted policy.

With reference to economies and the Government being unable to pay its employees, I wish to say that the Government is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, for in several ways money is largely being wasted by certain departments. I shall proceed to deal with a particular department in order to prove my point. I asked certain questions in Finance Committee regarding the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. I was promised the answers the following day, but up to now I have not yet received any answers. When Ministers of this Government offer to give answers to Members of this Council and then fail to do so, those Ministers have broken faith with the Members of this Council. I should have been given the answers to my questions.

I shall begin by referring to the expenditure allocated to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant over the past few years: In 1955, \$55,549; in 1956, \$54,833; in 1957, \$62,482; in 1958, \$193,161; in 1959, \$139,868. I question the wisdom of the Government in asking us to approve annually a figure of around \$90,000 when it is aware of the fact that there will be requests for Supplementary Expenditure to the tune of \$150,000 which is the last figure for 1960. I got the answer that it is difficult to estimate what it is going to cost. My reply to that was that if you have seen in the past year that that amount was inadequate, why not come to the Council and say "This is the amount of money we need to run the plant?" I say that money is wasted, and one may be justified in saying that money is stolen at the plant.

It may be surprising to Government and the Council to know that the Milk Pasteurisation Plant has lorries which collect milk from various parts of the country. Those lorries leave Georgetown every morning and travel as far as within three miles of the Abary to collect milk, and from the Abary trucks are hired by the Plant from two individuals whose names I will call, because mentioning

names in this Council today has become the pattern. The Plant hires lorries from Messrs. Sooklall and Arjune at \$40 per day to convey milk from the Abary bridge to Georgetown, in spite of the fact that the Government lorries go every day to a point three miles short of the Abary. In Georgetown the Plant also hires lorries at \$24 per day which does not include the wage of the drivers of the lorries which is at least \$5 per day. This happens in spite of the fact that the Plant has its own lorries.

I am told that when attempts have been made to put an end to this state of affairs the persons concerned have always gone to the Ministry, so that there is interference by the Ministry in the working of the Department concerned. That is my information which I cannot vouch for.

I asked in Finance Committee whether powdered milk, which is sometimes used at the Plant, is bought locally and not through the Crown Agents as required by the Financial Regulations, and I was given the answer that some of the powdered milk was bought locally, if not all of it. Not so long ago we had the experience of officers of the Housing Department being accused of a breach of the Financial Regulations, and one would like to know whether steps have been taken against anyone in the Milk Pasteurisation Plant for a similar breach, and to find out why powdered milk was bought in the Colony and not through the Crown Agents? I would also like to know why chocolate, which is used to make chocolate milk at the Plant, is also bought locally and not through the Crown Agents, and whether the cost of purchasing it locally is greater than the cost of importing it through the Crown Agents? I should like to know since I could not get an answer in Finance Committee.

I should also like to know why the trucks owned by the Plant are being repaired by a private individual when there

[MR. JACKSON]

was at one time a Government-owned garage which repaired the vehicles owned by the Plant? Is it a fact that the garage was closed because of an allegation that somebody who was buying and selling used cars had them repaired in Government's time by the person who was employed at the garage, and that as a result that employee has been transferred to Mon Repos? I bring this out for two reasons. One is that the Government is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. The other reason is that if on a previous occasion people have been accused of a breach of the Financial Regulations in which a large sum of money was involved, then one wants to know what steps have been taken to deal with a similar situation at the Milk Pasteurisation Plant in which \$40 per day has been paid for the hire of trucks to bring milk from the Abary to Georgetown which is sometimes thrown away. Up to yesterday milk was thrown down the drains in Georgetown.

I live very closely with the people and I get information at all times. I would like to know how many cans of milk were sent to the Salvation Army and how many were taken? If all were not taken, what has happened to the rest? I am told that milk is sent to various institutions: to the Dharam Sala and to the African Development Association in D'Urban Street, yet they have milk to throw down the drain. On Sunday, 11th December, milk was thrown away, and I said in Finance Committee that if that was the pattern Government should advertise more fully the milk produced at the Milk Pasteurisation Plant and reduce the price to the consumer. I was told that that would not be a sound economic policy. Milk is bought by the Plant at 96 cents per gallon and after being pasteurised it is sold at 50 cents per gallon. We admit that Government is subsidizing the milk and we concede that it ought to do so, but is that what is called subsidization? **Something is wrong and**

before **this** debate is concluded I expect Government to give the answers to the questions I have asked in Finance Committee.

I know that it would not cost the Plant \$1,000 a year to run its own lorries between Georgetown and the furthest point to the Abary. Has the Director of Agriculture kept faith with the people of this country when this has been permitted to happen? Here is a Guianese filling the post of Director of Agriculture, and if Guianese are to fill these important posts we should criticize them when they do not do so satisfactorily, because when independence comes we want Guianese to do their jobs efficiently, otherwise we will have an independent country which cannot stand on its legs. Who is at fault at the Department concerned?

Of course the Plant is run without any money, in spite of the fact that it gets a large supplementary provision. As recently as two weeks ago it could not pay persons who sell its milk on commission, so that I had to be disturbed by another set of people complaining that they could not get the wages due to them. Of course that was strange news to the Minister in charge, but I do not blame him because it was a recent thing. I trust that on this point the Government will have a lot to say to satisfy the people with respect to its policy in that direction.

Now, Sir, we have heard a lot about housing; we have heard a lot about employment; we have heard a lot of the policy of the Government in respect of the need to find employment for people. We have heard, in glowing terms, of how the foundation had been truly laid to provide this country with all it requires. We have heard of the plans which have brought about benefits which would be felt by the people of this country, if not already felt by them; but let us see how much money has been spent on development over the past three years.

Mr. Speaker: I think you may have to get a Motion. I usually give a lot of latitude on budget debates, but you have doubled your time.

Mr. Tello: I beg to move that the Member be allowed another 30 minutes.

Mr. Kendall: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Jackson: A great deal of money has been spent on development projects. Incidentally, I gather from my reading of one important document that all these things have been introduced by the present Government and that it is reaping the benefits of what it has sown. I remember reading, however, that some people plant, others water and others reap. When we examine the extent to which there has been expenditure on development projects and the extent to which we have, in our midst, unemployment — growing unemployment — we have to ask whether the correct approach to the Development Programme has been made by the Government. One admits that this is largely and mainly an agricultural country. One admits that an economy of that kind should be encouraged and should be taken care of in every possible way, but one also has to ask the question whether the intention to provide employment by this Programme has been carried out even by 25 per cent.

In 1956 the unemployment figures were startling and disturbing, and since the Government took office there were more people who were thrown out of employment, in one way or another or by one means or another. Added to this, there are people who leave school every year; so that the situation with respect to unemployment is affecting more and more young people more than our old population. This must be a serious thing, for if our young people are leaving school without any certainty that they

could find employment here, there or elsewhere, then they will resort to other means to find a livelihood.

Last year, we voted a great deal of money under the Development Programme and by half the year only a very small amount of that money was spent. One wonders what has been the position for the second half of 1959; whether there has been any speeding up of expenditure. If, for the first half of the year, they spent under 24 per cent. of what was allocated to them, then it is difficult to speculate how much they will spend in the other half of the year. One wonders whether it is their intention, again this year, to squeeze the people out of employment any further or whether they intend to go all out this year and spend the money which was allocated.

Housing is a problem in Georgetown and its environs. Ever since we have been in this Council I have been criticizing this Government with respect to its policy on housing. I am not attempting to agree that anyone has been dishonest with respect to his or her duties. That is a matter with which no one in this Council would agree, but the frustration in Georgetown and its environs is increasing at a rapid rate, and the extent to which housing accommodation is provided by Government and private institutions makes one think there is an inadequacy of provision. Government, although allocating between 1960 and 1964 \$5 million for housing, has not been able to create any great impression with regard to the housing position in Georgetown and its environs.

I understand from the Speech that a start was made. I shall be grateful to hear the Minister, in reply, say exactly how much has been done — whether much has been done and whether it is the intention of the Government to use up more money in 1961 to provide houses for people to live in. I make this point because there were people who were under the impression that by now another housing scheme would have materialized;

[MR. JACKSON]

and so it is imperative that the housing programme of the Government should be expedited to a very large extent, if not entirely, in the year which relates to the Estimates and the Budget Speech of the Financial Secretary.

People are still living huddled together like sardines. I know the Minister moves about quite a great deal; and I know she will agree with me that too many people live in one house and that the time has come when we should have better accommodation so that the children would be brought up in an atmosphere in which they would be delighted to live.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to offer the hon. the Financial Secretary my warmest congratulations on the highly analytical Budget Speech he has put before this Council this year. I think it is not only highly analytical, but factual. It savours of his very concise and analytical mind and was able to state the trends of this year.

Another factor on which I would like to offer my congratulations is the fact that he has been able to get out the Budget Speech in December. We have been unable to do that for some little while now and, therefore, I think we should congratulate him and the Government on being able to do so this year. At the same time, I still think he is a trifle late because, as you know, we are trying to get it through before the end of the year; and I think it is taxing the resources of Members, particularly at this season. However, I differ from him slightly in his conclusion about our gross national income of exports which he places at about 15 per cent. above last year's. He does say that in 1959 we suffered from a recession or a drop in general trade. But if he were to compare his exports with 1955 and 1957 he would see that they barely measure up. Nevertheless, it is a good sign; it indicates that we are recovering some of what we lost recently.

With regard to our imports, there is one special pattern to which I desire to draw Government's attention. I refer to the large amount of money that goes out of this country by way of the importation of machinery. I concede that some of it is inescapable, but, in view of the large amount of tractors and other machinery that have recently been imported into this country, I think we should take steps to see that the machinery imported is put into useful service. If something is not done in this matter, I can visualize a certain amount of overlapping of excess machinery in this particular field at some stage. In my view it is something to be watched carefully.

With regard to the amount of money spent this year and proposed to be spent next year, the Financial Secretary makes special reference to this at page 4 of his Budget Speech. He says:

"It is hoped to reduce cost substantially next year by reorganizing the marketing division and improving efficiency".

We have been told this year that fish was brought in slightly in excess of our immediate requirements. We were told in Finance Committee that Government had to budget for a loss because fish came in excess of any previous year's catch. I would be glad to know if my conclusions on this point are wrong, but it does seem to be questionable that because there is a large through-put of fish we should now budget for a loss. I feel that the reorganization of this Department has been delayed too long, and that the matter should be tackled efficiently, urgently and energetically.

Let me now refer to the diversification of our agricultural economy. At page 13 of the Financial Secretary's Speech he makes special reference to the fact that "45,000 cocoa, 150,000 coconut and 7,000 citrus seedlings were distributed during the year". It is my view that was not enough. We

are now trying to grapple with some of the essentials of our diversification. I know that Government has in mind the question of paying a bonus on castor oil, but it is not yet paying this particular project sufficient attention.

Then there is the question of corn. Nothing has been done to stimulate the production of corn locally. Here is a field in which the Government should push strongly and could get good results. I believe Government is aware that a large quantity of corn has to be imported in order to fulfil the feeding requirements of stock. Surely this Colony should be in a position to reduce the gap between our essential requirements and what is being imported. I think we should endeavour to make a reduction on what could be called unnecessary importations.

Quite recently the Government imported dairy cattle as well as beef cattle. I would like to offer my strong and sincere congratulations to the Government for taking such action. I understand that Government imported about seventy head of cattle. The animals cost a good few Canadian and American dollars, and I believe that Government will recover the expenditure tenfold within a short period. The Colony certainly needed that "stick-in-the-arm" in order to improve our blood stock in cattle.

But what I do not quite understand in the policy of this Government, is that Ministers or the people who are authorized to represent them or speak for them say that all dairy herds and cattle must be produced in the Fourth and Fifth Depths of this country. This cannot be done overnight. Such a project would have to be given serious thought, and much land-cleaning preparation. I think the Members of the Government are a bit muddled in their thinking so far as this particular matter is concerned, and my view, after giving the matter very serious thought and consideration, is

that Government should endeavour to integrate into the coastal lands as a start the better grade dairy animals and gather material for use in the overall plan later.

With regard to beef cattle, the Government still appears to be going around in circles. The cattle trail is closed; the few heads of cattle Government has imported for the purpose of improving its beef stock have been sent to the Rupununi. If the cattle trail is closed and the facilities for flying live cattle to Georgetown are not only difficult to arrange, but definitely out of reasonable proportions so far as expenses are concerned, then it would appear that Government has decided to improve only its beef cattle in the Rupununi District.

I think this is a short-sighted policy, because it must be remembered that Government has made arrangements for the reservation of certain substantial areas of land for cattle — the Black Bush Polder is one of those areas. I think there must have been confusion in the minds of Members of the Government when they took all of the young cattle which came in and sent them to the Rupununi. I have seen them myself, and I am very impressed with the quality of the bulls and heifers. Although yearlings, they have received much handling—they are not afraid of people, and they appear to be quiet animals—animals that will be a credit to this country. But when we take this grade of cattle and hide them away in the Rupununi that is not good enough for all concerned. I ask that this policy—if it can be called a policy—be reviewed, and possibly altered.

I would also like to congratulate the Government on its Health Programme: measures preventive and curative. My confreres along the countryside and I appear to be satisfied with the measures Government have

MR. DAVIS]

been endeavouring to introduce in order to provide better facilities for health. I have already spoken in Finance Committee about two or three times on this matter, but I would like to place on record my view that a little more could be done for the people who live in the Rupununi District. I have spent almost four weeks there. I saw some sick women who had to travel to Lethem Hospital, and I was shocked at the conditions under which they had to travel. It is a scandal and disgrace that in this modern age our people should be subjected to such primitive modes of transport.

However, the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing has done me the honour of saying that she will examine the question as to whether it will be possible in the near future to provide an ambulance service on the basis of a jeep for service in this particular part of the country. It has to be remembered that this country has one of the most difficult terrains one could ever hope to find.

I would like to congratulate Government on its efforts to remove the Prison from the heart of the City. This is a very commendable step, and I sincerely hope the Minister concerned will not allow the proposal to be shelved for another decade.

I should like to return to the subject of rice milling facilities. In his Budget Speech, on page 3 under the heading "Prospects For 1961", the Financial Secretary says:

"With good weather, the additional land that will come under cultivation as the Black Bush Polder project nears completion, should expand our rice production."

That means that within the next few months the Black Bush project with its 27,000 acres will have been completed, but I would ask Government what are

its plans regarding milling facilities to cope with the extensive increase in rice production? At one time Government favoured another large mill, and at another time it was hoping that private enterprise would supply the need. But we are still living in the air without any settled policy as regards the necessity to provide increased and efficient milling facilities for this rice. It is not an easy question, but it is not one which can wait until our backs are against the wall. It is essential for Government to face up to the question and make a positive decision. I have searched through the Development Estimates and the Recurrent Estimates but have not been able to see a single item to provide increased milling facilities, or even the slightest indication of what will be Government's policy with respect to this very important phase of the rice industry.

I am one of those who believe that we can sell all the rice we can produce, but I also know that if our milling facilities are not of the required and desired efficiency we shall have great difficulty in marketing any badly manufactured rice. In 1955 when, through inclement weather, we produced a tremendous quantity of No. 2, No. 3 and unclassified rice those Members of the Government, who were at that time on the Rice Marketing Board, know of the difficulty we experienced in marketing that rice. During the latter part of this year and towards the end of last year we produced again a fairly substantial quantity of No. 2 and B quality rice.

At the end of the Board's financial year in September there were 400,000 bags of that rice on hand, and we were fortunate this year that all the padi reaped in the 1960 Autumn crop has been of fairly good quality. It is now more the exception than the rule to be able to pick out parcels of bad padi and manufacture rice of good standard, but we may not always be

so fortunate. Therefore I suggest that we should approach the problem in a businesslike manner.

I wish to touch very briefly on land development. I commend the Government on its efforts to put our land development schemes into the hands of the people. We must have our growing pains, but at the same time we must prepare the people for what must be their responsibility as the months and years go by. I think that if our Cane Grove scheme is to be taken as a beacon, then the getting out of Cane Grove has been a little too precipitate. I would have preferred Government to organize the several authorities which are to take over the administrative functions of these land development schemes before moving out gradually. I think it is essential that this should be done, but I do not suggest that the process of moving out should be retarded unduly. It may well be that certain amenities that should obtain in the districts may be neglected and get into disrepair. I think I have seen evidence of just that. All in all I hope Government will not feel that I am criticizing its efforts to hand over responsibility to the people. I think it is not only desirable but necessary, but I say that Government should have pursued a more orderly retreat rather than this hasty withdrawal that we saw and experienced at Cane Grove.

I have already said that the Rupununi district is an extremely hard country, but we have passed the day and the time when we could leave those people to the mercies of the Brazilians. During the three years I have been a Member of this Council, I have not been able to see any positive steps to improve the lot of our people in the Rupununi district. They have been left to get along as best they can, and the effect has been to chase them into the hands of the Brazilians. They have reached the stage where they prefer to

sell their produce to the Brazilians because they get quick money for their greens or whatever they produce.

Seeing the country and seeing the manner in which they produce their citrus fruits and the like, I got the impression that the country is, by and large, offering itself for large scale development of citrus. The sandy looms, particularly, seem to offer good prospects for this particular crop. I have travelled between the mountains, valleys and, in particular, in the Mocha-Mocha and San José districts, and I have never in my life seen, except in the Tacama and Ebini areas, such splendid specimens of limes and lemons. They grow abundantly — each tree being heavily laden — and I want to throw out a suggestion to Government for examination and, perhaps, discussion with the authorities — the Director of Agriculture and his officers — for the initiation of a pilot scheme at Lethem for the expressed purpose of extracting oil and pulp from the citrus grown in that area.

Why I suggest this particular mode of approach is because I feel it would be entirely out of the reach of any of the smaller people in the area to be able to put down any such mill for extraction as I have suggested; and I think that the oil, juice and pulp thus produced, will be able to bear the air freight down. We have to bear in mind that the Government, of its own volition, closed the trail, and the only other means of getting the scheme going two ways is by air.

About the Tapakuma Scheme: I am in favour of the development of all areas as quickly and as completely as possible, but I would ask for a further examination of the Tapakuma Scheme. I know that the Government has inherited a very difficult project in the Anna Regina rice mill. Large sums of money have been spent on it to get it

[MR. DAVIS]

into being and when it was finished and the mill started to work, someone at that stage seemed to have turned around and asked the question: Where was the padi to come from to make the proposition at Anna Regina a possible, reasonable and economical one? I know that that state of events has been inherited by the Government and I wonder, now, if this factor has not weighed on its mind, unduly, in bringing forward this Tapakuma Scheme. In other words, what I mean is just this: To get padi to make the Anna Regina mill a viable and reasonable proposition, let us spend \$17 million on the Tapakuma Scheme to make this possible because, examining the scheme from its present possibilities to what is envisaged on its completion, I think the scheme cannot, in a strict sense, be considered to be an economic one.

Possibly, the Government has decided to make it not only an economic, but a social project. In other words, to make more money, more work and so on available in that area — the Essequibo area — sometimes referred to as the "Cinderella Area". If it is a social project, I think Government should state the case clearly and say that it is not exactly an economic project, but it is one that would provide more social amenities for the area. If not, we might wake up one of these mornings and find ourselves in a position not dissimilar to what we have found in another sector—the Bonasika Scheme — which can be, at times, considered "an elephant of some colour" — whether pink, white or otherwise. Have your choice! I would like Government to examine a little more accurately and intensely, this Tapakuma Scheme. I am not satisfied in my mind that it is an economic project; and I say so quite distinctly and clearly.

Then this Government, through its mouthpiece the Financial Secretary, does not see the necessity to change, one way or the other, any of the excise duties in any of the revenue-raising departments. Actually, I expected this because, as we know, we are looking forward to the next few months when we go to the polls to decide who our next Government should be, with independence around the corner. But, all in all, may I say I do not find any serious fault with the Budget. I have said so in Finance Committee and I shall maintain that attitude throughout this Budget debate. [Pause.]

Mr. Speaker: If there are no other contributions, then I shall ask the Financial Secretary to reply, if he so desires. [Pause.] It appears that the Financial Secretary does not wish to reply. The Question is, hon. Members, "that the Bill be read a Second time".

Question put, and agreed to. [Pause.]

Mr. Kendall: I think the reason for all this is due to the Government. You have a very important thing like the Education Bill, and today when Members come here, instead of dealing with that Bill, we find an agenda—

Mr. Speaker: What are you speaking on?

Mr. Kendall: I am saying that the reason —

Mr. Speaker: The Bill has been read a Second time.

Mr. Kendall: We are supposed to be speaking on the Heads, and I am making an observation.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. Speaker: I shall suspend the sitting of this Council, so that the hon. the Financial Secretary can make up his mind as to what he should do.

The Financial Secretary: I am sorry, Sir. I was looking for——

Mr. Speaker: I shall suspend the sitting for ten minutes.

Sitting suspended at 4.16 p.m.

Council resumed at 4.26 p.m.

Mr. Kendall: Now that we have resumed, I would like to move the adjournment of Council until tomorrow so that hon. Members would have an opportunity to study the Appropriation Bill. [*Laughter.*] I move the adjournment of Council, because, from what I have seen before the sitting was suspended, the Financial Secretary is not ready to proceed with the Bill and Members on this side of the Table are not ready.

Sir, I found the Order Paper on the Table before me. When I came into this Council I received an indication from Government that on the 28th December, which is today, the Order Paper would be forwarded. It was only then that I realized that the Appropriation Bill was to be discussed today.

Mr. Bowman: I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that hon. Members are rather late, and if anybody is to be blamed it is they. When we reached this item on the Order Paper, I can remember distinctly that the Financial Secretary rose and asked that the Council resume for the purpose of continuing the debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. I did not let it go like that. I rose; read the item; and repeated the item which was for consideration. I even mentioned that the Financial Secretary had already spoken and that his Budget Speech was before us. No Member said anything on the question; no member said he was not prepared to go on with it, and I proceeded with the item.

The hon. Member for Georgetown North rose and spoke on the Bill. As hon. Members will recall, he began by referring to what took place at the opening of the Sessions and then, ultimately, he proceeded to debate the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill.

He spoke at considerable length, and, when he had spoken for one hour, I remarked that for him to proceed any longer it was necessary to have a Motion moved. As a matter of fact that was in keeping with what had taken place on a previous occasion. I shall refer to the *Hansard*, so that Members will see the lapse of time that occurred. The *Hansard* report of the 18th January, 1960, records in column 150:

“**Mr. Speaker:** I should like to remind hon. Members that this is the Appropriation Bill before us, and as the Budget is under debate I thought I should allow Members a half an hour more than they are permitted to speak under the Standing Orders. If further time is necessary, it will have to be secured by way of a substantive Motion. I am just telling the hon. Member for Georgetown North that his extra half-hour is fast running out and there is still the Committee stage left.”

A Motion was moved and the hon. Member for Georgetown North had his time extended for half an hour, but in point of fact he did not use up all of the extra half an hour, because his hour ended at 3.16 p.m. and he spoke for another 10 minutes, which ended at 3.26 p.m.

Up to then there was not one word by any Member as to his being put out by the wish of the Government to proceed. At 3.28 p.m. Mr. Davis rose and he spoke until ten minutes past four. After Mr. Davis had sat down and I allowed about three minutes to elapse, I asked whether any other Member wished to speak. No Member responded. I then intimated that if no other Member wished to speak I would ask the hon. the Financial Secretary to wind up the debate. No response came from the

[MR. SPEAKER]

Financial Secretary, nor did any come from any other Member. I asked again whether the Financial Secretary wished to wind up the debate, but there was no answer. I then said that it appeared that the Financial Secretary did not wish to reply to the debate.

There was no protest from anyone. I then put the question that the Bill be read a Second time. This was carried. I then directed that the Bill be read a Second time. It was at this stage that the hon. Member for New Amsterdam (Mr. Kendall) rose to speak, and after he had said a few words I inquired of him whether he was speaking on the Motion. I did not know what he was speaking on. In fact there was no Motion on which he could speak. I then looked at the Financial Secretary and asked him what he intended to do. As it appeared to me, he did not seem to comprehend or he did not appreciate what the position was. I asked again but he seemed unable to appreciate what the position was, therefore, in fairness to the Financial Secretary and Members, I adjourned the Council for ten minutes in order to let the Financial Secretary make up his mind, because the next move was with him, and that is the position at the present time.

Of course during a debate Members may have to consult each other on certain questions, and perhaps in their intense discussions they pay no heed to the progress of the debate. If as a result of their actions things go awry they cannot blame anyone but themselves. In the circumstances, I could only conclude that no other Member wished to contribute to the debate, nor did the Financial Secretary wish to reply.

Now we have a Motion for an adjournment of the debate. That is a matter entirely for Members. If they wish to adjourn this debate on the Budget for another time it is a matter entirely for them, but I thought I should make

the position perfectly clear so that Members may realize that considerable indulgence was given, and that the debate proceeded in an unhurried manner. I shall put the Question. The Question is, "That this Council be adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m."

Council divided and voted as follows :

For	Against
Mr. Bowman	Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Davis	Mr. Saffee
Mr. Tello	Mr. Rai
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Ram Karran
Mr. Campbell	Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Burnham	Mr. Benn
Mr. Kendall	Dr. Jagan
	The Financial Secretary
	The Attorney-General
	The Chief Secretary.
	10

Did Not Vote

Mr. Gajraj 1.

Mr. Speaker: The Motion is lost. We shall proceed.

Mr. Bowman: I wish to introduce a Motion.

Mr. Speaker: Not now; you cannot move another Motion now. We shall proceed.

The Financial Secretary: I move that this Council resolves itself into Committee to consider the Bill Clause by Clause.

Mr. Burnham: I would like to ask the Financial Secretary through you. Sir, if he could supply us with copies of the Estimates because, like him, we did not bring our copies with us this afternoon, and we are unable to make any contribution to the consideration in Committee without copies of the Estimates. It is a courtesy to which I think we are entitled. Copies of the Estimates should be made available to us before we proceed.

The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan) : I was in Council when we adjourned at the last meeting, and we were all informed of the business of today's meeting and the fact that we would be sitting this evening. I presume that other Members received the same information.

Mr. Speaker: I was about to say that a Motion was moved for an adjournment and it was lost.

Mr. Burnham: I have asked the Financial Secretary to extend what I consider an elementary courtesy because, like him, we do not have our copies of the Estimates here.

The Chief Secretary (Mr. Hedges): did say to the Council on the 23rd of December that this week would be devoted to the Budget debate.

Mr. Bowman: I would like to be supplied with a copy of the Financial Secretary's Budget Speech. I did not bring mine.

Mr. Speaker: That is a domestic arrangement. I am not concerned with those details.

The Chief Secretary: A certain Members do not have copies of the Estimates with them, and as the time is now 4.45 p.m., I move that the Council adjourn to 8.30 this evening to allow other Members to bring their copies of the Estimates.

The Attorney-General (Mr. Austin) : I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Burnham: Standing Order 5 provides that the Council shall sit from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m., and paragraph (5) says that, "a sitting may be continued after 5 p.m. if the Council, on motion made without notice, so orders." Paragraph (6) says: "The Council may from time to time alter the hours provided in this Standing Order for beginning and ending a sitting."

I am submitting that if these times are to be changed they must be altered by the Council from time to time. We cannot assume that we can normally adjourn to eight o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: If you want us to sit on here until five o'clock, I am prepared to do so. This Council can move and make an order to sit at any time, just as how it can decide to sit on Monday or Tuesday, or any day at any particular time.

These are the Orders of the Council itself. This is the supreme body; it regulates its own procedure, and if the Supreme Body wants to sit at any hour, there can be a Motion for that purpose. There is a Motion and if this Council carries it, it is quite in order.

Mr. Bowman: With your permission, I want to say that discretion is used in every field of human activity; and in view of the fact that almost everyone on this side of the Council came unprepared, I do not think the Members of the Government should resist. Of what are they afraid? I move that the decision be rescinded.

Mr. Speaker: It cannot be done. It is against the Standing Orders. As I said before, I was very patient; and when Members make such demands, they must realize that they themselves are grievously at fault.

Mr. Bowman: Two Members came here prepared whilst others came unprepared. Those of us who came unprepared felt that those who were prepared would have spoken — I mean Government Members. I have lost my opportunity. Are they afraid to hear what we have to say?

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that the Motion that the decision be rescinded cannot be put. A Motion had been already put. Members must understand that they must always pay attention; and I wish to say this:

[MR. SPEAKER]

In another well-ordered Legislative Council, when an important debate is foreshadowed or is being anxiously awaited, Members of the Council who are for or against a particular Motion, more particularly if they are of one mind on the particular debate, decide among themselves as to who should speak. One Member may speak on certain aspects and others on different aspects and so on. They would also decide in what order they would speak. Again, there is a principle followed by Members; and, moreso, when they are opposing and want to take part in a long debate, they decide among themselves on what they would debate; then there is usually no lag in the debate. It may well be that, in certain other places, members of the Government and Opposition speak alternately. Whatever procedure is adopted is the choice of Members, but they must stand or fall by their choice and by their own attitude. Ofttimes Members, including movers of Motions, after they have spoken, seem to have not much interest in the contributions others may make; they leave for the lobby and miss a good deal of what takes place. This inattention is partly responsible for the inconveniences of which Members complain. The Question now before Council, however, is that we adjourn to 8.30 p.m.

Mr. Tello: Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence. It is proper that the Council be aware of the facts to be ———

Mr. Speaker: If you want to speak, go on; but I will put the Motion even if it is five o'clock.

Mr. Tello: I want to say that the Motion now seeks to adjourn this Council until 8.30 p.m. However, I would point out to the hon. the Financial Secretary that he has not fulfilled the most important obligation, and that is this: The printed Estimates that he offered us were subjected to several amendments in Finance Committee and they are not

here with us; and we cannot rely on our memories. Consequently, I am asking him to be fair to us, legislators, and give us some time until tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: On Thursday, the hon. the Chief Secretary proposed, among other things, that we should sit this evening at 8.30 p.m. I am afraid that the hon. Member's recollection is very seriously at fault. That was on Thursday afternoon and, at that time, the hon. Member for Georgetown North asked whether that was a fixture and I replied it was a proposal. The Minutes on Friday contained the whole of the proposal; and on Friday I specifically attracted the attention of Members to the proposal contained in the Minutes, so that Members, who had been absent from the previous meeting and had not noticed the proposal in the Minutes, would then have an opportunity of saying something about it. No one expressed any opinion and I took it that Members did not wish to say anything. Members therefore, cannot plead unawareness of that fact. Now that the Motion is moved for the adjournment, Members cannot properly say they had not been apprised or that they did not have foreknowledge of this Motion. The Motion now before Council is: that this Council be adjourned to 8.30 o'clock this evening.

Question put, Council divided and voted as follows:

For	Against
Mr. Hubbard	Mr. Bowman
Mr. Davis	Mr. Tello
Mr. Gajraj	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Saffee	Mr. Campbell
Mr. Rai	Mr. Burnham
Mr. Ram Karran	Mr. Kendall — 6.
Mrs. Jagan	
Mr. Benn	
Dr. Jagan	
The Financial Secretary	
The Attorney-General	
The Chief Secretary — 12.	

Motion carried.

Mr. Speaker: The Council's sitting is now suspended until 8.30 o'clock this evening.

Sitting suspended at five o'clock.

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

Council resumed at 8.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: When we suspended the sitting, hon. Members, the Second Reading of the Bill intitled:

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

had been completed. We will now proceed.

Council resolved itself into Committee to consider the Bill clause by clause.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Clause 1. — *Short Title* — passed as printed.

Clause 2. — *Accountant General to defray expenses of Civil Government.*

The Financial Secretary: I would ask that consideration of Clause 2 for which there is an Amendment consequential on changes in the Schedule be deferred.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 2, by leave, deferred.

SCHEDULE

The Financial Secretary: I beg to move that the Schedule set out in Appendix "D" of the Report of Finance Committee be adopted as a Schedule to the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

The Chairman: I assume that you will take it with the resolve clause later on.

The Financial Secretary: Yes, Sir.

GOVERNOR

UPKEEP OF GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Mr. Burnham: Under "Other Charges", I beg to move the reduction of Sub-Head 2 — "Upkeep of Government House" — \$3,000, by \$1,000. It seems to me to be a rather small amount in a Budget of over \$50 Million, but, in the absence of any proper explanation, it seems to me that \$3,000 for the Upkeep of Government House is both extravagant and uncalled for. In these days of parsimony on the part of the Government and the desire to economize, I do not see why the Upkeep of Government House should be increased by \$1,000.

The Financial Secretary: The amount is the same as the provision and actual expenditure in 1959.

Mr. Burnham: I am not interested in whether it is the same figure. It is \$80 more or \$2,000 on the approved Estimates for 1960, and you are now increasing it by another \$1,000. There is nothing here to indicate that the amount voted last year was inadequate. Therefore why vote an extra \$1,000?

The Financial Secretary: It is neither for entertainment, nor the upkeep of the building. It is for furniture, plate, linen, etc.

Mr. Burnham: Then the Sub-Head is a misnomer. What has furniture to do with upkeep?

The Financial Secretary: The Sub-Head is explained in the note in the Estimates which states: "Sub-head redesignated, formerly shown as "furniture, plate, linen, etc."

Mr. Burnham: The Sub-Head makes nonsense of English: furniture, plate and linen are under the upkeep of Government House. Why are you trying to hide them under "Upkeep of Government House"? [*Interruption.*] I am not going to listen to the hon. Ex-Minister of Ignorance. "Upkeep of Government House" means what it says. The note: "Sub-Head redesignated, formerly shown as **"furniture, plate, linen, etc."**" does not help us. In the first place it is not upkeep. If the amount is to be used for furniture, plate, linen, etc., why is it necessary to purchase more furniture in 1961 than in 1960?

The Chief Secretary: I believe I am correct in saying that the figure was originally \$3,000, but it was reduced in 1960. We are now going back to the original figure. This amount is for furniture, plate, linen, including the refurnishing of settees etc., and other items of furniture that are in need of repair.

The Chairman: I seem to recall that when I was at the age of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, there was a saying which runs thus: "Call a rose by any other name it smells just as sweet".

Mr. Burnham: My worry is why this "rose" is costing us \$1,000 more than in 1960. If the vote for last year was inadequate, let us say so. I am asking the Financial Secretary whether it was found that \$2,000 was insufficient for the Governor's furniture, plate and linen? As one who runs a household and has the responsibility for furniture, plate and linen, I do not see any explanation for this increase. The chairs at Government House will be less frequently sat on and, consequently, the covers and so on will last longer. Let us say that we want an extra \$1,000 for the Governor's furniture, plate and linen.

The Financial Secretary: The amount was inadequate, and they have been spending \$3,000 for several years.

Mr. Jackson: May I ask the Financial Secretary whether he has any Supplementary Estimates in connection with this matter for 1960?

The Financial Secretary: There was no supplementary expenditure in 1960.

Mr. Burnham: If this is the 28th December and up to now we have not had any supplementary, I cannot see by what process of reasoning you can say that \$2,000 was inadequate. Was he unaware until now that he had to re-furnish or replace furniture?

The Financial Secretary: The very fact that the provision was inadequate in 1960 is an added reason for the increase in the provision in 1961.

Mr. Burnham: I have not seen any deterioration of appearance.

The Chairman: The Question is, "That Sub-Head 2—"Upkeep of Government House"—\$3,000, be reduced by by \$1,000."

Amendment negatived.

The Chairman: The Motion is lost. The Question is, "That Head 1—Governor—be carried out at \$18,868".

Agreed to.

Head passed.

GOVERNOR'S SECRETARIAT

The Chairman: The Question is, "That Head 1A—Governor's Secretariat—be carried out at \$42,934".

Agreed to.

Head passed.

LEGISLATURE

The Chairman: The Question is, "That Head 2—Legislature—be carried out at \$44,683".

Agreed to.

Head passed.

AGRICULTURE.

Mr. Jackson: I beg to move a reduction by \$1 of Sub-Head 35—Miscellaneous Services—Milk Pasteurisation Plant—\$100,000. This type of unrealistic preparation of the Budget for this Council is something which we must condemn on every occasion. Last year I did the same thing that I am doing tonight. In the Estimates for 1960, it will be seen that the figures are the same as they were in 1959; and, in spite of the fact that there has been an increase in the wages paid to Government employees of this category from 1959 throughout the whole of this year, we have the same figure put down in the Estimates for 1961. This fooling of the Council by the Government is something which is to be deplored. Unless the staff has been considerably reduced there is something wrong in the preparation of the Estimates for 1961. The amount for wages of workers was increased by about 9 per cent. in 1960, but Government has put down the same figures for 1961. In addition Government has not yet made up its mind as to what it will cost to implement the new minimum wage of \$3.04 per day. Will Government tell this Council why the figure in the estimate for 1961 is the same as it was in 1959 and 1960?

Mr. Benn: The hon. Member seems to have answered his own question. The position is that the Department does not yet know how much it will cost. The estimate for 1960 was the same, and until the year is ended it will not be possible to know how much it will cost to run this section of the Department.

Mr. Jackson: If the Minister is definite in his explanation at least he has been the folly of his reply, for in 1959 the amount was the same as in 1960. In 1960 Government added 9 per cent.

or more as an increase in wages, therefore what is the reason that we do not see for 1961 the total amount of the increase paid in 1960?

Mr. Benn: Because we did not want to "fool" the Council any further, but preferred to wait until we got the correct figures.

Mr. Jackson: The Minister, perhaps, is still suffering from the effects of the dinner he has eaten tonight, because there has been an increase of the minimum wage to \$3.04, which is more than \$2.75 per day. The figure put down for 1959 was based on a minimum wage of \$2.52 per day, but Government paid \$2.75 per day from 1959 throughout 1960. Could the 1961 estimate not be based on the 1960 payment?

Mr. Benn: The hon. Member is assuming a lot of things—that we employ the same number of people and that all of them will be working in the same place. Actually some of the people were transferred to the Central Agricultural Station at Mon Repos last year or the year before.

Mr. Burnham: The Minister has got himself further entangled. If you are not transferring some of the people, on what basis do you show the identical figure? If you are not transferring them, and if they are being paid more, the amount must be more. That answer gets us in a further labyrinth.

Mr. Jackson: Will the Financial Secretary tell us something about this? The Minister has ventured into a field which should be covered by the Financial Secretary.

The Financial Secretary: I can assure the hon. Member that these Estimates were prepared in the Department concerned, and they cover the expenditure for which the Sub-Head is to provide. That is all I can say.

Mr. Jackson : Does the Financial Secretary therefore admit that he has not full knowledge of what transpires in this Department, and that he just takes what is submitted to him and puts it on the Estimates?

The Financial Secretary : If estimates are reasonable I accept them. I had no reason to believe that this was unreasonable.

Mr. Jackson : I assume that if transfers were made they would be reflected in this estimate, for it would mean that there were less people to be paid. My own knowledge is that the transfers took place long before this year, and that the figure put down in 1960 took care of the transfers to Mon Repos. What I have been trying to point out is that if the Legislative Council is asked to vote money for services it should have full knowledge of the reason it is asked to vote that amount of money. I should have expected to hear from Government that because of the extent of the economy which has been exercised by the Department, and by the Government, what is the saving effected on this particular item by (a) reduction of staff, (b) reduction of working conditions, or (c) whether there has not been full implementation of the points in the wages structure which have been agreed upon.

The Financial Secretary : I have not exercised any economy in this case. This is what the Department asked for. It was a reasonable request and it was allowed.

Mr. Burnham : May I find out from the Minister how many employees are covered by this item?

Mr. Benn : The hon. Member can use the Finance Committee for that purpose. I am unable to keep all those points in my head. I am sorry I do not have the information.

Mr. Jackson : I would like this Government to understand that it can-

not shut out the opposition by the attitude it is adopting. In 1958 they sat over there, kept their mouths closed and did not reply to the comments made on this side of the Table. We therefore had to use this Committee to bring out what we wanted, and we are going to use it again.

Mr. Tello: Reference to the Financial Secretary's Budget Speech makes it quite clear that there was an anticipated increase in wages equivalent to more than \$1 million, and having stated that he anticipated such an increase I am sure the Financial Secretary must have questioned any estimate coming from any Department which was the exact figure of the previous year. We on this side of the Table are wondering whether these figures indicate that there will be a tremendous reduction in staff, for if there are to be increased wages and the estimate remains the same, it must mean that there will be less people to be paid. As a trade unionist I fear that Government is going to dismiss many of the girls and boys working in this Department.

The Financial Secretary : I think I made it quite clear in my Budget Speech that these estimates do not reflect the latest increase in wages. That will require supplementary provision when we know how much the increase under each Head amounts to.

Mr. Burnham: It was the same thing we were told last year. Last year, Mr. Chairman, we had \$7,942 on this item. We were told by the hon. Financial Secretary's predecessor in office that we must wait until the true figures are ascertained — until the impact of the paltry increase becomes obvious. Very well, but \$7,942, the former Financial Secretary said, was based on \$2.52; then, in 1960, I think they had paid \$2.75 and therefore you are just holding on to the new increase to see what they should be. At least you should have had in the estimates for 1961, the increase reflected in 1960.

The Financial Secretary : Provision of this amount does not only reflect wages; there is also the size of the provision and the number of people employed.

Mr. Burnham: That is exactly the same point I am making; keep the same figures and pay the same staff. That is why the hon. Minister could not tell us what is the size of the staff.

Mr. Benn: The hon. Member must know that the answers to these questions deserve some kind of notice so that information relating to the size of the staff in any section or department could be obtained. If we are expected to answer how many watchmen and gardeners are working in each department, we will have to walk with an encyclopedia. Actually, in this section of the department, one or two girls have been employed during the year to investigate the need for more milk in certain sections of the City of Georgetown.

Mr. Burnham : It is the first time in my life I have heard that we have to go to a dictionary or encyclopedia to know the number of employees. Words must have changed their meanings for the hon. Minister. I do not expect the hon. Minister to say how many watchmen and gardeners are employed; but what I would expect the hon. Minister to say is that we have put the same figures because we have reduced the number or, I am sorry, we have put the same figures because the number is not reduced—that the number is going up and, at least, at this stage we can have an Amendment—and not tell us about dictionaries and encyclopedia. Where that comes in I do not know.

Mr. Kendall: Could the hon. Minister say whether it is the policy of the Government to reduce its labour force, in order to pay the basic rate of \$3.04?

Mr. Benn: There is no question of the reduction of the labour force; and the hon. Member must not hold on to this point.

Mr. Burnham : Now that the heat is generated, perhaps the hon. Minister can tell us why he has the same figures for 1961 as he had in 1959?

Mr. Benn: The answers have been given and no more answers will be given.

Mr. Jackson : The Minister has tried to make us believe, or wants to represent to us, that he does not examine these things — for it is rather elementary to examine figures — but he said, when we were debating the Bill on Education, that he has a flair for research. Why does he not go into this matter and see that the position is unrealistic?

Mr. Benn: That is for you to do.

Mr. Jackson : And I will do it. Why does he, as Minister, not answer the question? Why did he not consult the Head of the Department and say why the figures for 1961 are the same as in 1959 and 1960? Had he done that, he would have been fully aware of the circumstances — whether there would have been a retrenchment in the staff or a reduction in the number of people employed and so forth. We are entitled to information in this Council and we should have it. We know that they have complete disregard for the "Opposition" and, therefore, they adopt this attitude.

Mr. Benn: That is not so.

Mr. Tello : I noticed the hon. Minister was anxious to assure this Council that there is no question of reduction; I want him to assure this Council that there will be no reduction.

Mr. Benn : I can give no assurance of what is going to happen in any department during the year. The hon. Member, himself, during the debate this afternoon, was questioning certain things in relation to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. The hon. Member must know that the activities of the Plant are under constant investigation and supervision.

Mr. Tello : Therefore, that statement of 'there is no question of reduction' is an empty one! When shall I be in a position to accept what is given to this Council?

Mrs. Jagan : The hon. Member seems to be unaware of the fact that there is an increase in the Estimates for the payment of \$3.04 per day. Certainly, that increase is based on the existing labour force. I assure the hon. Member that we do not have to stand on our heads and wriggle our feet to make that point.

Mr. Burnham : The point I want to make is this: the hon. Minister said he cannot give any undertaking whether or not there will be any reduction.

The Chairman : I just want to clear my own mind. As far as I can gather here, this amount of \$7,942 is the same as it was in 1959 and the same as it was in 1960. It is alleged, and perhaps you may correct me if I am wrong, that some years earlier the same figures appeared when the rate was \$2.52 and the figures also appeared when the rate had been increased to \$2.75, and for next year the rate is \$3.04. The difficulty Members seem to be experiencing is: **Would it be the same figure if the staff is maintained at the same numerical strength?** It follows, as night follows day, that it cannot be the same if the staff is maintained at the same strength and an increase in wages is maintained. I understand the hon. Financial Secretary to say that the proper amount is not yet known but that when this proper amount is ascertained, there will be a supplementary estimate. The Members are questioning why was the figure not changed in 1960 and why was it not anticipated, having regard to the position. Is that so?

Sir,

Yes.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh : I want to know if this amount includes casual workers? If it includes casual workers it would vary from day to day, from week to week and from year to year. An amount like this would be subject to variation. And if in 1959 the rate was \$2.52 and in 1960 it was \$2.75 and there was no variation, it would be reflected in the Financial Secretary's rectification of amounts.

Mr. Jackson : My hon. Friend, who has just arrived, has not yet grasped the subject. If he would look at the Head above he would see that it deals with the Gardens Supervisor. I am sure he will agree that I should know something about the staff in the Gardens and elsewhere. I am sure that he will admit that I have more intimate knowledge in connection with this matter than he does. I am saying, without any fear of contradiction, that this staff is a regular staff. It is because of the fact that I know the extent of regular employment in this place that I challenge the figure in the Estimates.

I did say that I appreciate the fact that, on the latest revision (\$3.04 a day) it would be difficult to put down what it would cost Government next year. The point I make is that the Estimates for 1961 should have reflected what was spent this year.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh : Mr. Chairman, the same objection should have been raised while discussing the Estimates for 1960 when in 1959 there was a rise of 23c. —from \$2.52 to \$2.75. I think this is merely a question of quibbling on the part of some hon. Members. If Government has given an undertaking to the workers, the matter will be attended to. This is merely a question of delaying the proceedings.

Mr. Jackson : If the hon. Member were present this afternoon when he ought to have been, he would not have

made this comment. He would have known that I raised the same point by referring to the *Hansard* for 1960.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I was doing public business elsewhere; I was not sitting in my office doing nothing. So far as this matter is concerned, if it were a question which was watertight and there was no possibility of varying it, I would have agreed to fight the matter.

It has been said that certain revisions will take place during the course of 1961. The Financial Secretary can come here at any time during the year and say that the Department of Agriculture needs more money for the purpose of adorning the City of Georgetown, and that he needs \$5,000 for that purpose.

Mr. Burnham: I happen to know that the hon. Member for Georgetown South is aspiring to a Government office —

The Chairman: You have said something of which I am not aware. You may have certain knowledge which I do not possess, but I do say that I am entitled to understand fully what is said in this Council so that I can follow the proceedings: please do not keep me in the dark.

Mr. Burnham: I can give you no further insight into the aspiration of the hon. Member, but I happen to know that the hon. Member, who claims to have been doing public business, left a certain place to come here and did not come here.

The hon. Member talks about quibbling. It must be understood that under our Standing Orders we cannot increase expenditure, and we have to seek this opportunity to put over certain points. If the hon. Member for Georgetown South is uneasy, having attended the meeting for the first time,

let him keep his uneasiness to himself or go home. He has not yet been raised to the post of Speaker of this Council.

Mr. Benn: The hon. Member is no worse than the others. He was not here and could not speak; the others were here and did not speak.

The Chairman: I must say this, with due respect to the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, that the hon. Member for Georgetown South never retreats from an attack; he is quite capable of standing on his own and defending himself.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I thank you very much, Sir. This is a question of thrust and counter thrust. I would like my hon. and learned Friend, the Member for Georgetown Central, to understand—

The Chairman: I think the situation has been cleared; if we continue in this manner we will not get far. I shall put the Motion if hon. Members insist.

Mr. Jackson: I will not insist on my Amendment being put. I beg to withdraw my Motion.

Agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

The Chairman: Anything else under Agriculture?

MILK PASTEURISATION PLANT

Mr. Jackson: I had hoped to have received information regarding the questions I have asked the Minister about the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. I want a reply, but the Minister has remained mute. In the circumstances, I beg to move the reduction by \$1 of Sub-Head 35 — Milk Pasteurisation Plant — \$100,000. Earlier today I said that the Milk Pasteurisation Plant has been

[Mr. JACKSON]

operating in a manner which leaves room for improvement. I also said that for the past two or three years we have been asked to vote the same amount of money year after year, and that subsequent to the passing of the Estimates we have had to approve supplementary provision. This year the supplementary expenditure is \$150,000 and, therefore, it is clear that the request should have been a figure of \$245,000. Why is the Government attempting to mislead the Members of this Council? I wish to say that, despite the nibbling on the part of Government to increase the vote for this Milk Pasteurisation Plant, there is still a certain amount of wastage and, possibly, dishonesty practised in some Departments.

I pointed out that, despite the fact that Government lorries leave Georgetown daily to go within three miles of the Abary Bridge, the Government still uses the lorries of two persons whose names I mentioned earlier. The Government pays these two people \$40 a day each to bring the milk from Abary to Georgetown. That is a condition which should not be allowed, for if the Government had taken a complete analysis of the working of this Plant it would have known that it would have been more economical to purchase two lorries to cover the three-mile distance between the point where its lorries stop at Abary Bridge and Abary proper. That appears to be condoning a racket.

Mr. Benn: The hon. Member is wrong in his statement regarding the hire of two lorries from the two gentlemen. Under the Regulations for the supply of milk anyone can take milk direct to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant and he will be paid at a higher rate than if the Milk Pasteurisation Plant's lorry collects the milk at his doorstep. The lorries from these two gentlemen were not hired by the Department; the two gentlemen collected milk from certain parts of

Berbice and transported it to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. If that practice is to be stopped, it will be necessary to amend the Regulations. This is under the investigation of the Government and the Ministry at the moment. Anyone can take a pint of milk to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant and receive more for it than if a Government lorry collected the milk and took it there. Those are the conditions under which the Government in power took over the Milk Pasteurisation Plant that was set up by the Interim Government.

Mr. Jackson: I am glad that the Minister can quote Regulations, and say that anyone can take a pint of milk to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant and receive payment for it. Whose responsibility is it for collecting the milk? If Mr. "X" collects milk from Mr. "Z" in the country and brings it to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant in Georgetown, is it expected that the price to be obtained for the milk is so high as to defray the cost of hiring two trucks at \$40 a day? Will the Minister of Natural Resources tell us whether the hiring of trucks is confined to the East Coast of Demreara only, or whether it applies also to Georgetown? I said earlier today that trucks are hired by the Government in Georgetown at \$24 a day and that the drivers are paid separately by the Government. Can the Minister deny my statements?

Mr. Benn: The hon. Member talks about the hiring of trucks and of people condoning rackets. I do not know who he is suggesting is in a racket. The hiring of trucks is done by way of tenders. I do not know whether the hon. Member is suggesting that the Tenders Board is encouraging or engaging in a racket. I maintain that these two gentlemen receive a higher rate per gallon for the milk they deliver to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant than would have been paid to them if the Government's lorry had collected the milk at their doorsteps. Even if a lorry from the Milk

Pasteurisation Plant went to a particular area and the people decided to deliver the milk to the Plant themselves, the Regulations would permit them to do so. We are trying to correct that at the moment.

The Chairman: If I understand the Minister aright, there is no question of hiring a truck to bring in milk. But if people collect the milk and take it to the Plant they are paid so much per gallon higher than if it were collected by a Government lorry and delivered to the Plant.

Mr. Benn: Not in every case, Sir. In some cases the Milk Pasteurisation Plant has to hire trucks to collect and distribute milk, when there is a shortage of lorries in the Department.

The Chairman: The position is that when the Department sends a truck to collect milk an additional expenditure is incurred and less is paid for the milk. On the other hand, if an individual delivers the milk at the Plant he receives a higher price per gallon. The question seems to be; whether you have two sets of trucks doing practically the same work. The only question which seems to me to arise is whether there are two sets of contractors doing practically the same business.

Mr. Kendall: The Minister in defending the apparent deficiency of the Milk Pasteurisation Plant suggested that it is a legacy from the Interim Government. Let me admit that that is true, but the present Government used that as a platform to get into power. The fact is that after three years this Government has been unable to straighten it out. It shows the Government's inefficiency.

Dr. Jagan: There seems to be need for explanation of some of the nonsense that is said here. A few years ago the Milk Pasteurisation Plant was reconstituting powdered milk and conducting an

intensive campaign to get people to buy it in bottles. The former Minister of Natural Resources and I went all the way to the Abary and begged the people to produce milk and sell it to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. We even suggested that the Plant should make chocolate milk so as to encourage a greater consumption of milk. What the hon. Member fails to see is that when the Milk Pasteurisation Plant was bought it was badly planned, as its capacity is far in excess of the milk we produce, and what is happening now is that as a result of increased co-operation we are getting larger supplies of milk which, unfortunately, the people are not consuming because, for one reason or another, canned milk is being consumed. But efforts are being made to see that a greater consumption of pasteurised milk takes place. In fact it is now being considered whether some of the milk collected in an area should be distributed there without being pasteurised, rather than bringing it all the way to Georgetown and, perhaps, having to give it away.

The problem is one of consumption. It is not that the situation has remained static. Much more milk is coming to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant now than in the last few years, but the fact is that at the moment the milk is not being consumed as readily as it should be. I have seen some figures which show that in 1957 the production was a little over 250,000 gallons, but in 1959 it rose to 500,000 gallons. It is an achievement in itself that we were able to get people all over the country to produce milk. Even if it is being given away and we are losing money, it means that the nutritional standard of the people is being benefited. So that Members must not think it is a complete waste. Certain people are benefiting, and the country is producing more milk. The Plant was badly designed at the beginning. The production of milk was not fully investigated, and it is a legacy we have inherited. We are now trying to straighten it out with the help of experts from the

[DR. JAGAN]

International Co-operation Administration. I would like any Member to show how it can be done any better.

Mr. Burnham: We hear about increased production and expansion of the milk industry, but will the Minister tell this Council why, within the last three months, the Manager of the Milk Pasteurisation Plant bought powdered milk from a Bourda Market stall?

Mr. Benn: In the last three months milk production really increased towards the end of the year. When rice farmers are out of the rice fields the production of milk goes up rapidly. If the Manager of the Plant purchased powdered milk from the hon. Member's headquarters (I am sorry — from the Bourda Market stall) he might have been using it himself.

Mr. Burnham: It may be that powdered milk was bought from my headquarters, but the trouble is that people are not buying the pasteurised milk. Yet there was bought for the Plant within the last three months a tremendous amount of milk from the Bourda Market.

Mr. Jackson: The question of the dumping of milk referred to by the Minister of Trade and Industry is nothing new. I am sure he will remember that milk was being thrown away before the Milk Pasteurisation Plant was installed. I am not saying that they are throwing milk away now.

The Minister of Natural Resources said that those persons who take their milk to the plant are being paid at a higher rate per gallon than was paid to those whose milk was collected in their districts. I assume, therefore, that he knows the rate per gallon which is being paid to those persons who bring their milk from Abary to Georgetown. Can he now tell us what is the rate per gallon

paid to those persons and what is paid to those whose milk is collected by the plant?

Mr. Benn: The rate paid at the Plant is 80 cents per gallon, while that paid in the districts varies from 70 cents per gallon.

Mr. Jackson: Government is paying 80 cents per gallon for milk transported from the Abary to Georgetown, and 70 cents per gallon for milk conveyed from Catherinville, just three miles shorter than from Abary. So that for a distance of three miles Government is paying 10 cents per gallon more for the milk.

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran): As I understand it, milk bought in Georgetown is paid for at the rate of 80 cents per gallon. If I produce milk at Bel Air, at Industry or in the Abary, and I take it to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant in Georgetown I get 80 cents per gallon for it. On the other hand, if the lorries of the Plant collect the milk at Bel Air, Industry or Abary, then the price paid will be less than 80 cents per gallon. The price per gallon depends on the distance over which the milk has to be transported.

Perhaps, I may add something for the hon. Member's information. As the Minister of Trade and Industry indicated, some time ago there was a shortage of milk at the Plant and the persons the hon. Member referred to began collecting milk at the request of the former Minister of Natural Resources. Those two gentlemen went into the Abary, from which point no milk was actually bought. In fact, prior to that time the lorries of the Plant did not go beyond Burma, because it was found that when they went further they arrived in Georgetown too late, with the result that in most cases the milk turned sour. But after the great shortages occurred the Minister went to

the Abary and organized the people in the district. One of the collectors who previously ran a launch service in the Abary creek for years, was asked to resume his business, and he began collecting milk in the Abary, but when he brought it out to the road he found that there were no lorries available to bring it to Georgetown. After a couple of weeks he bought a lorry and brought the milk to Georgetown where he received payment. He paid the producers for their milk on his way back at the end of the week.

That is how the system started; just a few gallons of milk, as the Minister of Natural Resources has just pointed out, particularly in the rice-producing areas. Milk production drops very steeply during the rice-reaping season, and the present over-production of milk is not something that happens all the time. Sometimes those people who bring milk from the Abary bring very small quantities, depending on the season.

Mr. Jackson : With respect to the use of powdered milk and the reply given by the Minister of Communications and Works, the question really is: are the officers in charge of the Milk Pasteurisation Plant permitted to buy powdered milk at the Bourda Market, or are they supposed to obtain items of that sort through the Crown Agents? If they are supposed to obtain such supplies through the Crown Agents, has anyone broken the Financial Regulations? I would also like to know why chocolate, which is used at the Plant to make chocolate milk, is also purchased locally and not through the Crown Agents? We must bear in mind that not so long ago, for similar action, certain officers in the Housing Department were charged with failure to comply with the Financial Regulations.

Mr. Benn : If the hon. Member has any information which he wishes to bring to my attention I will that action is taken. If there is a shortage

of chocolate milk at the Plant and the Manager wants to keep a supply of chocolate milk on the market, I think it would be difficult for him to get into contact with the Crown Agents always in order to purchase chocolate. So that if once or twice powdered milk or chocolate has to be bought locally, I am quite certain that he would seek the permission of the Financial Secretary to do so. If the hon. Member has any information to the contrary Government will certainly investigate it.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh : We would like to know what steps Government is taking to utilize the milk that is now being produced in this great quantity and cannot be consumed?

Mr. Benn : The Government has been considering this great problem. The hon. Member would like to know whether the Government has under consideration the purchase of a milk sterilization plant in order to sterilize milk. I understand sterilized milk would last for six months. It is believed that it can be stored and sent to the remote parts of the country for use, and there will be less waste. So, subject to the approval of the Finance Committee, Government hopes to purchase a sterilization plant as another step towards reducing the deficit.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh : Is Government considering the possibility of getting some type of cheese made from the excess milk?

Mr. Benn : We have had a campaign as the first step towards reducing this excess. The dairy management, with the assistance of I.C.A. officials, are working on several plans in order to put up proposals to Government, and I understand that the question of making cheese is under consideration.

The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan): We were also advised that to convert milk into cheese, butter or condensed milk will be an expensive pro-

[DR. JAGAN]

position based on the price of milk at the moment. We must also remember that in many countries from which cheese comes or is produced and imported into British Guiana, the farmers are sometimes paid subsidized prices; and many of these products are sold at dumped prices in those countries. They have the domestic price which is far higher than what is charged in the export market. So it is not simply a question of technically making something, whether it is cheese, butter or condensed milk. It is a question of the cost of conversion. This has been gone into on many occasions and it was found that, based on the producing price of milk at the moment, if it were converted into condensed milk, the loss would be greater than if it were done in the first stage by sterilization.

Mr. Jackson: Milk which is produced here cannot make butter or cheese. It has not enough fat content to make a large amount of butter or cheese for sale to commercial concerns.

Mr. Ram Karran: wonder from where the hon. Member got his information.

Mr. Davis: Let me agree with the Government that the quantity of milk has increased considerably, but I am a bit alarmed, now, to hear that it is being thought of sterilizing milk. As I understand it, milk which is sterilized loses much of its nutritive value.

want to refer to the Minister of Trade and Industry's remarks. Milk that will go to the condensary to be made into condensed milk will be surplus milk of which there is no fixed price. That is important. The other point is: I think the stage is set, now, where Government must consider forthwith, or limit to a certain extent, the amount of powdered milk and, perhaps, condensed milk that comes into the Colony, so that our milk would be more readily saleable.

The factor that has affected the sale of local milk is not only the point made by the Minister of Trade and Industry in that a lot of milk is dumped here cheaply; but the United Nations Organization sends milk here for distribution in certain areas and that, also, has a great effect on the sale of local milk.

The Chairman: The Question "That Sub-Head 35 — Milk Pasteurisation Plant \$100,000 be reduced by \$1."

Question put, and negatived

The Chairman: The Question "That Head 3 — Agriculture — be carried out at \$2,138,152."

Agreed to.

Head passed.

ANALYST

The Chairman: The Question "That Head 4—Analyst—be carried out at \$69,589"

Agreed to.

Head passed.

AUDIT

The Chairman: The Question "That Head 5 Audit — be carried \$174,442".

Agreed to

Head passed.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

The Chairman: The Question is "That Head 6—Town and Country Planning Department be carried out at \$74,118".

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE

DEPUTY CHIEF SECRETARY

Mr. Burnham: I beg to move the deletion of Sub-Head 1(2) — 1 Deputy Chief Secretary — \$8,640. Mr. Chairman, with the impending constitutional changes, the post of Chief Secretary will vanish. The powers enjoyed by the holder of that post will no longer be enjoyed.

As I understand it, the person in the Public Service, even though he can remain, perhaps, until the 31st July, you will have no Chief Secretary after then and, therefore, no Deputy Chief Secretary. There seems to be short-sighted planning, in view of the fact that the new constitution will come into operation not later than eight months in the year, to have both of these posts appearing here; and that is my reason for moving the deletion of that item. All the Chief Secretary's political work will be done, in future, by an elected politician and whatever administrative and civil service work left to be done will be done, perhaps, by the Deputy Chief Secretary; and it seems to me a waste of money to vote money for a Chief Secretary and a Deputy Chief Secretary for the whole of 1961. The wisest course will appear to be not to have the posts up to the end of the year. There will then be consequential savings, for the posts will not continue to the end of the year.

Question put, and negatived.

PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT, ARCHIVES

Mr. Burnham: I beg to move the reduction by \$1 of Sub-Head 6 — under Extraordinary — Purchase of Equipment, Archives — \$3,000. It seems to me that the provision of \$3,000 for the purchase of Equipment in relation to the preservation of the Archives is inadequate. Archives, as I understand them Mr. Chairman, are supposed to be places where material of historic value is kept and preserved. In

these days we are becoming more conscious of our history and I think, from my own experience of what happened over the past five or six years, there is much more research being done as well as the collecting of material. In the circumstances, it seems to me that \$3,000 is a very inadequate sum.

From certain remarks I have had made to me from persons who have had to do research in the Archives, such a sum is inadequate. It may be said by the Government that it may be possible for a larger sum to be voted under Supplementary Estimates during the year: but, on the other hand, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, if you can now anticipate the reason for more money, it seems a waste of time to approve it under Supplementary Estimates. I wonder whether Government would not be inclined, in view of my remarks, at a later stage, to increase this vote by at least \$3,000. I have had discussion with someone who is an expert in this field, and he has given me the assurance that a provision of this size is wholly inadequate for any country that seriously desires to have up-to-date Archives.

The Financial Secretary: The provision in the Estimates is what the Archivist himself asked for.

Mr. Burnham: I understand that you have one Archivist. I was attracting this matter to your attention, based on what an expert mentioned to me while he was in this Colony some time ago.

Dr. Jagan: I would suggest that the hon. Member for Central Georgetown let his informer speak to the Archivist who will then approach the Financial Secretary.

Mr. Burnham: If the *quondam* revolutionary has become afflicted by that red tape, I will bow to that.

I now beg to withdraw my Motion.

Agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman: The Question is, "That Head 7—Chief Secretary's Office—be carried out at \$68,919".

The Chief Secretary: I beg to move that this Council adjourn until 2 p.m.

Agreed to.

The Speaker: This Council is adjourned until 2 p.m. on Thursday, 29th December, 1960.

Head passed.

Council resumed.

Council adjourned accordingly, at 10.10 p.m.