

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 1]

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

16th Sitting

Friday, 2nd March, 1962.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

[Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*]

Present:

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

Members of the Government

People's Progressive Party

Ministers

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

Dr. the Honourable Charles Jacob, Jr. —*Minister of Finance (Member for Vreed-en-Hoop)*

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

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

Parliamentary Secretary

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

Other Members

Mr. S. M. Saffee —*(Member for Berbice—West)*
 Mr. G. L. Robertson —*(Member for Leonora)*
 Mr. M. Bhagwan —*(Member for Essequibo Islands)*
 Mr. J. B. Caldeira —*(Member for Pomeroon)*
 Mr. V. Downer —*(Member for Berbice—East)*
 Mr. M. Hamid —*(Member for Demerara—Central)*
 Mr. D. C. Jagan —*(Member for Suddie)*
 Mr. H. Lall —*(Member for Corentyne—West)*
 Mr. M. Shakoor —*(Member for Corentyne River)*

Members Constituting the Minority

(i) *People's National Congress*

Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C. —*(Member for Ruinveldt)*
 Mr. W. O. R. Kendall, Deputy Speaker —*(Member for New Amsterdam)*
 Mr. J. Carter —*(Member for Werk-en-Rust)*
 Mr. E. E. Correia —*(Member for Mazaruni-Potaro)*
 Mr. N. J. Bissember —*(Member for Campbellville)*
 Mr. W. A. Blair —*(Member for Berbice River)*
 Mr. R. S. S. Hugh —*(Member for Georgetown—South)*
 Mr. J. G. Joaquim —*(Member for Kitty)*
 Mr. R. J. Jordan —*(Member for Upper Demerara River)*
 Mr. C. A. Merriman —*(Member for La Penitence—Lodge)*
 Mr. H. M. S. Wharton —*(Member for Abary)*

(ii) *United Force*

Mr. P. d'Aguiar —*(Member for Georgetown—Central)*
 Mr. S. Campbell —*(Member for North West)*
 Mr. R. E. Cheeks —*(Member for Georgetown—North)*

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

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

ABSENT:

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE
SPEAKER

LEAVE TO MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I have to announce that the hon. Member for Rupununi, Mr. Melville, has applied for leave to be absent from the sittings of this Assembly from today, 2nd March until 24th March.

PAPERS LAID

The following Paper was laid:

Report of the Government Information Services, British Guiana, for the year 1960. [Premier & Minister of Development and Planning.]

PUBLIC BUSINESS

MOTIONS

PAYMENT OF SALARIES TO
PUBLIC SERVANTS
FOR 1961

"Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly approves of the payment of salaries to Public Servants with effect from 1st January, 1961, at the rates set out in the Report of the Commission to Review Wages, Salaries and Conditions of Service in the Public Service, British Guiana, 1961, as modified by the Government in Sessional Paper No. 3 of 1962 pending final consideration in the light of the decisions arising from discussion in Whitley Council;

Be it further resolved that in terms of section 18 of the Financial Administration and Audit Ordinance, 1961 (No. 39), this Legislative Assembly authorises the expenditure of 2,600,000 required to meet the payment of arrears of salaries on the aforementioned basis in respect of the year 1961." [The Minister of Finance.]

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will recall that when we adjourned the sitting last evening the hon. the Premier had just finished his speech. At the end of it, he moved an Amendment to the

Amendment to the effect that the words "subject to funds being available" should be added after the word "workers" and that the full stop should be replaced by a comma. This means, as I see it, that the hon. the Premier, on behalf of the Government, indicated acceptance of the additional resolve clause which had been moved by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central and the further Amendment by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River. If my understanding is right, then we will be able to proceed.

The Premier and Minister of Development and Planning (Dr. Jagan): Sir, the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central is in two parts—

Mr. Speaker I am referring to the second part.

The Premier: We do not accept the first part.

Mr. Speaker But you are prepared to accept the additional clause with the addition of the words "subject to funds being available". In such circumstances, hon. Members, the words which appear after the word "that" in that further resolve clause—and I quote the words, "this Assembly recommend that" -- need no longer appear since the Government has indicated its willingness to accept the proposals, except for a change of figure. So that if it is agreed that it can go in such fashion, it need no longer remain as a recommendation.

The Premier: As I understand it, this is a financial measure and, therefore, any amendment proposing the expenditure of funds will have to be in the form of a recommendation. That was indicated to the Movers and we have accepted this Amendment with that phrasing, and in addition to that, the words which I suggested being put at

[THE PREMIER]

the end. That is, "subject to funds being available." So that the whole resolve clause will read as follows:

"Be it further resolved that this Assembly recommends that the minimum basic daily wage for unclassified Government workers be increased from \$3.04 per day to \$4.00 per day with corresponding increases for all unclassified Government workers, subject to funds being available."

I have already said that we are opposed to the first part of the Amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. I just wanted to be absolutely clear before we reached the stage of putting the question. To make things easier, perhaps the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, who had been originally suggesting \$3.64, would be agreeable to accepting the change proposed by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River for making it \$4.00 per day.

Mr. d'Aguiar (Georgetown Central): In moving the Amendment to raise the minimum to \$3.64 from \$3.04, I was giving very careful consideration to the financial situation and also to the recommendations of the Federation of Unions of Government Employees which had suggested that the increase should be spread over a three-year period, making it a total of \$4.50. But having regard to the fact that the hon. the Premier should be more aware of the financial situation than any of us here; having regard to the fact that he has accepted the further Amendment of a \$4.00 minimum; and having further regard to the fact that, whereas there might not be sufficient funds for \$4.00, there might be for \$3.64, it would indicate that the hon. the Premier must be aware that there will be sufficient funds for the payment of \$4.00. *[Laughter]*.

With these considerations, I beg leave, with the permission of the Seconder of the Motion, to withdraw the motion raising the minimum from \$3.04 to \$3.64 and to indicate that I will be most happy to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think, hon. Member, that you can ask leave to withdraw the whole of that Amendment at this stage. All you need do is to agree to substitute \$4.00 for \$3.64 because if you withdraw that, we will have really no clause to put before the House.

Mr. d'Aguiar: I withdraw the figure \$3.64. I certainly appreciate that the gap is now narrowing and, therefore, I think all the more reason why hon. Members should give due consideration to the other part of the Motion. That is, that the Guillebaud Report be accepted without amendment.

Mr. Burnham (Ruimveldt): I have noted that the hon. the Premier has indicated his willingness to accept the \$4.00 per day minimum provided funds are available. That, to my mind, is the essence of hypocrisy. Number one, why did he have to be prodded into considering the figure of \$4.00, and number two, unless he is grossly incompetent, he ought at this stage to know whether or not the funds are available. After all, it is the Premier speaking. If the Premier and his Ministers had sat down and had allowed the other Members of the House to pass that Amendment, that recommendation, then, of course, it would have been dependent upon funds being available. But since he is the person to get up to support the \$4.00 he ought to know whether funds are available; and it strikes me that he and his Government do not intend to pay the \$4.00 because if they had that intention it would have been unnecessary to put in that rider or that condition.

This sort of attitude as displayed by the Premier in his Amendment is typical and dates right back to the very early days of his Government during the period 1957 to 1961. Indeed, the Motion proper, which we have been asked to consider, has only been made necessary now because of the dilatory tactics of the Government who ought to have foreseen, several months ago, the necessity for paying the Government employees the sums which it now proposes to pay them.

2.15 p.m.

When the Government unclassified sections went on strike in 1959, the Premier said, "not a cent more." He said that at Windsor Forest which, apparently, is his happy hunting ground for making irresponsible statements like "not a cent more", or inviting his frightened cohorts to Georgetown to support his falling Government. In November, 1959, he stated that the poor rice farmers were more in need of increases than the Government employees. It took a strike for the offer of \$2.75 per day, and it took a prolongation of the strike to get \$3.04 per day, with an agreement for the reference of the subject to Whitley Council.

The Minister of Finance has professed — and I use the word "professed" advisedly — anxiety to settle this long-standing matter. If this Government were in fact in earnest or anxious to get over this long-standing dispute with its employees, this House would certainly have given it the necessary approval for the expenditure of money.

I am subject to correction, but as I understand the Budget Statement which was made on the 31st January, the Minister of Finance proposed a sum of \$2,600,000 to pay increased salaries in 1962. It means, therefore, that had it not been for the strong action taken by the Government workers during the month of February they would not have

been able to get this \$2.6 million for increased salaries during 1961. Now, says the Minister of Finance, the Government's wish is that a public servant should be a contented person. I am happy to hear that, because it was this same Government, through its Premier, who had accused civil servants of being stooges and tools of the imperialist masters. I hope that the statement by the Minister of Finance indicates a change of heart, and not merely a change of facade in the context of the present embarrassment of the Government.

Whatever this Government may say, there can be no denying that it is the greatest disgrace for any Government more especially a working-class Government, to have its workers coming out on strike over conditions of work and wages. It is no sense throwing bouquets around and exchanging compliments as to who is fascist and who is communist. It has to be admitted by anyone that this is a sorry state of things for which the Government must be blamed, when its workers go out on strike for better wages and conditions of work, and that the strike was justified from the point of view of the Government workers is proved by the fact that they did not go back in until their terms of resumption were accepted by the Premier — he who will govern, for he said "We were elected to govern, and govern we will."

Never before in history has an employer been forced not merely to accept all the terms the workers insisted on, but also to give the workers a holiday over the period they were out on strike. If this is not an admission of incompetence and poor handling of an industrial dispute, what on earth is? Says the Premier, "Away back on the 24th January, 1962, I met the Staff Associations." But he has not told us how uninformed he was when he told the teachers that their increases ranged from 10 to 13 per cent., and it had to be pointed out to him that the increases proposed ranged

[MR. BURNHAM]

from 5 to 8 per cent. He was obviously badly advised and did not know what on earth he was talking about. Imagine the Premier, the Head of the Government, telling Staff Associations that they were getting increases ranging from 10 to 13 per cent. and their having to tell him they were 5 to 8 per cent; and then having to say "That is my information"? Who gave him that information? That is one head that should roll. He was made to appear very incompetent and ill informed.

It was in October last year that a request was made by the Federation of Unions of Government Employees for reference of their dispute with the Government to the Whitley Council, but not even the courtesy of a reply to that request was sent to the Federation. Indeed, it seems to me that there is a great deal of reason, and there are several facts upon which the proposition can be based — there is a good deal of reason for the suggestion by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River (Mr. Jordan) that the Government's attitude towards its employees, whether classified or unclassified, was influenced by the belief on the part of the Government that those were persons who did not give the People's Progressive Party political support at the last two elections.

Now, says the Premier, "The original recommendations made by the Government are basically the same as were eventually accepted." I want to understand that. I really want to be taught. I should have thought that the Premier having recovered from his recent experience, at least would have condescended to particulars and explained to the House what were the basic proposals made prior to the strike, what were the terms of resumption, and in what lay this close similarity. I do not believe him because he had not given us the details, and I have good reason to believe, from

information from the trade unionists, that what he said there is totally inaccurate and untrue.

In explaining his predicament, the Premier said that we on the Opposition benches have not the foggiest idea of what are the implications and the difficulties of the situation. Indeed, the files are not at our disposal. If we do not have the foggiest idea we are following in the noble tradition of the Premier when he was the hon. Member for Central Demerara in the old Legislative Council, between 1947 and 1953. It does not seem to me that the Premier has made out a case against the increases which ought to have been given before, and the further increase which I shall argue later ought to be given now. It is puerile to come here, quasi-economist as he is, to tell us that Berrill based his recommendations for the Development Programme on a minimum wage of \$2.52 per day. It requires a minimum of literacy to have appreciated the fact that Berrill's recommendations were on the basis of \$2.52 per day, and it requires a modicum of consistency and honesty to have rejected Berrill so far as he based his recommendations on \$2.52 per day.

I recall very clearly that on the 13th November, 1959, the Minister of Communications and Works, as he then was, now the Minister of Works and Hydraulics (Mr. Ram Karran), extended his chest measurement and said "You cannot criticize our proposals for the Development Programme because there is nothing in them to criticize." It is no sense coming to us now and telling us that Berrill started on the assumption of \$2.52, therefore we should blame Berrill. It reminds me of a certain ex-Chief Justice who used to tell the jury "My opinion is this, but if you accept my opinion it then becomes your opinion." The leaders of the Government accepted the basis of \$2.52, therefore it became their basis. I remember

a Sunday afternoon in 1954, when the report of the Commission for the Revision of Salaries was published, that I was sitting in the house of the Premier, who was then deposed with the rest of the Government, and that he remarked "Too little and too late" regarding the report which recommended a minimum wage of \$2.52 per day.

By all that is just, unless ignorance is interposed, unless dishonesty has supervened, how could this Government have accepted Berrill's proposals based on \$2.52 per day, when the present leader of the Government in 1954 thought that \$2.52 per day was "too little and too late"? Liars must have good memories, and you are not going to fool anyone here by any suaveness. Either you cannot run the Government—and the showing yesterday was such as to convince any but the fanatic that you cannot run the Government—or you are dishonest. You now tell us that in 1948, when you were asking for higher salaries and wages, the results of Dr. Giglioli's experiments in the eradication of malaria had not yet shown their full effect on our birth-rate, but none but a tyro would not have realized that eventually it would be reflected on the labour market. When you were asking for better wages there were not so many mouths to feed, you say. When you are the Government I say you must pay better wages regardless of the number of mouths.

I remember when I was a colleague of the Premier that he used to make a very sound point—that the first charge on any institution or industry is the payment of proper wages and salaries to its employees. Do not come here with the capitalist approach—"we have not got money." That is what the capitalist says. He will always tell you "We have not made enough profits and therefore we cannot pay better wages." It is not for you, a socialist (alleged) to come here and tell us "Government cannot pay the workers more because we do not have the money."

2.30 p.m.

Now, as I was saying before I rested to sip some water, let us consider this proposal of the Government that it cannot afford increases. It cannot afford increases, it says, because it cannot find money. Is it not appreciated that if it pays increases to these poor people—these members of the proletariat that it says it represents—such increases will be reflected in the spending power of the people; and since it has not changed the old capitalist form of taxation—taxation by way of customs duties—that that additional spending power will be reflected in revenue from customs and excise duties and, consequently, the increase which it will have paid the lower class of Government employees will not be as great as it had first appeared on the Estimates of Expenditure side? A part of it will be absorbed in the figures it will find in the Estimates of Revenue side. **[Mr. Mann:** "That is obvious."] I am no economist; I have no degree in economics, but I am told by an historian that what I am saying is obvious. Therefore, I shall not proceed, having convinced one, I hope he will use his good offices to convince his somewhat mentally opaque brethren.

Says the hon. Premier in his defence of an indefensible position: "One of the things that has contributed to the difficulty in which the Government now finds itself is the flight of capital, or the export of capital from this country." There are two observations to be made on that, and he must not be allowed to get away with these half-truths. That statement is good for the street corner, but not for the Premier when he is speaking here as Premier. **The Premier knew that the flight of capital started before August, but during the election campaign he was lying to the public when he said that it was untrue to say that there was any flight of capital.**

Mr. Speaker : Let me remind the hon. Member that he is sailing very close to the rocks by using the word "lying". He has before him what my predecessor called the "Bible" for checking procedure in this House. He knows that the word "lie", when used in connection with an hon. Member, is not permitted in this House. He knows that such language is contrary to Parliamentary practice. He may say that the statement differs from the facts and things of that kind, but he must not use the word "lie".

Mr. Burnham : I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for making that statement inadvertently. First, I will say that the hon. Premier was probably inaccurate when, during the election campaign, he said that there had been no flight of capital. He now has to admit, on further research no doubt and with a greater *penchant* for accuracy, that the flight of capital started before August, 1961.

Secondly, he cannot brush aside the fact that the greatest exporters of capital in recent months are members and supporters or ex-members and ex-supporters of the PPP. It is not for us to be blamed. We, the PNC, have no capital to export; we do not even have enough capital on which to live! **Mr. Benn:** "You looted though." I had promised the House that I would not place any personal responsibility on anyone for the looting and so on. I understand it is now being suggested that we looted. But we did not have guns in our homes! *[Laughter in the Public Gallery.]*

Mr. Speaker : Will members in the Public Gallery please understand that, whilst they may enjoy what is being said, they must not express that enjoyment by sound! Please do not disturb the House.

Mr. Burnham: If it is a fact that the Government's inability to honour its obligations to its employees has, in some

measure, been caused by the flight of capital, then I submit that it is a matter for which the Government must take full responsibility. If its own Party supporters are so scared and frightened that they want to send away their money, there must be something wrong in this country. I know of one PPP member, for instance who banks his money in Switzerland. He said at a public meeting that Dr. Jagan would be the Premier. It means that Government has not been able to keep and preserve the loyalty of the people. I am not talking about withdrawals from the Post Office. Therefore it is for the Government to attempt to correct whatever is responsible for this flight of capital. At the moment I am not prepared to say what is responsible for the flight of capital, but it is a matter for Government to recognize what is responsible and to have it corrected. I would not suggest that it is the ideology of the Government; I would not suggest that it is the declarations of the Government; I do not or am not prepared at the moment to say what it is; but if Government is interested in British Guiana, if it is interested, first of all, in the economy of the country and its ability to recompense the workers for the work they do, Government must see to it that the fault is corrected.

The hon. Premier told us that last year he had to borrow \$1M for the Development Programme this year. I do not understand figures too well — that is not my field of expertise — but what I do not understand is this, and I hope the Minister of Finance will explain it to me: Last year this Government proposed an expenditure of \$23M for the Development Programme, but by the end of the year it used only \$21M according to the statement given by the Ministry of Development. The first question I want to ask is: Did the Government know in December, 1960, when it was proposing to spend \$23M that it would not have \$23M? Secondly, if

Government thought it would have had \$23M, why did it spend only \$21M? I should be very grateful if the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleagues would give me some explanation. It seems to me to be high finance if you vote \$23M, and cannot spend it, and then to say that the money is not enough!

We are told that there must be greater sacrifices. It is easy for Government to call upon people to make sacrifices, but, before it can persuade the people to make sacrifices it must convince them (1) that it is a Government of the whole country and not a part thereof, and (2) that their welfare is its primary concern. If I may add an additional consideration, you must impress them with your own willingness to make sacrifices. It is in this context that we consider the \$200 a month entertainment allowance which is given to the hon. Premier tax free. Let me say very clearly that, for any man who knows how to entertain, \$200 a month is a miserly sum. I do not grudge the Premier that, but I am interested in the psychological impact on the community. What is the use of telling the people about austerity and sacrifices when the hon. Premier votes for himself the sum of \$200 a month entertainment allowance tax free? — **[Mr. Ram Karran: "What about the Mayor's allowance?"]**— Says the "Minister of Humour", "What about the Mayor's allowance?" Tax-free entertainment, for other people, has been cut out.

I remember, when I was very much younger, there was some Governor here who decided to give up income tax exemption on his salary. I think it was Sir Gordon Guggisberg who decided to set the example. Not that it mattered much how much income tax he was going to pay, but he wanted to set an example in the circumstances of his asking Public Servants and persons employed in the Civil Service to work for less than they deserved. That is the

sort of thing that makes a psychological impact upon the people — not two car allowances when you use only one car for travelling; not taking tax-free entertainment allowances and tax-free house allowances and at the same time asking people to make sacrifices!

It is an example that this country needs, and it is no sense being wholly and proverbially hypocritical, saying: "Do what I say, and not what I do." Set an example for the country and the people will follow it, provided the two other prerequisites are there. You must show the people that your interest in the country is your primary concern. I had thought that the hon. Premier was of that point of view when, in his television broadcast in America sometime last year, he said that he was a socialist, but he would not permit his socialism to interfere with the development of this country. I do not know what he meant, but I interpreted it this way: Regardless of his own personal idiosyncrasy, ideology or otherwise, he would keep foremost in his mind the welfare of the country. But, apparently, I misinterpreted what he said.

I want to make another remark in the context of this cry of poverty on the part of the Government — a cry which was rejected by the then hon. Member for Central Demerara in the period 1947 to 1953. Whenever the Government said it had no money the then hon. Member for Central Demerara always criticized and castigated it for just pulling clichés out of the bag.

The Premier said yesterday that it is necessary to have the British troops here. Says the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, "So long as law and order are to be preserved, I will see that it is preserved. Therefore the presence of the British troops here is necessary."

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mr. Kendall (New Amsterdam): beg to move that the hon. Member for Ruimsveldt be given 15 minutes more.

Mr. Carter seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Burnham: If this country is so poor that it cannot afford to pay its poor workers for whom this Government professes so much solicitude, how can it afford to pay these highly paid 2.45 p.m.

British troops? I have heard that it takes \$5,000 per day per warship. We had five. In the name of all that is just, if you really want to tackle the situation; if you really want to put the country on its feet; if you really want to do your duty to the workers, are you going to take the children's bread and throw it to the "limey" soldiers? That is what you are doing, and I am not really describing them as "limey" I am merely quoting. Let Britain pay for them; let Britain keep them where she wants them. But you are going to bring them here. You cannot pay people and you talk about unemployment and your solicitude for the working class.

Let us now consider some of the Government's recommendations which we are asked to agree to, but may I assure it right away that so far as the People's National Congress is concerned, we are going to vote for the \$2.6 million. Our only regret is that we cannot vote for more.

I do not think I should waste time on the explanation or introduction to this Sessional Paper, for all this talk about the rise in the consumer price index for urban working class families being 10% since 1954 but the rise in wages 12% and therefore that there is a rise in the real level of 2% only is nonsense. It is based on two false grounds. The first false ground is that the standard and level of wages of the workers in 1954 were such as to keep them well fed, well clothed, and well housed. If

you are going to talk about the rise from 1954, you will have to prove that the 1954 level of wages was adequate. And we all know that on the basis of the Nutrition Report Nicholson, workers in 1954 were not getting enough to feed themselves and to give themselves and families a sufficient number of calories to enjoy proper health. So for the Premier to say that there has been a rise in the level of wages by 12% as against only a 1% rise in the cost of living index is to fool himself and to attempt to fool the public unless of course he can show, which he cannot show, that level of wages in 1954 was fair and sufficient for the purpose for which wages are meant.

The second fallacy in this observation here, and I comment on it lest they believe that we swallow the pill, is that the consumer index is accurate. The first man to allege that the consumer index was inaccurate was the hon. the Premier, but he now shows such disregard for accuracy that he is now depending on the figures from the consumer index.

How low can we sink? How much more can we try to fool the workers? They are the same people who say that the workers have been misled, the workers have been fooled. Indeed, they have been fooled but those are the people [*pointing to the Government members*] who have fooled the workers, and what is aching and hurting them now is that the workers are now sufficiently enlightened not to accept any more fooling and sufficiently militant to take a strong stand. [] It seems if the Minister of Works and Hydraulics is interested in me, I may assure him that like him I have not benefited from the fooling. I am sure he is very sorry about that, but I am happy for myself.

We find here, further in the introduction, with respect to primary school teachers, the suggestion that the increase

is 10% when it has been shown to the hon. the Premier that it is between 5% and 8%. Why does this Government persist in inaccuracies and fooling? Let me inform this Government that this interim settlement, this interim payment of \$2.6 million is not the last word that you have heard because my information — and it is the best information — is that the workers are not going to be satisfied. The employees — white collar and manual—are not going to be satisfied unless and until they get proper wages and proper salaries. So do not believe that the Service will forever close its mouth.

Understand that the teachers want more money and they will get more money, or else—; white collar workers want more money, and they will get more money, or else—; those workers who are represented by the Federation of Unions of Government Employees want more money, and they will get more money, or else —. So let us face that fact. Let us not fool ourselves that by voting a \$2.6 million, which we did not propose to vote before, we have finished the quarrel.

The Government has agreed to go to Whitley Council. It had to be forced to go to Whitley Council. First of all, the Minister of Finance, I understand, could not give a decision. He had to consult. Secondly, he did not answer the letter on the question of Whitley Council and when he did answer, he and his Premier only wanted to submit to Whitley Council, the Government's recommendations or the Government's variations of the Guillebaud Report. Sufficient for that.

Let us consider a few of these items. Long ago, first of all let me say, it was decided by this House that Government would do away as far as possible with the system of personal allowances. Yet, these recommendations are replete with personal allowances: Financial Secretary (now Secretary to the Treasury) — personal allowance; Dep-

uty Chief Medical Officer — personal allowance; Secretary to the Office of the Governor—personal allowance; Director of Marketing — personal allowance. Those are the personal allowances that I see at the moment. I do not know if they are special boys. I suppose there is some explanation for it, but do let us have the explanation.

There is something I am concerned about though in this change of the recommendations of Guillebaud in so far as some of the superscale posts are concerned. Guillebaud recommended for Judges \$11,520 per annum. This Government has decided to reduce it to \$10,560. Let me make it very clear that I am always of the conviction that the lower grades must get the first assistance; the ordinary daily worker must first get a reasonable day's wage. But there are certain considerations which a Government must have in mind. One of these considerations is the necessity for an erudite, experienced and impartial Judiciary. I know that you want to put in People's Judges. I know that you want to establish People's Courts, but even People's Judges and People's Courts must have a certain amount of dignity. Even People's Judges and People's Courts — I know the Attorney General would not agree with People's Judges and People's Courts — must be such that those who administer justice are above suspicion so far as the quality of their learning is concerned, and their impartiality.

It seems to me that the recommendations with respect to judges' salaries were not the recommendations that you ought to have changed. **[An hon. Member:** "The Chief Justice."] The Chief Justice? That is a matter for you. I have no brief to hold for the judges. Those who know me know I have no reason to hold any brief for any judge, but it is the principle that is involved. I feel that the Government has made an awful mistake by rejecting the recommendations for a salary of \$11,520 for judges.

[MR. BURNHAM]

3.00 p.m.

I notice, also, that so far as the Directors of Public Works, of Drainage and Irrigation, of Agriculture, etc., are concerned, there has been a change in the original recommendations. I can see that there is some difficulty in deciding what you are going to do with these superscale posts, but the fact is that, at the moment, you are competing in a market where there is a greater demand than the supply of top-flight qualified men, technologists and professional men. That is a fact you have to face. It is unfortunate that, thanks to the colonial system, we have not had more material available at that level and, thanks to the dilatoriness of this Government, which was its own predecessor, there are not more people nearing the point of experience and qualification to take over all of these posts immediately. But it is a fact that it is difficult to get people to fill these technical posts unless you can pay them salaries or emoluments similar to or comparable with those which they can get in other parts of the world.

I note that the Attorney-General is to get \$11,400 per annum. First of all, I observe that Guillebaud's recommendation was for \$12,960 per annum. I have no love for the Attorney-General at all, but this I say, that it is important that the Government be advised by a competent and experienced member of the profession, and you cannot attract for long—I do not know how long the present Attorney-General will be attracted—a competent and experienced member of my profession for that sort of salary. It is something that this Government has to consider carefully. It is true that as between Ministers, the Attorney-Generalship might not be a senior Ministry like that of the Premier, but when we consider that the Premier is getting a \$500 house, plus \$200 for entertainment, it would be wise if it were considered proper to see to it that whoever you are going to have as Attorney-General is properly remunerated.

I hope that the little that has been given here does refer to the political Attorney-General, otherwise what have you put it here for? I hope that the Minister of Finance, especially as the Attorney-General is sitting on his right, will be questioned by him and he in turn will tell us whether or not this is intended to refer to the political Attorney-General. If it does, then I congratulate Government upon giving him an increase. If it does not, then I castigate them for being so short-sighted. If he is entitled to an increase I hope he will be given the \$12,960 proposed in the Guillebaud Report.

Guillebaud was invited to this country to report on the question of salaries, and his competence was assumed and vouched for by the Government who appointed him, and he was accepted by the Staff Associations, but his recommendations have now truncated. Either you agree or you do not agree that he is competent. If you accept his competency, for goodness sake, shoemakerstick to your last. You invited Guillebaud because he was an economist and because he was competent. The two parties to the dispute, the employer and the employee, agreed on his competence and accepted him, but when he makes recommendations you change those recommendations all around.

Mr. Kendall: I move that the hon. Member be allowed another 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Carter seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Burnham: As understand further, not only was Guillebaud chosen by the Government and accepted by the Staff Associations for his expertise, but also were Col. Bernard, Mr. Kranenburg

and Mr. Macnie, and then you truncate their report. I do not know why some people and Governments create trouble for themselves. You have in this sessional Paper which you have presented here, the seeds of disagreement and more trouble. Why don't you accept the whole of the Guillebaud recommendations and agree to go to Whitley Council on those points of the recommendations with which the Staff Associations do not agree? After all Guillebaud was Government's agent, so to speak. Is Government denying agency and casting aside the expert whom it brought here?

You make a lot of changes in the recommendations of the Guillebaud Report. You want a loyal Police Force, such as you have at the moment, but you change the emoluments of officers as recommended by Guillebaud. You want a better educational system but you down grade the salaries of Queen's College Masters, Bishop's High School Mistresses, and Senior Educational Officers. This Government must know where it is heading, but if I may be permitted to venture an opinion, I would briefly say that it is heading for trouble. It has not learnt its lesson, apparently. It feels that perhaps British troops will always come here to intimidate workers to go back to work, and that perhaps, having got this breathing space, it can visit the full severity of the law under the Essential Services Ordinance.

I would recommend to the Government to pass this \$2.6 million because I really want to save you from the trouble that will take place if you do not, and I would not even like my enemies to be placed in such an embarrassing situation. After getting approval for the payout of \$2.6 million today, Government should decide to go to Whitley Council on those questions on which there is dispute. That seems to me the only sensible thing to do in the circumstances.

Yesterday, on the Motion for the Adjournment I criticized Government for its handling of the situation.

First of all there was the unwillingness of the Government to negotiate, the impoliteness of the Minister of Finance who was written to since October, and unwillingness to make a decision for himself, unlike the Minister of Home Affairs who has just entered the Chamber. Don't you ever attempt to make unilateral decisions with respect to your workers' wages and conditions of work. That is the gravest mistake which this Government made, and do not go about saying "Not a cent more", because when workers withhold their services you cannot run the Government. Although you may be able to recruit your supporters to come to Georgetown to support the Government you cannot get them to work with pen and ink.

As regards a strike against a working-class Government, we are not interested at this stage whether or not some people who today support the workers supported them some time before, or were against them. All that is past history: it is not relevant.

Let this be clearly understood, however, Dr. Jagan wrote in 1954 in his book *Forbidden Freedom*, that the workers in British Guiana would not go out on a political strike, but would only go out on strike when conditions of work are unbearable. What was true of 1954 is true of 1962. Let us forget which businessman was sympathetic or unsympathetic. Remember your statement that workers will not go out unless their employers force them to do so by their attitude and treatment, and when they go out it means that you have fallen down, and it is all the more embarrassing when you claim to be a working-class Government. Do not let us have any talk about fascist and communist. That is not the point. The point is that you are the Government. The question is whether or not employers deal fairly with their workers. This Government has not dealt fairly with its workers, and I am convinced that if it were to pay the increases recommended by the Guillebaud Commission, Government

[MR. BURNHAM]

would get a more efficient Civil Service in whom it could have confidence and who would have confidence in Government. The result would be greater efficiency and greater revenue, and this country would move forward. That I offer you as my simple and humble advice, but it is a matter for you whether you accept this advice or not.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics (Mr. Mann): Unlike the hon. Member for Ruimveldt (Mr. Burnham), I wish to reply merely for the sake of setting the record straight. I am not interested in making speeches to the gallery. What I am concerned about is dealing with what is relevant. The hon. Member said that the acceptance of a minimum wage of \$4 per day is hypocritical on the part of the Government. In my opinion the remark shows a marked lack of agility to appreciate the fundamental difference between the acceptance of a principle and the ability to implement it. In short, this Government is always prepared to accept a minimum wage which it considers justifiable in terms of the existing financial situation of the country. During the elections we heard a lot about a \$10 per day minimum wage. These flights of fancy were so obviously capricious, that even their authors were forced to admit that that proposition was ridiculous. If Government were to pay a minimum wage of \$5 or \$10 per day it would mean wholesale retrenchment. For example, in our Ministry at the moment we are obliged to grapple with the problem of maintaining the \$3.04 minimum wage in the face of labour redundancy. It is not enough to say that the Government's acceptance of the principle of a \$4 per day minimum wage means in fact that it is hypocritically suggesting its ability to implement it. This, to my mind, is ridiculous.

In the second place the hon. Member said that the Guillebaud Report has been pigeon-holed and delayed. This is not

accurate. The fact of the matter is that the Report was under study to make adjustments of those levels of income which were considered inadequate in relation to the upper levels of income which we feel Guillebaud had unjustifiably increased by too much. Then he launched into a dissertation on the levels of money income to Government employees. I have no pretensions to being an economist, but this much I know: that the money wages which Government pays out to its employees — and I assert that Government is the largest employer of labour — bear only part ratio to the total real income which any Government employee receives. Government pays out income not only in form of wages but social income — roads, schools, hospitals and other social services. It would be better if those who have no understanding of the subtleties of economics would keep their mouths shut and learn something about matters on which they dogmatize.

3.15 p.m.

This factor should be increasingly brought home, because it appears that there is a great deal of confusion as regards income. If the Government proposes to make increases in minimum wages, then the workers must also realize that it may mean that the level of social income, which is presently maintained, may drop. In short, the building of schools may be retarded; the building of hospitals and the expansion of facilities therein and so on may be retarded. In other words, money income has to be balanced against social income which is always being handed out. That is the fact of the matter.

I want to touch very briefly on a remark which the hon. Member made concerning the flight of capital from this country. He said that many supporters of the P.P.P. were in this habit of exporting capital. This may be so, but then he went on to say that P.P.P. supporters were the chief perpetrators of the iniquitous habit of exporting capital. By no stretch of imagination can we conceive a statement more fantastic. The truth is

that the foreign companies are the largest exporters of capital from this country — not only foreign companies but, indeed, some local ones.

For example, you will remember that, just before the elections, one big concern on the East Bank, to wit, Bank Breweries, exported a handsome margin of its profits to Barbados in order to establish an industry over there. — **Mr. d'Aguiar:** "Say something new."—I have no desire to enter into polemics with a dotard. In fact the Managing Director said that he had exported capital to Barbados in order to exploit the Barbadians. [*Interruption.*] Such behaviour highlights the mentality of the local capitalist class. We had better not enter into a controversy about the shares, because I have already told this House about the large number of shares owned by a certain d'Aguiar family.

If one were to compare the volume of exported capital by local businessmen against that exported by foreign companies, one would see that the proportion exported by local businessmen bears inverse ratio to the huge amounts sent out by foreign companies.

We also heard that the Government was misleading its workers. I remember, in a great speech at Bourda Green on the night of the 12th, the hon. Member for Ruimveldt informed his supporters that this Government was increasing the tax on china-ware and it wanted to make itself a "calabash" Government. I do not know whether, in his social circles, he has had practice in the use of china-ware. China-ware is, in fact, the most expensive kind of crockery which is imported into this country. It is true that local popular parlance have expanded the classical definition of china-ware to include almost all types of crockery. Any sophisticated person knows that china-ware is something distinct; it is the original product—manual skills are involved, and what is casually referred to as china-ware is very far from being the genuine article.

I do not wish to dwell very long on the question of misleading the workers, nor do I wish to indulge in controversy as to whether the strikes have been politically inspired or could have been politically inspired. But this I want to observe: that the records will show that the Opposition has rendered itself devoid of intellectual integrity in the particular circumstances of a country such as this. What has been done has increased the burdens of the Government.

We also heard that the judiciary should be independent, impartial, and there should be no attempt to establish a People's Court with the People's Judges. I am very glad to hear that this remark has been repeated in this House by no less a man than the hon. Member for Ruimveldt—a member, however eminent or obscure, of the legal profession. But what I wish to recall is that the dignity of the courts is hardly upheld when eminent members of the same political party of which he is the leader observe, for example, that the sentences given by a certain magistrate are extremely severe. That casts a tremendous aspersion on the character of the court concerned. Nor is it—**Mr. Burnham:** "It is the right of every lawyer to comment on the severity of sentences, and I wish that people who know nothing about our practice will keep quiet."

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. Member has a right to be heard without interruption.

Mr. Mann: I say that, at the moment, the dignity of the court is hardly upheld when the eminent members of the political party of which the hon. Member for Ruimveldt is the leader, make pronouncements of that sort. I need not observe, for example, that during the period when election petitions were being heard before a certain judge—

Mr. Speaker: That should not enter into this discussion. The hon. Member was referring in general to the question of

independence and the impartiality of the judiciary. I will not permit any other Member to refer to what happened in any particular case in the court.

Mr. Mann: I accept your ruling, and I withdraw my statements if not my sentiments. I want to turn, briefly, to a statement which the hon. Member made concerning the salaries paid in British Guiana *vis-a-vis* those paid elsewhere. It is a very reasonable contention that no Government should attempt to pay salaries on the basis of comparison between one territory and another and enter into a competition for several reasons. In a country such as ours, money income should not be the overwhelming determinant of professional performance. If this Government were to attempt to compare salaries with Canada or the U.S.A., it would be obvious that it would be completely unable to cope with income levels in countries which have enjoyed for a much longer time much greater national production.

The point I wish to bring home is this: What is the point in comparing the salaries paid in British Guiana with those paid in West Indian territories without analysing the analogies or anomalies between this country and those territories? It is necessary to make employees understand the criteria by which salaries are determined and to accept salaries however low in relation to those paid elsewhere, on the grounds that in terms of the national financial and productive situation higher salaries cannot be afforded. This is not to say that the Government is not willing to pay higher salaries when those circumstances permit. Indeed, Members of the Opposition are free at any time to draft proposals for salaries in relation to the total income, if there is any justification for it.

I wish to conclude by saying that when responsible members of the community delude first themselves, and then large sections of the population as to the true facts regarding their responsibilities

or activities, we are getting further and further into deeper waters. They must sit down, endeavour to make an intellectual analysis of the situations that have arisen, and attempt to explain them rather than making political propaganda out of them. They should use their scholastic ability and the intellectual skills within their competence to explain rather than resort to deluding large sections of the population and running the risk of creating circumstances similar or graver than those which occurred during the last few weeks.

I should like to end with a very sincere appeal to Members of the Opposition, first, to attempt to study and analyse the situation before venturing pronouncements or making plays to the gallery. They should not make public speeches which are dishonest and fundamentally hypocritical; they should serve their true functions as an Opposition instead of using their limited abilities and limited talents against those who, by the will of the people, sit on this side of the Table.

Mr. Kendall: I have been asked by the last speaker to assist the Government in finding this \$2,600,000 that is interfering with the economy of the country. He has asked the Members of the Opposition to assist Government with this task. I had hoped that a Government with such talent would not have found it necessary to make such an appeal to Members on this side of the House. The Salaries Revision Report was prepared by a Commission, and have indicated how the Government should find the money required to pay its employees. This is not a case of doing something to interfere with the economy of the country.

3.30 p.m.

They based their contention on past experience of previous Governments and how those Governments were able to show a surplus balance by way of astute and honest calculations. The question is that suggested by my colleagues

Mr. Speaker: The question has not been proposed.

Mr. Kendall : In this Report, on page 16 paragraph 58, it is proved that from 1957 to 1960, there has been a surplus balance every year of over \$2 million and in 1960 it was \$5.47 million. That was at a time when there was no political Finance Minister. There were Treasurers who had the interest of the country at heart and who never tried to underestimate the revenue-earning capacity of the country. Today, with the first political Finance Minister, this Government has proved its inability to show that this is a country that can earn by its customs and excise duties a substantial figure to run the country and keep its economy buoyant.

In the revenue side of the Government's Budget Statement as presented by our political Finance Minister, it is significant to observe that although in 1960 the approved estimate for customs and excise was \$27 million odd and the revised estimate for 1961 was \$29½ million, still this Government, without faith in itself and in the ability of this country to continue the Customs and Excise Department as a revenue-earning department, is anticipating in 1962, instead of more than \$29 million, \$27,882,000. Apparently, the Government was satisfied in its inability to get the mercantile community to import more goods and to get the consumer public to use those goods. But I am inclined to feel that it was a wilful attempt to underestimate the revenue-earning capacity of these departments in order that the Government might carry out its new tax proposals. These proposals, to a large extent, created the crisis which this country suffered — something that has never occurred in its long colonial history.

As a member of the Public Accounts Committee for over four years, and as its Chairman, I was satisfied that you can have an efficient Civil Service with men who will make the Service a career and remain in British Guiana only if and when the Government is prepared to give those civil servants attractive salaries. Ap-

parently, there is a flight not only of capital from this country, but of personnel. It has never occurred in the history of this country that so many of its senior officers are leaving the shores. Is it that British Guiana is so well off that they can leave, or are they forced to leave because there is no future for them?

Here is a Government that is always talking about the masses and of protecting the working class people being unable to keep them here; being unable to get local capital to invest and also being unable to attract foreign capital. I do not know how the members expect to run the Government and keep things on an even keel. This Government that is always boasting of its ability to win an election in 1953, in 1957 and in 1961 has never, over these years, done anything of a tangible nature to prove to this country its ability to initiate schemes and carry them out for the benefit of the country.

My friend, the hon. the Premier, who was a colleague of mine in 1947 in the old Legislative Council—[**An hon. Member:** "Never".] Well, we were members. You would not accept that we were colleagues, yet you ask from your side of the House for help and advice from this side. He became Premier and yesterday he mentioned something about the "Kendall" highway. For some reason or the other, that particular term, from 1954 to 1957, has always been a thorn in the meagre flesh of some of the Members on the Government benches. But the \$1½ million. I would like to add, that was spent on the survey for that "Kendall" highway was well spent. I think the Minister of Works and Hydraulics is able to read the investigation, to digest it, I hope, and to understand it. If he takes time off he can go on the East Coast road and see a patch of road—the experiment on the findings of the road consultant engineer.

For the last three years, there has not been one cent spent on maintenance of the road built with sand from our

[MR. KENDALL]

coastal reefs. But the very Minister in his day took \$800,000 from the Railway Rehabilitation Fund—money which was **set aside to renew the rolling-stock of the East Coast and West Coast railways** and gave an unknown firm to survey the railway embankment on the East Coast Demerara for a new highway. After that was done, he still sought the advice of the United Nations expert on whether that very embankment was suitable for a highway.

That is the type of efficient Government we have here: a Government that criticizes another Government—a Government that never caused unemployment to be as great as it is now; the very Government that kept the urban area employed by various projects; the very Government that made the “cadillac” building that is giving this present Government over \$500,000 revenue by way of telephone rents; the very Government that they always say picked a white elephant in the purchase of the Demerara Electric Company. When this Government came into power, it found a man to introduce nuclear energy here and after he had spent a long time, it found out that it was not necessary. Again, the figure which I offered the Company four years ago was the very figure the Government had to accept today—with plant that was not renewed.

What has this Government done? It cannot show one project that it has negotiated that has benefited this country. And it is interesting to observe that the very Minister who holds the portfolio of Trade and Industry now had a lot to say in this House about the Demerara Electric Company and its purchase. But today he is able to bray that they have been able to make enough money from that same white elephant to meet its commitments.

Mr. Speaker: Surely the hon. Member meant “brag”

Mr. Kendall: I am sorry if I conveyed the wrong meaning.

I am satisfied from this Guillebaud Report that the \$2.6 million can be paid and that the minimum wage as suggested in the Amendment can be met. But it is necessary for this Government to re-create confidence in the minds of the people—both the workers and the employers. The Members will have to see by their conduct that money does not leave this country because of fear in the ability of the Government to run the country well. They must also prove their worth and their ability, not as street corner orators, but as men capable of sitting down and working out schemes for the benefit of the people of this country.

3.40 p.m.

The hon. Member for Ruimveldt cited a few instances where the Government has been wilful in taking off certain amounts which were recommended in the Report. I know that there are clear cases in which civil servants have had to remain in Departments because of their experience, and were denied promotion to other Departments. The previous Government saw to it that those officers were compensated by way of pay and promotion. In this report there are such cases which I hope the Whitley Council will adjust, and I also hope that the Government will not seek to mutilate the salaries of certain civil servants because of personal differences.

I hope that when the Motion, as amended, has been accepted and implemented, and when all civil servants have had their back pay, the Government will be honest and admit that although it has paid out \$2.6 million to Government employees it has got back one-fifth of that amount by way of direct and indirect taxation. It is unfortunate that Government does not let the public know that whenever it gives civil servants increased pay the Government does not lose all of it, as a good deal of it is returned by way of income tax.

In asking the people of this country to make sacrifices so as to make British Guiana a better place, I think Government should realize that there is a large section of rice producers in this country, incidentally some of its supporters, and I would have thought the Premier and his advisers would have seen to it that on every bag of rice produced a cess of 50 cents would be levied by the Rice Marketing Board. Many of those people who sell their rice to the Board do not pay income tax because their names are not known.

Mr. Speaker : This is not a revenue debate.

Mr. Kendall: I am trying to show how income tax can be collected from such people. The Premier has said that the payment of \$2.6 million to civil servants will rock the economy of the country because it cannot stand it, and we have been asked by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics (Mr. Mann) to assist the Government in finding ways and means of increasing revenue. I have made a suggestion and hope I am in order in making it.

Mr. Speaker : You have made it.

Mr. Kendall : There is no need to speak about the position of wage-earner, for the simple reason that previous speakers have made their observations, and the Amendment for a minimum wage of \$4 per day has been accepted by the Premier with a rider which is not worth much. It only shows the Government's unwillingness to accept the Amendment in its entirety. If the hon. Member who spoke last would rise from his seat and demonstrate, as an elected Member, his ability to assist the Government in finding additional revenue, he would suggest that in his area certain commodities which are famous there should also assist in contributing to the revenues of this country.

Mr. Bismember (Campbellville): The hon. Parliamentary Secretary, who is not

now present in the Chamber, has suddenly arrogated to himself the title of a qualified economist. I am not one, and I do not wish to reply to what he said. It is amusing.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it is right to say that he arrogated to himself the title of a qualified economist. If my memory serves me he did say clearly that he was not an economist.

Mr. Bismember: I am speaking sarcastically about what he said. He referred to a certain member of a political party talking about severity of sentences handed out by Magistrates. May I say to him that while the City was burning and the Fire Brigade and Police were doing a brilliant job in Georgetown trying to intercept alleged looters, the Premier, Mr. Justice Jagan, gets on the radio and says—

Mr. Speaker: There is no such Premier in the country.

Mr. Bismember: The hon. the Premier who, apparently, from his statement thinks he is a Justice of the Peace, or one of Her Majesty's Judges, said this on the radio: "I can assure you that the full severity of the law will be meted out to every person arrested for looting". I am sure that the hon. the Attorney-General, if he heard it, must have felt disgusted to hear the Premier saying that he assured businessmen and other members of the community that the Magistrates, by inference, would have to do what he suggested they should do. That is the only interpretation to be put on what he said.

3.50 p.m.

When that state of affairs is reached in British Guiana—I hope it will never be reached because, from my experience during the last week in the Magistrates' Courts, I want to place on record that the magistrates have done a wonderful job and have treated each case on the facts, evidence and circumstances placed before the courts. What is inferred in certain statements is something which I

[MR. BISSEMBER]

hope will never at any time influence the judiciary or the magistracy in arriving at decisions.

Speaking briefly on the Motion, may I say that, while the Government fails to consider the unclassified wage-earner who earns \$3.04 a day, it must not go unnoticed that in the proposed personal allowance to people in this country an unmarried employee of the Government who gets \$3.04 a day and works regularly will have to pay income tax according to the new suggestions made by the hon. Minister of Finance. It will be recalled that Government is reducing the personal allowance from \$900 to \$750.

Some members of this Government who, at one time, were the authors of *Forbidden Freedom* and the champions of the working class are now proceeding to take away some of their money instead of paying them something more than \$3.04 a day. It is not a question of the Premier saying whether funds are available for paying more than \$3.04 a day. Not so long ago this Legislative Assembly sanctioned an overdraft from the Bank in order to improve the conditions of rice farmers in this country. The Members of this Assembly voted for the Motion to enable this Government to get an overdraft from the bank to finance the Rice Marketing Development Company so that the rice farmers would achieve a better social and economic position. What is the difference? If the Legislative Assembly can give Government its approval to borrow money from the bank and get an overdraft, what is the use of saying "if funds are available" when it is a question of paying the poor workers in this country?

Sir, the answer is obvious. This Government does not intend to increase the daily wage from \$3.04 because the

majority of the unclassified employees in the Government are not supporters of the P.P.P. This is implicit discrimination. The Members of this Government are blatantly carrying out racial discrimination, and then they go to the United Nations and say that they are speaking for 83% of the people in this country.

The time has come when this Government must understand that it has caused a big strike recently. Government is now prepared to implement certain portions of the Guillebaud Report. Is it not a strange coincidence that this Report was published since August last year, and only immediately after the strike was called off by the Trade Union Council that this Government is willing to implement some of the recommendations in the Report? This Government waited from August last year to March this year — it took a strike to make this Government decide to come to this Legislative Assembly and ask us to vote money to pay the people.

Sir, this is the kind of hypocrisy on the part of people in this country who call themselves the champions of the working class. They must understand that they do not represent a particular class of worker in British Guiana. There are many types of workers in this country, and the Government must be primarily concerned with the workers it employs. Why say that funds are not available to pay the people higher wages, when you are trying to take something by way of income tax from the unmarried man who works for \$3.04 a day?

In the same way that the hon. Premier and his hon. Colleagues have got together to get an overdraft from the bank to finance and build up the economic position of the rice farmers in this country, they should secure an overdraft from the bank so that the poor unclassified workers and Government employees

can get a decent salary. With reference to the Unclassified Service, the Guillebaud Report states at page 38:

"157. Difficulties have arisen as the result of a considerable number of public employees holding clerical or departmental appointments carrying salaries which, in some grades, are the equivalent of those in the Classified Clerical Service. Appointments to these posts, however, have not been governed by the Rules prescribed for admission to the Administrative and Clerical Grades of the Service, e.g. certain minimum educational qualifications attained before the maximum age of recruitment, now 23 years of age. This section of the Service, known as the Unclassified Service, has expanded over the years, as projects and departmental activities which had originally been considered to be of a temporary nature, proved to be of a permanent character. Members of this section of the Service find themselves with inferior career prospects in comparison with their opposite numbers in the Classified Service; although in some cases they work side by side, performing duties which are identical with those of officers in the Classified Service. They stagnate in the ranges of lower salaries, are not entitled to pensions, and not unnaturally feel that they are being unfairly treated."

This Report has recommended that certain members of the Unclassified branch of the Service be absorbed into the Classified section of the Service. I wish to speak particularly of certain people whose posts have just been redesignated as Clerk Interpreters in the Magistrates' Department. This Report indicates that these people are doing particular jobs and they should be absorbed in the Classified Service. I hold no brief for any Clerk Interpreter, but I want to say this — and I know the hon. Attorney-General will bear me out — that there are two Clerk Interpreters who are in fact performing the duties of Class I Clerks in the Magistrates' Courts. One is in the indictable court (Court III, and the other one in the civil court (Court V). Those who go into these courts will tell you that the indictable and civil courts are very difficult courts in which

to work. Even the Financial Secretary has agreed that the office of these two clerks should be redesignated and called Clerk Interpreters.

Sir, up to now this Government has done nothing towards the implementation of that part of the Guillebaud Report, where certain members of the Unclassified Service have no promotion to get, no salary scale on par with Class I Clerks, though they are in fact doing a job which a Class I Clerk should do.

4 p.m.

I sincerely hope that the Minister of Finance will look into this matter, with particular reference to the grade of Clerk Interpreter, to whose Association the former Financial Secretary had promised that in the 1962 Estimates their salaries would be regraded, putting them in the Classified Service and giving them the A 14 salary.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn): I am constrained to say a few words after hearing all the verbiage and offal and rubbish that have emanated from the side of the House which calls itself "Opposition", on this question of payment of wages and salaries. We have just heard the most ridiculous suggestion that the Government should take an overdraft from the bank to pay the workers. How are you going to repay the overdraft? [**Mr. Bissember:** "You took one for the rice farmers."] The rice farmers, out of the proceeds of the rice, are able to pay back the overdraft. The hon. Member is so daft I do not know how he became a Barrister.

Mr. Speaker: I will not permit that at all. Hon. Members must appreciate the fact that they cannot talk about the profession or the integrity or the honesty or the ability of other Members. All of us in this House owe our origins differently. Some might have come from very poor and humble cir-

[MR. SPEAKER]

cumstances. Others might have been better placed in starting life. But in here, we are all Members of the Legislative Assembly. Besides myself, all of you have been elected by your constituents to do a job primarily on their behalf, but generally on behalf of the Colony as a whole.

Therefore, let us not get down into these very deep gutters. Let us do our work in a better way. It is true that from time to time Members have been filled with emotion and sometimes they lose control of themselves, but let us not, Mr. Minister particularly in your position, get down into these back-waters. Please let us deal with the problems facing us.

Mr. Benn: This is not a reflection on the Speaker of the House, but after the remarks which have been made by some hon. Members regarding the Premier, after the manner in which he has been referred to by Members of the Opposition — and this is no reflection on you, sir — I am constrained to treat those people who come here with a lack of knowledge in what I believe to be a similar manner.

Whoever heard of anyone taking an overdraft to pay wages when the employment is not productive? The overdraft for the Rice Development Company was paid to the Government to enable the Company to carry out certain works as a result of which the money was paid back to the bank. The money was taken to purchase padi. The moneys lent to Black Bush Polder for the rice mills are repaid out of the production of the rice mills. "Lending" does not mean that it is a gift. But this is the type of rubbish that is fed to the people at the street corners.

The amount of money that these hon. Members are suggesting and trying to mislead the people in this honourable House should be paid is fantastic. Pay

everybody. Give them all the money. Pay the superscales. Pay the middle grades more. Pay the bottom grades more. Everybody would want more to enjoy a better standard of living. Anybody in his right senses could imagine all the money that would be necessary, and if one read the Estimates as proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance one would appreciate the financial position of the country.

I am not making a wailing and a weeping over it. Those are the facts. Pay them \$4 million more, and cut out the schools; cut out the roads; cut out everything and pay them \$5 million more. Give to those who have and forget those who have not. They talk about unemployment and there are thousands of people unemployed in this country. If the money is not used judiciously, the unemployed will not get employment.

Hon. Members spoke about the Electricity Corporation. It is not only P.P.P. supporters who get work there. Go and see. This has come about as a result of the efforts of this Government, not talk. We secured the money. Take the road on the West Bank of Demerara — the road from Parika to Makouria. That has not come about as a result of talk, but as a result of the hard work and bargaining of the Premier and the Members on this side of the House.

always say, and I said once before in this House, that emotion is a good petrol but it is a very bad driver. We saw it last week after they stirred the people up; misled them; and told the Police a few minutes earlier: "Stay and fight your enemies," and to a crowd said: "Go and find Ramjohn Holder in the crowd." [Interruption.] The hon. Member forgets that I was at Freedom House when he sent his hordes against me. I stayed there all the time. Tell the people the truth. Emotion is a good petrol but as we saw last week, it is a very bad driver.

I told Members this in the debate on the Budget Speech in 1958, and I am constrained to remind them of this same thing. I hope they will take it to heart.

I have made my remarks because some hon. Members say that the Government is fighting for only one section of the community. You give people land at Bath; you give them land in some other part of the country, but if the weather is not fair, they would not reap a good rice crop. If there is not proper drainage or if there is blast disease, there is no rice crop. Whether the rain falls or the sun shines those who are getting \$3.04 a day, will get it. This is a fact.

4.10 p.m.

How many people on the rice lands of this country have not lost their crop because of bad drainage and irrigation, or because blast disease overtook the rice cultivation? Who has ever gone into the economics of the rice industry to realize that where land is drained and irrigated, when disease attacks the padi, it costs the farmer more money for fertilizers and insecticides? People are being told that Government is helping only one section. People were given 2,000 acres of land by the Kabawer Cattle Ranch and Onderneeming, and that is regarded as a great deal of assistance. The money which is given to rice farmers for pure line seed padi is repaid to Government, because it is a loan to the farmers. We are trying to point out the dishonesty of Members who are endeavouring to sow the seeds of destruction and discontent in this country by saying that Government is only working for one section of the community. As regards the Black Bush Polder, some of the people there have gone to Tapakuma with money in their pockets. *[Interruption.]*

Mr. Speaker: What is this Assembly descending to? Are we to have these statements across the Table like this?

Mr. Benn: Hon. Members would like to stand up here and mislead the gallery with their untruthful statements, with their twisting of the truth, and I understand that the twist is the new craze. They would like to mislead the people and stir up more seeds of discontent in this country.

The hon. Member for La Penitence-Lodge (Mr. Merriman) asked about the Housing Schemes. He evidently does not know that they are in progress. One section has practically been given out and self-help houses are being built. More contracts are to be given out shortly. Money is not being spent in the most improper manner that it was spent between 1954 and 1957, when certain people got "kick backs" for land, telephones and other things. This Government is not interested in such things. The only reason I have spoken is in order to set matters straight. The engineers and mechanics to a large extent comprise the very people against whom the Government is said to be discriminating. Many of them have today left the Black Bush Polder and gone to Tapakuma to work.

I picked up a News Summary by the B.G. Sugar Producers Association entitled "News Flashes", and I saw at the end, dated *Daily Chronicle*, 27th January, 1962, a News Flash which states:

"Junior Administrative Section of C.S.A. reported at a specially convened meeting on the Thursday afternoon decided to accept Government's conditional pay-out offer of \$2.6 million in salaries and wages increase to members of the Public Service."

So we have now come to approve of the payment of money, which it is said we did not want to pay at all. On the 31st of January the Minister of Finance announced in this House the acceptance of the Guillebaud recommendations in his Budget Speech, yet hon. Members

[Mr. BENN]

who, by their behaviour and encouragement of incendiarism, arson, murder and looting, prevented this Assembly from meeting, are saying that Government was forced into agreeing to pay increased wages and salaries. All this was announced before, but the House was not allowed to meet because of intimidation by fascists in this House. After arrangements were made for the discussion of the Budget they started such a turmoil that the Minister has had to take this step to get the money paid out. Let me tell those who oppose us, that thousands, nay millions of enlightened people all over the world are with the progressive forces who are moving ahead to Independence, peace and socialism. I have in my hand, sir, a cable to the Premier, Dr. Jagan, which, with your permission, will read. It states:

"Dr. Jagan, Prime Minister, British Guiana. The Central Council of the Committee of African Organisation meeting at African Unity House, reaffirms its confidence in your leadership of British Guiana towards Independence, and congratulates you on your recent success in foiling the saboteurs of your popular Government.

K. A. Amoo-Adare,
Assistant Secretary-General".

It is difficult to understand why some people, whose only occupation is the exploitation of the working classes while they say they are supporting them, do not understand these things. I want to remind them that time and history are on our side.

Mr. Speaker: The usual time for adjournment for tea is at four o'clock, but in view of the fact that the Minister of Natural Resources wished to speak at that stage, and because also of the desire which I believe some hon. Members have to be able to step across the road to St. Andrew's Church where the funeral of one of their friends will take place at 4.30 p.m., I have allowed the

proceedings of the House to go on until now. I now adjourn the sitting until five minutes past five o'clock.

The Assembly was adjourned accordingly at 4.18 p.m.

p.m.

On resumption —

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Jacob) (replying): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier and also the hon. Minister of Natural Resources have already replied to certain of the criticisms from the other side of the House. In order to avoid prolonging this debate I shall deal only with those criticisms which have not yet been touched. Hon. Members on the opposite side of the House said that wage-earners were not considered in the Government's decisions on the recommendations of the Guillebaud Commission. Now, the Government's decisions were based on the recommendations made by the Commission. If the hon. Members who made these criticisms had studied the Report and the Sessional Paper thereon very carefully they would not have misrepresented the Government on this matter. Such ill-informed criticisms and misrepresentations are all right for the street corners, but certainly inappropriate for the Legislature of this country.

In order to prove my point, shall refer to paragraphs 6 and 16 of the Sessional Paper. In para. 6 it is stated, and I quote:

"In the same period the level of Government wages rates has been raised by 20½% at the bottom of the wages scale (the wages of the male adult unskilled labour) falling to 12½% at the top (the highest grade of skilled labour employed by the Government). The Commission has not recommended any further revision of wage rates."

The Commission did not recommend any further revision for unskilled and skilled workers because the rates had already been raised by 20½% at the bottom of the wages scale and by 12½% at the top.

In dealing with the question of wages, para. 16 of the Sessional Paper stated:

“The Commission concluded that since the rates had already been revised and now bear a reasonable relationship with rates prevailing outside the Public Service and no other members of the Public Service (except on lower “B” and “C” scales) have had any increases since 1954, there was no justification with the limited financial resources available, for increasing wage rates beyond the level to which they have been recently raised — 20½% at the bottom of the wages scale falling to 12½% at the top above the 1954 level.”

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is one criticism which was without justification, but merely made by certain Members of the Opposition in order to create further dissatisfaction among the workers employed by the Government. We have already seen the results of the activities of some of the people in this community. The working class now have a new champion in the person of the leader of a Fascist clique that has been dignified with the name of a party. The leader of that group stands on the floor of this House and asks the hon. Premier of the country to make a declaration as to whether or not he is a Communist!

The activities of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central coincide with those of people who have been described as Fascist in other countries of the world. When these people find that they are cornered like rodents, they become desperate and resort to force. They 5.10 p.m.

have sought to overthrow the legally elected Government of this country by intimidation and force, because they have not been able to gain political power by constitutional means. They have sought to get themselves into office by illegal tactics. This is a new technique. We understand democracy to mean that parties or groups which have won elections are the parties or groups which

ought to run the country. But this new departure means that those who have lost, and who cannot and who will not in the future win elections democratically, must have the right to become the Government of the country, and to operate it in the same old fashion, which has resulted today in countries like ours and many others being underdeveloped and full of problems such as poverty and backwardness.

These days are coming to an end, and these new champions of the working class who have done nothing, nothing whatever, in the past have been able, by tactics peculiar to them, to mislead, misguide and use the working class to fight their battle to overthrow the Government. Then there are people sitting in the Opposition who style themselves defenders of the working class, who pose as Socialists, who confuse the people, who have betrayed the workers of this country — the Guianese people. There are people who crawl, who say they do not want freedom. And certain of the defenders of the *status quo* are found among this other group, and they, today, have also been responsible for misleading the working class people of this country.

“Pay a higher minimum wage. Pay fairly” — so cries the hon. Member for Georgetown Central. “Pay \$10 a day.” That was good for the street corners. I notice he has not said that in this House. His propaganda machine is very efficient. It is a machine very well lubricated with oil and money. We are prepared to pay a higher minimum wage, but where is the Government — [Interruption] Yes, we might be forced, but do not let us hear the leader of the fascist clique cry out when we seek to raise the revenue from those who are in a position to pay and from those who have been evading and avoiding taxes. We have devised a system which would catch these people. The burden of the taxation proposals

[DR. JACOB]

was to fall on the backs of the wealthy. When we seek to raise this increased revenue by way of personal income tax, increased corporate or company income tax, capital gains tax and net property tax, then we shall hear all of the avoiders and the evaders crying out.

All Governments tax in order to be able to spend. It is true that Governments can borrow as well in order to spend, but it is a very dangerous thing for the Government to borrow to finance current expenditure. To the uninformed, like the hon. Member for Campbellville who suggested that we should borrow money from the banks in order to pay increased salaries, I shall have a few words of advice a little later on. If we borrow money to meet our current needs, what is going to happen? We have no means of controlling our monetary system. We are now trying to do this by means of exchange control and the establishment of a Central Bank. Without these controls, it would be impossible to borrow money to finance anything but development works.

Governments are able to adjust their income according to their expenditure. In general, this is true, and this is the reverse of what happens in private businesses. They usually adjust their expenditure to their income. If we were to agree to pay higher wages and salaries, it follows naturally that we would have to increase taxation. There is another way to do it.

There are two main courses which are open to any Government if the revenues are not sufficient to meet current expenditure. Firstly the Government can issue paper money. Well, clearly this is inflationary in its immediate effects because you increase the quantity of money, then what happens? The mercantile community would immediately inflate their prices and they would benefit from this increased quantity of

money. But even in an underdeveloped country like ours where we have idle resources like land and unemployed labour, it is suggested by some that we can resort to the printing press and increase the amount of money in circulation.

But this form of currency inflation is something which is rather dangerous because, from the time that you do this—you increase the money supply—and you pay these higher wages, there is a time lag before money which might have been put into productive enterprise could produce enough goods and services to offset the increase 5.20 p.m.

in money supply. Therefore, this first way by which the Government can increase its revenue, that is by printing money, is very dangerous, and is one which is unlikely to be adopted by any Government which owes a responsibility to the working people. There are other forms of securing revenue. We can ask the public to subscribe to loans, and the funds so secured by the Government, which would mean contraction of expenditure, would indeed help to generate economic activity and would not lead to inflation.

That is one means of mobilizing resources. We have already adopted this over the past few years, and we have been able to secure money which was used for development, but the amount of money so secured is not enough for certain reasons which I shall explain a little later. But the Government may also borrow from the Banks, as suggested by the hon. Member for Campbellville (Mr. Bissemer), but in that case, as I think I have explained already, that kind of borrowing, although it increases the money supply, results in inflation which, followed by increased prices, inevitably affects the working class people. It therefore seems to me that some of the Members of the Opposition are either ignorant of the economic consequences of raising

money in the manner suggested by them, or, on the other hand, they are enemies of the working class, although they have been able to pose and to masquerade as defenders and friends of the working class people of this country.

The inadequacy of local funds for investment purposes is due primarily to the fact that certain people in the community have been exporting the wealth of this country to other developed countries. Why? I think — and this is not peculiar to British Guiana — I will answer the question. I have it here on the authority of a man who is most knowledgeable and experienced in this field, and his discovery is after studying the problems of underdevelopment and the problems of exploitation of countries like ours, not only by foreigners but by natives — [Mr. Burnham: What is his name?] — who export capital, points to the position in these territories — [Interruption.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Burnham : If you are quoting you should give the name.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister is not finished.

Dr. Jacob: Let him wait. This gentleman has pointed out that the position in these underdeveloped countries has been aggravated by the clandestine movement of capital from underdeveloped countries to the developed countries. I quote this sentence:

“The amount is larger than the total annual lending of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.”

The name of this gentleman is Professor Gunnar Myrdal, an economist of worldwide repute. So you see why it was necessary to create in the minds of the pub-

lic that because of some sinister motive on the part of the Government this flight of capital has taken place; but the fact is that this flight has been going on ever since these underdeveloped countries fell under the yoke of the exploiting countries abroad, and those exploiters have been able to enlist the support and the co-operation of natives in these countries to assist in the plunder and looting that have gone on. That is why today we in this country are backward and underdeveloped. Our aim is to try to mobilize the resources of our own people so that we can make a move forward. But no such opposition has been generated to our efforts by the same people who are guilty of this economic plunder and loot in collaboration with foreigners, that certain modifications will be made to our taxation proposals, and in the place of those modifications other proposals will be put forward.

I think some months ago I referred to the Opposition being in two segments. Today I shall not refer to them as two segments any longer. They were united in the attempt to bring about the overthrow of the Government by violence. They use various phrases to describe themselves, but in actual fact they are serving the same master. I note that the hon. Member for Ruimveldt, in referring to this Government and to the United Kingdom, said that the troops were sent by our ex-imperialist masters, but I maintain that those people are still the servants of the same old imperialist masters.

5.30 p.m.

Now, the hon. Member for Ruimveldt misrepresented the Government when he said that pay increases were not to be made retroactive with effect from January 1, 1961. That is a plain unadulterated falsehood. But these people are so accustomed to misrepresentation that they bring into the Legislative Assembly the tactics used at the street-

[Dr. Jacob]

corners. He has threatened the Government in this House that if it does not accede to certain demands, which will no doubt be inspired by him — in fact he said: “The Government is heading for trouble.” We shall discover in the very near future who caused all of this trouble. [Mr. Burnham: “The P.Y.O.”]

In my opening remarks when I was moving the Motion, I said that Mr. Guillebaud was an economist of some repute in the United Kingdom. It is true that we agreed to invite him and certain members of the local community to form this Commission. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Guillebaud was selected because he was an economist. If one studies Mr. Guillebaud's Report very carefully, one will find that he performed other functions — functions other than those of an economist. I can come to no other conclusion than that it was an attempt, whether deliberate or otherwise I cannot say, to embarrass the Government. [Hon. Members: “Shame!”] It seems to me that he did the work of a politician and not of an economist, and he has been told so. [Hon. Members: Tell us about Kaldor.”]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Dr. Jacob: I am not afraid to say that some of the proposals in the Budget were proposals which were, for a long time, in the minds of the members of the P.P.P. Mr. Kaldor is not wholly responsible for the proposals in the Budget. Take, for example, the capital gains tax. We proposed that because we knew of the enormous profits which were being made in the country through speculation in real estate. [Mr. Burnham: “Holmes Street”.]

Furthermore, the Interim Legislator — the Member for New Amsterdam, who now poses as a Socialist and has

secured a seat on the other side of the House, was a Member of the Interim Government — [Mr. Kendall: “Not me.”] He spoke about the flight not only of capital, but also of personnel. I wonder whether he has ever heard of a West Indian island called Jamaica where there has been an enormous exodus of Jamaicans to the Mother Country — a country to which the same hon. Gentleman, who now poses as a friend of the workers, went in 1953 to support the destruction of democracy in this country and who, today, stands up and poses as a champion of the Guianese people. But, Mr. Speaker, things are different today. [Mr. Kendall: “This time you called the British troops.”]

The hon. Member for Campbellville uttered a falsehood when he said that an unmarried man who earns \$3.04 a day will have to pay income tax. This matter has been carefully investigated by the Ministry of Finance before a decision was made to reduce the exemption, and no burden will be placed on an individual who earns the minimum wage. I want to give two other examples for the benefit not only of hon. Members of the House, but also of the public. Before the proposal to lower the exemption, a single man earning \$75 a month paid no tax. The effect of the new exemption will be that this single man earning \$75 a month will now be asked to pay 75c. a month, which is a very small burden when compared with that which those in the higher income brackets will be asked to pay. [Interruption.] Some people are incapable of understanding simple English, yet they sit and interrupt Members who are trying to explain things to them.

Let us take the case of a man with a wife and two small children. If he earned \$200 a month before the introduction of the new proposal in the Budget, the effect of the lower exemption

will be that he will be asked to pay only 75c. a month. I submit that these are very small amounts which the people will be asked to pay in order to enable the Government to collect increased revenue for the development of this country.

5.40 p.m.

I did say that a little belt-tightening was necessary, and I cannot see that any reasonable person can object to this lowering of the exemption. But the same so-called friends of the people have used every means at their disposal to engender fear and hatred in their hearts so that they could rise up and take violent action against the Government merely because the Government was seeking to mobilize money for the progress and the building up of this country.

Those are all the points which were dealt with by hon. Members on the other side and which were deserving of any reply from this side. In conclusion, I wish to repeat what I said in moving the Motion that we regard the public servants, all of them, as an indispensable part of the machinery of the Government of this country. Attempts have been made by some people in this House to cause dissatisfaction among public servants, among all ranks of the Public Service, for political reasons. We wish to assure all public servants that unless there is a greater degree of harmony in the Service and unless everyone is prepared to discharge his duty efficiently and faithfully, it would increase to a very great degree the problems of the elected Government and also make difficult the great task which now faces us — the task of reconstruction.

Therefore, I would end on a note of requesting, not only for the present, but for all time, more goodwill not only on the part of the civil servants but also on the part of all the members of

the community. I am sure that we can only generate this goodwill for the progress of the country if the same fascist elements, to which I have referred, stop their propaganda and cease bringing into our country people and material to undermine the fabric of this society. We are known to be a very hospitable people. We welcome all kinds of characters into this country, but the time is going to come, very soon, when we will have to take steps to keep out all undesirables and subversives. *[Interruption.]* And those fascists who are speaking without having permission to stand will understand that we are in deadly earnest.

So, I would recommend to the Guianese people that they beware of these false defenders and champions. Their memories are not so short. They know what treatment they have had at the hands of similar people in the past. Let them remember 1953 and the days prior to 1953, and let them also remember the kind of people who then represented them. These people want to get back into the seats of power and they are going to use every means, including force, to destroy the legally elected Government of this country. We will not submit to their threats of violence and assassination. The day of reckoning is at hand and the fascists and their subversives who have entered our country had better beware. *[Applause.]*

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I am sure you will agree that we have had a very full and free and frank discussion of the various points around which this Motion was moved. I believe that before I turn to the putting of the Motion, it will not be out of place for me to say that the Guianese people will surely be glad to have been assured by the honourable Minister of Finance that the Government at no time proposes to increase the amount of money in this country by the issue of printed paper

[MR. SPEAKER]

money without the proper backing of worth. Indeed, it must be clear to all that if paper money were printed without the proper value and worth being behind it, it would mean an immediate reduction in the value of all of the currency of the country which would have been in existence prior to the new printing.

It would mean, therefore, that, as was suggested, there would be tremendous inflation, for you will find that the amount of money that anyone may have may be greater, but its value may be less. We do not wish to have that happening in our country. The Government has made it clear, and it is true that the only solution is an increase in real wealth. Real wealth only comes from production — whether the production is agricultural or industrial or we may increase our wealth from the minerals that the country has.

5.50 p.m.

Having said that, it is my duty to clear the air so that Members should know on what to vote. The Motion which had been moved reads thus:

“Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly approves of the payment of salaries to Public Servants with effect from 1st January, 1961, at the rates set out in the Report of the Commission to Review Wages, Salaries and Conditions of Service in the Public Service, British Guiana, 1961, as modified by the Government in Sessional Paper No. 3 of 1962, pending final consideration in the light of the decisions arising from discussion in Whitley Council;

Be it further resolved that in terms of section 18 of the Financial Administration and Audit Ordinance, 1961, (No. 39), this Legislative Assembly authorises the expenditure of \$2,600,000 required to meet the payment of arrears of salaries on the aforementioned basis in respect of the year 1961.”

Now, we have had, firstly, an Amendment moved by the hon. Member for

Georgetown Central (Mr. d'Aguiar), the first part of which seeks to delete from the first resolve clause the words “as modified by the Government in Sessional Paper No. 3 of 1962.” The effect would mean that the Resolution of the House would be for the acceptance of the Report of the Commission without the modifications of the Government.

The second part of his Amendment is to add a further resolve clause which is worded thus:

“And be it further resolved that this Assembly recommends that the minimum basic daily wage for unclassified Government workers be increased from \$3.04 per day to \$3.64 per day with corresponding increases for all unclassified Government workers.”

The hon. Member has agreed to delete the figure of \$3.64 and to accept the figure of \$4 per day in an Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River (Mr. Jordan). The hon. Member for Upper Demerara River has also moved an Amendment in two sections. The first part is to add to the second resolve clause, after the full stop at 1961, for which a comma should be substituted, the following words: “and such additional funds as may be necessary.” The effect of that is that in addition to agreeing to the vote of \$2,600,000, — any additional funds that may be necessary as a result of final consideration in the light of the decision of Whitley Council. In other words, while \$2.6 million is indicated by the Government as being required for payment in the proposal which it has made, there can be an unspecified additional sum voted for any additions which may have to be paid later on.

The third Amendment is that of the Premier to the third resolve clause moved by the hon. Member for George-

town Central, for the addition of the words: "subject to funds being available."

I propose to put the Amendments in the following order. I shall first put the Amendment of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central to the first part of the resolve clause of the Motion, for the deletion of the words: "as modified by the Government in Sessional Paper No. 3 of 1962." Then I shall put the Amendment by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River, and then finally the addition of the third resolve clause with the changes which have been proposed today. So I shall take the Amendments in three parts. The first therefore will be that the words "as modified by the Government in Sessional Paper No. 3 of 1962" be deleted from the first resolve clause. As many as are of that opinion will say "Aye", and those of the contrary opinion will say "No."

The Amendment was negatived on the following division:

<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Mr. Cheeks	Mr. Shakoor
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Lall
Mr. d'Aguiar	Mr. Jagan
Mr. Wharton	Mr. Hamid
Mr. Merriman	Mr. Downer
Mr. Jordan	Mr. Caldeira
Mr. Joaquim	Mr. Bhagwan
Mr. Hugh	Mr. Robertson
Mr. Blair	Mr. Saffee
Mr. Bissember	Mr. Mann
Mr. Correia	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Carter	Dr. Ramsahoye
Mr. Kendall	Dr. Jacob
Mr. Burnham. — 14.	Mr. Chandisingh
	Mr. Rai
	Mr. Ram Karran
	Mr. Benn
	Dr. Jagan. — 18.

Mr. Speaker: The Question is resolved in the negative. Now we shall take the first part of the Amendment by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River for the addition of the words at the end of the second resolve clause, "and such additional funds as may be necessary."

Question put.

The Clerk proceeded to take a division.

Mr. Benn (interrupting the division): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether this Amendment takes account of the Premier's Amendment?

Mr. Speaker: No, it only refers to the second resolve clause of the Motion.

The Premier: If the Motion was put in the form it was written there could be no misunderstanding.

Mr. Burnham : To a point of order! It is submitted that there can be no discussion when a division is being taken.

Mr. Speaker : I agree with you, but it is not a discussion; it is information that is being sought. One does not wish to find that any error or misunderstanding is created and a wrong decision is taken. I agree with the claim made, because it is unfortunate that we have not circulated the actual wording of the Amendments moved by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River, but they are in the Minutes of yesterday's meeting 6 p.m.

But, as I see it, there is nothing ulterior about it. It seems to me to consist of proposals which have been made before the House, and it is merely asking that further to the \$2.6M to be voted, "such additional sums as may be necessary" in view of the decisions taken.

Mr. Burnham: Are you submitting that this particular question ought not to be put because it is consequential on the question which was put and defeated? The original proposal was \$2.6M to implement the Guillebaud Report, as recommended by the Government. Additional sums would have been required to implement the Guillebaud Report *simpliciter*, after the Government's amendments.

Mr. Speaker : That is partly where the question lies, but not wholly. The hon. Member for Upper Demerara River also moved a further Amendment which was amended by the Government, and that would mean additional funds. In the circumstances, it is unnecessary to review the Motion. The first part of the hon. Member for Upper Demerara's Amendment is as follows:

"Substitute a comma for the full stop at the end of the second resolve clause and add the words "and such additional funds as may be necessary."

Question put; Assembly divided:
Ayes 29. Did not Vote 2. Noes 1, as follows:

<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Mr. Cheeks	Mr. Caldeira 1.
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. d'Aguiar	<i>Did Not Vote</i>
Mr. Wharton	
Mr. Merriman	Mr. Saffee
Mr. Jordan	Mr. Mann — 2.
Mr. Joaquim	
Mr. Hugh	
Mr. Blair	
Mr. Bissember	
Mr. Correia	
Mr. Carter	
Mr. Kendall	
Mr. Burnham	
Mr. Shakoore	
Mr. Lall	
Mr. Jagan	
Mr. Hamid	
Mr. Downer	
Mr. Bhagwan	
Mr. Robertson	
Mr. Wilson	
Dr. Ramsahoye	
Dr. Jacob	
Mr. Chandisingh	
Mr. Rai	
Mr. Ram Karran	
Mr. Benn	
Dr. Jagan — 29.	

Mr. Speaker: The Motion is carried, and therefore the Amendment will be added to the particular clause.

The third question will be in relation to the Amendments moved by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River and the Amendment to those

Amendments by the Premier. I propose to join them together and put them as one.

Mr. Burnham : Mr. Speaker, many of us want to vote differently on that, and you have the power so to do.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker has a great deal of power, and he uses it very reasonably and correctly. I propose, in accordance with the power that is vested in me by the Standing Orders, to put the question as I feel is in the best interest of the House. If the question is negatived, then I shall put the other Amendments in inverse order. The question will be as follows:

"That this Assembly recommends that the minimum basic daily wage for unclassified Government workers be increased from \$3.04 per day to \$4.00 per day with corresponding increases for all unclassified Government workers, subject to funds being available."

Mr. Burnham : On a point of order. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker has no power to put two Amendments together. One question was proposed by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River, and another question was proposed by the hon. Premier — two different Amendments. One is an Amendment to amend another Amendment. I submit that the Chair has no power to put two Amendments together without the consent of the respective Movers and Seconders of the Amendments, and it is unfair to the rest of the House who may desire to vote for one Amendment and not for the other.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Member for Ruimveldt has made the matter very clear for me when he says that there was one Amendment by the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River and one by the Premier. What I read included the Amendment by the Premier. I

shall read it again, and take a vote on it. The question is, that the following words be added to the third resolve clause:

“ subject to funds being available.”

Hon. Members will remember that the hon. Member for Georgetown Central had agreed to change the figures \$3.04 to \$4.00 and, in effect, what remains is one Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment carried.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the third resolve clause as amended.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, as amended, put and agreed to.

6.10 p.m.

PURCHASE AND ALTERATION OF PREMISES SITUATE AT LOT 21 BRICKDAM, GEORGETOWN

“Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly authorises the expenditure of \$81,000 for the purchase and alteration of premises situate at S½ Lot 21 Brickdam, Georgetown, to accommodate the Ministry of Education and Social Development.” [The Minister of Finance.]

Mr. Speaker : May we deal with the second Motion that is on the Order Paper. [*Interruption from the Public Gallery.*] Quiet in the Public Gallery, please.

Dr. Jacob: I wish to lay on the Table the Governor’s recommendation for consideration of this matter.

With the introduction of the new Constitution, the Ministries and offices have been expanded, and, also, in accordance with the policy of integration, there has been experienced a serious shortage

of office accommodation. This has led to overcrowding and this makes impossible the efficient conduct of public business. The various Ministries were asked to put up their needs for the present and future and, after considering these proposals for increased accommodation, it was discovered that the Ministry of Education and Social Development had the greatest need.

The Ministry of Education and Social Development is at present housed in the Ministerial Building. Because this Ministry requires more space, it is proposed to provide this in one building so that the various offices and departments which come under this new Ministry may be physically integrated. This is a temporary arrangement because it is proposed at some future date to have extensive alterations made to the buildings in the Education Department compound to house this Ministry.

In the meantime, the Government proposes to acquire a property situate at 21 Brickdam, Georgetown, to house the Ministry of Education and Social Development. The purchase of the Brickdam property has been decided upon because of certain factors. For example, it is a suitable location, the premises lend themselves to expansion, and the property is flanked by Government property on both sides. Also, it is adjacent to the existing Co-operative Department. If the Ministry of Education and Social Development gets this building, which is to be altered, it would provide, in the interim, adequate accommodation for the Ministry.

I therefore formally move the Motion.

Mr. Speaker: The question is before the House, hon. Members.

Mr. Kendall : As a matter of information, can the Finance Minister tell us what Government proposes to do with the Ministerial Building after?

Dr. Jacob: The Ministry of Education and Social Development is at present occupying the building across the street known as the Ministerial Building. When this Ministry removes, it is proposed that this building be occupied by the Audit Department which at present occupies a part of the Public Buildings. It is also proposed that the Training Section of the Finance Ministry and the Valuation Division of the Ministry of Home Affairs should be located in the Ministerial Building.

Mr. Kendall: Thanks very much.
[Pause.]

Mr. Speaker: No other Member wishes to speak? Then I shall put the question.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Speaker : I think that we have disposed of the business on our Order Paper. Does the hon. Leader of the House wish to indicate when we may adjourn to?

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, "That this Assembly do now adjourn to a date to be fixed." [Mr. Benn.]

Adjourned accordingly at 6.18 p.m.