

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Wednesday, 16th November, 1960

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. Major I. O. Smith, O.B.E. (Acting)

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

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

ex officio

The Honourable **B. H. Benn**

—Member for Essequibo River
(Minister of Natural Resources)

Janet Jagan

—Member for Western Essequibo
(Minister of Labour, Health and
Housing)

Ram Karran

—Member for Demerara-Essequibo
(Minister of Communications
Works)

B. S. Rai

—Member for Central Demerara
(Minister of Community Development
and Education).

Mr. **R. B. Gajraj**

—Nominated Member

„ **W. O. R. Kendall**

—Member for New Amsterdam

„ **R. C. Tello**

—Nominated Member

„ **F. Bowman**

—Member for Demerara River

„ **L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.**

—Member for Georgetown Central

S. Campbell

—Member for North Western District

„ **A. L. Jackson**

—Member for Georgetown North

„ **E. B. Beharry**

—Member for Eastern Demerara

„ **S. M. Saffee**

—Member for Western Berbice

„ **Jai Narine Singh**

—Member for Georgetown South

„ **R. E. Davis**

—Nominated Member

„ **A. M. Fredericks**

—Nominated Member

„ **H. J. M. Hubbard**

—Nominated Member.

Mr. I. Crum Ewing—Clerk of the Legislature

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

ABSENT:

The hon. Dr. C. B. Jagan—Minister of Trade and Industry—on leave

Mr. Ajodha Singh — Member for Berbice River

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

The Clerk read prayers.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 10th November, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

ORAL ASKING AND ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS

MANAGEMENT OF B.G. AIRWAYS

Mr. Tello: I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran), Question No. 32 standing in my name on the Order Paper. It reads as follows: Will the Minister of Communications and Works state whether anyone is being trained to take over the management of B.G. Airways after the agreement between Government and British West Indian Airways for running the Company terminates?

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn): On behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works, I wish to make the following reply: There is no agreement in existence at present between Government and the British West Indian Airways for the management of British Guiana Airways.

There are British Guianese now employed with British Overseas Airways Corporation in London and with British Guiana Airways as well as the Department of Civil Aviation in this country, who are gaining experience in airline business.

There should be no difficulty in having a management course tailored to fit whichever candidate is selected as being most suitable for appointment as the future Manager of British Guiana Airways.

Mr. Tello: As a Supplementary Question: Do I understand, from the answer to the question, that these Guianese employed with the British

Overseas Airways Corporation in London, the British Guiana Airways and the Department of Civil Aviation, would be invited as candidates to be considered for appointment in succession to the present Manager?

[No reply was offered.]

ORDER OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

BOYCOTT OF TRADE WITH SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Speaker: There is a Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member for Central Georgetown which reads as follows:

"Resolved: That this Council recommends to Government that all trade between British Guiana and the Union of South Africa be prohibited."

Mr. Burnham: Mr. Speaker, I think it was during the month of March this year, that the civilized world was shocked by the massacre of 24 Africans at Sharpeville and Pondoland; and I believe that it was during that month that the Motion expressing solidarity with the relatives of the deceased and criticism of the government which was responsible for that massacre was passed in this Council.

During that month also, Mr. Speaker, as far as my information goes, there were demonstrations and public meetings throughout the world, and British Guiana saw some of those demonstrations and public meetings. There has also been started, a fund in British Guiana for the assistance of those who are fighting apartheid in South Africa and the relatives of those who had been slaughtered as a result of the shootings at Sharpeville and Pondoland.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is not sufficient to merely join in those expressions of solidarity. It seems to me, too, not sufficient to express pious

sentiments directed against the philosophy of the South African Government. Something much more definite and active must be done, and that is the reason for my moving this Motion which, incidentally, I tabled last year and which had to be renewed this year, on the 9th January.

I must express some concern and disappointment at the fact that this Government has taken so long before bringing this Motion before the Council. I cannot understand the reason for their sleeping on it this long, and I cannot see that there are any complications whatsoever. The whole South African Government's policy is to be deprecated, and the shootings at Sharpeville and Pondoland were just the culmination of a most disgusting policy. Not only are the native Africans — the original inhabitants of the country — robbed of their political rights, but they are also destitute of human rights. They are not allowed to organize trade unions in the same way as the whites are. It is an offence for them to strike, and the trade union leaders are, from time to time, prosecuted.

Since the Sharpeville and Pondoland incidents, there have been mass arrests, particularly of Africans and a few well-meaning members of other racial groups. Since these incidents have taken place, countries like Ghana, Malaya and Jamaica have decided to apply a total boycott of South African goods. In these days when we avoid, if possible, the necessity for using force, I submit that the most potent instrument is the instrument of the boycott or economic sanctions.

Unfortunately, the United Kingdom Government does not see fit to do what Ghana, Malaya and Jamaica have done, but there is a Movement in Britain which is gaining momentum; and I feel that we, in British Guiana, as a Colonial territory soon to be independent, should

not necessarily or at all take a cue from the United Kingdom Government, but from countries like Jamaica, Ghana and Malaya.

The boycott which has been instituted against South Africa has had severe effects, and the Minister of Transport in South Africa, speaking in August this year, has had to concede that if the boycott by the various parts of the world were to continue, an economic crisis would be reached sometime in South Africa. That is exactly what we want. We want an economic crisis to be reached as a result of pressure from outside, so that the Government can be pressurized and that there may be some change in the Government.

British Guiana's imports from South Africa last year were valued at \$213,612. This year, between January and July, we imported from South Africa \$57,347 worth of goods. On the other hand, during last year we exported only \$400 worth of goods to South Africa, but between January and July this year we have exported \$34,331 worth of goods to South Africa. In the first place it is to be observed that our imports from South Africa do not represent a very substantial part of South Africa's trade. For instance, the whole of the British West Indies between January and July, 1959, were only responsible for .2 per cent. of South Africa's total trade.

But in these days it is not so much the amount that matters, because if a number of countries, each of them not importing a great deal from South Africa, were to decide, all of them, to boycott South African goods there is no doubt that the cumulative effect would be to cut down considerably South Africa's exports. During the first six months of this year, for instance, South Africa's unfavourable trade balance as a result of the boycott by several countries of South African goods, amounted to £20 mil-

[MR. BURNHAM]

ion more than the unfavourable balance for the same period in 1959, and I think that we in British Guiana can make our contribution by refusing to import any South Africa goods, and since our exports to South Africa are so small we can also refuse to sell anything to them. South African canned fruits, South African wines, South African peanut butter and various other products of South Africa have no right to come into a country like British Guiana at all. They are cheaper than imports from parts of the world of similar commodities, because they are produced on the blood and sweat of the African who is treated like a dog. And we would be unfair to ourselves, our country and to humanity if we in any way contributed towards the economic prosperity of a Government and a country, the philosophy of which is apartheid.

It is not usual for me, when introducing a Motion like this one, to speak at any length, because I cannot conceive at this moment of any opposition to this Motion. If, however, any person wants to move any Amendment or in any way proposes to oppose it, I will exercise my right to reply. I accordingly move:

"Be it resolved: That this Council recommends to Government that all trade between British Guiana and the Union of South Africa be prohibited."

The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan): I rise to second this Motion recommending that all trade between British Guiana and South Africa be prohibited. This Council has already had a lengthy debate on this very complicated question of apartheid existing in South Africa. In July, 1952, there was a debate in this Chamber on a Motion moved by the then Hon. Lionel Luckhoo asking that the Council express its disapproval of the racial segregation existing in South Africa. Actually, prior to that time the Hon. Dr. Jagan had tabled

a Motion in 1951 asking the Council to consider much the same policy. However, his Motion was never debated, but the debate in July, 1952, is one which took place within recent times, and I believe most Members here are aware of that debate and the keen interest shown by Members of the Council and also by members of the community. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the *Hansard* report of the debate on the 25th July, 1952:

"Dr. Jagan: ... But let me assure hon. Members that what is happening in South Africa today is not merely a racial question. It is above all an economic problem. The hon. Mover has given us a number of Acts which were passed by the South African Government, but when we examine all of them — whether it is the Group Areas Act, or the Inter-racial Mixed Marriages Act, or the Population Registration Act — we would see that what the South African Government has done is merely to use the political power which it has to deny economic rise to the masses of the people of South Africa."

He went on further to say:

"It is not, as I have said before, merely a matter of racial segregation. Above all it is a means of using the political power to keep the masses of the people in a subservient state, in a down-trodden state; to keep them half-starved and ill educated. That is the position we are dealing with in South Africa."

Dr. Jagan went on further to suggest an amendment to the Motion expressing abhorrence at the policy of racial segregation as enforced by the Government of South Africa. His Amendment read:

"And be it further resolved that this Council recommend to Government the immediate cessation of all trade with the Union of South Africa."

So we can see that in 1952 the Legislature debated a more or less similar Motion, and we cannot help observing that what was happening eight years ago in South Africa has hardly changed. The repression about which all of us felt so

strongly over eight years ago has perhaps increased, and perhaps one of the bloodiest spectacles occurred quite recently when there was an outrage in South Africa. The outrage was so great that here in British Guiana an Anti-apartheid Committee was organized not only to express its sympathy with the situation in South Africa but also to take more positive steps, one of them being to urge a boycott of South African goods, and efforts were made to get the Trade Union Movement and other groups to urge their members not to buy South African goods. In fact this Committee went so far as to itemize the various goods this country was importing from South Africa and to advise persons not to buy them.

The Committee also raised a considerable sum of money to send to the families of the victims of the outrage so as to give them substantial financial assistance. I think we can all remember the demonstration that took place throughout the City, led by the Committee, which included representatives of the T.U.C. and the political party which I represent. The demonstration, which was perhaps one of the largest ever seen in the City of Georgetown, and which was joined by persons from all walks of life, gave real expression to the sentiments of the people of this country on this issue of what is happening in South Africa.

The political party which I represent has for many years expressed its keen sympathy with the struggle now going on in South Africa to bring equality to those people. It has also given financial assistance to them and has taken a firm stand in the matter wherever possible. One particular incident which many of us know about I would like to refer to because it occurred in fairly recent times. The Hon. Dr. Jagan expressed publicly his view that a West Indian cricket team should not play in South Africa under the conditions existing there, unless its all-

coloured team was accepted in full equality. His public statement was very much criticized locally, but one of our greatest sportsmen in this country gave it support. But what is interesting is to know what was the reaction to South Africa, and I would like to read from "Thunder" of September 26, 1959, an extract from a letter to the People's Progressive Party from Mr. D. Nokwe, Secretary General of the African National Congress, who wrote:

"We were greatly impressed when we read an article by Dr. Cheddi Jagan in which he objected to Worrell's tour of our country. We are happy to say that through our joint efforts we were able to make sportsmen understand that the tour would not be in the interests of our struggle. We should express our gratitude to your countrymen for agreeing to call off this tour.

The solidarity of your organisation with the cause of our people inspires us and confirms our belief that your disabilities as well as ours are temporary."

This brought British Guiana into the international light or sphere by taking part in the international resentment of the situation in South Africa.

I would like to refer to one or two instances of what has taken place there in support of this Motion, and one of the reasons why we must not only give moral and financial support to the South Africans who are fighting against one of the greatest acts of suppression in modern history, but also make efforts to bring economic sanctions to bear against that country. All of us are aware that the United Nations have from time to time taken up the issue of South Africa. The Reverend Michael Scott, who experienced much of the oppression there, at one time attempted to speak at the United Nations but, as far as I can recall, his attempt was held back.

I have here an interesting booklet called "The Threatened People". It refers to the case for a South African demo-

[MRS. JAGAN]

crazy, and it is issued by the South African Congress of Democrats, Johannesburg. What I believe is a very moving introduction in support of the case, is a quotation from Abraham Lincoln in 1858 when he was President of the United States. He said, and I quote:

"When...you have succeeded in dehumanising the Negro, when you have put him down and made it impossible for him to live but as the beasts of the field; when you have extinguished his soul in this world and placed him where the ray of hope is blown out as in the darkness of the damned, are you quite sure that the demon you have roused will not turn and rend you ?

If you make yourself familiar with the chains of bondage you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustom yourselves to trample out rights of others and you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you..."

The writer of this book continues:

"We in South Africa have accustomed ourselves to the trampling out of the rights of others.

We have succeeded in dehumanising the Negro and in making ourselves familiar with the chains of bondage. Never have we been more familiar with them than since May 1948 when the Nationalist Government was returned to power.

"We have seen mounting attacks on the Rule of Law and the rights of the courts; attacks on the freedoms of association and speech and on the rights of trade unions; attacks on civil liberties, with the aim of stilling criticism from those outspokenly opposed to the Nationalist Government."

We know that in South Africa today those who lift their voices to object against wrong things are thrown into gaol. Many of them are indicted under the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950, and the people who raised their voices were termed Communists in South Africa.

A booklet from The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, states:

"*Suppression of Communism Act 1950*: This Act, passed in 1950 by the Union Parliament, replaces the earlier Anti-Communism Act. The change was not merely one of name; the latter act is more inclusive. It empowers the executive to take action not only against communists but those who encourage hostility between European and non-European races. While the racial policy of the Union Government does not have the approbation of international opinion, executive action against those who transgress racial laws would not evoke such unanimous disapproval, if undertaken in the name of a crusade against communism. This Act is in reality a measure to suppress just agitation by Indians and Africans for redress of genuine grievances."

The Government of India's Information Bureau has supported this general contention made by other writers; that the Suppression of Communism Act is nothing but a cover to gaol and confine people who try to oppose the stratification of society laid down by the apartheid policy in South Africa.

Mr. Fenner Brockway, writing this year in a most interesting booklet called "Africa's Year of Destiny", states:

"THE CLIMAX OF CRISIS

South Africa

We turn to South Africa, where crisis is moving to climax.

South Africa has become the decisive battleground where the issue will be fought to a conclusion between those who believe in racial equality and co-operative association and those who believe in the superiority of the White races and the isolation of the 'coloured' peoples in separate communities."

He attacks the apartheid policy and refers to the pressure in the United Nations. He states:

"Year after year resolutions protesting against South Africa's apartheid policy have come before the United Nations

Political Committee and the General Assembly. The South African delegation has absented itself, claiming that the issue is entirely a matter of internal policy. The sponsors of the resolution have pointed out that the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights pledge all the Member States to practise human equality. At the General Assembly in 1959 the resolution was carried by 63 votes to 3."

Some critics in British Guiana always say that Guianese must not delve into the internal affairs of other nations. Though we have expressed sympathy with similar struggles in Nyasaland, Nigeria, Kenya, etc., those who cannot stand international solidarity always use the argument used by the South African Government when the matter is raised in the United Nations: it is an internal affair.

I believe we have reached the stage where the whole world feels that the situation in South Africa is so intense that it has become the personal concern of many nations and millions of people. Therefore it is the appropriate time that this Legislative Council should take its stand with those countries that have already expressed themselves very clearly on the subject of oppression in South Africa. It is evident that we should go beyond an expression of sympathy, and ask that trade sanctions be introduced.

It is true that the restrictions of International Trade Agreements such as G.A.T.T. have for some time stood in the way of certain countries taking an open stand on this question of South African Trade. This matter has been given careful consideration, and it is felt that, in spite of what exists in such Agreements, the time has been reached when it is impossible for us to take anything other than a definite stand. It is for those reasons that we have decided to give full support to this Motion.

Mr. Fredericks: We have heard in this Council various shades of expressions voiced with respect to trade between this

country and other territories in a recent debate just concluded. I would like to state clearly at the outset that I intend to support this Motion. Indeed I commend the hon. Mover of this Motion, the Member for Georgetown Central. He is the leader of the People's National Congress, and should be congratulated for bringing this timely Motion before this Council. However, we have the right to expect that he should set an example of consistency in his opinions, be it trade between British Guiana and other countries, or any matter which comes before this Council. The leader of the People's National Congress —

Mr. Speaker: The Member for Georgetown Central.

Mr. Fredericks: The hon. Member for Georgetown Central said during the Motion regarding trade with Cuba, that he was in favour of this country trading with the devil, provided such trade was favourable to this country. So far as he is concerned, and I believe he speaks for his party, the internal affairs of the Cubans were a matter for the Cubans themselves. They were not interested in whether this country granted timber concessions to Cuba and thereby provide them with an opportunity of infiltration into this country. They were totally unconcerned with whom this country was trading in the past. The trade with South Africa has been advantageous — [**Mr. Burnham:** "To whom?"] — to British Guiana. Can he state by what process of reasoning he has the temerity to bring this Motion before this Council? [**Mr. Burnham:** "As an Elected Member."]

When the Cuban issue was debated they did not exercise one of the greatest privileges of this Council: the right to vote; they abstained from voting on one of the most vital issues that has come before this Council. I, as a member of the United Force — [*Applause.*]

Mr. Speaker: I always remind Members that they speak here as Members of the Legislature. Terms are being used here which confuse me sometimes. **[Mr. Burnham:** "Especially the United Force".] Such terms as "Leader of the Opposition" and so on confuse me. If you refer to the Member for Georgetown Central, the Minister of so and so, the Nominated Member, Mr. So and So, I will know to whom you are referring, because it will be in one universe of discourse. But when you call one person by two or three names I get confused, and I do not know to whom you are referring. Just for my non-confusion, I will ask hon. Members to grant me that indulgence by referring to the names as we know them in this Council.

Mr. Fredericks: I can assure Your Honour that I do not desire to disturb your comfort.

Mr. Speaker: Not my comfort, but to prevent me from being confused. I am conscious of my imperfections.

Mr. Fredericks: I am sorry, Sir. The last speaker has quoted from "Thunder". She spoke of the P.P.P. and she referred to the party in her speech. **[Mr. Benn:** "That is a party".] I want to speak as a member of my party, a properly and duly constituted political organization. I hereby solemnly and most emphatically declare that I will support any Motion, be it from the G.I.M., P.N.C., or P.P.P., if it is in the interest of this country.

I am sorry that the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, is not in his seat. I shall watch with unabashed interest to see whether his acrobatic eloquence will permit his business brain to vote for this Motion which definitely curtails and limits trade to the disadvantage of businessmen like himself. How often do we, in this Council, have to quote Shakespeare's immortal lines: "To thine own

self be true." I am sorry he is not here to ask him to act true to himself and according to his convictions, and not be a puppet of another Party or organization.

Sir, the all-white Government of the Union of South Africa does not believe in the concept that the native South African is a human being endowed with equal and similar rights to his white counterpart. The policy of such a Government, therefore, has sought to curtail the God-given rights with which every human being is endowed — the right to live, to have liberty and to enjoy happiness. The curtailment and the limitations of such inalienable rights must lead to racial antagonism and bloodshed, and that has, unfortunately, been the inevitable results in that unhappy land of South Africa.

In the Union of South Africa today, some of the schools which cater for the native population have been closed because of the withdrawal of the Government's subsidies. Others have been closed because they have not been allowed to renew their registrations. There is no such talk as racial integration in schools and it has not been heard of there. Today, there are stricter and more severe restrictions on the native African population. They are confined to their own individual areas, and they are not allowed to go outside without a pass, and that pass can be asked for by any white member of the population of South Africa. Even when it comes to the question of worship, they are not allowed to practise their religion except within restricted areas.

In the Union of South Africa today, there are separate buses, separate street cars, separate schools, separate cinemas, and even in public buildings there are separate elevators. Even in the extensive and very rich gold mines of the Union of South Africa where the native population employed is almost 99 per cent. of the

total labour force, the native population has been kept down. They are not allowed normal promotion or to fill high offices. They are strictly relegated to places which are determined by the whites.

In a country with a population of 15 million, the whites are out-numbered four to one. The whites are afraid that universal adult suffrage and equal opportunity based on racial equality will lead to racial inequality favourable to the preponderant native population. They are afraid of losing their land, their possessions, their wealth, their belongings. In short, the white population of the Union of South Africa is trying to delay the inevitable. In trying to stem the surging and torrential tide of African nationalism they are fighting for survival with the most diabolical devices and inhuman means at their disposal, and it is the duty of the Government of this country to protest, in a tangible manner, against the brutality and oppression of the natives of South Africa.

I would suggest, like the last two speakers, that the most potent expression of our abhorrence and condemnation should take the form not only of our prayers but also the prohibition of all trade relations with the Union of South Africa.

Mr. Beharry: I rise to support this Motion, and I wish to congratulate the Member for Central Georgetown for asking, in this Motion, that Government — I particularly want to stress the word "Government" — should prohibit trade between British Guiana and the Union of South Africa. As I understand it, the Legislative Council is comprised of the Government on one side and on this side we have the "Opposition". I notice a Government Minister is recommending to herself — because she is part and parcel of the Government — that we should discontinue trade with South Africa. But what strikes me most forcibly

is that this Government Minister, namely, the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing, quoted very extensively what the Minister of Trade and Industry, noted for his talking, has stated since 1952 — of the injustices in South Africa. But I do not blame him, because at that time he was sitting on this side of the Table. At that time he was supposed to be a member of the Opposition, so he spoke very loudly.

It is true that a lot of injustices are being done to the natives of South Africa. The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing even quoted the Minister of Trade and Industry as saying that cricketers in the West Indies should not go to South Africa to play this game. So much she was trying to tell us that the Government is against any relationship of this country and South Africa, that she even quoted her Party and her Party's paper in support of the South African situation. And yet we find that we are sitting here supporting a Motion asking the people sitting on the other side, including the hon. Minister, that sanctions should be introduced against South Africa — that we should not trade with South Africa. The exact words used by the Minister is that we should carry out the sanction of this Legislature. In actual fact, it is the "Opposition" of this Legislature that is recommending to the Members of the Government on the other side — if any action is to be taken with respect to sanction — to prohibit trade with South Africa. The Members on that side or the Minister should have done it; not the Members who are sitting over here.

The Mover of this Motion, in no uncertain manner, has told us that Jamaica, which is still a Colony, has already put an embargo on trade with South Africa. Mr. Manley had not been clamouring since 1952, but we have the Leader of the Majority Party clamouring since 1952. He has been running this Government for four years; he had seen

[MR. BEHARRY]

fit to condemn the policy of the South African Government since 1952, yet he had not seen fit to take action. Some people cannot pass the talking stage. They will continue to talk. Action is foreign to them. History will prove what I am saying is true. I do hope they will have the courage to take action on this Motion, because action is in their hands. They should not have been sitting on this particular issue. If the Members of the Government felt so strongly about it, they should have already taken action. The hon. Member for Georgetown Central should not have had the cause to bring it here. If the Government felt so strongly about it they should have taken action.

Dealing with the Mover of the Motion himself, on another occasion he referred to me as a political neophyte. When we were discussing the Cuban trade Motion, introduced by the Member for Demerara River, I was referred to in such strong language because I argued that British Guiana should not tie its economy, in any form, with Cuba. The hon. Member for Central Georgetown stated that he was like Churchill—once it would benefit his country he would trade with the devil, and as far as trade was concerned he will not discriminate once his country will gain. I agree with the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredricks, that people should be consistent. I think some people cannot see the faults in themselves, but only those in other people. History will prove whether they are right. As regards the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, I am looking forward to see how he will vote on this Motion.

Mr. Speaker: He is not here now.

Mr. Beharry: He is here; he is hiding. I believe he is deliberately staying outside. He was one of those who said that so far as businessmen were concerned they regarded a matter of trade as

purely a business transaction. His Cuban friends were involved in the Motion by the hon. Member for Demerara River, and he had to support them. We will see how he will support his Cuban friends today.

The hon. Member for Central Georgetown pointed out that last year British Guiana imports from South Africa amounted to the tidy sum of \$200,000, but I know that imports from South Africa have been falling every year. My firm used to import from South Africa, but in the last three years we have not bought anything from that country. I also know that several firms in Water Street have not been importing goods from South Africa. They have been supporting a policy not adopted by our own Government but initiated by the Government of Jamaica, and as a result of public reaction Water Street merchants have not been importing items like peanut butter from South Africa, but getting their supplies from Canada. Not a single merchant in British Guiana is importing peanut butter, apple juice, tomato juice and certain other fruit juices from South Africa.

This Government has not had the courage, or has not seen fit to carry out a boycott of South African goods, but the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing has seconded this Motion and spoken on it. Politics has entered this matter to such an extent that when the present Leader of the Government (Dr. Jagan) was on this side of the Table in 1952 he was then a great champion of the down-trodden, but today, when he runs the Government, he is no longer their champion, and this Legislature has to tell him what to do.

Mr. Jackson: In 1957 a certain number of political parties contested an election which brought Members to this Council Chamber. Four of the contesting parties won seats in this Council, and since then two of those parties have

merged and have become the People's National Congress. The People's Progressive Party, whose members form the Government, have had some defections or resignations. [A Member: "Expulsions"]. We share the privilege of sitting in this Council with persons who have been Nominated to this Council as part of the Government's choice. Yet we hear from those who have defected from the People's Progressive Party, and some of those who have been put here by nomination, that they belong to another political party, as though that party is represented in this Council. It is somewhat of a twist of mentality which could make anyone who has been nominated to this Council claim that he now represents a political party which he calls a recognized political party. It appears to me that such a twist of mentality is a regrettable thing in this Council, and if those who have defected from the People's Progressive Party want to claim that they belong to another party—

Mr. Speaker: I wish to point out again that I am not going to permit any descanting upon parties. I think hon. Members should stick to the terms we are accustomed to in this Council, and I shall read out the names of the Members of this Council for the benefit of Members. The Members of this Council are the Chief Secretary, the Attorney-General, the Financial Secretary, the Hon. Dr. Jagan (Member for Eastern Berbice), Minister of Trade and Industry; the Hon. B. H. Benn (Member for Essequibo River), Minister of Natural Resources; the Hon. Mrs. Janet Jagan (Member for Western Essequibo), Minister of Labour, Health and Housing; Hon. Ram Karran (Member for Demerara-Essequibo), Minister of Communications and Works; Hon. B. S. Rai (Member for Central Demerara), Minister of Community Development and Education; Mr. R. B. Gajraj, Nominated Member; Mr. W. O. R. Kendall, Member for New Amsterdam; Mr. R. C. Tello,

Nominated Member; Mr. F. Bowman, Member for Demerara River; Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, Member for Georgetown Central; Mr. S. Campbell, Member for North Western District; Mr. A. L. Jackson, Member for Georgetown North; Mr. E. B. Beharry, Member for Eastern Demerara; Mr. S. M. Saffee, Member for Western Berbice; Mr. Ajodha Singh, Member for Berbice River; Mr. Jai Narine Singh, Member for Georgetown South; Mr. R. E. Davis, Nominated Member; Mr. A. M. Fredericks, Nominated Member; Mr. H. J. M. Hubbard, Nominated Member; Mr. A. G. Tasker, O.B.E., Nominated Member.

I allow Members sometimes to make passing reference to one party or another; the Speaker does not intervene in every instance. But I cannot allow Members on a Motion which deals with a particular subject, to be descanting on political parties and attacking one party and another. I hope Members will pay regard to the manner in which Members of this Council should be styled. It is provided in the Standing Orders. I trust they will also desist from making remarks about other political parties; there are political platforms outside for that purpose.

Mr. Jackson: It is known that I have always had regard and respect for the Speaker's ruling and I do not propose to depart from that on this occasion. After the 1957 election the Governor asked the Leader of the successful political party to recommend those whom he desired to be Ministers, and it is a fact that we now have a party system in this country. That is the reason why we sometimes refer to political parties as being represented in this Council. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, has accused members of the People's National Congress in this Council of not being concerned about the infiltration of Cubans into this country —

Mr. Speaker: You will recollect that I stopped him from referring to any political party. I told him he should refer to the Member for Georgetown Central, and having stopped him I cannot permit other Members to do the same thing.

Mr. Jackson: He accused the Member for Georgetown Central of not being concerned about the infiltration of Cubans into this country. If there has ever been an unfair comment about another Member in this Council it is the comment made by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, this afternoon. During the debate on the Motion dealing with timber concessions to Cuba the hon. Member for Georgetown Central expressed the view that it would be unrealistic in a matter of trade to attempt to tie the hands of the Executive Government, an Executive which has a voting majority in this Council, and suggested that what was wanted was an assurance that in their negotiations with the Cuban Government this Government would safeguard the interests of the people of this country.

Mr. Fredericks: To a point of correction! I said that the hon. Member for Georgetown Central was unconcerned over the issue, and that that was proved by the fact that he abstained from voting on the Motion.

Mr. Burnham: I ask leave to make a personal explanation, Sir. I was not present in this Chamber when the division was taken. I had left to attend the Estimates meeting of the Town Council. I wish that these Nominated Members would get their facts straight.

Mr. Jackson: Now that the hon. Member for Georgetown Central has put the hon. Nominated Member's mind in its proper perspective I think I would be within my right to refrain from making any further observation in that respect.

It is unfortunate that when a Motion of this nature is being debated Members seek to bring into debate matters which are irrelevant. This Motion was first tabled in March, 1959, which indicates that the hon. Member for Georgetown Central and those who are of the same mind as he is have been giving consideration to this problem for quite a long time.

As a matter of fact long before this Motion was tabled in 1959, he and those with whom he is associated and who have a voice in the People's National Congress did advocate a boycott of South African goods. It is because of our firm conviction that that ought to have been done that this Motion was re-tabled by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central in January this year.

We have a very good memory with respect to what happened in the month of March, 1960, and the Members of this Council agreed that we should register a very strong protest against the continuation of the policy of apartheid in South Africa. It is somewhat unfortunate that, in spite of what happened here in March, the Government did not see it fit to bring this Motion before this Council before today, for the Motion ought to have been taken at the time when other countries were moving in the same direction to boycott, officially, South African goods in so far as trade was concerned.

No one wants to deny that it is a crime for any one set of people to believe that they have the right to destroy the integrity of another set of people. No one set of people have the right to hold themselves up as superior in any respect to another set of people. No one set of people have the right to condemn to the gutter another set of people, for in every respect every human being is made up of the same chemical and spiritual properties and as such it is the right of every human being to enjoy freedom as well as equal relationship as is enjoyed by another individual.

I would express the hope that while we, in this Council, are supporting the Motion in an attempt to destroy racial discrimination, segregation, racial lines of demarcation and inhuman treatment, we would examine ourselves and our people to see whether there is anything in us locally which has a bearing similar to what obtains in South Africa which we have condemned in the past and are condemning at the moment.

We trust that, in spite of this belated effort on our part to support other countries in their endeavour to support the people in South Africa who are suffering at the moment, it will not be too late for the boycott to have a serious effect upon the economy of the South African Government.

It would appear that inhuman treatment has been meted out to the people, because they have a darker colour than the white people who think they are a master race. Let us, in our endeavour to force an international country into submission, examine ourselves with a view to seeing that we are not doing the same things we are trying to eradicate in South Africa.

Mr. Tello: I desire to say a few words in support of this Motion. I believe that the hon. Mover of this Motion is quite sincere in his objection to what is taking place in South Africa, because it has been proven that, prior to the ghastly reports received here last year, the Motion was tabled and it was expected that the pattern set in the Caribbean by Jamaica would have been followed by this Government

I now feel quite sure that this Government is going to accept the recommendation contained in this Motion and will take the necessary steps to implement it, but the timing of these things can assist a great deal. Already Members have mentioned this unfortunate delay in

dealing with the Motion, and I am sorry that I must refer to it myself. The hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing mentioned that she participated in the demonstration against the apartheid behaviour in the Union of South Africa. I was associated in that demonstration, and I was also associated with the Action Committee against South African apartheid. At the time when the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing telephoned and suggested that the demonstration planned by the T.U.C. in protest of this ghastly behaviour by the South African Government should have a national approach, I thought it was a sensible and sincere suggestion and at once we welcomed it. We participated in the demonstration as a national protest to this unfortunate and most barbaric behaviour of the South African Government. While we were demonstrating a few facts came to my mind, and I wonder whether, even at this late stage, I should question the sincerity of the Government in this matter?

It is the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing herself who reminded us that since 1951 the hon. Dr. Jagan, who is now the Minister of Trade and Industry, thought that economic sanctions should be applied against the South African Government, and probably he expressed his sincere desire in 1952 when he moved an amendment to the Motion which was tabled by the hon. Mr. Lionel Luckhoo. Again that amendment indicated economic sanctions.

It is quite true that when a Government gets into power for the first time, there are so many things to be done that one can be forgiven for reshuffling priorities. What worries me, however, is why this Government should have put this matter almost into a freezing chamber, when only last year so much has been happening, when a Minister of the Government has been actively participat-

[MR. TELLO]

ing in a demonstration of protest knowing full well that this Motion was with the Government. This Motion has been set aside until now, and I say it is coincidental that the elections are around the corner.

We must take these things into consideration. If it is true that in 1951 you wanted to apply sanctions on South Africa; in 1952 and 1953 you have forgotten it in dealing with all the vicissitudes of life, how can we accept the same excuse today when this Motion was submitted since March, 1959, and re-tabled in January, 1960? Government has waited until November, just when we are about to take a turn into the election year, to bring this Motion before us for debate. While the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing is ready and willing to second the Motion, it is something which could have been brought to this Council two years ago. I say that other than sincerity of purpose there is an electioneering value, and I believe that some action will be taken on the Motion now.

Are we going to allow this Apartheid? All sorts of other advantages are taking place the world over, possibly in British Guiana also which has the same unemployment problem. Are we going to wait until electioneering time to deal with those problems? Look at the amount of references the hon. Minister made! Some of those books I have only heard of, but those books have been continuous companions with the Minister of this Government. If they had forgotten what happened in South Africa and the demonstration in British Guiana, they should not have forgotten the Motion.

I recall that the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing started off with us in the demonstration of the T.U.C. and other public bodies. She had a big placard in her hands; and before she had travelled a hundred yards her photograph was taken and she passed

the placard on to another individual, a lesser light of the P.P.P. All of that was for mere publicity. Perhaps I am wrong, but I am beginning to think that her seconding this Motion is also another bit of electioneering publicity. If they had forgotten the shootings in South Africa, the Minister had as her daily companions the publications that should have reminded her of the evils of apartheid and so on.

Today, probably, is the best time for her to deal with the Motion, and at last the Government has awakened to the fact that something must be done in the matter. One would have thought that the Government itself rather than seconding this Motion, having demonstrated against this unfortunate and barbaric behaviour on the part of the South African Government, would have introduced legislation here to empower the boycotting of trade with South Africa. Instead of doing that, the Members of the Government interested themselves in granting concessions to Cubans who, as far as I know, have no apartheid problems. In South Africa the people are dying at the hands of their slave-masters with no glimmering hope of a change. The Ministers knew that since 1951, but they have forgotten the South Africans and have asked us to grant concessions to the Cubans.

It is fortunate that this Motion gave them an excuse. Probably they feared that the election being so near, they might have been needed for keeping this Motion nearly two years before bringing it to this Council. And if it is a change of heart or if it is good electioneering campaigning or whatever it is, thank God, at last, it is here; and by the hon. Minister seconding the Motion, there is some indication, at long last, that something is going to be done by this ever-sleeping, ever-talking Government.

Mr. Bowman: I, like the other speakers, have risen to support this Motion. To do anything otherwise,

would be against my very nature. I am one of those persons who hate discrimination of any sort. Further, when this question of South Africa was discussed earlier this year in this Council, I moved an Amendment, at the time, asking that the British Government seek the United Nation's agreement to place an economic embargo on South Africa because I felt, and I still feel, that passing resolutions and so forth are just a waste of time. I was surprised that my Amendment was not accepted. I had read between the lines, later, because immediately after that Motion was disposed of, another Motion concerning a Parliamentary delegation to go to Trinidad came up for discussion. The mover of the Motion rejected my Amendment and said that he could not accept it; but with another Amendment which followed I noticed that he, rather than accepting my Amendment, accepted an Amendment by the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing.

Shortly after that amended Motion, a Motion concerning the question of sending two delegates to Trinidad at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference came up. I suggested that we send Mr. Stephen Campbell because I felt it would create an impression on the minds of the other Parliamentary Members that we in British Guiana are thinking in terms of racial equality, and that he being the only Amerindian Member should be given a chance to go. Mr. Jackson was selected instead of Mr. Campbell in spite of my pleadings; and right there I felt there was a deal between the two of them—she supported him and he was selected.

Mr. Speaker: Are you accurate when you say that that took place in this Council?

Mr. Bowman: I know there was a deal, and I am right.

Mr. Speaker: I am just asking for information. Do not say you know. You spoke about a Parliamentary Conference

and I am Chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association's branch here. I am just asking for information, whether you are correct in saying it was done in this Council or at a meeting of our branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association?

Mr. Bowman: It was done at a meeting of our branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Mr. Speaker: Then you are not correct?

Mr. Bowman: I said shortly after the South African Motion this question came up.

Mr. Speaker: The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is an entirely different thing. When it meets here that does not mean that it is a meeting of this Council. Therefore, you must not be quick to say you are right.

Mr. Bowman: I am saying it came up the same day at another meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Persons can make mistakes; and if a person makes a mistake it is honourable for him to say that he made that mistake. It does not matter how high or humble that person may be. I could have corrected you at once, but I merely asked the question to get you on the track. If you made a mistake, you made a mistake; and any person can make a mistake.

Mr. Bowman: I accept the fact that I made a mistake. The fact that I want to convey is that the meeting of the Parliamentary Association was held shortly after we had disposed of the South African Motion.

Mr. Speaker: The reason why I asked is because however much people may have sides in the Legislative Council, in the Parliamentary Association, as I understand it and as I understand the principles, there are no sides.

Mr. Bowman: I bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I am going to make my point nevertheless. It struck me that there was a deal between the two individuals.

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran): To a point of correction: For the hon. Member to say that there was a deal between the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing and the Member for Georgetown North is, I think, improper.

Mr. Bowman: Not at all.

Mr. Speaker: It is.

Mr. Bowman rose—

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment! I had the occasion to speak to one hon. Member before when that hon. Member made use of a similar remark. I am not going to have that sort of thing in this Council—not as long as I am in the Chair. Members have a number of rights. They can prosecute their rights and make their points as forcibly as they wish, but they should, also make their points properly. And I noticed you said you are going to make your point nevertheless. If that means a defiance of the ruling of the Speaker, then I shall name you if you persist in doing that.

I do not believe Members think I am incapable of acting sternly when the opportunity arises; and I hope the hon. Member for Demerara River would not, at all, get up again and say that in spite of what I say he is going to make his point.

Mr. Bowman: What I said was not intended to be in defiance of what you said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That is implied.

Mr. Bowman: These people [*pointing to certain Members of the Majority Party*] have been interrupting me.

Mr. Speaker: If any Minister or any Member interrupts you or makes any unpleasant remarks, your duty is to call the attention of the Speaker, and the Speaker will call that particular Minister or Member to order. Two wrongs cannot make a right—not in this Council or in any other.

Mr. Ram Karran: I rose to a point of order to point out that the hon. Member had referred to a deal between the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing and the hon. Member for Georgetown North. I did not interrupt the hon. Member.

Mr. Speaker: I must say this: Sometimes there are several voices coming together from that quarter. It is difficult for me to hear the hon. Member, himself sometimes when he is speaking, and at other times a chorus of voices from the Ministers' Bench make it difficult for me to hear. I do hope it will be made easy for me to hear.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that during his contribution to this debate, the hon. Member brings out what is the deal between the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing and myself?

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled him out of order already. I do not know to what he is referring, but I have ruled him out of order. I will read again from the Standing Orders—Standing Order No. 33 (9) (a):

"No Member shall—

(a) impute improper motives to any other Member;"

Talking about deal and improper deal would come into this category. I wish that Members of the Legislative Council would read their Standing Orders and it should not be necessary for the Speaker to call the attention of Members, over and over again, to these things. Members ought to maintain a certain standard. I

regard every Member as a reputable Member, and I expect every Member to conduct himself according to the best traditions of public debate.

Mr. Bowman: I was trying to remind this Council that when this question of South Africa was debated, I moved an Amendment which sought to ask the British Government to seek the United Nations' assistance to place an embargo on South Africa because I believed that these resolutions and protests do not mean anything. There is need for something more tangible to be done. I referred to the defunct League of Nations during the conflict between Abyssinia and Italy in an attempt to show that the League of Nations had placed an embargo on Italy. My Amendment was turned down and instead of that, an Amendment moved by the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing was accepted.

I am opposed to discrimination of any kind. To prove my case, when I was in Australia last year attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, fortunately for me, I spoke immediately after one of the South African representatives; and with Your Honour's permission, I will read what I said at that Conference:

"It may be that some members of the Commonwealth are suffering from or perhaps enjoying, the false notion or concept of racial superiority. As a result, they may feel that the low standard of living and bad conditions that obtain in most underdeveloped countries are good enough for us, since most of us are coloured. Well, if there are people who think in that way, I want to tell them that I am opposed to any such view. What I believe in implicitly is Jefferson's superb crystallization of the popular opinion that all men are created equal; that we are all endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If such a narrow and selfish outlook still exists among any of us today, I say that it is time that it was done away with for to do so would be in the best interest of the Commonwealth.

I view with horror the conditions in South Africa, moreso because the people who are suffering oppression there are my kinsmen. Whenever the question of South Africa comes up it stirs my innermost feeling, for it is said that blood is thicker than water. I am speaking particularly because of that, for whether it concerns Chinese or Portuguese, I am hurt. I am opposed to any inhuman action, but I feel it more in this case because the people who are suffering in South Africa are my kinsmen. That is why I am supporting the Motion. If I had the means at my disposal I would do more than that; perhaps I would take up arms. That is my feeling; that is my conviction. Some people here, because the general election is approaching, and because they hope to capture some people's imagination, will speak glibly on this Motion, but what I say I mean from my heart. I am supporting the Motion.

Mr. Gajraj: There have been, I am told, a number of references to the position I took up not many days ago when the question of trade with Cuba was under consideration by this Council, and it has been suggested, I believe, that it would be interesting to hear and perhaps to understand what would be my point of view with regard to the Motion which is now before the Council, and which has, I believe, been lying in the files of the Legislature for quite a number of months.

This Motion aims at boycotting trade with the Union of South Africa. I have, I think quite rightly, expressed the point of view that trade is international, and that in the pursuit of it there should be no frontiers. It has been felt by some of my friends on this side of the Table that, to be consistent, I should say the same thing in regard to this Motion. Undoubtedly I say the same thing. I say that trade is universal, trade is international and knows no bounds or frontiers. But let me remind my colleagues that in the same speech in which I referred to the universal position of trade

[MR. GAJRAJ:]

I also pointed out that one of the occasions on which Governments decree embargoes on trade with other territories was when they were at war with them, and I remember asking the question very clearly, whether we had declared war on Cuba, or had Cuba declared war on British Guiana? Because one knows that when a state of war exists between two countries the normal channels of trade are definitely cut off, and no trade results.

I believe that the reason for this Motion stems from the inhuman actions of the South African Government towards people like ourselves—people of the non-white races who are under the laws of that country, subject to the most inhuman and degrading situations. I would like to say here that I consider myself very fortunately placed and privileged, that earlier this year when some Members of this Council were in London and were met together, by our silent protest we made it clear to the people of the world at large that we in British Guiana did not approve of the manner in which our fellow non-white citizens in the Union of South Africa were mowed down without rhyme or reason by guns held by soldiers and police of that Government.

It was an opportunity which we seized to help to focus world opinion upon the situation in South Africa at that time, and what I believe the hon. Mover of the Motion has been endeavouring to do not only today but from the time he gave notice of it, is to impress upon us all that so far as the relations between those who govern and those who are governed is concerned, they are inhuman and can be considered in the sense that a small minority group has been, and still is, at war with the majority of the people of South Africa.

It is because of the way in which they have arrogated to themselves the power whereby they control the lives and the destiny of the great majority of the natives of the country that lends itself to the description of being inhuman, and if inhumanity exists then there must be a feeling of unrest, a feeling which we do not like to see exist but nevertheless it is a human feeling, a feeling of hatred for the oppressors is bound to come to the surface.

We, the people of British Guiana, in the main belong to the non-white races, and as such, in spite of whatever other principles that we might expound and follow in normal ways, if we find ourselves being called upon to show sympathy and to create a front of solidarity with those of our own people who, because of circumstances, are placed in this unfortunate position, then we must seek these ways and means of showing sympathy and of enlisting this idea of solidarity in their struggle. How can we find such means of displaying our sympathy? We cannot, of course, say that we will take physical action against them in the sense of creating hurt to their bodies. That is entirely beyond us. The proposal before the Council is that we recommend to Government that we try to hurt them by means of denying them trade. In other words, that the goods they may have and may want to sell to us and to our friends in the West Indies, that we should say we do not wish to buy. Similarly, if there is anything they may wish from us we should deny them that as well.

The question of suspending trade is not a new one. Looking back into history we find that because of the attitude of the South African Government, many years ago the Government of India banned all trade with the Union of South Africa. That, of course, is the way in which they have tried to tell the people of South Africa that much as we live by

trade we do not agree with the way in which you have been treating our fellow human beings.

The question has been asked: what about free trade? Yes, there is nothing wrong in saying that we should keep trade free. There is also nothing wrong in asking that for a while, as a deterrent, as a form of punishment, we should suspend trade. I contend that the outlook in this matter is not exactly the same and is not entirely on all fours with the question we considered last week. I say that very clearly, in spite of the chuckles that may come from any of my colleagues, because the elements which come into consideration in this particular instance were not present for our consideration in the other case. I am perfectly satisfied that if we pass this Motion we would be taking a step which will not only place us in line with other people in this part of the world who have shown by similar action their horror for the form of treatment which is meted out to the people of South Africa, but we will also create in the minds of others a clear understanding that we will not be a party to agreeing with such forms of treatment.

There is not much more I wish to say, because my time is rather limited in this Council this afternoon, so I shall end by saying that I heartily support this Motion.

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran): I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. Mover of the Motion because it does appear that this is one of the few opportunities we have to examine his party's programme. I think he said he was afraid to issue his programme lest others should copy it. We will have a chance to copy some parts of his programme by the discussion of this Motion.

We are living in an age far removed from the days of the divine rights of kings, and for a long number of years the

the world has been struggling, with very common people of various countries in great loss of life and bloodshed to democratize their Governments and to improve their living and working conditions. It is more or less established that Elected Governments are chosen by the people who, usually, have the right to change these Governments when they wish to do so.

In some countries we know that dictatorships have arisen, denying people of an opportunity to resort to changes when they want to, and it is expected that in these countries where difficulties are imposed by these dictators and would-be dictators, the people would have the right, even if it means adopting revolutionary measures, to remove from their backs these oppressors, many of whom exist in the world today.

South Africa is one such case where, I think, it is agreed that the coloured folk who form the majority of the people inhabiting the country can never hope, by democratic means, to change the Government. For we have seen that efforts have been made, and are continually being made to safeguard the retention of the system whereby the minority continues to dominate the country. It is the right of these people, who are forced to live under conditions where they have no opportunity of expressing their will, to overthrow the Government when an opportunity arises, or alternately to create such opportunities to remove such oppressive Governments.

I do not think my friends on the opposite side of the Table, who were talking last week in such strong terms about revolution, would express that view if it were applicable to South Africa. That is, if the majority of people in South Africa were to oppose the Government which dominated them, because the minority in South Africa, headed by a Fascist dictatorship, continues to deny the people not only of

[MR. RAM KARRAN]

their elementary rights guaranteed by the Human Rights Charter and such documents, but it continues a system of intense oppression. The arming of police, and the shooting of innocent people are more or less the order of the day in South Africa.

People and organizations from within and without have resorted to this method of bringing about some measure of pressure on the South African Government—the people who are responsible for the dirty dealings to the natives in that country—but to no avail!

Some of my friends on the other side have suggested that, because of the fact that the elections are around the corner, this Government has deliberately held up the Motion for a long time without discussing it. It has been suggested that it is being discussed today, because it will be used as a political advantage. What rubbish! Had the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, been unacquainted with the procedure of Government, I might have excused him for making such comments. He knows the procedure of Government, and for that reason he should not have tried—although he did very hard—to give the impression that Government has deliberately delayed action on the Motion.

Very often hon. Members on the other side have shouted themselves hoarse, and expressed the fear that this Government will act arbitrarily; this Communist Government will do this and will do that. On an issue like this when the Government is tied by international obligations, an opportunity should be taken, at least, to examine these obligations. That is one of the reasons why this Motion has taken such a long time in coming before the Council. Hon. Members must realize that consultations had to be made with people outside of British Guiana.

The hon. Member is not unaware of the limitations of the Constitution under which we are governed. In point of fact he would like us to continue under this childish Constitution by which the Government will have to seek advice and directives from people outside.

Reference was also made the other day to the discussions on the trade agreement with Cuba. Today we hear that this Government is giving concessions to Cuba. I think I should take this opportunity to correct this impression. The term “timber concessions” which has been misunderstood by the hon. Mover of the Motion, the Member for Demerara River, has not been used in its proper perspective. He says that timber concessions mean special concessions with the Cuban people, but that is inaccurate because “concession” is one of the terms used with respect to leases of land. I think that I should take this opportunity to clarify the position, and to enlighten the hon. Member.

I should also like to take this opportunity to make this other point: The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, accused the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing of seconding this Motion for political or other reasons. I would ask him to use the time at his disposal to read the books from which the Minister has quoted, but he may regard them as subversive. I should like to take time off to remind him of the Party's organ, “Thunder”, and other publications of the P.P.P. to show that this stand has been taken consistently by this Party to support and encourage people all over the world where Colonialism exists.

Hon. Members are all in support of the boycott of trade with South Africa. Why? Because we know that it is a case of oppression, and that the people are hardly able, even by revolution, to change that form of Government or the people who are oppressing them. That is where the Majority Party has been consistent.

I want to remind hon. Members of the activities of the Government of Portuguese East Africa, and of the losing battles the people are fighting in Portuguese India; the oppression of France in Spain, and Colonial struggles in other parts of the world. I think that some hon. Members should endeavour to be as consistent as the P.P.P., rather than support, for emotional reasons alone, an attempt to stop oppression in this part of the world only. A collection of our publications will give Members an idea of the consistency of the People's Progressive Party, and I gladly invite hon. Members to join in this battle against colonialism wherever it exists.

Mr. Burnham (replying): It has been said that one must not look a "gift-horse" in the mouth. And, perhaps, because I enjoy the unusual privilege and pleasure of seeing a Motion of mine being passed without a dissentient voice, someone may urge upon me the validity of that advice. But I cannot resist the temptation to make a few remarks and observations on what I consider to be incompetence and cynicism on the part of this Government.

This Motion was originally tabled on the 7th July, 1959. A certain Political Party called the People's National Congress started a public campaign for the boycotting of South African goods since January, 1959, and I refuse to believe that it has taken this Government since January, 1959—let us imagine for a moment and concede that the Members of this Government are forgetful, and they had no time between 1957 and 1959—I refuse to believe that any Government worth its salt would have taken the whole of 1959 and nearly the whole of 1960 before making use of the euphemistic term employed by the Minister of Communications and Works.

He talks about the examination of international obligations. What does that mean? Is it G.A.T.T., well tell us?

Have you and your public servants got arthritis that you could not have started the correspondence since last year? You say you are a revolutionary Party. Let me say here and now, were I a member of the Government, there would have been no question of international obligations and all that nonsense. We are going to exercise a right by legislation to ban South African trade, and who does not like it, it is a matter for them. It is our country. When we are finished, let them tell us about G.A.T.T. But some people are street-corner revolutionaries only.

The Government has not attempted to give a forthright explanation for holding this Motion over for more than a year. I am not going to indulge in advertisement about what part I took outside the South African House in London or about a parade down the streets of Georgetown and getting a picture taken out with a placard. I am a black man and my people in South Africa are being treated like dogs. This is not politics. This goes deep. It is nice sometimes to have the sympathy of others. Sympathy can be useful, but I accuse this Government of politicking with this Motion. If the officials were holding it up—if these officials were attempting, in any way, to harness your democratic energies or to thwart your democratic efforts—we would have excused you; but—sheer incompetence!

And now for this Lilliputian chauvinist, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks. People like him can always be depended upon to make the P.P.P. appear to be independent, whether by design or accident. Let me recall the Motion on the *Cape St. Mary* when he and I sat and decided to throw out the vote, and after the Minister of Communications and Works had spoken to him, he turned around and said: I am not persisting. That is the man who talks about being consistent. Those who live

[MR. BURNHAM]

in glass houses cannot throw stones. Before thou attemptest to take the mote out of thy brother's eye, take the beam out of thine own eye. I am waiting to see if he is going to bring a Motion to ban Portuguese goods, because the Portuguese were and still are the nastiest colonial power in the world. But he, like those of whom he is a satellite, will never come here and propose such a Motion.

He goes on to talk about the concessions to Cuba. People like him would make the People's Progressive Party appear to be geniuses. The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry went to Cuba and said: "My Government is prepared to give you concessions." Castro told the hon. Minister: "No concessions. It smacks of imperialism, let me give you \$8½ million as a sort of advance for timber export to us"; and you hear this idiocy in this Council about concessions. Left to the hon. Minister you would have had concessions; but, as I had to point out during the course of that debate, the great anti-imperialist had to be taught what is imperialism and was prepared to be the imperialist stooge of another imperialist.

Mr. Fredericks: To a point of correction: In the preamble of the Motion that the hon. Member for Georgetown Central referred to, it is stated that the Minister of Trade and Industry said publicly that it is the intention of his Government to enter into a partnership with the Cubans for timber concessions.

Mr. Burnham: Mr. Speaker, a few extra words have been added, but no further light has been shed on the subject. In his broadcast, the Minister said: I was prepared to give concessions but I was told by the Cubans, we do not want concessions because they smack of imperialism. I am sorry I had not brought the typescript here for the education and the edification of those who would not understand the spoken and written word.

The stand with respect to Cuba is quite different from the stand with respect to South Africa. The stand with respect to a communist country is quite different from the stand with respect to South Africa. It is admitted that, by and large, they are fundamentally two different political systems with two different political philosophies.

So far as I am concerned, the communist philosophy is unacceptable to me and not in the interest of British Guiana, but it is no sense being stupid and to say that communist countries do not exist. America recognizes the U.S.S.R. That is a fact. It is only some people who say they do not recognize Red China. Therefore, I cannot see how this can be on par with South Africa. Have we heard about things in Cuba similar to what is happening in South Africa? Have we heard, as a deliberate policy of the Cuban Government, that 95% of the population is suffering from permanent malnutrition? Have we heard that, as a deliberate policy of the Cuban Government, 65% of the children do not reach the age of 16? Have we heard that? Well, that is what is happening in South Africa—65% of the coloured South African children do not reach the age of 16.

I did not anticipate that the debate on this Motion, which I thought would have been acceptable to all, would have been the occasion for the advertisement of some new group or party. I came to debate this Motion because I felt deeply on it. My Party feels deeply on it; and I am led to believe that the greater part of this country feels deeply on this question. I am not interested in all those who say you must ban goods from everywhere, you must do this and do that.

I am sorry—very sorry—that this Government has taken this long to bring up this Motion; and why I am particularly sorry is because the larger part of importations from South Africa in these days consist of wines. South African wines are of the same quality as all the

wines from other countries, and they are cheap; and at this time—we are now in November—when the wines, most probably, have come in, and with the decision of the Government to implement the recommendation of this particular Motion coming so late, it would not be as effective as it might have been if it had come up earlier. That is one thing I am sorry about, and that is one reason why this Government should be further castigated. I suggest that they take their jobs more seriously. I suggest that they carry out what they say. If they had tackled this Motion last year, we would have already reduced a large part of our importations from South Africa.

I have been congratulated for proposing this Motion. I want to say this: This is one of the proudest moments of my life and for my Party, for the P.N.C. has chosen me to pilot through this Council a Motion which seeks to do something definite and material to destroy this theory of the Herrenvolk, to destroy racial discrimination. That is all we can do at the moment. I hope that if the necessity arises at some other time where the native people of South Africa take up arms—let those who are afraid of revolutions listen to me carefully; if the native people of South Africa take up arms against their oppressors—people like me should be volunteers because at a certain point violence is justifiable; and I contend that violence on the part of the native South Africans is absolutely justifiable.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, the Question is: “That this Council recommends to Government that all trade between British Guiana and the Union of South Africa be prohibited”.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion carried unanimously.

PROPOSED INCREASE OF TAX-HOLIDAY CONCESSIONS

Mr. Speaker: The next Motion is one standing in the name of the hon.

Member for Demerara River: It reads as follows:

“Whereas the unemployment situation throughout the Colony is progressively deteriorating and it is generally believed that only industrial investments on a large scale can alleviate this desperate situation and that the greatest encouragement should be given to investors both local and foreign:

Be it resolved: That this Council recommends to Government that the present period of tax-holiday concessions offered by Government to all new industrial enterprises be increased from five years to seven years”.

Mr. Bowman: This is one of two Motions of which I gave notice after I left the People's Progressive Party last year. The Council was subsequently prorogued and the Motions lapsed. I tabled this Motion again on the 5th January this year. Today is the 16th November, the eleventh month of the year, and it is only now that this Government has seen fit to have this Motion debated. I would like not only this Council but the people of the country in general to take special notice of the Government's deliberate reluctance to have Motions by Members outside the P.P.P. debated in this Council.

My reasons for tabling this Motion are threefold. One stems from jealousy. I am sorry to say it but, to be frank, I am jealous of the industrial development that is taking place in The West Indies Federation, particularly in the two large unit territories of Jamaica and Trinidad. Development has proceeded in those islands at an accelerated pace during the last three years — the same period of time in which this Government has been in office. Compared with the industrial development in The West Indies, that in British Guiana has moved at a snail's pace. What are the reasons for that? The Minister of Trade and Industry not long ago commented in the Press that investors were not taking advantage of the offers made by Government. He admitted that industrial development was

[MR. BOWMAN]

lacking in this country, and I wonder whether he had asked himself the reasons?

My second reason for bringing this Motion is the almost complete lack of enthusiasm among investors, local and foreign, and my third reason is because of the great army of unemployed. The preamble to the Motion states:

"Whereas the unemployment situation throughout the Colony is progressively deteriorating and it is generally believed that only industrial investments on a large scale can alleviate this desperate situation, and that the greatest encouragement should be given to investors, both local and foreign".

That is the position. Perhaps the Government has not asked itself what are the reasons why people are afraid to come to British Guiana and invest their money. We have an extraordinarily large army of unemployed and under-employed people, yet this Government has sat for more than a year on a Motion which aims at encouraging investors to invest money in the country and provide employment for its people. Had this Motion been readily welcomed when I introduced it, we might have had fifteen new industrial concerns established in this country. Who knows? The increased tax concessions which I am asking for have been provided for in Trinidad and throughout the West Indies, even in Barbados. There is no doubt that the extended tax holiday concessions have brought investors to those islands, and I believe that if similar concessions were provided in this country investors would have been attracted and we would not have had this unemployment problem. At least it would have been reduced.

I am asking Government to increase the tax holiday period from five to seven years. The present tax concessions offered by the Government are provided under the Industries Aid and Encouragement Ordinance, 1956, the Income Tax (In Aid of Industry) (Amendment)

Ordinance, Chapter 300, and the Industries Aid and Encouragement (Amendment) Ordinance, No. 21 of 1957. Those concessions are not sufficient, in my opinion, to create the necessary incentive to investors to come to this country. In Jamaica those concessions and more, together with a tax holiday of seven years, are provided. If this Government was really interested in encouraging investors to come to this country it would have taken the opportunity ever since to put our tax concessions on par with those offered in the West Indies so as to attract investors to this country.

I have been a member of the People's Progressive Party and I cannot help repeating that I know how they think. They are opposed to the free enterprise system, in spite of what they may say. They are opposed to people making profit from their hard earned cash which they invest. They would like to get people like Castro in Cuba to come here and barter tobacco for timber. They are not interested in getting people to come here and invest money, because they do not want to have any dealings with capitalists. Only last week the Minister of Communications and Works reminded us of the "blood money of slavery". He was referring to the imperialists of old, and that is the trend of thought which seems to be operating in the minds of some people all the time. They do not want to have any dealings with capitalists because they say that capitalism is an outmoded and dying system. They would like to see the establishment of a communist regime in this country, as they prefer to deal with communists. That is why they have sat down on this Motion. What has caused them to bring it forward now I do not know.

While I was a member of the P.P.P. I often urged the Executive to increase our tax concessions, and they cannot deny what I am saying. On the

Party Executive I have argued from time to time that the best means of encouraging investors to come to this country and to provide jobs for our jobless was to provide the necessary incentive and encouragement not only to investors from abroad but also to local people with money to invest. But every time I introduced that argument it was brushed aside, and that is the reason why I tabled this Motion immediately after I left the Party.

The Motion is very clear and it does not need very much argument to prove to my former friends that what I am saying is not guess-work. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read an extract from an article in a Jamaica magazine headed "New Opportunities for Industrial Investments." On page 7 it says:

"A Healthy Industrial Climate . . .

. . . for profitable operation and for sound future growth awaits new manufacturers in Jamaica.

Generous New Incentive Legislation . . .

. . . has been passed in Jamaica, in order to launch an unprecedented drive to attract and expand industry. The government has enacted the following laws:

The Industrial Incentives Law (No. 45-1956) enacted in August 1956, provides freedom from income tax for periods up to seven years. It also offers important relief from customs duties on factory building materials and equipment. It applies to companies whose Jamaica production will be sold wholly or in part on the local market.

The Export Industry Encouragement Law (No. 49-1956) enacted in October 1956, is a specially tailored statute offered to companies manufacturing in Jamaica solely for export to world markets. It offers similar income tax relief and import duty concessions and also allows them duty-free entry of raw materials.

The International Business Companies Law (No. 36-1956) enacted in August, 1956, provides freedom from income tax for all time to international business companies whose activities do not in-

clude trading within the prescribed area—The British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras.

An earlier Law, the *Pioneer Industries (Encouragement Law)* is still in effect and offers tax relief to manufacturers of products not previously manufactured on the Island, in the form of accelerated depreciation, and duty-free importation of machinery and building materials.

The Hotels Aid Law, amended and liberalized since it was originally enacted, offers incentives to investors engaged in new hotel construction."

I will quote from the Annual Report of the Industrial Development Corporation for the year ended 31st December, 1956.

Mr. Speaker: From where?

Mr. Bowman: From Jamaica, I will read from page 2, paragraphs 2 to 4:

"Industrial Incentives Law, 1956:

The Industrial Incentives Law, 1956 was proclaimed on the 23rd August. This Law provides for the grant of concessions to any industry if the Government is satisfied that it will be of benefit to the Island, both economic and non-economic considerations being taken into account. The provisions of this Law make it a more flexible instrument of development than the Pioneer Industries (Encouragement) Law since a product may be approved even though manufacture is already being carried on, should such approval be justified by other considerations. This enables the existing manufacturer to apply for concessions under this Law for the expansion of his manufacture, and the benefits of the Law are not confined to new industries entirely.

The following are the concessions:—

Relief from Import Duties:

Similar duty-free concessions are offered as under the Pioneer Industries (Encouragement) Law during the time that the industry continues to be an "approved enterprise", viz., duty-free importation of all building materials, tools, plant, machinery, pipes, pumps, conveyor belts or other appliances and materials necessary for and used in the construction, alteration, reconstruction or exten-

[MR. BOWMAN]

sion of the factory or for equipping the factory or any extension thereof but not for repairs or replacements.

Relief from Income Tax:

There is choice of one of two options. The first option is a 7-year tax holiday. In this period, however, notional depreciation of assets must be set up and in the 8th and successive years annual allowances may be made only on the depreciated value at the conclusion of the 7-year period. The second option allows for 6 years of tax benefits, the first 4 involving total relief and in the 5th and 6th years, relief of two-thirds and one-third respectively of chargeable income, after deduction of normal depreciation. A company may, however, delay taking advantage of the tax holiday for three years from the date of production, during which time, it will be permitted normal annual depreciation allowances. Once the Company enters the first 4 years of the tax holiday, allowances for depreciation will cease but may be resumed in the concluding 5th and 6th years."

This is another Report from Barbados [*The Member holds a document in his right hand*] which tells us the same thing — 7 years. I am not saying that the concessions, apart from the 5 years that are offered by this country, are not good. I am arguing that the time should be increased from 5 years to 7 years. I feel that the other concessions offered compare favourably with what are offered in the West Indies, but we are offering only 5 years whereas they are giving 7 years. I have no doubt that the 7-year limit is the reason why investors prefer to invest their money in the West Indies. Apart from this concession there is something else which I believe could have encouraged investors to invest in Jamaica and the West Indies.

The West Indies have a good market. They have a population of three million people as compared with British Guiana's half-million. Several people are investing in the West Indies,

and I would prefer to see that our tax concessions are brought on a par with the West Indies. Let us do that and see what happens.

I am sure that it will give greater encouragement to local investors and would-be investors. I am also sure we could encourage investors to come here by giving them two more years tax concessions together with other benefits which can be found in the Reports which I have read. I know that better conditions are offered to investors in Trinidad and Jamaica than what are offered in British Guiana. If the concessions to which I have referred are introduced in British Guiana, there is every likelihood that investors will be encouraged to come here.

I am appealing to this Government not to harden their hearts because the Motion has not come from them, but to accept the Motion in order to improve the industrial development of this country. I do not want to boost myself too much. When I was in Australia last year I made a point during my speech. Before I left here there was an interim policy statement by a party which was started by myself and Mr. Manraj. We said at the time and before I left for Australia:

"That the Progressive Liberal Party believes in free enterprise, the ownership of private and individual property and freehold title to land. We feel that people with initiative must be allowed to make reasonable profits from their investments. We are therefore pledged to become the bridgehead for Commonwealth and foreign investments on an unprecedented scale in the Colony.

To do this we are prepared to give the necessary encouragement — greater tax holiday. In other words, we will create the right atmosphere for investments, so that nobody will be afraid to invest."

This would prevent people from being afraid to invest money in this country. That is the stand I took last year

before leaving for Australia. **[Mr. Rai: "Who wrote that?"]** I am responsible for this statement. That is the way in which I have been thinking, and I supplemented it in my speech in Australia. I will read one paragraph of my speech in Australia. I was referring to the hardship which our people in this country have to undergo. I said:

"This is the kind of thinking that is being expressed in my country today. I am telling you this, because the fantastic scientific achievements of the Russians coming one after the other, almost every day, and their vast economic achievement and expansion, are things in themselves that can have profound influence on the minds of such young people. Therefore, I am asking those of you who have the power and the authority in your hands to put these facts to your financiers, your investors and your industrialists, and urge them to come to British Guiana and make some investments. The country has great investment possibilities, great potentials. I guarantee that if they come they will get fair returns from their investments. We are prepared to give all the necessary tax concessions conducive to investment."

You can see the consistency of my argument, unlike my hon. Friends on the other side of the Table who say one thing today and something else tomorrow. Everything that I have read has shown consistency. That is the way I have always been thinking, but when I discussed the matter in the Party's Council I was told: "Comrade, we do not want these people to come here and suck the life-blood of our people. We do not want them to enter our country and carry out all of the profits."

In Jamaica perpetual tax concessions are given to international companies; the companies are excluded from taxation for all times. Would this Government do that? **[Mr. Benn "Never".]** Why? Because you are opposed to capitalists, and because you are a Communist.

Mr. Speaker: Please address the Chair.

Mr. Bowman: They are not prepared to give tax concessions. Mr. Manley was prepared to give concessions in Jamaica, but this idiotic Government, this pack of nincompoops who run this Government —

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You must not say that.

Mr. Bowman: When I left, the Minister of Trade and Industry told the Press that he could not think of making such a silly mistake as to offer me a Ministry. That is a lie; he offered me Mr. Edward Beharry's Ministry twice.

Mr. Speaker: You were going very well, but now you have reached a certain part you are getting off the track.

Mr. Bowman: I am only trying to show how my former friends or colleagues think. I want people to understand the type of people whom we have in this Government, and unless I tell them they will not know. My former friends are people who doubt their words. They will say one thing before your face today, and if it goes against them tomorrow they will deny what they have said.

Mr. Benn: That is irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker: I will not leave it to Members to decide what is relevant or not.

Mr. Bowman: I am trying to make Members see the type of people who are running this Government. They are not prepared to do the necessary things to encourage industrial development in this country. What they are prepared to do is to create chaos. Only last week the Minister of Trade and Industry said that revolutions come when the people are disgusted and cannot bear conditions any longer. That is what he is trying to do in this country. Every one of them, even that stooge there —

Mr. Benn: Sir, to a point of order——

Mr. Speaker: I called "order". Are you going to take it out of my hands?

Mr. Benn: The hon. Member must withdraw the remark. The hon. Member has been consistently attacking members of the Government.

Mr. Speaker: I called the hon. Member to order, and while I was doing so, you got up and took over. I am not waiting for Members to tell me. I must again say that the hon. Member is entirely out of order for making this remark. I stopped the hon. Member and if the hon. Member does that again, I will have to name him in this Council.

It is now five o'clock and we will have the adjournment; but I want to warn the hon. Member, if it happens again I will have to name him. It is happening far too often. But I do wish that when I am taking Members to task

and calling them to order on a particular information that other Members do not take over the ruling of the Chair. They should wait until I have finished. It is now five o'clock ——

The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai): Before the adjournment is taken, I respectfully ask you to call on the hon. Member to withdraw the statement. He has called a Member of the Government a stooge.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that the hon. Member is out of order.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Chief Secretary (Major Smith): I beg to move that Council adjourn to next Wednesday, 23rd November, 1960, at two o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Council is adjourned to next Wednesday at two o'clock in the afternoon.

Council adjourned accordingly, at 5.05 p.m.