

# SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Tuesday, 19th January, 1960.

The Council met at 2 p.m.

## PRESENT:

**Speaker**, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

**Chief Secretary**, Hon. D. M. Hedges

**Attorney-General**, Hon. A. M. I. Austin, Q.C. } *ex officio*

**Financial Secretary**, Hon. F. W. Essex, C.M.G. }

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 and Works)

„ „ **B. S. Rai**

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

Mr. **R. B. Gajraj**

—Nominated Member

„ **W. O. R. Kendall**

—Member for *New Amsterdam*

„ **R. C. Tello**

—Nominated Member

„ **F. Bowman**

—Member for *Demerara River*

„ **L. F. S. Burnham**

—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*

„ **Ajodha Singh**

—Member for *Berbice River*

„ **Jai Narine Singh**

—Member for *Georgetown South*

„ **R. E. Davis**

—Nominated Member

„ **A. M. Fredericks**

—Nominated Member

**H. J. M. Hubbard**

—Nominated Member

„ **A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.**

—Nominated Member.

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

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

## ABSENT:

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

The Clerk read prayers.

## MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 18th January, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

## ORDER OF THE DAY

## APPROPRIATION BILL

## BUDGET DEBATE

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall now resume the debate on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill intituled

"An Ordinance to Appropriate the Supplies granted in the current session of the Legislative Council".

Anyone else who desires to contribute may do so now.

**Mr. Campbell:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid I have not prepared a speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** You are not bound to.

**Mr. Campbell:** I will touch on a few points. It is the first time that allocations of so many thousands of dollars have been made available for Amerindian Development. Right away I wish to thank the Government for their generosity so far. The figures look all right "in the books" but the question is the implementation of the funds made available so that the best results can accrue — results from the economic point of view. The whole Council emphasizes the economy of the country, that is, the producing power of the population.

There are people in the rural areas who stand in need of great help from the educational angle, from the social angle, from the economical angle and even from the political angle. As education happens to be a prerequisite in any development plan it calls for the academic and practical education of the rural people so that the best efforts are brought forth in any development plan.

There is a special item under Amerindian Development Scheme—Item 8 — "Training Centres". For the last two years I have, from time to time in this Council and outside, questioned whether the people in charge of the administration—the Officials—are still satisfied that the training is really answering the purpose. It was through the good offices of the people of the United States that the education of Amerindians was started here in British Guiana. The plan was to teach these people how to help themselves in becoming artisans—teach them how to use tools and, in time, to make better use of furniture and houses; teach them carpentry; and teach the women and young girls better cookery. From my observation I was not satisfied and now I am still not satisfied that that particular scheme is being carried out satisfactorily, and I would like to ask the Chief Secretary if he is satisfied that the training being given will answer the particular purpose for which it is intended.

The emphasis of the Government now is on farming. I agree with that policy. I agree that in a country like British Guiana, with its economy built more or less on farming, agriculture should be emphasized. There is a tremendous amount of unemployment and under-employment — about 60,000 — and the people are more or less filled with fear about earning a living. Government is right about looking at agriculture to employ the available labour force in the land, but before some of the labour force in British Guiana can be employed properly in agriculture there are so many things to be done — communications, for instance. Emphasis has got to be put on communications in the interior—roadways, the tapping of virgin forest, water services, air transport and so on.

There is an allocation of \$65,000 for developing a certain section of the North West District with the planting of coconuts, etc. That is something in the right direction, but before coconuts, cocoa, citrus and other things can be

grown you have got to provide roadways; and I am glad to say that the Officials who have to deal with that particular scheme are thinking seriously about opening up the 20-mile stretch between two rivers to make some highlands available to the Amerindian settlers. That is something good and I am thankful. But on the other side, towards the Venezuelan frontier, there are other ranges of fertile hilly lands. Government need to stir themselves and look into that section.

If I may touch on a certain phase of farming in the North West District and outline what it has been, there, in the last 50 years: The time was when farmers began farming in the lower parts of the Barima and Waini Rivers. They farmed as the years passed right up to the foothills. At that time the factors for making money with farm produce were there and the farmers made good. The lands were virgin and fertile and labour force was available. There were two sources from which labour was got.

The Amerindians were contracted for six months to serve on the farms and the farmers got about 10 hours a day from them. The other source of labour was the ex-indentured people. East Indians came from their homeland to serve on the sugar estates and they had the option after five years of returning to their homeland or staying. They stayed here and made farming a success.

During the period I am dealing with they were looking around to decide where to settle, and that was when they served the farmers of the North West District on contract for six months. The farmers, therefore, had an available labour force to enable them to carry on their farming, as all they had to do was to ask for 60 or 100 labourers. But times have changed. Those indentured people are today the owners of their own farms. The Amerindians also do not want to work on farms any more under those conditions; they want to start farming on their own, but they are handicapped by lack

of funds. Some of them have gone into the logging industry and manganese mining where they can earn quick money.

At that time the rice industry was not so well established, and ground provisions and plantains were mostly planted to serve as staples in the Pomeroon and in the North West District. Farmers worked the same land for four or five years, with the result that it lost its fertility, and they continued breaking new ground up rivers to work new land. Now they are planting on the hills. They say that the low lands cannot be depended upon. They are not good for cocoa or coconuts, but suitable for coffee. The life span of a coffee tree on the low lands is about 10 years, but on the hills it is between 40 and 50 years. The farmers, seeing that a few of them are doing better on the hills, now want to leave their farms on the low lands and take to the hills, but they need accessible roads and financial help to do farming on the hills. That is why I am asking Government to assist the farmers in the North West District to start life anew on the hills. I live amongst them and I know what they need.

I wish to warn Government that some of the farmers in the North West are going to the Venezuelan border where they are in contact with Venezuelans. They tell me that the Venezuelan Government is providing credit facilities for those who wish to go in for farming. It provides them with sufficient money to make a start, and if the first venture is not a success the farmers are given more money for a second trial, but if they go a third time for assistance they are told that they are no good as farmers. I cannot vouch for this information but it is what I have been told by some of our farmers. They complain that this Government does not seem to think very much about them, and is oblivious to their needs. The south-eastern end, the Moruka area of the North West District, is suitable for coconut, cocoa, coffee and citrus cultivation, but the soil at the other end needs looking after.

[MR. CAMPBELL]

Yesterday one of my colleagues on this side of the Table asked the Government to make a statement on its land policy, and the recent Land Bonds legislation came in for some caustic comment. The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing slated Members of the "Opposition" for their criticisms of the Government and said that they were pulling the good name of this country down. May I ask if we really have a good name abroad? Even among ourselves this country has a doubtful name. Some time ago about 40 Canadian businessmen came to British Guiana to investigate the possibilities of industry. I would like to know what percentage of those businessmen were lured by the sweet name of British Guiana into investing money in this country. How many of them have established industries in this country? The few industries which have been established cannot relieve the unemployment situation.

Government seems quite happy about the inducements it offers to investors, but I am not sure that it is anxious for capital to come into this country. There is something wrong somewhere. I do not like to criticize. My nature is such that I always like to be charitable, but there appears to be a tremendous amount of confusion in Government's land policy.

There are great possibilities for agriculture in this country which attracts the people in the rural areas, but they need more assistance. Agriculture does not appeal to the townsman who is not attracted to the rural areas. He has to be sold the idea of going in for agriculture. Georgetown is bursting at the seams, and the ordinary man in the City has to be persuaded by the leaders that life in the country districts makes for independence for himself and progress for the country. Leaders must convince their people that in the final analysis the soil makes a man independent, provided he puts his all into it, and that there is

no profit in milling around in Georgetown where the housing shortage is so acute and crime is on the increase. I do not agree with the suggestion that the increase in crime is due to a lack of work. I believe that even if there was work available there would still be crime.

I would like to be enlightened as to what is meant by a diversification of agriculture. I take it that it means planting more coconuts, more coffee, more cocoa and so on.

There again, the higher lands and sandy loam offer greater possibilities for diversification of crops like peanuts, black eye peas, and Irish potatoes, with the necessary direction from the Department of Agriculture.

There is another question that I must touch on, and that is land tenure. There is an element of fear among the farmers of British Guiana concerning the Land Bonds Ordinance and I think they would like to be told exactly what the Ordinance means, and what Government's policy is when it comes to land tenure. I remember some time ago Government stated that freehold system was being abused and that land was being fragmented in a major way. Be that as it may, I think freehold system offers the right incentive to settlers. This is because the person who owns freehold land feels that he has a stake in the country: "I have all rights and title to this land, and I can work it for myself and leave it safely for my children". A large section of the farming population in British Guiana feels that way.

Everybody in this Council refers to me as an Amerindian, and I am proud to be numbered among the Amerindians of British Guiana. I would like to say a word about their position so far as land tenure is concerned. They usually have no documents entitling them to the ownership of land. They are only on sufferance, occupying Crown Lands. The result is they are squatters on the

land, and some better arrangement could be brought about. I have spoken to many Amerindians in the North West District, and I find that they are fearful about the tenure of the lands which they are going to cultivate with crops of coffee, coconuts, and so on. They say to themselves: "Will the land really be mine? I want title to it. I want an arrangement made that will be to my satisfaction. I want paper for this land". Let the Amerindian come under the heading of land-owners, even though a slow process may be involved. We must remember that the development of Amerindians aims at merging them into the community—and that is something that I agree with—but they have to be trained to live under conditions similar to those under which other people in the community live. They have to be taught. They have not been thinking for themselves all these years because officials have been thinking for them. They have reached a stage where social systems and agencies play a practical part in their lives in the rural areas and they want to become responsible citizens. Personally, I can fight my own battles and I am at home either in Reservations or in City, but I believe I am an exception to the rule where most Amerindians are concerned.

I will ask the Chief Secretary to take a little time off and consider the affairs of the Amerindians. Guiana is in the melting pot, and I must admit that I am confused about the political trend of things. What is going to happen to the Amerindians who are being brought closer to community affairs, and still have a long way to go in their educational training to become responsible citizens. The Chief Secretary should see to it that the educational development of Amerindians is also pursued in order to bring about the desired result.

I will go on to transport. The North West District happens to be very far away from the city of Georgetown and it would take more than twenty-four hours sometimes and a tedious journey

to get there and return. A new steamer is to be provided in 1962 and it is said that it will be faster and carry more people than the present one. I do hope that that does not remain in the realms of mere theory and I hope that it would not be long before that steamer is serving that District. We must remember that the North West District is expanding and moving ahead, and therefore there will be more cargo and passengers to transport to and from the District.

The North West District also calls for greater development in agriculture, among other things. The hospital at Mabaruma is still inadequately equipped. I wish the time will soon come when Government will do something to provide more equipment. I may mention that if someone drowns and the police picks up the body in a disintegrated form, there is no proper means of taking the body to the mortuary.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would just like to get it clear; is the hon. Member speaking on the general policy or on individual policy?

**Mr. Campbell:** General policy.

**Mr. Speaker:** If you refer to the specific items in the Budget it will help me.

**Mr. Campbell:** It is the general policy that I am referring to, and I have one more point. As the District is going to earn more money by way of manganese production, I am looking forward to see that the Royalty earned is ploughed back into the district by way of development.

**Mr. Fredericks:** We have been presented with a Budget which makes no provision for additional taxation. Quite rightly, we are gratified at this, though it is extremely difficult to visualize how Government could have justified any extra taxation having regard to the unsatisfactory position of the country's economy.

[MR. FREDERICKS]

I concede that it does not require a great deal of imagination to produce a tax-free Budget, but I must commend the hon. the Financial Secretary on his detailed analysis and review of the country's economy and the future prospects. He can rest assured that the so-called experts on this side of the Table will not join issue with him in his forecast of the revenue for 1960.

It is, however, a matter of concern that the anticipated surplus is only \$1.1 million, and when one considers the considerable demands on the supplementary expenditure one can readily appreciate that there is the possibility of no surplus. There has been an increase in the recurrent expenditure of approximately \$3 million. We are told that half of this has been absorbed or will be absorbed by public debt and the greater portion by increased salaries of teachers, gratuities and pensions. We do not see any large-scale capital expenditure or any extensive scheme of a long-term policy being financed from our income. This, I feel, is unsatisfactory as we are unable to provide for even a small portion of our population increase and points to our total dependence on loans and grants to finance our developmental expenditure as we are unable to make any substantial contribution in that direction.

I do not subscribe to the view that Government spending alone will contribute to solving the country's unemployment situation; and I feel that private enterprise, through manufacturing industries, coupled with an expansion in the agricultural sector is vitally important and necessary to absorb the increased population. I agree that the whole emphasis of the Development Programme has been placed on the agricultural sector and this is fully taken care of, but I do not think that industrial development is proceeding apace and I feel that the climate should be made more attractive by Government to permit the growth of industrial expansion. Manufacturing establishments are rapidly

being set up in Trinidad, Jamaica and Puerto Rico and in those countries we find that the *per capita* income has passed that of this country's.

I read with interest of the Government's intention to establish an industrial corporation in the United States of America and in the United Kingdom. This is, indeed, a laudible step in the right direction, but I must reiterate that Government should provide the necessary incentives to attract private capital investment.

It has been said that economists do not agree with incentives to attract industrial expansion, and they point to Trinidad and Jamaica where some industries have taken advantage of incentives and on the cessation of those incentives, have closed or transferred their operation elsewhere — incentives such as a tax-free holiday period. I say to Government, granted that there may be the possibility of a similar occurrence here, 'go ahead and offer even more incentives until such time as the country's economy is less wholly dependent on rice, sugar and bauxite and until such time as we have come to reap the benefits of the Development Programme.' The possibility of private investment is also affected by the manner in which Government conducts its own business and does its spending, and I am indeed gratified to hear that it is Government's intention to try to run its business as economically as possible and avoid waste and adopt positive measures to avoid the possibility of fraud.

However, let the hon. the Financial Secretary be under no misconception that any form of waste or loss is inevitable in any commercial business; as in these days of severe competition, such an attitude to waste or loss will soon see the end of that business.

We are also told that a comprehensive machinery for Government spending will also be carried out for the protection of the public's interest. This is,

indeed, commendable as such an overhaul is necessary; and I feel that the heads of Government departments should be advised to enforce the new regulations rigidly. It is time, I feel, that Government should awake to the realization that it cannot compete with private enterprise in many spheres. Enormous savings can accrue if it curtails its working force to the minimum consistent with efficiency, and also give out on contract to private enterprise, work in the fields of transport (both land and water), drainage and irrigation, road clearing and maintenance and also land clearing. The difficulties of the transferring of such works from Government to private enterprise are real, but I think it will be beneficial to Government if those difficulties are overcome.

I note in the last paragraph of the hon. the Financial Secretary's address to this Council his optimism about the 1960 prospects. The ingredients of this happy outlook appear to be, in his own words, the new look of the Development Programme. I regret I cannot share the hon. the Financial Secretary's feeling in this matter. I would be much happier were I assured that Government would try to receive greater value for the money it is spending, and also that the climate for private investment and expansion would be made very much more attractive.

**Mr. Beharry:** Last year this country saw a series of taxation from the present Government. Such taxation affected every section of the community, particularly so, the working-class of the country. At that time the working-class people were told that they were to make that sacrifice in order that more employment would be provided by the present Government. At that time we were told that this taxation will not produce \$2 million because it was \$2 million that was expected in the past, but that we should find \$3 million in order to carry out this Development Pro-

gramme and the increase from this taxation would be used for the purpose of developing our country.

We find that one section of our people carry the burden of this increased taxation—to get what? They get no benefit whatsoever. We had an increase of \$1.4m in revenue last year, a shortfall from the \$3m which was expected. We have been presented with a “no taxation” Budget. Every section of the commercial community is pleased because there is to be no increased taxation, but I wish to warn the commercial community that this is not because of any genuine desire by the Government to permit local industries to expand so as to provide employment. That is not the purpose. It has been motivated by the Government's desire to remain in power so that at a later stage it may be able to submit further taxation proposals which are simply being postponed for a future date, in order to implement its backward policy. Everyone knows the present Government's ideology and philosophy. There is a saying that today's rejoicing will change to tomorrow's weeping. That is life, and that philosophy applies to this Budget. The gladness of today will be the sorrow of tomorrow. I can visualize now that there will also be no increased taxation next year, because of the obvious desire of the present Government to remain in office. There will be a general election next year.

I have always believed that there was a genuine desire of political parties to do things for the good of a country, to relieve the sufferings of the people, but we see the emergence of a political party in this country, not with a desire to do things for the benefit of the people, but to provide employment for some of its members in the Legislature. For I can say without any fear of contradiction that very many of them would have to walk the streets barefooted if they did not have a seat in this Council. For that reason they have to act as touts.

[MR. BEHARRY]

We see that an increase in revenue is estimated for this year. In 1959 the revenue collected was \$48,373,875 and the revenue estimated for this year is put at \$51,555,625, an increase of \$3,181,750. Let us look at the other side of the balance-sheet. Last year the cost of running this country amounted to \$46,880,000, while the estimated expenditure for this year is \$50,457,418. The increase in expenditure for this year is much greater than the increased revenue anticipated. Is this sound business sense by the type of people who are running our country? Some of them cannot even run a cake shop. They are incapable of running their own homes. Running a country needs ability; one must know about finance — not only how to spend.

In this Budget Speech the Financial Secretary states what has been significant in our country during the last six or seven years. On page 2 of his speech he says:

“However, looking now at the Gross Domestic Product which has been provisionally estimated for 1959, it appears that the economy as a whole is still marking time, for the figure is almost exactly the same as that for 1958”.

He admits that today British Guiana is marking time economically. It has been marking time politically since the Government was thrown out in 1953, so that today this country is not only marking time politically but economically. On page 6 of his speech the Financial Secretary also says:

“We are still in the position that sugar, bauxite and rice account for 90% of our exports, and if anything untoward happens to one of these, for climatic or external economic reasons, our expansion is held back.”

I wonder how many of the Government Members realize the seriousness of this statement by the Financial Secretary, that if perchance anything happens to sugar, bauxite or rice it means that the Five-Year Development Programme, of

which so much has been said, and for which every section of the community is taxed, will come to failure? I wonder if the Members of the Government realize the serious situation this country is really facing. The price of sugar has already fallen, and people on sugar estates can hardly get work. Only yesterday the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, spoke of the situation.

As regards bauxite, the Financial Secretary states that new finds are being made throughout the world today. The economy of this country is dependent mainly on two industries—bauxite and sugar. The Financial Secretary also observes, and rightly so, that rice is playing a wonderful part today in the economy of the country, thanks to the present land policy, but production without the ability to sell is another matter. Even the situation with regard to rice I consider to be very dangerous. Are we to wait until disaster befalls us? We have no guaranteed market for rice as we have for sugar, although the greater portion of our development funds has been earmarked for the expansion of our rice industry. Our Development Programme, which has been praised by every section of the community, puts emphasis on the economic rather than the social sector. But where is the accent in the economic sector? It is on the production of more and more rice, for which there is no assured market. As the Financial Secretary rightly observes, if anything happens to any of our three major industries — sugar, bauxite and rice — our Development Programme will come to a standstill.

The Financial Secretary, who is not a politician, has said that British Guiana is marking time. If he were a politician I would ask him if unemployment in this country is also marking time. While he may not be a politician, he voices the opinion of the Government, and his policy is the policy of the present Government.

I mentioned just now that there was an increase in revenue of \$3,181,750 for

1959-60. I would also point out that the figure of \$3,500,000 represents an increase in expenditure for that period. On page vii of the Recurrent Estimates we see over 72 different Heads, and out of those the cost of 52 has gone up. Is that why we were taxed last year? I know it means increase in salaries for certain Departments, but maybe I will be told that it is no concern of mine. What I am concerned about is the fact that people are starving, and that is more than a mere slogan. I am not a trade unionist, but I will remind this Government that only recently there was a strike by Government employees, the "down-trodden", the "people in the gutter". "Their payment should not rise." "Their purchasing power should not increase." "He who has should be given more." Apparently that is the philosophy of the Government.

One of the things that has been occupying my attention since 1957 is that this country imports too much of the food that it consumes. I have said and I will repeat that we have land here that can be used for certain agricultural crops, like grass for beef cattle. There is to be an expansion of the dairy programme, and we are asked to vote \$20,185 more for this purpose. Is it to produce more milk, to give it away? Is that the policy of this Government, which is seeking to set itself up in business? They do not understand business. Business is not as simple as a legislator drawing his salary. If you do not know how to run a business, you starve.

What worries me is that if people do not have employment, they cannot spend; and as a merchant, I cannot make money, cannot expand or employ more people. A vicious circle results. But what does that matter to the Government? What does profit or loss mean to the Ministers when they can draw their salaries at the end of the month? I only wish they would adopt a realistic attitude to the situation.

Government has repeatedly stated that the Development Programme will provide employment for people. Other Governments in the world, with the interest of their people at heart, embark upon development programmes: with the object to attract private capital after creating certain conditions, to provide more employment, to increase the spending power of the people and raise the national income. The Programme this Government has embarked upon will never solve the unemployment problem unless the Government is prepared to establish conditions which would attract private enterprise. Government investment cannot do everything: private capital must flow from abroad.

It is very depressing to read of the migration of private capital to other West Indian Colonies. Those Colonies are not free or independent. They are still run by the Colonial Office, and yet they are able to attract this capital. This Government is like an empty drum rolling along the road. They can only make a bit of noise. They shout that they want independence, but the Development Programme they produce is only possible through the generosity of the British Government, who contributed \$20 million. They said that after spending, they had a surplus of over \$1 million last year. That is not all; we have to create the conditions which will encourage the flow of foreign capital into this country.

I sat here last year and heard the Minister of Labour say that although Banks beer had been taxed it was still being sold at the same price.

**The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran):** You are a shareholder.

**Mr. Beharry:** I own shares, but long before I joined the Party. I am proud to be a shareholder because I am assisting in finding work for people. Capital is one of the greatest things on earth. These people will have to learn——

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not understand the term, "these people".

**Mr. Beharry:** Government will have to learn——

**Mr. Speaker:** Just a moment. I would like to attract your attention to Standing Order 33, which you can read at your leisure.

**Mr. Beharry:** I was commenting on the remarks of the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing that the only disgruntled people are the few legislators on this side of the Table, referring to the taxation on Banks beer, but what the hon. Minister missed is that a country like British Guiana that needs capital; that a country like British Guiana that should do everything to encourage capital, because of the behaviour of this Government ——

[Noises]

**Mr. Speaker:** It is very difficult for me to hear what is being said with the sounds I am hearing from the Lobby.

**Mr. Beharry:** As I was saying: What the Minister missed is that by taxing Banks beer, capital which is so badly needed in this country is migrating from this country to another country — money which should have been invested in this country. We have not yet started the manufacture of stout or ale. Bank Breweries Limited, has not yet made its full contribution to the country. When I say that I mean it has not contributed fully to the economy of the country. I expect it to manufacture other products allied to beer. I have not seen that industry fully grown yet. It should grow and expand to provide more employment for the people. But does it matter whether people get employment or not so long as certain people are able to exert their authority as Ministers running a country?

I was speaking on the Dairy Expansion Programme when I mentioned that the Government was in business. We cannot have a surplus in order to develop

our country because every industry, scheme or business run by this Government runs at a loss. We lose money producing because we have to pay interest doing it. We have to pay interest in order to develop the cattle industry, and when we produce the milk we cannot sell it. Trinidad is not a country with an agricultural economy, but Trinidad had been able to build a dairy industry and condensery. Whenever there is a surplus of milk in Trinidad, it is canned. When there is no surplus they use powdered milk. The industry does not lose money. The economy of Jamaica is not agricultural, but they have been able to establish a condensery. But British Guiana, with an agricultural economy, finds it difficult to establish a condensery. This Government, after being in office for two and a half years, now finds it difficult to attract the necessary investment for a condensery. Is it the desire of the Government that no private industry should come into the country? Government should raise the production of milk, then allow private industry to come in and take care of the distribution aspect of it. Unless private industry works alongside Government programmes, their programmes are all doomed.

The Public Debt of this country is rising and, given an opportunity, this Government will borrow more. But no sensible business organization will lend money to this Government because when one borrows money one must use that money to create wealth. This Government borrows money for what?—to pay interest by taxing the people and to keep the economy marking time, according to the words of the hon. the Financial Secretary. If we continue along the path we are going, God help us.

The hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing, while she was replying to the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, made the remark that it is the Members from this side of the Table who are scaring capital from this country. Is it the desire of the hon. Minis-

ter to justify capital not coming into this country by trying to throw the blame on people who are prepared to point out where the fault lies? Everyone, inside this country and outside, knows their ideological mouthings. Everyone, inside and outside this country, knows the ideological beliefs of the people who run this Government. I do not refer to the little "Tin gods" because they amount to nothing. I do not mean the members of the Government who, only in the newspapers, look like something. I refer to the "power behind the throne" who only has to say "I am not a communist" and that will cause a flow of capital into the country.

I want to say in this Legislature that it is not the utterances of Members here that are scaring capital from coming into this country. It is the behaviour of the people who control the country that prevents capital from coming in this country. It is not the words of the members of the "Opposition" that prevent the flow of capital. Any sensible and reasonable thinking man who has the interest of this country at heart knows that it is the behaviour of the present members of the Government.

It is said in the Budget Speech that we have an abundance of resources. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, stated yesterday that there should be a land policy statement. I think, Mr. Speaker, we do not need a policy statement on whether Government believes in leasehold *versus* freehold. We do not need that. The Government stated in this Council that they believe in leasehold and not freehold. When I spoke as Minister I made my position quite clear that I am against leasehold.

The Black Bush Polder scheme costs \$14 million, and 1,500 settlers are to be sent to this scheme.

**Mr. Speaker:** Your time is running out.

**Mr. Beharry:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, \$14 million in expenditure and that is only for drainage, irrigation and roads.

That is not for the establishment of the scheme. Many more millions of dollars will have to go into it. To do what? — to establish settlers on leasehold rights. That is money which has to be repaid by the Colony of British Guiana. Why are these lands not to be sold and the people given freehold rights so that we will get back money and make more lands available to put more people on them? But no, ideological reasons prevent the Ministers on the other side from accepting the policy where people can own lands and the expenditure for bringing these lands under production retrieved. Now we have to spend that money so that the ideological whims and fancies of the present Government could be satisfied.

In the recurrent estimates we find Government running a number of land settlement schemes, every one of them at a loss. Why doesn't Government decide to sell the plots to the settlers on those schemes? Stop running these schemes at a loss and thereby create a greater surplus balance so that we can develop the country. The Financial Secretary points out that 90 per cent. of our export is based on agriculture. There is nothing in the Development Programme that will diversify the economy of this country. It is an Agricultural Development Programme with the emphasis on the production of more rice. The main purpose is to provide water control schemes in rice-producing areas, and to bring more areas under rice production, yet the Financial Secretary who, of course, cannot dictate policy, says there is need for diversification of the economy of the country.

We cannot have diversification of our economy because of the behaviour and policy pursued by the present Government. Year after year we shall continue to vote money here, taxpayers' money, to run land settlement schemes at a loss, to satisfy the ideological beliefs of the people who form the Government. All sorts of excuses were made to justify the retention of the land settlement schemes on a leasehold basis.

**Mr. Speaker:** You have three minutes more.

**Mr. Beharry:** What worries me most is not only the retention of the present land settlement schemes under the leasehold system, but that the purpose of the whole Development Budget is to bring more land under production, and every acre that is brought under production will be under the leasehold system. Not a single farmer will be able to buy a plot of land, because all the land to be developed will be controlled on the basis of land settlement schemes. I view this whole Development Programme as a one-sided affair. If the proper accent was given to it large sums of money which are spent on development would return to the Government and ease the burden of development, but in the present circumstances they will remain permanent expenditure. It is only from indirect income that the country will derive any benefit from this expenditure, because when a man begins to till the soil he must eat. So that is how Government intends to repay the money borrowed—from the economic sector. Where is it taking us? Like my friend, the hon. Member for Demerara River, I ask this Government to realize that whatever is said here is said with all sincerity, so that this country may move forward. My future, and the future of our country, is tied up in the unusual behaviour of the Government, because if people do not get work they cannot buy, and if they cannot buy it affects the economy.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have given you every opportunity.

**Mr. Beharry:** I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence and I rest now in the hope that when the Development Budget is being debated I shall have an opportunity to express my views.

**Mr. Rani Karran:** The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, remarked yesterday afternoon on the

emptiness of the strangers' gallery, and I think the view expressed was that there was little interest evinced in such an important matter as the Budget debate in the Legislature. I think we have listened enough and heard enough from the hon. Members on the other side of the Table to be convinced that the disinterestedness on the part of the public is justified on account of what we have heard so far—that the empty strangers' gallery is due to the emptiness we have heard from Members on the other side who have tried to speak. I say "tried to speak" on the Estimates. We have listened to a mass of contradictions and confusion.

This Government and, indeed, no one who has listened to the debate so far can be certain whether hon. Members on the other side wish to have a tax-free budget or whether they want to have more taxation imposed. In most of the speeches we have heard reference to subjects other than the Estimates which are before us. All the sins of the Government, ideological and otherwise, have been dragged before this Council, as has been the practice in the past, and one must sympathize with those Members who, unfortunately, cannot find anything constructive to say on this important matter.

Starting from the beginning we had the hon. Member for Georgetown North with his usual complaints. If he is not complaining about the treatment of the Civil Service he is complaining about the treatment to a section of the Civil Service. It is very difficult for me to say that I have been able to find anything constructive in the speeches made by Members who have spoken, to which I can reply. However, although the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing has already dealt with the question of Government's land policy we find the hon. Member for the North Western District dwelling upon the question of freehold and leasehold again, and I imagine that it is going to be a weekly feature in this Council. Possibly it is because

those who have spoken on the subject have not been satisfied as to some of the reasons why this Government has been pursuing the land policy laid down, not only by the Interim Government of yesteryear but the Government which preceded the Interim Government. As far as we are aware, it has been the policy of all Governments in British Guiana not to allow the outright sale of lands which are still under the control of the Crown. I think it has been explained before that Government lands in British Guiana are divided into two sections—Crown lands, which are under the control of Her Majesty's Government, and Colony lands which are controlled by the local Government.

Some Members ask "Why don't you sell the lands on the land settlement schemes?" The running of these land settlement schemes is a big headache for Government. But who is going to purchase those lands? I would invite those Members who advocate the freehold system on land settlement schemes to go there and suggest to the people who can hardly find sufficient food to eat, that they should purchase the lands they occupy with reasonable security—lands which cannot be taken away from them unless they commit some very grave breaches of their tenancy. Let those hon. Members go to Windsor Forest, a part of my constituency, and Vergenoegen, and merely suggest that they should agitate for the sale of those lands to them. I am sure they would come back convinced.

Some Members talk about ideology. What is their ideology? What would be the outcome of the sale of those lands? Shopkeepers and people who speculate in lands would take them away from those who occupy them now.

There is also the fear of fragmentation. I happen to be the owner of a piece of land 3 x 750 rods which is useless to me and to my neighbours, because one cannot cultivate a piece of land which is so narrow and has such a great depth. That

is what has been happening. I am sure that the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, is aware that east of his estate at Fairfield fragmentation is the curse of the people in that area, which is referred to as a republic. There is such fragmentation of land that nobody knows where his cows can graze and where he can plant rice. That is a problem which this Government or some future Government will have to solve in order to consolidate holdings or get people who are occupying lands to put them under beneficial occupation. Obviously under the transport system and other existing legislation the beneficial occupation of land cannot be controlled.

The hon. Member for North West District spoke in praise of the freehold system. If he was making his remarks with particular reference to Amerindians, I would ask him to examine the position with regard to freehold ownership and the Aborigines in Canada, Australia, United States and other places.

The hon. Member for Demerara River wanted Government to pursue a policy of road-building, and he wanted to know what was being done about building the Madhia-Lethem road. He expressed the view that a road leading to the southern border would encourage settlers all along the way. As I have indicated in this Council already, Government has been working on this project, and will embark on the first section of the road from Makouria to Parika as soon as funds are provided and weather conditions permit. It must be remembered that road-building is not something that can be done overnight; for one thing, staff and materials have to be obtained. The hon. Member for Eastern Demerara has been referring to the "Recurrent Development Estimates", and I took it that he meant the Recurrent Estimates. I would like to mention that new staff carries out not only development work but recurrent work, and the cost of staff is bound to go up from year to year on account of annual increments. I do not know if it is the intention of some speakers to suggest

[MR. RAM KARRAN]

that we cut out annual increments and run Government as a business, in order to make a profit. It has been pointed out before on the other side that Government cannot be run like a shop. Black-marketing is completely prohibited in Government business.

I would have been glad if the hon. Member (Mr. Beharry) was in his seat. I do not know if his colleagues would indicate to him or correct the misconceptions he had in his mind. He talked about our having no guaranteed market for rice. Anyone who sits in this Council and who has been a member of the B. G. Rice Marketing Board and can still say that there is no guaranteed market for our rice is either dishonest or ignorant. This country has a Contract and Agreement based on certain terms and conditions which afford us a guaranteed market for the sale of all the rice required in the West Indies. It seems that we have reached a stage where some Members would like us to sell our rice before we produce it. I thought that the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara, from his experience on the Rice Marketing Board would have learned a little more, but obviously he has not benefited much from his association with, or his experience on, the Board.

Time and time again our inquiries from rice-eating countries in different parts of the world have brought us the reply — “we buy rice on a year-to-year basis — a competitive basis — and when you have stocks in hand let us know, and we will inform you if we can buy.” That is how rice is disposed of in the world. That is how we were able to sell a bulk of padi to Venezuela. Although the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, said we could have sold rice — in order to create employment — although the people were not interested——

**Mr. Tello:** I would like to correct the record at once. It is not true that Venezuela bought the rice or padi on the

basis of their annual need, so the hon. Minister's statement is incorrect.

**Mr. Ram Karran:** I never said so. I said that because of stocks we had we were able to persuade Venezuela to buy padi from us. Venezuela, as we all know, had a shortage of padi resulting from the attack of white leaf disease on their padi, and they have also been buying padi from Surinam and the Far East; also, they will be short of padi for a long time to come.

**Mr. Tello:** I thank the hon. Minister for correcting himself.

**Mr. Ram Karran:** The freehold and leasehold controversy, although it will be with us for some time, has been disposed of so far in this debate, and this is perhaps a good point at which to deal with another matter raised by the hon. Member for Demerara River. He suggested yesterday that the acceptance of loans and grants would mean a furtherance of our colonial status. I would refer him to a pamphlet written by Professor W. Arthur Lewis in the Fabian Colonial Bureau series in which he made it quite clear that prior to the visit of the Royal Commission, headed by Lord Moyne, to the West Indies and British Guiana these territories were suffering from adverse conditions because of several reasons, and grants should be made to these territories because Britain had in fact been exploiting these territories for years and years under conditions of slave labour, low standards of living, poverty, disease and ignorance. Those conditions, he added, were exploited to build up the cities of Europe.

So that twenty years ago Professor Lewis advocated that Britain should provide grants for the assistance of these territories as well as loans at low interest rates for the purpose of draining swamps, establishing land settlements and providing employment for the people who were struggling economically on sugar estates.

He said, also, that the Colony should fight for and should make every

effort to get the British Government to pay us a better price for the sugar we sell them—better prices for all our products because even 20 years ago the economy of the West Indies and British Guiana was based on a system of buying goods from high-cost producers while selling them our products cheaply. That is, perhaps, one more lesson my friend will probably be able to appreciate, for it is absolutely shameful of this Legislative Council or any Colonial territory asking and fighting for its independence to perpetuate it. Perhaps, my friends who have recently gone over to the other side, are now becoming ashamed. Perhaps they have become more respectable and 'independence' which had been their by-word in the past has now become a word of which they are ashamed.

Some of our colleagues of yesterday who had been shouting from the house tops "We want only self-government" are now shouting "We want independence" only because that has been conceded by the Secretary of State.

**Mr. Ajodha Singh:** I, like other Members of this Council, would like, firstly, to congratulate the hon. the Financial Secretary for presenting such a wonderful Budget. I am sure that 90% of the people of British Guiana are satisfied with such a Budget. But what confuses me a little is what has been said by certain Members of the "Opposition".

Yesterday I sat in this Council and listened to one member of the "Opposition", the hon. Member for Georgetown North, accusing this Government of being a *bourgeois* Government. Today, I am surprised to hear the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara accusing this Government of being a Government known for its ideology, meaning that this Government believes in socialism. What he means is communism. That is really confusing me. On the one hand we are accused of joining the Officials of this Government, and on the other hand we are accused of being communists. But

it is said, when you do not like a man you give him a basket to fetch water. It is an old creole saying, Mr. Speaker.

The "Opposition" realizes, especially the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara, that the day has come when people who can only talk and cannot act, cannot find a place around this horse-shoe Table. In his speech he mentioned that this Budget was presented because of the future General Elections. I know he is annoyed. I know he realizes that his chances of sitting here again are poor, although he mentioned that certain Members on this side of the Table, if they do not win seats in this Council, will have to walk barefeet. He did not mention any particular Member; but I would like to tell that hon. Member that honesty and sincerity of purpose are very important when you are a representative of the people. If, trying to represent those people honestly would cause you to walk barefeet, then any honest and sincere representative of the people must be prepared to walk barefeet.

My friend, the hon. Member for Demerara River, said yesterday that a lot of money was earmarked to be spent in the new Development Programme on drainage and irrigation, but drainage and irrigation, he went on to say, would not help the unemployed working-class. I would like to refresh—

**Mr. Bowman:** To a point of correction, I did not say that. What I did say was: I am sure when this Programme is finished, unemployment will still be stalking this country.

**Mr. Ajodha Singh:** My comrade [Laughter]. My ex-comrade, Mr. Speaker, just cannot remember what he said yesterday. I remember he was trying to outline the difference between the peasant and the working-class. I can remember, clearly, that those words were said; and I want to inform the hon. Member that when those schemes are carried out, the same unemployed whom he mentioned

[MR. AJODHA SINGH]

yesterday would be given land to settle on and employment would be given to them in the carrying out of those schemes. Thousands of people would be employed. I want to refer to the Corentyne scheme — the Pauling Scheme — and to inform him that over 1,300 were employed on that scheme in its constructional stage by Pauling and the sub-contractors, and I want to inform him also that over 900 families would be settling there; and people who cannot secure a tea in the morning would be employed there.

We are being criticized in this Council by members of the "Opposition" that we are paying no heed to the working-class people of this country. Many used these words: "What is being done for the working-class — the ordinary man?" But those hon. Members do not realize that the position of British Guiana today is due to the lack of foresight of members of past governments — those so-called intelligent leaders. And because of that big backlog of unemployment created over so long a time, it is impossible for any Government, no matter how good that Government may be, to erase the misery and suffering of the people in a mere legislative term. It would take time; and these hon. Gentlemen should realize that.

If they cast their attention to other countries which, not too long ago, were removed from the 'colonial yoke', they would realize that those countries, although for many years have gained their independence, are still struggling today to solve the problems of their people. I, like other Members on this side of the Table, look forward, with great interest, to the future of this country. We are satisfied that by putting money in the productive sector of this country we would be able to help solve the problems of our people.

Mention was made yesterday by one hon. Member of the fine job that was

done for the sugar workers of this country and the Union leaders came in for praises, but for the knowledge of this Council I will like to inform hon. Members of the wages and salaries paid to the sugar workers of this country. An unskilled sugar worker on the estate is paid \$2.33 per day— far below that which other workers are getting in other industries and Government. A female worker is paid \$1.62 per day; a skilled factory worker gets \$3.13 per day; a semi-skilled factory worker gets \$2.56 per day; a male field worker gets \$2.33 per day; and a female field worker gets \$1.63 per day. Young male workers get \$1.63 per day and young women workers get \$1.44 per day. These are the wages that they earn. It is true when the crop ends these people receive a bonus, but these bonuses are based on production. If production is not increased, bonuses will not be paid to these people. I mentioned these things not because I want to ridicule these people but because I want to clarify the position.

I am at one, all the time, with people fighting for their rights in order to get proper wages to eke out a decent livelihood. I, as a trade unionist, would help in any struggle, but when such pictures are painted in this Council, hon. Members who are not concerned with the industry would go away with the idea that things are happy in the industry. After the last negotiations the sugar workers got a 7½% increase. I would like to assure Members of the "Opposition" that it is the policy of this Government to help the people of British Guiana and they must realize that you cannot change, in a mere 2½ years conditions that took nearly 30 years to be accumulated.

It will take time and plenty of money and sacrifice by the people of British Guiana. If we are to make progress we must learn to bear our burdens and contribute to the development of our country, and when we do so other people will be willing to help us.

Yesterday some Members of the "Opposition" tried to belittle this Government by saying that it is endeavouring to create a wage freeze in this country. I would like to tell this Council that at no time will it be the policy of this Government to freeze wages in this country. All Government is saying is that at the present moment an increase in wages would mean that it would have to tax people who are unemployed and unable to find three meals a day, and that it would be wrong to impose additional taxation at this juncture. We feel that those who are starving should not be further burdened with increased taxation. This Government feels that it should try to put money into the productive sector in order to improve the economic position of the country. When that is achieved it will be possible to increase wages. We are willing but we cannot afford to pay more. With these few words I would like to congratulate the hon. Financial Secretary on the able manner in which he presented the Budget.

**Mr. Davis:** I am with those Members on this side of the Table when they suggest that the Budget is non-controversial. I foresaw that as a reasonable expectation that would be the case, in view of the drought during the first half of last year, which made money very scarce, and because of the fact that for the first few months of the year we were unable to export rice through the almost total loss of the Spring crop. For those reasons I thought there was a reasonable expectation that the Budget would not contain many controversial items. It has also occurred to me that because of the General Election to take place next year the Government would be chary about introducing subjects which were likely to be highly controversial.

I do not agree with the Financial Secretary when he states in Paragraph 3 of his Budget Statement that the economy of this country is still marking time. I think he is being too cautious in expressing his views, because in that

same paragraph he states that the Gross Domestic Product for 1958 was about \$223 million, in spite of the unfavourable conditions to which I have referred, and in paragraph 4 he points out that the estimated value of our total trade in 1959 is \$214 million, of which imports account for \$110 million and exports \$104 million. But the significant part of this is, that the visible trade deficit decreased from nearly \$19 million in 1958 to about \$6 million in 1959, a year of many set-backs to which reference has been made already. So that I think, speaking generally, the Financial Secretary has been over-cautious in his Budget analysis.

I would like to pay tribute to a commendable action by Government in which the Minister of Trade and Industry seemed to have gone out of his way to solicit and stress the importance of the co-operation of those engaged in our mining industries, and that spirit was particularly manifest during the conference of geologists held in this Chamber only a few months ago. I think he adopted the correct attitude and I wish to commend him for it.

Other Members have spoken about tax concessions to industries. It is my considered opinion that those concessions have not been sufficiently publicized, and I would suggest to Government that urgent steps be taken to correct this obvious omission. I am strengthened in this opinion by the comment made by the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing who said that representatives of a company interested in the manufacture of furniture, who were recently in the Colony, did not seem to be aware of the tax concessions which Government offered as an inducement to the establishment of industries in this country. The hon. Member for Demerara River has made reference to the fact that he had given notice of a Motion which had been soft-pedalled. I am very interested in his Motion and I would like to give it the support which I think it deserves, especially if tax concessions will be given to companies which

[MR. DAVIS]

are prepared to invest their money to resuscitate the gold mining projects which have been closed down since October, 1958. Some such shot in the arm would be not only desirable but necessary if gold mining in this country is to be brought back into being.

The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, spoke about industrial co-operation and the establishment of Industrial Corporations in the United States and the United Kingdom. I have not heard very much about that proposal; perhaps he has more information on the subject. What I do know about this is that the Industrial Committee which was set up some years ago by this Government under the Chairmanship of the Minister of Trade and Industry, was subsequently taken over by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard. I do not know if that Committee is ashamed of its work, or feels that its recommendations should not be made public, but in view of the need and great urge for industrial development I think that such a document should be laid on the Table of this Council and discussed, and its recommendations implemented as early as possible, if practicable and/or worthwhile. I think the Government should pay more attention to small matters which tend to develop the necessary climate in which we would like certain matters to be discussed.

We see in Paragraph 13 of the Budget speech, that

“For rice there will be an increased acreage as large areas of additional land come into production from the efforts of individual farmers in extending their cultivation, and from the drainage and irrigation programme.”

On this question of acreage under production I want to say that I do not think accurate figures can be obtained if, as is done, an Agricultural Extension Officer stands at the roadside and asks a farmer, “How many acres do you plant?” Then somebody says, “Sixteen” or “Twenty”, the Officer writes this down and goes on

to the next farmer. That is not good enough.

In 1959, admittedly, there was a good harvest of rice, but I say without the slightest fear of contradiction that in very many areas crops failed.

In May last year I tabled a Motion in this Council seeking the establishment of a Stabilization Fund for the rice industry. The Government has not seen fit up to now to bring it forward for debate. Naturally it went out with the prorogation of the Council last year. I have since re-tabled it, and it was circulated to Members — at least I have got a copy. The subject of that Motion is vital, especially since we are now hearing strong rumours of a decline in rice prices.

I am sorry that the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, who is the Chairman of the B.G. Rice Marketing Board, is not in this Chamber at the moment, in view of the further remarks I propose to make on this vital industry. The Rice Marketing Board has published prices which came into effect on October 1st, 1959. At that time the millers in the industry bought padi on standards — to call them grades might be more accurate — which had been authorized by the Rice Marketing Board. In due course millers bought and farmers sold. Now what has happened? The Rice Marketing Board has released a new set of standards which, in my opinion, vary materially from the established grades used in the past.

I am not *persona grata* with the Rice Millers Association in this matter. We have our quarrels, it is true, but I am with them on the stand they take that the newly released standards vary considerably from the former ones, and as a result the millers are placed in a precarious position. In due course they would show a loss on operations. Is this another way of eradicating small mills? I am not for a moment saying that certain standards should not be

maintained. In fact, my attitude has been that the industry must streamline itself in order to meet competition which is bound to come from rice-producing areas abroad. But what I do say is, that if changes are contemplated, then the millers and the farmers should be acquainted about them, in good time, so that they can know what to expect, and cut their cloth to suit the pattern to be adopted.

There is yet another aspect to which I desire to draw the attention of the Government. That is, that Government is not getting sufficient revenue from the rice industry. I say that as a Guianese and particularly as a rice miller and one generally interested in the industry in particular and the Colony in general. However, better can be done, because it is well known that some large-scale farmers who produce a couple of thousands of bags of padi distribute that padi to five or six mills. I am wondering if this is not done to dodge certain responsibilities.

**A Member:** Income tax.

**Mr. Davis:** We must take steps to minimize the chances of dodging as early as possible.

Paragraph 13 also refers to the increase in milk production. I think it is time that a limitation should be imposed on the importation of powdered milk. Then there is also the powdered milk that is coming here free, being dumped into this Colony. It is well received, coming as it does to a poor country, but at the same time I believe it tends to stagnate the local milk industry to its disadvantage.

My next comment must be on roads, but would this be a convenient opportunity to stop, Sir?

**Mr. Speaker:** I thought you were winding up?

**Mr. Davis:** No Sir. There are seven or eight other items I desire to

speak on. With your indulgence I would suggest that we take the adjournment now.

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall suspend the sitting until eight o'clock tonight.

*The sitting was suspended at 5.03 p.m.*

#### RESUMPTION

*8 p.m.*

**Mr. Speaker:** When the sitting was suspended, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, was on his feet. He may resume now, if he so desires.

**Mr. Davis:** When the sitting was suspended this afternoon, I was trying to make the point that it is my judgment that enough money has not been set aside for our roads. I would like to make reference to what has been said by my Colleague, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, when he suggested to Government that they examine not only the repairs to roads to be done by contract, but transport, clearing of bushes and other like work. I think, and I am quite satisfied in my mind, that if that is done it will pay off handsomely. We have got the assurance of the hon. Minister of Communications and Works, in Finance Committee, that he would give consideration to such proposals.

To add to that, I would like to stress two points in particular. I have recently been over the Bartica-Potaro Road and I have seen where it is left unprotected to the whims of the weather. I want to suggest to the hon. Minister that when such works are completed that they should be given the benefit of some type of sealing. I travelled there during the rainy season and it really struck me, very forcibly, that the damage done by the ordinary rainfall was tremendous. It will be a sound and prudent gesture to give such works, when completed, the benefit of sealing. I offer this as a humble but considered opinion.

**[MR. DAVIS]**

I would also like to make reference to the roads that have been built in the Black Bush Polder area and to say that I have heard of the damage done to those roads by cattle in the area and that no attempt, whatever, is made by the authorities — those in immediate charge — to try to prevent such damage. Government should, at least, put a seal on those roads so that this untold damage by cattle does not continue. It may be an unpopular gesture, but it is one that should be given some consideration.

I would like, also, to make reference to the road to the Rupununi. I want to make an observation, particularly as I have this in mind: I have had the benefit of a trip, recently, to the Ebini Station, and I would like to compliment Government and its officers who are responsible for the work there. I was rather impressed with the work there and it brought to my mind, forcibly, the necessity for us to get on with the job in trying to secure more beef cattle. I know that Government is doing a fairly good job with regard to dairy farming, but no particular attention is being paid, at the moment, to beef cattle. I think this is an opportunity to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources that he should, first of all, give consideration to a scheme similar to the dairy farming scheme by giving a farmer a heifer and taking back its prodigy and so initiate a scheme for beef cattle.

Another thought that had occurred to me is that, at the rate at which we have been stepping up our exports of cattle, we shall soon see a shortage created; and the Government might be well advised to give consideration to a scheme of trying to develop two or three pilot schemes of about 50 to 60 heifers of pure beef cattle. And the only place I can visualize to get that amount of heifers and to start such schemes is the Rupununi. I mentioned this so that it can be considered along with all the other very solid points which, I feel, the

Minister should have at his disposal, why that cattle trail should not be closed in its entirety.

May I just say a word, now, on land development. Here, I would like to compliment Government on their efforts to settle people on the schemes that have been developed. But when these schemes have been worked out and developed, it is my judgment that something like this should be done: Take for example a scheme like the Cane Grove Scheme. This should be made into a village run by an authority or some such overall committee. It is my view that it would be quite wrong for the Administration to come out suddenly and the community left to carry on at random. Authorities must be established.

The other point I would like to make in connection with this is that I have had the privilege of serving on one of these selection committees, and I want to refer now to the Kortberaad/Borg-en-vlyt Land Settlement Scheme. This scheme envisages about 7,000 acres of land just below Mara, but there are certain very large draw-backs to the scheme about which I am going to warn Government. I have had a look at that area and found that there is no drainage whatsoever. There is no irrigation. It is just simply an undeveloped portion of land — secondary forest.

On inquiry, I have discovered that it has no direct ingress and egress and there has been no soil surveys in the consideration of the Committee. Such a scheme, in my judgment, is a half-baked scheme and we might well find that the very persons whom we are trying to help would be faced with greater burdens and problems, eventually. I feel it my duty to draw to the attention of Government the obvious disadvantages in such a scheme so that they may consider them and give a further thought to the land settlement problems.

I want to make passing reference, if I may, to Education which is dealt with in Paragraph 23 of the Budget Statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Passing reference, do you say?

**Mr. Davis:** Yes, Sir. In that Paragraph the Financial Secretary, referring to the rise of the Public Debt Head by \$1.4 million, states:

“The next largest increase is on the Education head which rises from about \$6.4 million in 1959 to over \$6.8 million in 1960. The big rise in this Head is of course on the cost of Primary Teachers’ salaries which we estimate will cost \$350,000 more in 1960 than was originally estimated for 1959 although, as Members will know, we had to take a supplementary estimate of \$159,000 for teachers’ salaries in 1959.”

The Financial Secretary goes on to deal with the question of secondary education, to which the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, made reference. The Financial Secretary states:

“It is most difficult to sustain the ever increasing cost of primary education much less the growing needs of secondary education. However, the Government sees no alternative to providing more money for primary education as the population continues to grow. It does make it difficult, however, to find additional money for increases in public expenditure for education at university level.

I want to support the remarks made by Mr. Tasker in this respect. If Guianization is to mean what I believe it should, I feel that we would be letting down our Guianese youth if we did not carry our education up to university level so as to enable our young people to equip themselves to take their proper places in our community, and I would ask the Government to give this matter second thoughts. I am sorry the Minister of Education is not in his seat.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does it matter if you are only making passing reference?

**Mr. Davis:** Even passing reference might be more appreciated by the Minister if made in his presence.

**Mr. Speaker:** You can rest assured that it will reach him.

**Mr. Davis:** There is at the moment great disquietude among the religious denominations with regard to Government’s educational policy. Only last night I heard that the Methodist body, of which I am a member, built the first school in this country in 1838, 122 years ago, and since then that body has made a substantial contribution to education in this country. One of the points made by the Minister of Education is a substantial one—that non-Christian teachers who are fully qualified are sometimes denied appointments as head teachers in certain denominational schools, because of their different religious persuasion.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not think you should elaborate on a point like that in making passing reference.

**Mr. Davis:** Paragraph 23 of the Budget Statement points to an increase of \$6 million in the expenditure on education.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not see anything in the Budget Statement which would justify any special pleading for any particular denomination.

**Mr. Davis:** It deals with development as well as recurrent expenditure, but if Your Honour rules I accept your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** Do not start a big debate on Education, for we will never get through.

**Mr. Davis:** I shall come back to it another time, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** You may table a Motion.

**Mr. Davis:** In respect of the Development Estimates I desire to make reference to Housing, for which I see the sum of \$1,239,711 has been earmarked. I do not think that is sufficient money for such an important item. I say this because I am convinced from my own observations, and also from discussions I

[MR. DAVIS]

have had with people who are most concerned, some of them Probation Officers, that a great deal of our trouble with our youths is due to unemployment and bad housing conditions. I recently had another look at the report on the Prisons Administration which shows that it costs the Colony \$700 per head per annum to maintain our prisons. I submit that it would be a sound policy to spend some more money on housing which may assist as a long-range project in this particular phase, because housing is indeed one of the ills that beset our thinking of development.

Before I take my seat may I just make one comment on something the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara said in his speech this afternoon. I deprecate very much his personal attacks this afternoon. I think when a Member brings this Legislature down to the level of a political arena it is really taking it too far. I am sorry the hon. Member is not here to hear me say so.

**Mr. Hubbard:** The Budget which is now before us is, in my view, not particularly significant on account of the financial proposals it makes, but it is very significant because of the political circumstances which have led to its coming here. When Sir Patrick Renison opened the first Session of this Legislature he said he hoped to see established here the processes of English parliamentary democracy, and when he opened the current Session the acting Governor read to us a "Speech from the Throne", and it is the proposals which were contained in that 'Speech from the Throne' which form the contents of our current budget. We have therefore embarked upon an historical act, the task of debating the first ever Budget to come before the Legislature of British Guiana in the manner appropriate to a political democracy.

A delegation will be going to London later this year to endeavour to translate into law what seems to exist in

fact, but we will not anticipate that delegation. We are simply conscious of the fact, so that as we consider this year's Budget we will be aware of the political advance that has replaced the period of marking time.

The history of British Guiana is largely the history of a struggle to control population. People had to be brought here to work in industry, and the population had to be maintained for the needs of industry. For years we had a dwindling population enervated and decimated by disease. Today we have a virile population which continues to get younger as time goes by.

I thought it might be appropriate to place before the Council an indication of the situation in terms of population, which we will face in the present decade. We are at the start of this new decade which is yet to be named—the sixties—and it is well that we should look at what we shall have to accomplish by the time we reach the next—the seventies. I asked the Registrar-General for some information, and he kindly gave me a statement which reads:

"The population of British Guiana, inclusive of Amerindians, was 540,700 as at 31st December, 1958.

A forecast reveals that in 1965 the population will be approximately 622,000 with 167,400 representing population of the school age group (5-14) years. Taking the average annual increase to be 21,000 and assuming that population growth continues to be as striking, in 1970 the population will reach 717,000 with a school age total of about 186,400".

Those figures seem to urge, to impress upon us the fact that we cannot afford to indulge in the pastime of wasting effort, money and time in matters that are of no consequence. In ten years our population will have increased by nearly half. In that same period our population of school age will merely have doubled. So that our virility today will be posing for us a grave problem in the next ten years. Whereas we now have places in schools for about 116,000

children, we shall have to provide by 1970 places for 186,400 children.

Therefore we must realize now, at the beginning of this decade, that what we do now, at the beginning, is going to determine how we will live when we reach its end.

A lot of time and effort, both inside and outside this Council, have been wasted in name-calling, and it seems to me at times that politicians, businessmen even, have not realized that in trying to destroy their political opponents they might destroy British Guiana, if they continue in this pursuit. Since it has crept again into the debates of this Council, I think I should like to set the record straight on the question of Communism in the political life of British Guiana.

Now, Sir, the first person to introduce Communism into the political life of British Guiana was Sir Alfred Sherlock who in his address to the shareholders in that year blamed the unrest in the Sugar Estates — which unrest led to the appointment of the Moyne Commission—on Communist agitators.

Since then, all heterodoxy or agitation has been 'Communist agitation', and as a corollary it happens that among the population, more particularly the peasantry and the working-class, to call a man a Communist is to write for him a certificate of the highest integrity; and similarly, to call him an anti-Communist is to imply the opposite.

So when we talk about Communist this or that, I do not know who we are trying to impress. If it is to try and impress the local electorate, the use of these epithets is just a waste of time.

I mention that in passing in the hope that we may be spared this ever-recurrent waste of time. Those who know the context of things in British Guiana will spare us this.

To revert to the figures which I placed before the Council, I think they

indicate the necessity for the highest degree of responsibility in all our adult citizens; those of us who have no children and those who have will have to face the 1970s in the terms that our population will dictate. And if those fortunate persons who enjoy the privileges of superannuation are to continue to enjoy them it seems to me that the greatest care must be taken in the management of the assets which we possess.

It is, I think, a very unhappy thing for this country that at the end of last year the leaders of that section of the trade union movement which is devoted to subordinate Government employees decided to press for a minimum wage of \$4.50 and even suggested that the general population should be taxed so that this demand should be met. I say it is an unhappy thing because in a country where the annual *per capita* income is just \$400, the suggestion that \$4.50 a day should be the minimum wage and should be met out of increased taxation tends to give the population the feeling that the civil servant or the Government employee, who enjoys security of employment above that of the average citizen, cares nothing at all about the citizens at large or for the general welfare of the country.

I would also like to mention that the employees of Government at the highest levels, that is to say, in the Civil Service, can do a great deal to help this country meet the challenges which face it in these coming years. Others have referred to the procedures employed by the Administration and they have mentioned the need to streamline methods and eliminate waste and the necessity to get the maximum benefit from money spent. Those are things which can only be done with relative ease if the members of the Civil Service and the so-called subordinates of the Government service were made to feel that they are part of the democratic process, whose beginnings I have noted tonight.

It was therefore with a great deal of pleasure that I read that the Minister of

[MR. HUBBARD]

Trade and Industry expressed his hope to see the methods of Joint Industrial Councils applied to the various Government Departments. I myself, when speaking last year, suggested that perhaps a beginning might be made with the Post Office Department. Nothing happened about it, but I hope that now we will get it. Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress that in view of what faces us, if we are to hold what we have and to go forward we must all act with the sense of responsibility which befits our period of history.

Reference has been made, here, to industrial development. I do not think that anyone disagrees with the need for industrial development, but I think that the slowness of our progress in that direction has got to be seen against our historical background. We are living in an age and country where endeavour has been necessarily restricted because of the needs of industry and the scarcity of population.

During the cotton famine which took place in England at the time of the American Civil War, cotton from British Guiana was of significance. Today, cotton is only produced here in the experimental fields of Government farms; and so with many other crops. But, as I say, we have passed that period of a shortage of labour and we have now come upon another period — the period of a super-abundance of labour. Nevertheless, we still have with us the attitudes of our past. Our people who possess capital means have, for a long time, been restricted to two fields—the field of commerce and the field of real estate. They have come to know these fields and they are chary about entering new fields. Industry, no doubt, carries with it some risk and they feel that their reward may not be as great as if they invest in a house or a shop.

It is true that incentives have been provided. Industrial capital is preferred to the extent that it is given five years

free of income tax, and certain other privileges are accorded today. But still, there are businessmen who insist that it is the duty of Government to pioneer the industrial field; to set up pilot factories to prove that enterprises are profit-making and then turn these factories over to private investors. Well, of course, Government's money is my money, it is your money; and if it is to be risked it must earn the reward for risk. It must not be forgotten that the philosophical justification for profit is that it is a reward for risk and enterprise. If, therefore, there is to be no risk; if there is to be no enterprise; then what is the justification for turning a profitable Government enterprise over to a private investor? So we have, as I said, a number of obstacles to surmount in this business of industrialization; and often people point to Jamaica and Trinidad and say they are getting factories, why can we not have? We have, but we have factories which, up to now, have been successful. If you will permit me to make a comparison, I will ask you: What happened to the Trinidad beer factory and what happened to our beer factory? Both are beer factories set up in rum-drinking countries. Trinidad has a bottling factory. It limped along. It made no money. It was losing money until a Guianese took over the Chairmanship and set it on its feet. Factories that fail hurt a country's economy.

I am very glad to know, from the speech of the hon. the Financial Secretary, that a number of incentives have been granted to new industries, and I do hope he will favour us with a list of the industries which have been rated worthy of tax concessions.

On the question of the Industrial Advisory Committee of which I am Deputy Chairman, I would like to say that the Committee submitted a number of recommendations to Government — actually, they were recommendations made to the Minister of Trade and Industry—and I understand that everyone of those recommendations was handed

to Mr. Kenneth Berrill, the Economist, who collaborated in the preparation of the current Development Programme, and a number of the recommendations of the Industrial Development Advisory Committee are contained in that Development Programme. For the most part, what remains to be settled are a number of recommendations of a fiscal nature which, I understand, the Government has considered but has not, so far, been able to accept. I would ask that an early statement be made on the fiscal recommendations put forward by the Industrial Development Advisory Committee.

Then, we naturally follow on to the question of education. In 1970, we will need to find 186,000 places in primary schools for our children, plus very much extended accommodation in secondary schools and universities. Education is a social service—a very costly social service, but a most necessary one. If we cannot educate our children, we cannot hope to go forward. That is the note on which I would like to end. The target for us is so to manage our affairs now, that in 10 years' time we can provide the 186,400 places in primary schools and the places in secondary schools and universities that will flow from that large school population.

In ending, I would like to ask Members, I would ask the public and I would ask all persons in authority to place the needs of this country above everything else and ensure that such efforts as we employ and such cash as we spend, shall be directed to a worthy purpose and help us to face the challenge which destiny has put before us. [*Pause.*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Anyone else desires to speak? The Financial Secretary is not here. I shall put the question. [*Pause.*]

*A Member rose —*

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon Members, I would like to say this at this stage: If Members desire to speak they should

make up their minds and do so promptly. I have had to rise over and over again. I do not know whether this is a game being played. As soon as I rise I hear a Member say he is going to speak. One of these days I shall put the question as soon as I am on my feet. Please do not let it happen again. If anybody desires to speak, now is the time; and if I rise I shall rise to put the question.

**Mr. Kendall:** The last speaker has appealed for tolerance, and I think his appeal was timely and heard by all. The Financial Secretary, in his attempt to give to this Council an honest appraisal of the economic position of this country, as seen through the eyes of one who is not so politically minded, has revealed how unimaginative his Government was in the preparation of a Budget that does not take into account the many problems confronting all sections of this country. I believe that this is one of the reasons why there has been an apparent lack of interest on the part of the general public, because this Budget Statement does not in any way reduce the frustration of the people or induce them to entertain any hopes that some of their ills may be remedied by a Government, the Members of which have always declared that if given the opportunity to manage the affairs of this country they would cure all ills.

The Financial Secretary is not in his seat but I must say that to some extent he should be complimented for his ability to ride over some of the rough spots in his Budget Statement so that its real impact upon the public may not be felt. He has admitted that this country cannot stand increased taxation, and although certain speakers on the other side have tried to imply that because of their interest in the country they have not proposed any increased taxation for 1960, from what is contained in the Budget Statement we see that because of the shortfall in revenue from those commodities which are always taxed, Government had no alternative but to present a Budget without increased taxation.

[MR. KENDALL]

In paragraph 15 of the Budget Statement, Government has admitted its inability to provide a Budget that will relieve the unemployment situation by creating facilities whereby people can be employed. We also see in that paragraph that whereas in 1959 Government told us that some of the taxes were protective, they have in fact turned out to be revenue earning. For example, it was suggested that the tax on potatoes would force the public to eat more cassava and plantains than they had done in previous years, because in carrying out its programme of agricultural expansion Government found that we were producing more than we could consume, and because of Government's inability to plan ahead we must be very careful how we spend money, time and energy in 1960.

Government has been unable to plan its economy, for while there is an incentive to increased production in the agricultural sector, its Produce Depot is losing money every day because of the thousands of pounds of produce which have to be dumped overboard. If Government can re-shape its policy and realize that in spite of the fact that this is an agricultural country there are other phases of its economy that must be looked after if we are to have a contented community.

There has been a great clamour for independence, and the last speaker indicated that very soon a delegation will be going to London to assist in framing a Constitution which will take us on the road towards nationhood. But in spite of that the Government, in its short-sightedness, has made no provision so that when nationhood is achieved our sons and daughters will be equipped to take their rightful places in the running of the new Guiana. Other Members have spoken of the short-sightedness of the Government in its educational policy in not making extra provision for the education of Guianese up to university level. From what I know of the elected Members of the Government, they have no

desire to educate the community to that stage where they could think for themselves at all times and in all circumstances.

I am very glad that the Official section of this Council can at this stage be so vehement in their protests, because I expect at all times that people who have come from a nation that has evolved over so many years and has a cultural and educational background which is respected all over the world, will, as part of a Government that is clamouring for independence, use their good offices in guiding so-called natives in a way that would equip them properly for the running of their own affairs. This 1960 Budget is an indication of a lack of interest on the part of some of those Officials who now decry the statement I made. I hope the time is not far distant when they will realize and appreciate that those of us who clamour for full internal self-government would like to know that we have at our side those persons who have guided our destinies over the years and are willing to put us safely on our road towards nationhood.

If I am wrong in saying that there is no provision for Guianese to be trained to take up important positions in the new nation, then I hope that when an opportunity is presented, the Official Section especially will tell this Council and the country that there is adequate provision for Guianese to take their positions in the new nation. I feel — and it has been the policy of all countries striving after nationhood — that years before they made their demand and fixed their date of independence they prepared their sons to fill important roles. In British Guiana the pattern is different. We are asking for independence in 1960 but we are unable to find men to fill important positions. [A Member: Shame!] Members on both sides of the Table are asking for independence or a greater share in the Government of British

Guiana in 1960, but the present Government has not the necessary machinery geared for independence. The last speaker spoke about the school population in another 10 years, but today there is not sufficient school accommodation for the present population. I do not know whether we should wait until 1970 to provide more school accommodation. No primary school has been built during 1959. I see the former Minister of Education looking at me. [Mr. Benn: Not true.] I would like him to state the number of new schools built in 1959, and where they were built. In its wisdom the Government has transferred the building of schools from the Education Department to the Public Works Department. I do not know whether the Minister of Communications and Works will tell this Council that the work of the Public Works Department was so heavy that it had no time to erect schools to prepare the future citizens of this country of whose progress this Government is so mindful.

There are other aspects of the Budget Statement which show how Government is thinking. At one time I sympathized with the Financial Secretary who, I felt, had to take orders from his elected Ministers, but at one moment we hear that the Government is being run by the Officials and that the elected Ministers have no voice. At another time one hears that nothing can be done unless it has the approval of the Elected Ministers. So that from now on, whatever happens in British Guiana, we will blame this "forced marriage" between the three Officials and the Elected Ministers of the Government. I know the supporters of the Government have tried to tell us that all is well and the "Opposition" is not right in criticizing the Government. I know they would like the "Opposition" to be quiet so that Government can carry on its business without criticism.

It is estimated that in 1960 there will be a surplus of \$3 million and that, the Government will probably suggest, will show, how well off we are. To me,

the situation is not as rosy as it looks, for we seem to be retrogressing economically and politically. The Member for Berbice River said that the object of Government is to put energies into the productive sector, so that in time more people can benefit from employment. That is a very nice statement, but for the last two and a half years since this Government has been in power unemployment has been increasing instead of decreasing. The Government has a duty to perform on behalf of all the people of British Guiana, and I think it is time they realize that they should turn their attention to the urban areas, with a view to providing more gainful employment.

One Member spoke of dual control—

**Mr. Speaker:** I have no recollection.

**Mr. Kendall:** It may not have been a Minister, but someone else.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think it was the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, and he did not speak on that subject proper, but referred to the history of it, how it started in 1858, it was something he said here last night for the first time.

**Mr. Kendall:** It is unfortunate that he was a bit parochial in his approach to something that affects not only the Methodist Body. But here we see \$1 million allocated—

**Mr. Speaker:** Do not start a debate on something that can be better debated on a substantiative motion, otherwise there would be no end to this debate on the Budget.

**Mr. Kendall:** Mr. Speaker, I thought that dual control was something that relates to the policy of the Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, and if you would like to continue until the end of the year, you can go on.

**Mr. Kendall:** I think the amount allocated by Government is inadequate. I think that the time they take to consider *who* shall build schools, the Government or the Denominational Bodies, they ought to get on with the business of building schools, because the shortage of school accommodation continues. For some reason or the other Government seems to have no desire to allow those people who assisted in giving education over the years to continue to give—

**Mr. Rai:** May I ask, through you, Sir, where the hon. Member has got that indication from? Did he get it—

**Mr. Kendall:** The policy of the Government was never put forward in this Council, but at Queen's College. I think we should give this debate some lustre.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think points should be made in the minimum of time. We should not try to lengthen out our discussion and launch out on side issues, because in that way this debate would take a considerable time.

**Mr. Kendall:** Mr. Speaker, when the debate on this Budget is finished, I think it will be clear that we did not waste time, and it might be the shortest in our history. I am very sorry that you do not want to hear me on dual control, which is a very important matter. This is the only forum where I have an opportunity to say what I think on certain issues. I have no desire to speak lengthily, but I would ask the Government to postpone their decision, or their desire, to have all primary schools controlled solely by them; I would also ask them to give all the necessary funds to the Denominational Bodies.

**Mr. Rai:** The Hon. Member's remarks are unfounded and incorrect, and I am now asking him to name any report which might justify his making such remarks.

**Mr. Kendall:** In my constituency, New Amsterdam, the hon. Minister of

Community Development and Education recently opened a new school provided solely by public funds — funds collected by people in New Amsterdam—and contributions perhaps from sympathizers outside, maybe the Minister himself contributed indirectly. While on his visit to New Amsterdam, his attention was directed to an old school nearly 100 years old and unfit for human habitation. I asked the Minister to give funds for the reconstruction of this old school. His reply was that he was prepared to establish a new school in New Amsterdam, but it would be a Government school; if he could be assured of that, then he would give the necessary orders. So it can be concluded from that that the policy of the Government is to build Government schools, and devote no time to Denominational schools in order that the latter would decline. That is what I was trying to establish.

**Mr. Speaker:** Well, you took a long time.

**Mr. Kendall:** These things take a long time when you have a vacillating Government.

One other point: in relation to Minor Industries. I notice my good hon. Friend, Mr. Hubbard, is not here, but I want to mention that he told me he was Chairman of a Committee concerned with the industrial advance of this country, and that Committee had already submitted a Report to Government. Now that Report has not been publicized, and perhaps it will not be, but I want to tell Government that when new industries are set up there should be a decentralization of the minor industries so that their impact can be felt in more Counties than one, in every place where the facilities are available for the establishment of these industries. There was a time when all these things were done in Demerara and people trekked from the other counties and came here to work. But, as you know, the Minister of Housing has ceased building houses and so there is no accommodation. If you want to keep the people in the country you must create

the means whereby they must be kept there; and I hope Government will address its mind to it. When that is done I think it will be the first outstanding achievement of the Government.

The hon. Member for Berbice River said that the present Government is unable to do anything outstanding because they have a lot of mess from the previous Government. Let me accept that as true as coming from a Member of the Government.

**The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn):** Telephone House!

**Mr. Kendall:** It is funny when these things are mentioned, but it is not mentioned that the Black Bush Polder and the Boerasirie have cost this country more than was anticipated. Maybe it is because they concern agriculture or are in constituencies which Ministers represent. All the projects and all the development schemes have increased in costs. Telephone House is in Georgetown and whatever increase there is, you have something to be proud of. It will last a long time and it will go down as being one of the most modern telephone exchanges in the Caribbean. I think it should be a credit to any thoughtful Government to have something like that to run. Cost is only considered when it suits certain people. When it does not suit them, cost has no value.

But Sir, getting serious, I think that this Budget Statement, with all due deference to my good Friend, is most disappointing and I can appreciate the disappointment of the public. I know whatever is done in 1960 would not, in any way, improve the labour situation. I really felt that this Government had an abiding interest in the common man and would see to it that whatever policy they advanced it will be a policy that would bring some measure of relief and would give him, at least, three square meals a day.

What do we find? We find that the hon. the Financial Secretary, in his Budget Speech, has indicated that even for

the \$2.75 per day which they had promised the ordinary workers from the 1st of April, 1959, no provision has been made in the 1960 Estimates. Instead of making provision, it is implied that in order to give the workers the \$2.75, some of their fellow workers will have to be retrenched. That is another phase of the Government's interest in the people. For the last 2½ years, in almost every department, instead of increasing the staff they are decreasing it. It happened at Carnegie, Housing and at the Post Office.

**The Attorney-General (Mr. Austin):** Efficiency!

**Mr. Kendall:** Efficiency is right, but it is known that even in the United Kingdom certain projects are introduced so that the people may live; and in British Guiana, the country without facilities for gainful employment in all sectors, for efficiency — efficiency which the Ministers cannot demonstrate properly — they are knocking off people in order to gain efficiency. I think I have said enough and I wish to thank you for your tolerance. I hope when we get into Committee Stage I will have a further opportunity to express my views.

**The Attorney-General:** It is always a pleasure to hear the hon. Member for New Amsterdam speak. It is in Budget time that, speaking in parliamentary terms, he seems to come to life. And were it not for the fact that one had to listen very carefully sometimes to find out whether or not his observations were accurate, one can sit back and be lulled by his attractive rich voice. What does he say about the progress of this country? He did not mention 'progress'. He said that the country has retrogressed steadily since this Government came into power. He has been supplied with a copy of the Estimates. Whether or not he has taken the trouble to read them, I do not know. But I think it is quite significant to observe that the revenue of the country since this Government has been in power has increased from some \$45 million in 1957 to \$51½ million in 1960.

**Mr. Kendall:** Everything has increased, even unemployment.

**The Attorney-General:** That is an increase of \$6½ million in less than three years. How he can say that the way in which this money is spent and the standard of living that is maintained by a large section of the community demonstrate that there is no progress, I cannot understand. In my view, the budget which has been presented in this Council is a realistic one. The Development Programme which goes hand in hand with it, and will do so for the next five budgets, shows that a significant step forward is being made, particularly this year with the beginning of the Development Programme which will enable the country to feel that when it marches forward constitutionally, it will do so on the firm foundation of economic progress.

Every country has its problems, even of solvency, and we all know that these problems continue even with the continued improvement of the standard of living of the inhabitants of the country. Problems cannot be solved overnight; and it is so easy to talk about the Government not doing anything to solve the unemployment problem, about Government being heedless about the need for education, about Government not carrying out the necessary services for the people—be they health services or drainage and irrigation services — and that all the Government wishes to do is to feather its own nest.

The hon. Member for New Amsterdam reiterated that familiar phrase — “the unhappy alliance between the Ministers and the Officials”. That presupposes that all of us are unhappy. Personally, I am not. I am extremely happy working with the Ministers and I know that my Colleagues are. We have, of course, our differences. If we did not, we probably should not be able to make such a contribution as we do, however

small it may be. But we respect them and I hope that they have a measure of respect for us.

One and all in the Government congratulate the hon. the Financial Secretary on this very masterful piece of work, and it is he, I am sure, who realizes more than anyone of us that figures do not mean anything in themselves. Those figures have to be translated into realities. And the people to do it are the Ministers and the Officials whilst they are here, and the Civil Servants; and I am quite sure that they do, and will continue to do their best. But no Government can function properly unless there is a live Opposition to keep it on its toes; and it is no good for the “Opposition” to become alive once a year and seek to earn their salt by making platitudes and discriminatory remarks.

**Mr. Kendall:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the remark made by the Attorney-General is parliamentary.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not unparliamentary. There was one word coming from one or both sides of the Table which is unparliamentary — the word “shame”.

**The Attorney-General:** The point I am trying to make is that the Government will only be able to make these figures a reality if, week by week, they are supported by constructive criticism by the “Opposition”. We want to hear about the shortcomings, the defects of this programme, and suggestions that one aspect or another is not being kept up to date. It is only when the “Opposition” asks questions, move Motions and speak on Motions for the Adjournment that this country, through this honourable Council, will live and become a vital economic force. But once a year you tell us —

**Mr. Davis:** I rise to a point of order! May I ask on which aspect of the Budget the hon. Attorney-General is speaking?

**The Attorney-General:** There is a vote for the Legislature in the Estimates, and it is under that item I am speaking. (*Laughter*). I do say that if we wish to make the most of this debate on the Development Programme we must have a live "Opposition" who must be prepared to oppose constructively. That is the duty of the Opposition, and no Government can function efficiently without the stimulus of constructive opposition. Therefore I would hope that the "Opposition" will maintain their vigorous attack throughout the year. They should ask questions and they will get, we hope, the right answers in good time. The sooner the "Opposition" accept their responsibilities in this respect, the sooner we shall go forward to the stage that we all —and I repeat the word "all"—desire, namely, of government of the people by the people for the people of British Guiana.

**Mr. Speaker** (*after a pause*): As there are no other speakers I shall —

**Mr. Burnham:** In spite of the fatherly lecture by the hon. the Attorney-General, in spite of his claim that this Budget is a realistic one, I must confess that it is a dull Budget, it is a gloomy picture. We miss even those flights of rhetoric which in past years we have associated with the Financial Secretary whose familiarity with the Classics of English literature so frequently obtruded itself. We miss his choice phrases, his sparkling humour and barbed wit. That he should have denuded himself of some of those qualities which had earned our admiration, I think is proof of the fact that he has been overcome by the gloomy picture which he sees, and the incompetency of which he is now part. It is true that there were some times in the course of his Budget Speech when he gave glimpses of his wonted sophistry when he attempted to "gild the lily" or to draw a veil over unpleasant facts. But his ability in that respect cannot blind us to the fact that because of the approaching elections this is a tax-free Budget, while the economic situation of British

Guiana still remains a dark and sultry one.

We pardon the Government and its financial spokesman for the late introduction of the Budget. There was no need for him to make an apology, for we have become accustomed to the Budget Statement being presented later and later every year. No doubt the time will come when, with a change of the financial year, what with the necessity of juggling with figures and hiding facts, the Budget Speech can be anticipated somewhere around the sixth month of the year to which it has reference.

We are grateful to the Financial Secretary for the comments and figures which he has produced on the second page of his Budget Speech which is nine pages shorter than that of last year. In the second paragraph on page 2 he relates that the provisional figure for the Gross Domestic Product at factor cost in 1957 was \$223 million. There was a shortfall in 1958 to \$208 million, representing a reversion to the 1956 figure, and as far as I can see, there is no possibility of the 1959 figures showing any rise. I reserve my comment on those figures at the moment, but mention that they are the first of a series of figures and facts which go to make a gloomy picture and a confession of failure.

It is the wont of the Financial Secretary year after year to leave himself an escape route by over-estimating Customs and Excise and under-estimating Income Tax. It is also his custom to repeat year after year that one cannot depend upon Government spending alone if there is to be a rise in the standard of living and an increase in the domestic product, and also an increase in capital accumulation. He said that in 1959, he said that in 1958, and he says it again in 1960, and one finds it difficult to escape the impression that, like his colleagues, he indulges in "wordiness". He can bring no proof of any improvement in the economic conditions and circumstances of the people of British Guiana.

[MR. BURNHAM]

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal more to say, and my watch says 10.05 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is not the clock. I shall tell you when it is ten o'clock.

**Mr. Burnham:** Even on a question of time Your Honour's ruling is final, but may I respectfully point out that if you are placing any reliance upon the timepiece across the road (the Stabroek Market clock) I am in a position to tell you it is not noted for its reliability.

**Mr. Speaker:** I never take the time from any clock outside this Chamber, and in the absence of the one up there my watch is my guide.

**Mr. Burnham:** Very well, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious when one surveys the situation as it is, that what is lacking is a proper overall plan. We hear a great deal of the tremendous amount of money being spent on drainage and irrigation and for clearing areas which were under bush, for the planting of rice. We hear

that some money is being spent for minor industries. We hear that \$820,000 will be spent for Education, but when one wants to fit all these things together into a pattern one cannot see a thread that can possibly hold them together. The Members of the Government have travelled far, to places like Puerto Rico, Jamaica and closer to Surinam. I would have thought that what struck economists of repute in all three of these countries to which I have referred would have struck them too, and that is, that planning is and ought to be taken seriously. Not only is there a planning unit attached to several large sectors of development, but there is an over-all planning unit, which co-ordinates the planning units of the various sectors.

No doubt at this time, Mr. Speaker, you may wish to adjourn.

**Mr. Speaker:** This Council is now adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon. It is proposed to suspend the sitting of that meeting at five o'clock and resume at eight o'clock at night.