

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, 17th November, 1938.

The Council met at 10.30 a.m. pursuant to adjournment, His Excellency the Governor, SIR WILFRID JACKSON, K.C.M.G., President, in the Chair.

PRESENT.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. G. D. Owen, C.M.G.

The Hon. the Attorney-General (Acting), Mr. S. E. Gomes.

The Hon. F. Dias, O.B.E. (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. E. A. Luckhoo, O.B.E., (Eastern Berbice).

The Hon. E. G. Woolford, K.C., (New Amsterdam).

The Hon. E. F. McDavid, M.B.E., Colonial Treasurer.

The Hon. F. J. Seaford, O.B.E., (Georgetown North).

The Hon. M. B. G. Austin, O.B.E., (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. N. M. Maclennan, Director of Medical Services.

The Hon. M. B. Laing, Commissioner of Labour and Local Government.

The Hon. G. O. Case, Director of Public Works and Sea Defences.

The Hon. H. P. Christiani, M.B.E., Commissioner of Lands and Mines.

The Hon. F. O. Richards, Comptroller of Customs (Acting).

The Hon. L. G. Crease, Director of Education (Acting).

The Hon. Percy C. Wight, O.B.E., (Georgetown Central).

The Hon. J. Eleazar (Berbice River).

The Hon. J. I. De Aguiar (Central Demerara).

The Hon. Peer Bacchus, (Western Berbice).

The Hon. E. M. Walcott (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. H. C. Humphrys, K.C., (Eastern Demerara).

The Hon. C. R. Jacob (North Western District).

The Hon. A. G. King (Demerara River).

The Hon. J. W. Jackson (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. F. A. Mackey (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. C. V. Wight (Western Essequibo).

MINUTES.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 16th November, as printed and circulated, were confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT.**PRESIDENT EXPLAINS ABSENCE.**

THE PRESIDENT: I must express my regret to the Council that I was unable to be present during the debate yesterday afternoon. I was called away on business of extreme urgency and very great Imperial importance. I considered the possibility of adjourning the Council but I know that the session makes very great demands on the time of members and I was unwilling to put them to any further inconvenience unless it was absolutely unavoidable.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

RICE CULTIVATION IN ESSEQUEBO RIVER.

Mr. JACOB, on behalf of Mr. LEE, asked the following questions :—

1. Will Government state what is the acreage under cultivation in Division 12 Essequibo River in—(a) padi (b) accounts (c) other agricultural products?
State value for the years 1935, 1936, 1937 respectively, and the estimated value for 1938?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. G. D. Owen) replied as follows :—

1. The approximate acreages are given hereunder. The information for 1938 is not available

(a) PADI—ACREAGE REAPED—1935-1937.

District.	1935		1936		1937	
	Acre.	Estimated value of Padi.	Acre.	Estimated value of Padi.	Acre.	Estimated value of Padi.
Wakenaam	4,656	84,404	4,662	82,161	5,054	116,574
Leguan	3,172	59,364	3,419	60,317	4,223	95,229
Essequibo Coast excluding (Pomeroon)	10,054	152,611	10,529	140,399	8,860	136,559
Tiger Island	427	7,282

(b) COCONUT ACREAGE—1935-1937.

District.	1935		1936		Acre.	Estimated value of crop—\$
	Acre.	Estimated value of crop—\$	Acre.	Estimated value of crop—\$		
Wakenaam	1,286	12,978	1,195	12,575	1,297	18,469
Leguan	141	1,480	141	1,486	141	2,007
Hog Island	1	10.54	1½	21.36
Essequibo Coast (excluding Pomeroon)	1,960	2,940	2,376	25,043	2,081	29,633
Tiger Island	325	4,623

(c) OTHER AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

District.	1935 acres.	1936 acres.	1937 acres.
Wakenaam	475	488	549
Leguan	181	181	197
Hog Island	556	613	629
Essequibo Coast (excluding Pomeroon)	397	171	353
Karabaroo and Jackie Island	92

It is not possible to state the values of products at (c).

2. What was the amount of rice produced in the islands of Leguan and Wakenaam for the aforementioned years and the value thereof?

2. The amount of padi (in bags) produced from the area reaped and the values are as given in the following table. The values are as given in the replies to Question 1.

District.	1935 bags.	Value	1936 bags.	Value \$	1937 bags.	Value \$
Wakenaam	81,158	84,404	86,486	82,161	94,776	116,574
Leguan	57,081	59,364	63,492	60,317	77,422	95,229
Essequibo Coast (excluding Pomeroon).	146,771	152,641	147,789	140,399	111,024	136,559
Tiger Island	5,929	7,292

BUDGET DEBATE.

The Council resumed the debate on the following motion:—

That, this Council approves of the Estimates of Expenditure to be defrayed from Revenue during the year ending 31st December, 1939, which have been laid on the table.

Mr. HUMPHRYS (resuming): I had almost concluded my remarks yesterday afternoon when the Council adjourned. I was then dealing with certain statements which had been made by the hon. member for North Western District (Mr. Jacob). I have no intention whatever to in any way repeat myself, but I do wish to say that the hon. member for North Western District indicated clearly in referring to the Governor's Speech, that one of the reasons why there was unrest on sugar estates was because of the eviction of tenants at will from certain of the estates. That is a misstatement which I hope the hon. member will have the grace to withdraw. That is not a fact. Any evictions that took place occurred as a result of trouble that arose on the estates through strikes and other disorderliness. I repeat that the hon. member would do well as a citizen if he would make it known to those with whom he comes into contact that a sugar estate is the same as any other private property, and if a man owns private property and his tenants at will he has the same right as any owner of private property in a town, village or anywhere else. If the hon. member would make it clear that if those tenants at will prove themselves disorderly or undesirable it is within the right of the proprietors of those estates to evict them according to law. What is more, the hon. member would do well to inform those persons that in accordance with our common law it is not even necessary for owners of private property, after giving notice to a tenant to quit, to take proceedings before a Magistrate or the Supreme Court. They have the right to re-enter and take possession after the notice has expired, and I think if a landlord has given notice to quit because of the expense of going to the Supreme Court or to the Magistrate's Court to regain possession, he has acted well in accordance with his rights as a citizen and because he is endeavouring to avoid any trouble whatever, and it is the duty of every citizen of this Colony to endeavour to co-operate

with each other and not to try to make strife and mischief. I want the hon. member to understand clearly that the law of this Colony is the same as the law of England in this respect, and has been the same for over 100 years. No change has been effected in the law here which is different from the law of England, or which is not exactly the same as in every British dominion and colony. The hon. member would be doing good if he would let those people know their duty, obligations and liabilities to the proprietors of the estates on which they reside. I have no wish to detain the Council further on this matter, and I hope for the good of all concerned the hon. member, if he thinks fit, would verify from any lawyer all I have stated, and endeavour in future to lead those with whom he comes into contact in the straight path, instead of endeavouring, by any remarks he makes in this Council, to suggest that the law is otherwise than it is.

Mr. JACOB: I crave your indulgence, sir, to make a short reply to what has fallen from the hon. member who has just taken his seat.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member has already spoken on this debate. He is only at liberty to speak on a point of correction or personal explanation, or to remove misunderstanding.

Mr. JACOB: That is so, sir. I am sorry that my friend, who is a lawyer, has been endeavouring to mislead this Council. What I said yesterday was this: that section 3 of Ordinance 6 of 1937 was amended to read:—

"Section thirty-one of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by the deletion of the words "and with force" occurring in the first line thereof."

That deletion, I said yesterday, was responsible, in a measure, for some of the disturbances we had here. I said further that by the amendment of section 15 of Chapter 92 the words "or at will" were added to that Ordinance, and that gave certain people the right to apply to Magistrates for eviction of tenants on sugar estates and other estates. If those words had not been added the proprietors would have had to go to the Supreme Court, which would have given tenants an opportunity to find other suitable places. It is a fact known to Your Excellency and to

all in this Council, that persons who have been evicted from sugar estates have not been given sufficient notice.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must confine himself to the removal of any misunderstanding.

Mr. JACOB: That I am endeavouring to do. Certain members of this Council do believe that if the law had not been amended the tenants would have had an opportunity to secure other places in time rather than remove from the estates within a week or two, and when it is considered that those tenants have not other places to go to—

THE PRESIDENT: I must remind the hon. member that he must confine himself to removing any misunderstanding. He must not enter again into the debate.

Mr. JACOB: I maintain that what the hon. member for Eastern Demerara (Mr. Humphrys) said is not a fact.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member does not seem to realise that this is a debate. If he has been misrepresented he is perfectly at liberty to remove any misrepresentation, but having already spoken he is not at liberty to enter into further debate or make another speech.

Mr. JACOB: I am trying to correct another misstatement by the hon. member. He said that all the laws of the Colony are in accordance with the English laws. Yesterday I referred to draft Bill No. 101.

Mr. HUMPHRYS: I never said that all the laws of the Colony are in accordance with the English laws. I said the law of landlord and tenant at will was in accordance with the English law.

THE PRESIDENT: Has the hon. member finished his explanation?

Mr. JACOB: I never anticipated that reference would have been made to this matter, or I would have brought my references to show that that is not exactly so.

Mr. SEAFORD: This debate has taken rather longer than was anticipated or hoped for, but I feel I cannot allow the occasion to pass without saying a few words. I have almost been dragged into this debate

against my will. Commenting on the Speech made by the Chair at the opening of the session one hon member said that it had not given the people of the Colony very much hope for the future. Another member shortly after said he considered it a very businesslike Address. With that view I am in entire agreement. It is no good putting forward to this Council and to the people of the Colony views which, although they may appear to be brilliant, are not a true exposition of the position. It is much better that we should be told exactly what we have to face in the future. What has happened in the past some of us think we know already, but we have to realise our financial position and we have to face it, and it is much better that the exact position be put before us rather than that we should be led into fields of conjecture. One hon. member said we ought to reduce our expenditure because he was terrified as to what was going to happen in the future. I am also a little nervous when I look into the future, but I cannot agree that the right method to pursue in trying to balance our budget is by curtailing expenditure. Would it be correct at the present time to curtail our expenditure on social services for instance? I do not think any member would agree to that. Would it also be right for us to curtail expenditure on the Civil Service? Again I do not think any member would agree to that. I feel that we require in this Colony not men, as in other parts of the world, but supermen to pull this Colony out of the rut. If we are to balance our budget we must make every effort we possibly can to increase our production. Our sugar industry is rather cramped; we are not allowed to expand at present. We have been told that we have to curtail our output for five years. There is no harm, and I feel sure Government will agree that the more we ram it down the throats of the Imperial Government and the Royal Commissioners who are coming here, that it is essential for us to increase our exports, and that our major export for the present and for some time to come is bound to be sugar, the more are we likely to be allowed an increase in our production. I am not only looking at today, but to the future. As regards our production, I hope and anticipate that the scheme which a Committee is now reporting on with regard to Essequibo will bear fruit. I feel almost convinced that it will,

and if it does and it is extended through out the Colony the rice industry will be on a very much sounder footing than it is to-day.

As regards our other exports, timber and minerals, I am not quite so optimistic, but I see in the near future a much wider and happier outlook as regards bauxite. We know that people are coming to explore, and we know what the industry has already done for this Colony. It was a matter of very great surprise and regret when a member of this Council—and members of the Council are supposed to have a certain amount of acumen and are supposed to be responsible for what they say—suggested that the time was ripe when the Bauxite Co. might pay double or treble the tax it is paying to-day. It seemed an extraordinary suggestion when that same member earlier in his speech said that we want development. Almost in the next breath he said that development must be stopped by taxation. The hon. member has been told already by the hon. member for Demerara River (Mr. King) in no mincing manner what his opinion was of the hon. member's remarks, and I would like to say that I agree with every word that hon. member said. We all know what wonderful work that company has done here. We also know that for many years it has carried on a bare existence, not knowing whether it would have to close down, and now things are looking up slightly we hear a cry to increase its taxation. When I was in England two or three years ago, and before that, I tried to get capital interested in this Colony. I was told by all "No, never. As soon as we come out and put money into the country we know that we are going to be taxed out of existence!" That has been the curse of the Colony for many years, and I hope it will be realised. I know that it is realised by every member of this Council and I hope it will be realised by everyone outside the Council, that that is not the wish of this Government or of this Council. The mere suggestion of such a thing seems to me to be criminal folly.

I must refer to one or two other points made by the hon. member. He referred to what he termed the minimum price fixed for sugar locally, and it was pointed out to him by the Colonial Treasurer that it was a maximum price. From his whole

argument on that point he did not seem to realise the difference between a maximum and a minimum price. He suggested that Government should remove it altogether. If you remove a maximum price, what is the natural result? The hon. member suggested that the rice industry should have the same facilities—that it should also have a maximum price fixed by Government. I wonder if that is really what he meant?

Mr. JACOB: I never suggested that. What I suggested was that the Excise duty on sugar should be removed.

Mr. SEAFORD: I admit that the hon. member said that, but he said that sugar was the only thing protected here and nursed by Government. He did not say, however, that the rice industry gets the same protection. As regards the Excise duty on sugar I notice the hon. member took very great care when he pointed out what the price was in this Colony as compared with the price in London, although he knows the figures very well. He did not let the public know that other British possessions are paying infinitely more than the people of this Colony for their sugar. In Australia they are paying 12 cents per lb., Natal about 9 cents. He also omitted to mention that the sugar producers in this Colony pay a direct tax of 90 cents per 100 lbs., and that this is the only Colony in the West Indies and in the British Empire where that is done, so far as I know. I do not suggest that the hon. member was trying to mislead the Council, but I do hope he will be more careful and explain in detail what he means.

There is one point I must take strong exception to, and that is the statement made by the hon. member that one of the causes of the trouble on sugar estates was the reduction of wages. I challenge that member to state one instance where that has been the cause of any trouble whatsoever. Is the hon. member honest when he makes a statement like that? Is he trying to mislead this Council on that point? The hon. member in his speech yesterday frequently used the word "we." When pressed he said that he referred to the Man Power Citizen's Association. Has he come here to advertise himself and the Man Power Association? He has forgotten that he has taken an oath here,

and that his duty is to the Colony as a whole. I feel that I have taken up enough time. Two days have been spent on this debate, and when we boil it down what have we got out of it? My answer is precisely "nil." We waste not only our own time but Government's time by asking a series of questions which have absolutely no bearing on anything at all, and which can be of no interest to anybody except to be used for attacking somebody. I appeal to members to have a little bit more consideration when they ask those numerous questions. I do not think they appreciate what trouble Government officers are put to in supplying answers to questions which, in the majority of cases, have no object whatever. In the majority of cases the information asked for can be got from the Blue Book and departmental reports. I will only give one example to show that the hon. member apparently never reads those reports. The hon. member referring to the reduction in the Customs revenue anticipated for next year as compared with the actual revenue collected last year, said that it showed that the spending power of the people had been reduced. If the hon. member had read the Report of the Colonial Treasurer he would have seen that that is not the case. He would have seen that the very large increase in 1937 was due to the fact that there was a war scare on and Water Street firms overstocked considerably, and also because it was Coronation year in which very large stocks were imported. It has nothing to do with the spending power of the people. I appeal to members to try to save as much time as we possibly can. We are all busy people here, except one or two of us, and we also cannot afford to waste the time of the Government members.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: In view of the admirable manner in which the reply to Your Excellency's Speech has been dealt with by hon. members who have spoken, and the fact that I have only been a member of this Council for the short period of 48 hours, I do not propose to be long in my remarks. I would like, however, to take this opportunity to associate myself with the congratulatory remarks made by the hon. members who have spoken, and to add to those remarks the thanks of the people of Essequibo for the recognition by Government of the need for funda-

mental economic reconstruction and the urgency of that need. There are one or two matters upon which I shall touch very briefly, affecting the people of the district which I have the honour to represent in this Council. The first is the coffee industry which affects to a large extent the population of the Pomeroon River. I observe from Your Excellency's Speech that the industry will receive some measure of assistance, and I hope the Secretary of State will not be long in replying to the Government. If the measure of assistance proposed by the Committee which sat is not exactly in accordance with the views of the Secretary of State I hope that he will by analogy subsidise the industry as was done in the United Kingdom in the case of the beet industry.

The second matter is with regard to the Stock Farm at La Belle Alliance. My friend the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar) referred to the name. I hope that he will at some stage consider a change of that name to the Triple Alliance, to show the maximum effort by which the Counties of Demerara, Berbice and Essequibo have produced a stock-raising industry in this Colony.

The rice industry is also one which affects the whole Essequibo Coast. It is pleasing to note that in the recommendations of Mr. Parker, who came here to make enquiries into the industry, there is a proposal for a central rice factory which he thinks will benefit the industry and the community by securing a stable price for padi. There is no doubt that one of the causes of unrest in the industry is the fact that millers give various weights and prices for rice and padi, the weight varying from 155 to 165 lbs. per bag. I think if a fixed weight is recommended in the proposals by Mr. Parker the present unrest in the industry will be allayed.

With regard to improved communication, to which reference was made in Your Excellency's Speech, I trust that Government will in the very near future improve the transport facilities of the Coast and in the Pomeroon river, and more especially improve the telephonic communication on the Essequibo Coast. The Suddie Post Office has been renovated, and we hope that the telegraph cables will shortly be renovated.

For the constructional works which have been undertaken in Essequibo I have to thank Government on behalf of the people of that district, especially with regard to the reconstruction of the Suddie Hospital and the Matron's quarters. I also observe the vote for the reconstruction of the roads of the Colony. I hope that the Director of Public Works will not allow his energy, which is enormous, to be confined entirely to the other coasts of the Colony and forget the Essequibo Coast.

In conclusion I observe that Your Excellency stated that the ultimate result of any external assistance given to this community will depend entirely on the enterprise, energy and patient determination of the inhabitants of the Colony. I hope that when those results have been achieved it will not be said that there has been a lack of enterprise, energy and patient determination on the part of the inhabitants of this Colony. (Hear, hear).

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There were one or two questions raised during the debate with which I should like to deal. The hon. member for North Western District asked one or two questions with regard to revenue. I would refer him to the Colonial Treasurer's memorandum on the Estimates printed in connection with the Explanatory Memorandum. The hon. member referred to the Bill of Entry tax being about \$30,000 less than in 1937. The reason is that 1937 was an exceptionally good year for trade, and the Bill of Entry tax is affected by the import duties paid. The hon. member also referred to the stamp duties. He pointed out that in 1937 the revenue from this source was \$39,000 while next year it was only estimated to be \$25,000. That item should be read in conjunction with item 1, Head IV., Court fees. The hon. member pointed out that the estimate of revenue from this item had been increased by about \$15,000. The reason for the reduction of one and the increase of the other is due to the fact that fees are now collected in cash and not by stamps affixed to the documents. The hon. member also referred to the reduction in the Acreage Tax. That of course is due to the smaller area under cultivation as a result of the sugar quota and one or two small estates going out of cultivation.

The hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar) asked whether His Excellency proposed to ask the Legislative Council to prepare a memorandum for submission to the Royal Commission. I cannot find any instance in which the Legislature has prepared a memorandum for a Commission, but I think it is possible that the unofficial members of the Legislature have prepared a memorandum, although I cannot find even a precedent for that.

ESTIMATES, 1939.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and proceeded to consider the Estimates of Expenditure to be defrayed from Revenue during the year ending 31st December, 1939.

GOVERNOR.

Mr. ELEAZAR: If I had the power I would move that the first item (The Governor, \$19,200) under this head be increased, but as I have not the power I have to be content to allow it to remain as it is. After that I would at once take the opportunity to remind Your Excellency that when I addressed the Council in reply to your Speech I particularly said that there were certain items which could be better dealt with under their respective heads than in the general reply to your Speech. On this occasion I think the time is opportune for me to make some remarks. In doing so I must find a text, and I wish to refer to a passage in Your Excellency's Speech in which you state:—

“These suggestions deal primarily with the Coastal areas. That does not mean that the possibilities of more effective utilisation of the resources of the interior are being relegated to a second place. The importance to the general economy of the country of the fuller development of its forest and mineral wealth cannot be overestimated but the line of approach to the solution of the problems connected with this development is likely to be more gradual and to call rather for long range methods. As Honourable members are aware a committee was appointed in July last on the motion of the Honourable J. Eleazar to inquire and advise as to the measures which might be taken to expedite the development of the interior and we await with interest the recommendations of that body.”

I am never very diffident to express my views at any time, except in the presence

of ladies and when I have to refer to myself, but I am compelled, before I go very much farther, to refer to myself in passing. The Hon. Mr. Austin and the hon. member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford) will remember that during the last three or four weeks we have met regularly on Saturday mornings.

Mr. AUSTIN : Ten weeks.

Mr. ELEAZAR : Thanks for the correction. On nearly everyone of those occasions I had need to say to my colleagues on that Committee: "Where there is no vision the people perish." Great was my surprise when I listened to the address broadcast from the Cathedral, to hear the learned divine take those words for his subject. Those words apply very aptly to the state of affairs in this country for years and up to the present. There is very little vision, and so the people perish. The motto of this country is "Damus Pettimusque Vicissim" which means "We give and we take in return." To be told by the hon. member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford) that we require supermen for this Colony to progress is an astounding remark to make. It would frighten Your Excellency from attempting something big. What we need here is to preserve all we have and expand. That is what was not done by your predecessors. Some of them attempted but one was prevented by death, another by being recalled, and others by getting promotion. That is how we have lagged behind all these years. We have gone on like the man with the muck rake in the "Pilgrims' Progress", who was so bent on the work he was doing that he would not look up and see the crown. In order to be able to understand why we have not progressed it is necessary to remind you that the original people who came to this country did not come as colonizers or settlers; they came purely as capitalists, exploiters of the wealth of the country for their personal benefit. They had no interest in the development of the country. Government therefore had to formulate its policy to suit those conditions—to conserve and assist the capitalists to make money, and collect taxes in order to carry on the Administration. That continued until the Emancipation, when new condition arose. The emancipated people had other interests—to

develop the country for themselves and their posterity. Government, however, never changed its policy, and therefore every attempt that has been made to develop the country has found itself in direct conflict with Government. It is so until this moment. Government kept on its policy of conservation and everything else became diametrically opposed to the policy of Government.

The Colony needs a Governor of your calibre. We must conserve our coastlands and make an effort to expand. That is where the vision comes in. If we could only visualise another Georgetown and another Buxton say 50 miles from Georgetown, and another Plaisance some distance away we would then begin to realise that we are truly living in a Magnificent Province. That is what I am inviting you to do, sir. That is a part for a Governor alone. He is the captain of this barque and we look to him to steer the barque into harbour. Only 10 years ago the Secretary of State sent out a Commission to enquire into the causes which have hitherto retarded the progress of the Colony. After 90 years of British occupation the Colony was not making progress and a Commission was sent out to find out the causes. The causes were and are to-day the conservation by Government of vested interests without an attempt to improve and expand. That is the reason why this country has not progressed. Having realised that we must improve our coastlands I am asking Your Excellency to cast your vision. They are offering us 500,000 Jews. Bring them; we have a plenty of land here.

On the Committee of which I have the honour to be a member, I asked every member "What do you think of the interior as regards agricultural development?" Every member of the official section said "No." On Saturday last Mr. Orella came to give evidence. He has lived in the interior during the last 16 years, if not longer, and the whole Committee was astounded at his answers. It was put to him "Do you think the interior can support a large population?" He said "Yes." The Chairman was astounded. "Can things grow there," he asked. Mr. Orella replied "Everything you can grow on the coastlands you can grow there much better." For example he said that

the cashew grows like grass there. He was then asked if coconut trees would thrive there and he repeated that anything would grow there. He then began to enumerate several things which were grown. He was then asked if those things would grow in the savannahs "No," he said, "but very near to the savannahs there are tremendous forests where we plant." The experts went to the savannahs to find nothing because they wanted to report nothing. The reason why I have pointed these things out is because of the fear which the hon. member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford) has attempted to cause you by his suggestion that the Colony needs a superman. It wants a man of vision. If you can get that vision the country is made, but until that is done we will be knocking our heads for the next 100 years. I defy any member to show anything attempted to develop the country that did not come into conflict with Government policy. We have an Ordinance which compels applicants for Crown lands to pay \$10 per acre. At that time abandoned estates were selling for \$2 per acre. Besides that one must have 100 acres at least, plus surveying and other fees. If that was not deliberately calculated to retard any progress in the interior I do not know what is.

We have not had a more brilliant opportunity than now that we expect a Royal Commission. I am pointing out what in my view is the function of the Governor. If we remain on the coastlands Your Excellency cannot fare any better than your predecessors. So long as we continue to call the coastlands British Guiana and confine all our energies and time to the coastlands what better fate do you expect than that which befell so many of your predecessors? The time is now when the Commissioners are coming. A larger Commission I have never heard of—15 members on one Commission. It shows that the West Indies and British Guiana are serious about development, and especially British Guiana, the largest of the group, the most sparsely populated and the most retrograde. There is unemployment in a half-populated country, and the unemployed becoming unemployable. I should certainly like to ask Government to address its mind to the opening up of the interior. I can see a vision of the interior accommodating many more than 500,000 Jews.

Item (b)—2 Class III clerks, \$1,698.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this item be amended to read "1 Class III clerk, \$618.

Item as amended put, and agreed to.

Mr. JACOB: I wanted to endorse all that has been said by the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar) and express the hope that we will have real progress. I share the view that we must have vision. We have not got to "water down" all our moral and other principles. We have to do what will benefit the inhabitants of the Colony. What we want is foresight and a determination to succeed. I think that in Your Excellency's Speech we have that foresight, and I can only plead that we should work together and achieve that progress.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move item *f* be re-lettered *g* and a new item *f* be inserted to read "Typist-Clerk (\$450 by \$30 to \$600), \$450."

Item put, and agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that I find it quite beyond me to reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar) without much longer thought than I can give them. It appears that the Governor of the Colony has the rather awe-inspiring alternative of being either a superman or a visionary. I can only say that I hope that the vision may come perhaps from the hon. member himself as he now has a very great opportunity in the review which he has wisely undertaken of the prospects of the opening of the interior, to lay before us and before the Commission which is coming, practical proposals to fulfil some of the visions which he so rightly cherishes. I am not being ironical when I say that I do look forward with great interest to the recommendations and the proposals of the Committee which he has inspired. I hope he will continue to be an inspirationist.

AGRICULTURE.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I cannot allow this head to pass although the Director is not here. I want to be serious this time (laughter). My friend laughs, but he must not laugh too soon. I am serious this

time with the Government and this Department.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why this time?

Mr. ELEAZAR: Yes, whatever I have said in the past I have only played with them. They are trifling with money—\$120,000 to produce only sugar and rice. That is what we are told every year. It is a monstrosity. In view of the coming of the Royal Commission and in view of what I said earlier about Mr. Orella's positive statement—and I am told he is one of hundreds of men who go into the interior—I am wondering whether the Department cannot be induced to make a survey of the agricultural possibilities of the hinterland in order to get something authentic. I see an item here for an economic survey. I wonder whether it should not be a survey of the hinterland, even if we have to increase the amount. A few years ago we had a very extensive survey made of the coastlands by the late Mr. Mullin and the Deputy Director of Agriculture. Might we not go further afield in view of all that is transpiring in the world? I do not know who caught the vision and suggested sending 500,000 Jews with millions behind them, but we should do everything we can to get the vision Mr. Orella tells us of. He lives in the interior, and as far as I know he intends to die there. If the survey proposed is to be carried out in the interior I think it will require more money. Government should enquire into the possibilities of the suggestion I have made.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The item was inserted in the current year's Estimate and the Council was informed that it commenced a 3-year programme. Judging by the amount provided I should not think that it deals with the interior.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with the interior. I am sorry the Director is not here, but I think it is in connection with the economic survey being made on the Demerara River, an experiment with an economic farm unit. I would not like to be positive about that, but the survey which the hon. member has in mind would be very much larger, and I would ask him to leave the matter over so far as the Estimates are concerned. It is quite possible that such a survey may be

made at some time. It would be impracticable to insert a sum of money on the Estimates without working out a plan fully.

Item (15)—Class I clerk, \$1,812.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this item be increased to \$1,896 in order to provide a full increment for the officer. I also move that item (16)—2 Class II. clerks, \$3,702 be increased to \$3,168. It is one of the new posts referred to at a previous meeting, and Service Allowances to those officers should have been included. I also move that item (17)—2 Class III. clerks, \$1,440 be amended to read "1 Class III. clerk, \$792."

Items as amended put, and agreed to.

Item (20) 2 Typist-Clerks—1 at \$450 to \$500 by \$30; 1 at \$288 to \$480 by \$24—\$900.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this item be amended to read "3 Typist-Clerks—1 at \$450 to \$600 by \$30; 2 at \$288 to \$480 by \$24—\$1,340. It is merely a transfer of a Class II. clerk to another Department and bringing in a typist-clerk.

Item as amended put, and agreed to.

COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

Item 6—Purchase of a typewriter, \$120.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I wish to withdraw unconditionally the remarks I made at a previous meeting with regard to the use of typewriters.

CUSTOMS.

Item 0—Crews, \$3,501.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this item be increased to \$3,717. This and a few other amendments I will make later, is in connection with paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Bain Gray Report in which certain revised scales of salaries were suggested for mechanics, artisans and tradesmen employed monthly in the several Departments. This is to enable certain members of the crews to receive slightly increased rates of wages.

Item as amended put, and agreed to.

EDUCATION.

Mr. ELEAZAR: This is a hardy annual. Although a Committee has been enquiring into the system of primary education, and I have the honour to be a member of that Committee, we have not yet got the Committee's report, I always have a very great fear, in some respects at least, when a Committee is appointed. Perhaps it is fate, but there seems to be some evil genius moving which prevents us from achieving anything except what certain people desire to have done. Very often the evil remains. I do not know whether that will happen in this case, because the Committee's report has not yet been submitted. I do not wish to tell tales out of school, but you must have observed that I only attended one meeting of the Select Committee which considered the Estimates, and on that occasion I met a very vigorous debate going on. Every member was up in arms against a certain proposition. After the meeting I observed in the newspapers a suggestion that married women should not be engaged in school teaching. When that matter came up before the Education Committee I protested strongly. My view is that they should be allowed to teach so long as the managers of the schools will engage them. Government might see the wisdom in certain natural circumstances, of giving a woman teacher a small gratuity and retiring her. Some members of the Committee were very violent because they pointed out that there are married women in the Civil Service. Complaints have been made to me that married women were allowed to remain in the Civil Service when single women wanted work. My reply was that Government was not supposed to find work for anybody. I get out of it in that way. (laughter). When a specific qualification required for a special job the exigencies of the Service must be considered. If Government had been following that principle there would be no cause for complaint. For example, a hospital nurse has to undergo special training and to pass three examinations, but the moment she marries she is sent off. That is a specialised job. There is too much of this fish-and-fowl policy, and no clear and distinct line drawn. Naturally, under such conditions people become dissatisfied and say all kinds of things against the Government.

I hope when we reach the item in connection with the Agricultural Bias scheme the Director will ask Government to delete it. It is a waste of the children's time during their school age. Government is fighting shy of establishing farm schools by trying to dove-tail this Agricultural Bias scheme in the short period of school life. It would be better to have one proper farm school and extend it gradually than to mislead the people about agricultural bias. I hope the Director will either defend it or plead guilty and have the item withdrawn.

Mr. JACOB: I suggest for the consideration of Government an increase of items *h* and *l* which provide for Attendance Officers. There is no doubt that the attendance in the primary schools is very unsatisfactory. There are large numbers of children of school-going age not attending school through a variety of causes. I think if there were a few more Attendance Officers there would be better attendance in the schools, and it would be the means of our not spending so much money on the Police Force. Recently we have had to strengthen the Police Force, and I think that was due to the very small expenditure on education. The Education Committee may report on it, but I share the view of the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar) that in some cases committees do not recommend what is required. On the whole I do not think it is a wise policy to spend so little on the education of children. When the matter was raised on a previous occasion in Select Committee I think an assurance was given that something more would be voted for Attendance Officers. I hope the matter will be considered and something will be done on supplementary estimate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any record of such an assurance?

Mr. CREASE: No, sir, I have no record.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is proposed to make provision in next year's estimates to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee in its interim report. Those amendments will be made on the distinct understanding that the Secretary of State will have to

review the situation in connection with the estimates as a whole. The items occur on page 15 of the Estimates under Personal Emoluments, Primary Schools. I move that in the place of \$18,804 the sum of \$20,590 be substituted for Colonial Schools; for Aided Schools the sum of \$319,677 be increased to \$356,273. Practical Instruction Centres, \$3,888 be increased to \$4,596; Teachers employed in connection with Agricultural Bias Scheme, \$4,368 be increased to \$5,562; Additional Assistant Teachers and 20 Pupil Teachers required in 1939, \$4,800 be increased to \$5,760. The other two items remain the same, the total being carried out at \$394,917. In the report of the Select Committee hon. members will see fully set out the reasons for the increase in each particular case. There is another amendment under item 33—Lighting, \$100. I move that the amount be increased to \$150. This is not a recommendation of the Select Committee. It has come to hand since the Committee reported. I have been informed by the Head of the Department that it would be quite impossible next year to make \$100 suffice in view of the fact that there will be two groups of students in residence from September. With regard to item 32—Attendance registers, etc., for schools, \$250, the Select Committee wish to draw attention to the fact that there is a certain amount of revenue coming in, and suggest that a note be inserted on the page opposite the item to this effect: "The proceeds of sales of school attendance registers are brought to account under revenue Head IV. Payment for specific services, sub-head 31—Education Department."

THE CHAIRMAN: Hon. members understand that these recommendations are the recommendations of the Education Committee. They have been referred to the Colonial Office which has not given any definite decision on them, reserving the question of their final adoption until the estimates as a whole are completed and presented. Therefore the increases proposed are in a sense provisional.

Mr. JACOB: Do I understand that no assurance is being given about the Attendance Officers?

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot give an assurance without further enquiry.

Mr. CREASE: I have given the matter very careful consideration and I propose to submit a recommendation to Government to increase the number of Attendance Officers. That particular point has also been raised by the Education Committee, but what their recommendations are in that respect I cannot say at present because I have not had their report. I believe, generally speaking, that the recommendation has the general support of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think it is likely to form part of the Committee's report?

Mr. CREASE: Yes, sir.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I desire to make a few remarks about item 2—Teachers employed in connection with Agricultural Bias Scheme, \$4,368. This scheme is a farce, and if this amount is going to influence the Secretary of State it should be deleted. An assistant teacher is engaged teaching 15 boys agricultural bias, and in the same school another teacher has a class of 80 to 90 children. It is a waste of time because no teacher can teach a class of 80. This agricultural bias scheme is an experiment at the cost of something more profitable.

Mr. JACKSON: I am quite sure that if the hon. member had a practical acquaintance with the Agricultural Bias scheme he would say differently. Perhaps if he would only extend his vision in that direction he would support the scheme rather than condemn it. There are numbers of persons who deem themselves qualified to deal with the matter of primary education, and who often declare that the Colony is not receiving full benefit for the money spent on education; that the children are not receiving the right type of education suitable to the needs of the Colony, but when the opportunity offers for them to place before Government their views on what is really needed in the matter of education for the needs of the Colony we find them slinking back without being able to offer any suggestion. Those persons might well be regarded as iconoclasts. They break down but they do not build.

A Committee was appointed to enquire into the whole question of primary

education, and what did we find? Those persons who know so much regarding the educational needs of this Colony could not make it possible or convenient to give evidence and show really what is needed. They are satisfied to stand aside and say that the system is unsuitable to the needs of the Colony, but they do not find it convenient or they do not consider themselves capable to offer some advice as to what is required. We are told that the children are being given book knowledge, and when Government makes an attempt to give a bias to a practical form of education we have people speaking in terms as used by the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar). The hon. member says that the scheme is a farce. (Mr. Eleazar: Hear, hear). I say it is not a farce but rather something, if properly carried out, that would make for the benefit of this Colony. He is inclined to move that the item be struck out, and he bolsters up his position by saying that there are teachers who have to teach large numbers of pupils, and the money might be spent in that direction. There is no denying the fact that a large number of teachers would be required for our primary schools if the number of pupils to be taught by a single individual is to be lowered, but I want to urge that if this amount is deleted it would not add considerably to the number of teachers. There are certain teachers who have been trained in agricultural work. They are sent to various schools and additional teachers have been appointed to take their places. Therefore, instead of a reduction of staff as a result of the scheme there has been an increase of staff. The number of additional teachers corresponds with the number of teachers engaged in teaching agriculture, so that the staffing of a school is increased when the agricultural bias scheme is employed in that school.

There are some people who think that there should be no handwork at all in connection with the schools, and I think in that class of people we find the hon. member for Berbice River. No man with vision could say that the application of the hand in conjunction with the head in the matter of education is not beneficial. My experience is that the handwork centres and the Agricultural Bias scheme are of considerable value.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Handwork centres are

post-primary. I was speaking about the agricultural bias in the school. Don't mislead the Council in that way.

Mr. JACKSON: The handwork centres are not post primary; they have been established in connection with the primary schools for the instruction of boys attending the primary schools. They go one day each week and are employed for the whole day at the centre. I am not surprised at the view expressed by the hon. member for Berbice River because his view is as loose as his information on that point. (laughter). I have observed that the boys who go to the Woodwork Centre give no trouble with their other lessons at school, and so it will be with the boys under the Agricultural Bias scheme. The more they use their hands the better it is for them with their other lessons. I believe that what is really needed in connection with our schools is a number of farm schools, but until Government is in a position to establish those schools I think Government is quite right in adopting what might be regarded as makeshifts in the form of the Agricultural Bias scheme and the woodwork and domestic centres. They are in connection with the primary schools. I say that and I mean it.

I know that in some of the schools the cost of repairing benches and desks is greatly minimised because the boys themselves do the repairs under the guidance and supervision of the master in charge. I invited my friend to go with me and see one of those centres and the work done by the boys, but he did not find it possible to go. I would be very glad if he would do so, and I am sure that after he has seen the boys at work and the work they have done he will change his views on the matter. I think it is very important that the hand, head and heart should work together, and I am frankly and wholeheartedly for all schemes that make for the successful use of the hand along with the head. Book knowledge and practical knowledge should go together, and I do not think the hon. member is extending his vision beyond what happened in his school days. I think if he would look far ahead and see a new Buxton in the interior and a better Georgetown he would be able to see a better class of boys able to cope with the higher standard of living, and a better class of girls able to work for them-

selves. Then and then only perhaps would he be able to appreciate correctly the value of the Agricultural Bias scheme and all handwork in connection with our schools.

Mr. ELEAZAR: If there is anything necessary to support the view I have expressed it is the able speech the hon. member has made. I challenge him to say whether he ever had any agricultural bias. I never got any at school; I got it from my grandfather. If my friend was a little younger I would say he is a dreamer. Government is going to makeshift with \$4,800. I do attend these Committee meetings, but I think it is unfair for him to suggest that on the Committee I should not make my point against the Director of Education and the Director of Agriculture. Just imagine the Director of Education and the Director of Agriculture telling me that a 11-year-old schoolboy should go into the garden. What sort of agricultural bias can you instil in a boy of 11 years? I stand by the view I have expressed. My friend is a living example of a proper foundation laid in the cultural subjects in the primary school. There was no agricultural bias in him. My point is that during school time we should teach school subjects.

Mr. JACKSON: I rise to a point of correction. When I spoke about iconoclasts I referred to those to talk a lot about what is necessary, but when the time came they could not come forward with suggestions. If the hon. member includes himself in that list I did not include him. With regard to his remark that I did not receive any agricultural bias as a pupil I would like the hon. member to understand that as a boy I went to the farm and did work there. Secondly, I took an agricultural course as a schoolmaster, and for many years I conducted a school garden with success, although I say it myself. My leaning towards agriculture in connection with the schools is chiefly due to the benefit I derived from agriculture as a boy, and the course of instruction I received as a man, coupled with my experience as one who conducted a school garden. It is my thorough conviction that agriculture is very necessary and a good thing for everybody to know something about.

The Council adjourned for the luncheon recess until 2 p.m.

2 p.m.—

Mr. JACOB: I listened with a good deal of interest to what the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar) has stated, and also to what the hon. nominated member, Mr. Jackson, stated this morning. When this item was introduced a few years ago I opposed it on the grounds that sufficient was not being done and the scheme was not properly considered, and also that the amount to be spent was not sufficient to be of any practical value to the Colony. My hon. friend on my left (Mr. Jackson) said this morning that if this scheme is properly conducted and carried out it will be all right. I think the whole burden rests on those few words. To tell this Council and this Colony that \$4,368 per annum spent on an Agricultural Bias scheme will bring improvement, I say without hesitation that it is simply playing with the situation and the money is being wasted. It is wasted in this way: You are not going to get any practical value for it, although teachers will be employed and the money expended will go into circulation. That is exactly what as a member of this Council I have complained about all the time, and will continue to complain. Things are not done in the way that they ought to be done for us to get practical benefits. The hon. nominated member referred to the fact that the people who are interested have not been before the Education Committee and given advice to the Committee. I say, sir, that is true, but we have to enquire what are the reasons. There is a fear to go before any committee or commission to state things that are true and which may affect certain people. There is no hiding of that fact. The situation is there and has to be faced. As a member of the Education Committee I have been told by teachers that they have criticized the scheme and said that it is not going to be of any practical benefit to the Colony though they will be getting something out of it, but it is not in their interest as teachers employed by Government to criticize the scheme openly. I mentioned it to the Director of Education some time ago. That is the position, and I am certain if an attempt is made to enquire into the matter the Director of Education will

be told, not officially, that it is so. The hon. Nominated member stated that in the expenditure of \$4,000 per annum, 16 to 24 teachers will be employed. I do not know by what method of arithmetic that has been arrived at, as I understand that high-grade teachers are employed in this particular work. I shall be glad to be informed how many teachers are actually employed or will be paid this \$4,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is aware that amendments have been moved increasing the amount to \$5,562.

Mr. JACOB: It does not make very much difference. I am sure that amount cannot pay 16 teachers. I shall like too to enquire in respect of item 3 under the very sub-head, how many of these new schools it is intended to establish in 1939 and where?

Mr. JACKSON: Perhaps it will be well for the hon. member for North Western District to say what he means by "high-grade" teachers. No one told him that high-grade teachers were employed. I do not know what he means by "high-grade."

Mr. JACOB: I mean teachers who hold first and second class teachers' certificates.

Mr. JACKSON: Well, you are misinformed.

Mr. CREASE (Director of Education): Rising to reply to my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Eleazar) I must say from the very outset that I regret I cannot agree with him that this scheme, which has been introduced about two years ago, is a waste of time and a farce. This scheme was introduced in January, 1937, and covers a two years' course, and the first batch will complete their course in December of this year. From the reports which have been submitted from time to time, it must be admitted that there are many difficulties to be overcome, while on the other hand it has been seen from those reports that there are great possibilities for the scheme and especially in regard to the extension of the scheme. One of the greatest difficulties with which we had to contend was the question of supplying teachers to take the places of those teachers who were wholly engaged in carrying out this course. Government

for the first twelve months endeavoured to carry on without the employment of these additional teachers but it has been found impractical and impossible to do so, and Government has been forced to employ additional teachers to take the places of those teachers who are fully and wholly employed on the scheme. The hon. member for North Western Essequibo referred to high-grade teachers being employed. I am afraid that the information he has received is not correct. The money, which has been asked for now, is not to pay those teachers who are actually employed in carrying out the scheme, but to pay what we may regard as temporary or interim teachers to take their places while so employed.

I said just now that from the reports received there is every indication of great possibilities for this scheme and perhaps an extension of the scheme. I may add here that I have appeared before the Primary Education Committee to give evidence, and I have touched on this subject. The views which I have expressed to that Committee, I think, have been embodied in their report, which Government will see and no doubt give due consideration to. Referring to that report I would like to assure my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Eleazar) that Government will give every consideration to that report, and I am sure that is evident by the fact that Government is not wasting any time whatever, for as a result of the interim report it has placed before this Council this morning recommendations of that Committee in connection with the increase of salaries of teachers. That I consider to be very quick work indeed.

In view of those facts which I have put before this Council, I do not feel I can possibly recommend at this juncture the deletion of this item from the Estimates for 1939, because I feel quite sure from the recommendations and proposals shortly to come before Government we shall see the need for carrying on the scheme and, if possible, extending it in the directions indicated in the report.

Mr. JACOB: Where do you intend to erect these new schools?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will indicate that later.

Mr. ELEAZAR: If that is the view of the Department, it has only intensified what I have already expressed. I do not know what this Committee is going to say. It is so easy to have these committees and then to ensure that they achieve nothing except the wishes of those who get them going. You need not put the motion, as Government is not accepting it, and as Government has a majority its wish will be carried. To save time I withdraw the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You withdraw it?

Mr. ELEAZAR: If Government says it cannot accept my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand, the Committee of which the hon. member is a member is considering it and may possibly recommend an extension of the scheme.

Mr. ELEAZAR: They can get anything done that they want.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is a member of the Committee and should know more than I do.

Mr. ELEAZAR: That is why I say the thing is a farce.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: The hon. Director of Education referred to the hon. member for North Western District as the member for North Western Essequibo. The member for Western Essequibo did not take part in the debate. I am sure the hon. Director will gladly correct the error.

THE CHAIRMAN (to Mr. Crease): Can you tell us how many teachers are engaged in the Agricultural Bias Scheme?

Mr. CREASE: I think there are eighteen, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN (to Mr. Jacob): You want further information on the next item?

Mr. JACOB: I desire to be informed how many new schools are to be established in 1939 for this \$1,752.

Mr. CREASE: In regard to that item, here is only one new school to be established. I think that item is not as clear

as it might be. It involves additional grants-in-aid for certain Regulation 80 schools which will disappear. They will be transferred to Grant-in-Aid schools.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are not strictly speaking new schools. I do not know whether it is worth making a correction in the item.

Item put, and agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL COURSE FOR TEACHERS.

Mr. JACOB: I notice that it is not proposed to continue the course in Agriculture for Teachers in 1939. I think it is complementary to the item which was debated just now. Should we not get an explanation in that regard?

Mr. CREASE: The training of a further batch of teachers in this course, it was decided by Government, should be deferred until the scheme which has been put into operation has completed its first two years and the results ascertained. It is felt unwise to continue training teachers for the scheme if the scheme itself does not prove the success Government anticipates.

Mr. JACOB: Does not that appear conflicting with what the hon. Director of Education mentioned just a few minutes ago? I was absent from the Colony and did not attend all the meetings of the Committee, but I have a recollection that the scheme was condemned by the Committee when it was discussed there. To-day I hear quite another story. That is the sort of thing we are confronted with. I do not know what is the position, whether the scheme will be carried on or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: You say "condemned by the Committee." Do you mean the Primary Education Committee?

Mr. JACOB: I have that idea, although a vote was not taken. When it was discussed by that Committee on a few occasions the general opinion was that the scheme should not be carried on except it was going to be enlarged—

THE CHAIRMAN: That can only be cleared up when we get the report of the Committee.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I do not understand.

Government has an advocate here who is a schoolmaster himself, and who tells you we never had any agricultural bias. He went with his grandfather to the backdam at Fellowship, I believe, and so did I at Buxton, and we both came out well in the end. I suppose all the farmers at Fellowship have given up farming and there is no one to see that the boys get an idea of farming, and so Government is advised to put up a scheme to work miracles. Now you come and say you are not training anybody until you are able to see what is going to happen to the scheme, and then you will decide what to do. Why bother to save that \$2,000? Is it because you have a doubt as to whether anything is going to happen and therefore you will not train any more teachers for the scheme? Yet it had been said here in such glowing language that it was the best thing ever conceived by the mind of a genius. Government can do anything.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you recommending that the money should be put back?

Mr. ELEAZAR: It should be taken out.

The matter dropped.

RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCE.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I want to make an observation. The Director of Education clings to his views like a limpet to a rock, as a friend used to say. The Director is not here and a new pharoah has come who, I hope, will take a better view of Joseph and his brethren. It is the practice, which I hope a stop will be put to, that when a school falls vacant either by the retirement or death of the headteacher for his successor not to be called a headteacher though qualified but an Assistant Headteacher and given \$10 which is called "Responsibility Allowance." He is the boss of the school but is not given the grant attached to the school. That kind of thing is juggling with the salaries. If a private individual does that you will say that he is defrauding the person who is working with him, and yet that goes on in the schools. Despite all the complaints made about it no one takes any notice.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member say to which item he is referring?

Mr. ELEAZAR: It is a general remark.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has had very great latitude in considering principles. In Committee we are confined to details. If the hon. member is not referring to any item on the page under consideration, I think he must choose some other time to make his remark.

Mr. ELEAZAR: It should have come under item 26 on page 16. It is only a remark I wanted to make. I do not want to delay the Council.

The matter dropped.

FIRE PROTECTION.

Items—Fire Floats.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: Will Government consider the necessity of purchasing a new fire-float? Some time ago the Georgetown Town Council received a report from the Engineer-in-charge that the boiler of one of the fire floats, I think it is the "Vesta," was in a state of disrepair and would probably "go to the wall" at the end of this year. I speak subject to correction. I think the Town Council has written Government on the matter. If that is so, will Government consider the necessity of purchasing a new fire float to take the place of the "Vesta"?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have not seen any correspondence in regard to this float, but I will look into the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can only undertake to go into it.

PURCHASE OF NEW FIRE ENGINE.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move, in connection with sub-head 23—"Purchase of new Fire Engine, \$3,600," that the amount be carried out at \$3,800. A set of spares is required for the new engine, the cost of which is \$300. Two-thirds of that sum must be included in the Estimates and the other one-third will be paid by the local Insurance Companies.

Sub-head as amended put, and agreed to.

FOREST DEPARTMENT.

Item—"Wages of Permanent Station Employees (5), \$1,620."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the amount be increased from \$1,620 to \$1,650, an increase of \$30. That is in connection with the Bain Gray Report, paragraph 17, to which I had referred earlier in the day. It is a slight increase to certain employees of that Department.

Item as amended put, and agreed to.

Item—"House Allowance, Conservator, \$720."

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: In regard to this item, I had intended at some stage—I think perhaps this is the best stage—to raise this question. I would like to know what does the term "House Allowance" embrace. Does it embrace merely the rental or any concomitants going with the term "rental"? If so, is it necessary or is it the corollary result that the allowance should be entirely spent by the officer, or is he allowed to save on that allowance?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think I am correct in saying that a fixed allowance is granted to him, and he is not required to account for the manner in which he spends it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it part of his term of appointment?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, sir.

Mr. ELEAZAR: It seems like wasting the time of this Council in complaining, because this Department was literally forced on this community against great opposition from its very inception. So strong was the opposition against it, when the Financial Commissioners who came here returned to England they practically complained this Council for objecting to the expenditure on this Department. But still the members of the Council protested because they then foresaw just what has happened now. That is to say, this Department has come to spend \$34,000 in one year. This year it has increased from last year by \$578. I am sorry the hon. member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford) is not here to let me see if he is going to somersault. People who change their minds never can be present for one to find out where they stand. We have

not the numbers to ask Government to strike out the whole thing or get the Imperial Government to undertake to run this Department which we do not require. In a country where you have forests only the very fringe of which so far has been touched, it is unwise to talk of conserving the forests. If you construe it properly the father will plant the tree and the great-grandson will be the person to fell it. Forestry is not a thing you can indulge in, when you are already bankrupt. \$34,000 for Forestry is too much at this time when you are really bankrupt and cannot afford to establish Farm Schools and there are so many other immediate and dire needs you cannot touch because you have no money. The tree planted now, you cannot hope to fell even within 25 years, and what is clear this Department was forced on us at a time when the country was not as badly off as it is now and when protest was made that we cannot see the necessity for it. What necessity is there now for the attempt to establish something to cure wood? I do not know that is part of Forestry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very much so.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I thank Your Excellency for the information. A man cannot know everything. You live and learn. (Laughter) Still we do not want \$34,000 to do that. Mr. Wood and one or two woodmen and, perhaps, another man to take his place when he is absent are quite sufficient for the Department. I do not know why this Department should not be amalgamated with the Lands and Mines Department? However, we have it here as a separate department and have to spend \$34,000 on it this coming year. I am saying that we are paying really too much for it. We have not got the number of members in this Council to successfully resist it, and therefore we have to allow it to pass, but it is not because we feel that we get value for the money spent. However good it may be—the Imperial Government may perhaps keep it as it is too good for us—we have too many more necessary things around to be done, and we cannot afford that expenditure on it.

Mr. JACOB: Lest it be taken that the Elected members of this Council agree to this Head, I join the previous speaker in his protest and endorse all that he has said.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think at the present time the necessity for this Department is greater than it has ever been. It has justified its existence during the last year or two. If the hon. members who have spoken would be kind enough to look up the Export Returns they would find that the export figures of Timber, like those of Bauxite, have increased tremendously. Apart from the export figures there must be taken into consideration the collection of Harbour and Port dues from the steamers that take the timber away. It will be a very grave mistake to consider abolishing this Department at the present time.

Mr. MACKEY: I would like to associate myself with the remarks just made by the hon. Nominated member, Mr. Walcott. I know something about the Timber Industry of this Colony, and I can say without fear of contradiction that so far as I am concerned I think the Department has more than justified its existence. As the hon. member has just said, one only has to look at the export figures of timber and further at what additional revenue Government is getting in the way of Harbour and Port dues.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. members only have to turn to the Revenue Estimates for 1938 and see that the actual revenue for 1937 under Forests is considerably less than the estimated revenue for the coming year. I think it will be a great mistake to consider reducing the strength of this Department.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I do not think this Council has need for such an elaborate Forest Department. It never had.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I cannot answer the thesis put forward by the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar) without allowing discussion on the subject. I want to draw hon. members' attention to the fact that this thesis—that where you have large forests already you do not need a Forest Department—is directly contrary to the experience of all other Colonies that I know of. Their experience is decidedly in the opposite direction. The larger the forests are the greater is the need for a Forest Department for the conservation and management of those forests,

so that the handling may be economically and properly carried out. Frankly in relation to the forests of British Guiana. I think the Forest Department in British Guiana is one of the cheapest in the Empire.

The matter dropped.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

Item—Assistant Schoolmaster and Assistant Clerk (\$450 by \$30 to \$600), \$450.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the item be amended and the sum of \$460 substituted for \$450. The post is vacant and it is hoped to be able to fill it before the close of this year. If that is done there will be an increment next year to pay the person appointed. If he is not appointed this year the extra \$10 will not be spent in 1939.

Item as amended put, and agreed to.

Item—7 Officers (1 at \$450 by \$30 to \$600, and 6 at \$288 by \$24 to \$480) \$3,402.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the item be amended to read, "8 Officers (1 at \$450 by \$30 to \$600, and 7 at \$288 by \$24 to \$480)" and the amount carried out at \$3,690. It is proposed to increase the number of officers by one so as to enable a shoemaker to be attached to the staff. The object is to teach the boys shoemaking.

Item as amended put, and agreed to.

Item—1 Matron, \$180.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the amount be increased to \$360. It is proposed to make a new appointment next year and \$180 is not sufficient to procure the services of the type of Matron that should be appointed for that school.

Motion put, and agreed to.

Item—Clerk and Storekeeper (\$570 by \$30 to \$720), \$600.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the amount be carried out at

\$720, that is to say at the maximum salary of the post. The reason for this is that it is considered that the officer, who will fill that post and has been in the Service a very long time but has not had any increase for some years, should be appointed at the maximum of the grade.

Item as amended put, and agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: All these items under Personal Emoluments are in pursuance of the plan which is being carried out for the improvement of the Industrial School and the raising of its quality and efficiency under the guidance of the new Head Master.

Sub-head—Clothing and Bedding, \$550.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the amount be reduced to \$500. It was found that \$50 can be saved under this sub-head.

Motion put, and agreed to.

Sub-head—Tools and Appliances, \$200.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this sub-head be amended to read "Workshop, tools and appliances" and the amount carried out at \$1,000. It is necessary to have new machines and to replace existing machines in the tools shop of the school.

Motion put, and agreed to.

Sub-head—Gratuities to boys on discharge, \$150.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this sub-head be amended to read "Gratuities and earnings to boys on discharge" and the amount carried out at \$200. It is found necessary to increase the amount. It is the recommendation of the Select Committee.

Motion put, and agreed to.

Mr. PERCY C. WIGHT: The hon. Colonial Secretary has omitted to strike out sub-head 12.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am sorry. Sub-head 12—Carpenter's shop, \$250—should be deleted.

Sub-head—Carpenter's shop, \$250.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that this sub-head be deleted. The amount of \$250 has been added to the new sub-head "Workshop, tools and appliances."

Motion put, and agreed to.

LABOUR AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. JACOB: I would like to take this opportunity to refer to the questions I had asked in regard to the strike of labourers at Pln. Blairmont and the replies given, as noted in the Minutes of the Council of Tuesday, November 15. The replies are as follows:—

(a) A strike of the punt-loading and the cane transport gangs occurred on the 1st December, 1937. There had been no reduction in the wages of these gangs but dissatisfaction was expressed with the prices being paid; the price paid for loading P.O.J. canes was increased from 4 to 5 cents per 1,000 lbs., and the gangs mentioned resumed work on the 6th December, 1937.

(b) A strike of the Estate shovel gang occurred on the 10th December, 1937. There had been no reduction of rates of pay and although these labourers expressed dissatisfaction with the rates no increase was made and they returned to work on 14th December, 1937.

The point was stressed here yesterday and from the general questions answered here, it would appear to nearly all the members of this Council that no reduction of wages was offered on that Estate that resulted in the strike there in December last. I have in my hand a document of 19 pages signed by Mr. G. M. Eccles, Manager of that plantation. Government is in possession of a copy of this document which was forwarded to it by me. On page 14 it states:—

Boy Gang.—On Wednesday morning, 1st December, they were told that they would be paid 3c. for their work on Tuesday and from that day (Wednesday) they would be paid by job. They did not consider this fair treatment.

That is the complaint of the boys at Pln. Blairmont. Another complaint is:—

The labourers stated further that up to three weeks ago they were paid 5c. per 100 for drawing down cane tops. Then it was reduced to 4c. per 100 unknown to them, and when they enquired they were told that the estate could not pay more than 4c. per 100 tops. Mr. Kingham, Deputy Manager from Pln. Bath, who came over to Blairmont a few months ago,

agreed that the estate could not pay more than 4c. per 100. Previously they were paid 6/- to 8/- per punt, and then, four of them working together earned about 60c. per day. When they were paid 5c. per 100 they earned about 50/56c. per day. Now that they were being paid 4c. per 100, they earned about 40/44c. per day.

That is the complaint of two gangs at Pln. Bath. The Manager states as follows:—

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: I rise to a point of explanation. Is it Pln. Bath or Pln. Blairmont?

Mr. JACOB: This is from the Manager of Pln. Blairmont. Mr. Eccles in reply to the complaint said:—

The system of drawing down cane tops is correctly stated to have been paid at 6/- to 8/- per punt. This refers to drawing plants ahead of the reaping. This was found to be unsatisfactory as, in order to fill the punts quickly, the boys were cutting a lot of cane which ought actually to have gone to the factory to make sugar, being in any case too hard for planting material. It was therefore decided to draw by the 100 tops which is the practice on some estates. As the payment in this case would be the same irrespective of the length of top, the incentive was naturally to draw the short top which was required. A punt takes about 15,000 such tops. The introduction of this method first met with considerable opposition until it was found that good money could be made at it, when no further complaints were heard. The original price fixed was 4c. per 100 but this was subsequently increased to 5c. per 100 in certain ratoon Diamond 10 fields which had arrowed very heavily, thus making the good tops for planting few and far between. After working in about 6 fields of this nature, we moved up to an 11-months old plant field, where only a very few of the canes had arrowed, and the tops were very much easier to obtain. The price was therefore dropped 1c. per 100 and notification of this was made before the boys had started to work.

I have read the complaints and the replies by the Manager of that Estate, and it is clear from this document that the wages were reduced. I am merely referring to one particular point here to satisfy this Council and this Government that whenever I make statements they have been supplied to me, and I try my utmost to bring them forward just as they have been supplied. Here are complaints made by the labourers to me personally as a representative of the people, and the only conclusion one can arrive at, knowing the circumstances and after reading the Manager's reply, is that a reduction of prices was offered and that resulted in the strike and unrest at Pln. Blairmont

in December, 1937. It is very astonishing to me to get a reply to my question from Government that no reduction in wages was offered. That is in connection with Pln. Blairmont. In connection with Pln. Nonpareil—

Mr. ELEAZAR: Under which Head is the hon. member addressing the Council?

Mr. JACOB: "Labour and Local Government." I think my hon. friend should allow me the opportunity to explain certain things—

Mr. ELEAZAR: I am going to ask Your Excellency to allow me to put the Council straight and you (Mr. Jacob) too. I desire to rise to a point of correction. The strike at Pln. Blairmont occurred as the result of thirteen boys in a gang having been given a certain piece of work to be finished at 4 o'clock—

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for North Western District is entitled to make his statement and to be given the ordinary courtesy of being allowed to complete it.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I do not think he should be allowed to make a statement that is not correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have an opportunity to correct the error.

Mr. JACOB: I have read statements made on both sides. As an impartial observer I say reduction of work was offered, bearing in mind that I have a knowledge of the kind of work. The hon. member may come to any conclusion he likes; I do not blame him. With regard to Pln. Nonpareil, the dissatisfaction arose there over a particular class of work in a particular field. The workers' contention up to the present time is that the field in question—Enterprise No. 2—is 12.67 acres, a figure that was supplied to me from the records of Pln. Nonpareil. It was submitted to the Department of Labour and Local Government, and on October 5, a reply was received to the effect that Enterprise No. 2 field is 12 acres only. This was a letter to the General Secretary of the Man Power Citizens' Association. A further letter dated 24th October was received from that Department which reads as follows:—

With reference to previous correspondence relating to the acreage of Field No. 2 Enverprise at Pln. Nonpareil, I have the honour to inform you that the field has been measured by the District Commissioner and that it is 12.15 acres; if the four-foots are excluded the acreage is 11.898 acres.

(Sgd.) M. B. LAING, Commissioner of Labour and Local Government.

Your Excellency, here we have two letters from the Department of Labour and Local Government, one giving the acreage as 12 acres and the other given on measurement by the District Commissioner as 12.15 acres, while we have been supplied with records from the Estate showing that the acreage of that field is 12.67 acres. As a responsible individual having been given these conflicting figures, I wrote to this Government enquiring what is the exact acreage and suggesting that a Sworn Land Surveyor be called in to measure that field so that the correct acreage can be ascertained, if the previous records of the Estate are not to be accepted. This Government refused that request, but said in correspondence that the District Commissioner measured that land and arrived at a certain acreage. I am compelled to make this observation. The District Commissioner, I submit, is not a Sworn Land Surveyor and is not competent to measure land and to give a correct acreage. It would be equally well, if that is the attitude of Government, to place say the Comptroller of Customs in the office of the Attorney-General to look after the Laws of the Colony, or *vice versa* the Attorney-General to do the work of the Comptroller of Customs—those are technical offices. This matter has caused considerable unrest and trouble, and I urge on this Government and Council to listen to both sides of the story and put forward as clearly and plainly as possible what this Government finds. This Government cannot bolster up the case in the way it has done. It is fundamentally a reduction of wages that has been responsible for the unrest and strike at Pln. Nonpareil and for the labourers remaining out of work for about six weeks. I have stated two cases to show that there has been a reduction of wages, and I shall state another case relating to Pln. La Bonne Intention. Happily there has been no strike there. At Pln. La Bonne Intention certain labourers were given a certain class of work which was to have been measured by a chain. They thought

that the chain was not correct in measurement and rightly too, as I had an opportunity of seeing and measuring with that chain. They brought the chain to me and we took it to the Commissioner of Labour and asked that the Inspector of Labour should measure it so as to arrive at the true length of it. Rightly the Inspector of Labour said he was not a Sworn Land Surveyor and therefore was not competent to measure the chain, but suggested that it be sent to the Lands and Mines Department to be measured. We agreed and it was sent there and measured. We then got a letter from the Department of Labour and Local Government dated 1st October, 1938 which reads as follows:—

I return by bearer the chain brought to the office on September 29, 1938, by the officers of your Association.

The Department of Lands and Mines which examined this chain informs me that it purports to be a 3 rood (Rhymland) chain but actually its measurement exclusive of handles is 37ft. 5ins.

Immediately we got this reply, I telephoned the Inspector of Labour to say that we have asked for two measurements—with and without the handles—and asked if he could kindly give us both measurements. He replied that he was sorry he could not give both measurements and would have to consult the Commissioner of Labour. I then got in touch with the Commissioner of Lands and Mines and asked him to measure the chain for the Man Power Citizens' Association and give a report on it. A letter dated 1st October, 1938, was received from the Department of Lands and Mines which reads as follows:—

With reference to your letter of today's date I have to inform you that the chain submitted has been examined and measured. It purports to be a 3 rood (Rhymland) chain but its measurement exclusive of the handles is 37ft. 5ins. and with the handles the measurement is 38ft. 3ins. It should be noted that the handles are of wire, consequently the latter measurement above is liable to considerable variation. I am of the opinion that any measurement of this chain can only be regarded as approximate.

It is clear from this correspondence that the labourers' contention was substantially correct—the chain is liable to considerable variation in measurement—but when submitted to the Department of Labour and Local Government material information has been withheld from the Association, and although requested for a copy of the letter up to the present

time it has not been supplied. Fortunately we can prove our case by showing a letter we have got from the Commissioner of Lands and Mines which made the position quite clear. I am afraid I am going to take up a little time on this matter, as the question is of such vital importance that it is essential that it be ventilated as fully as possible. There had been trouble at Plns. Albion and Port Mourant. It is within the knowledge of the Department of Labour and Local Government that reduced wages had been offered and were only increased after arbitration. There can be absolutely no doubt about that. I have in my possession a statement written by the Commissioner of Labour headed "Decisions reached in connection with complaints in regard to rates of wages and working conditions." It reads as follows:—

Pln. Albion:—Wages: Plain forking in "plant fields." To be paid for at the rate of 7/- per bed (equal to 4c. per bank). Extra payment for weeding.

Forking moulding (light) and forking banks. To be paid for at the rate of 6/- per bed (equal to 3½c. per bank).

Pln. Port Mourant:—Wages: Digging drains etc.—Earnings to be increased from 2/4 (56c.) to 2/11 (70c.) per day worked.

Shovel Gangs—For forking "plant" fields, fork-moulding etc., earnings to be increased from 2/2 (52c.) to 2/6 (60c.) per day worked. For half-banking the price paid per row to be increased from 2½d. (5c.) to 3d. (6c.).

Weeding Gangs—Earnings to be increased from 1/6 (36c.) to 1/8 (40c.) and from 1/2 (28c.) to 1/4 (32c.) per day worked.

Boy Gang—To be paid at above when engaged upon these works and when otherwise employed a rate to be fixed which will enable the older or stronger boys to earn a minimum wage of 2/- (48c.) and a younger or weaker boy 1/10 (40c.) per day. No contract work to be given.

I have given five instances to show that wages have been reduced resulting in disturbances not of a serious nature.

Mr. SEAFORD: To a point of order. The hon. member cites five cases where the wages were increased. I have not heard where the wages were reduced which he says caused all the trouble.

Mr. JACOB: My hon. friend was not in the Council when I gave the first two instances of reduction in wages. It may be argued, and I think it is being argued, that the prices of work were never reduced on the estates in question but were increased. If it is going to be seriously

contended that prices were never reduced, then I submit no decision can be arrived at until the case of the acreage of Enterprise No. 2, Pln. Nonpareil, has been tested out and verified to the satisfaction of all parties. It is true that prices vary in regard to conditions of weather and work, but the labourers have always contended that when the prices offered for similar work at the time of the dispute are compared with those of weeks or months ago there is a distinct reduction. I am here to submit the case of these unfortunate people. That, I consider, is my duty as one of their representatives in this Council and I am submitting complaints, both written and verbal, made to me. It is the duty of this Government, I respectfully submit, to see that these matters are investigated to the satisfaction of both sides, and I desire to make it perfectly clear that the other side is satisfied that in nine cases out of ten the investigations are carried out in a partial and unreliable manner without the other side being heard. I have been requested to make this statement, and I make it after an investigation of the facts given to me as the result of which I am perfectly satisfied that the workers' contention is correct.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I cannot allow the hon. member to make a statement in this Council, which I happen to know something about and which he knows is either incorrect or to put it mildly is misleading. I speak of the case of Pln. Blairmont, the facts in respect of which I know very well and the hon. member knows I know because we were there together. Thirteen boys of what is called the Boy Gang, who received 40 cents per day, were given a piece of work to be finished at 4 o'clock in the afternoon so as to make allowance for work to be done on the following day. These thirteen boys left the work, it is alleged, before the appointed hour—4 o'clock—and the work was not finished. On the next day they were threatened that they would have eight cents stopped from their pay for the previous day's lapse. Without seeing the Manager those thirteen boys got into a terrible rage, assaulted the Overseer, and chased the other people out of the field. Is that a quarrel over the reduction of wages? I do not like when the hon. member is representing his Association to run counter with him, I

would like more often than not to assist him whenever I can, but in fairness to the Council when he is stating facts he must state them as he knows them. My hon. friend, the member for Western Berbice (Mr. Peer Bacchus) was there before he arrived. The whole thing was threshed out before him. We decided—and the hon. member was there then—that if the boys had gone to the Manager and complained before doing anything else perhaps they might have got back the eight cents, because they would have been able to prove that they did not leave before their time. Before we left the place we practically had the men quiet. The hon. member for Demerara-Essequibo (Dr. Singh) was there with the hon. member, who cannot come here now and tell this Council that as the result of a reduction of wages there was a strike. I challenge the hon. member to say it is not so, and I appeal to my friend, the hon. member for Western Berbice (Mr. Peer Bacchus) to say whether it is so or not. I do not think my hon. friend is doing the community, or himself, or the Man Power Citizens' Association any good by allowing this statement to go to the public, because it injures our people and injures him; for example when I have to get up and say that what he states is not correct. He either deliberately makes incorrect statements or perhaps in his anxiety to defend these people he makes statements which are very misleading indeed.

Mr. JACOB: I am afraid my hon. friend was not paying attention when I was speaking. I read from a document signed by the Manager of Pln. Blairmont, and Government is in possession of a copy of it. If the hon. member wants to read from the document I can give it to him, but let it be distinctly understood that I read from a document. If the document is incorrect I am incorrect, and it is the document that is misleading this Council. I depreciate the statement that I am making misleading and mischievous statements. Here is a signed statement, a copy of which is in the possession of Government, and yet my hon. friend says I am saying something that is misleading and heinous.

Mr. ELEAZAR: My hon. friend knows the facts himself, and because he gets a document is it fair for him to come here

and hide himself behind it? I appeal to his own knowledge of the facts and not to the document.

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: I endorse all that has been said by the hon. member for Berbice River (Mr. Eleazar). I must admit that there was a little trouble at Pln. Blairmont, but it was not caused by a reduction of wages, as stated by the hon. member for North Western District (Mr. Jacob). Some time later in the course of his investigation of the matter it came out that there was an alleged reduction in the price paid for the pulling out of cane tops, but that reduction of one cent per 100 had been already restored under the new system which was being tried out when the trouble in question arose. There was no complaint at the time that they were being underpaid. The reduction was because the tops were more easily obtained. I think the hon. member will be able to tell this Council that although one cent per 100 tops was taken off the price, the labourers earned practically the same amount as when they got the one cent more on the rate. I think he read in that very document that very few of the canes had arrowed and the tops were very much easier to obtain. That is the reason why the reduction was made. The whole cause of the trouble at Pln. Blairmont was due to the indiscretion of those thirteen boys, and in order to assist them the rest of the labourers of the estate went on strike for two or three days. I do not think the hon. member for North Western District can say that there was any more trouble at Pln. Blairmont because of any more reduction in wages and, as I said, I support the hon. member for Berbice River in the view that the trouble at Pln. Blairmont had nothing to do with the reduction of wages.

Mr. AUSTIN: As has been customary within recent days, statements made by the hon. member for North Western District bristle with inaccuracies, and the statement he has just made is not different from the many others. As regards the trouble at Pln. Nonpareil, it is absolutely incorrect to state that it started over the measurement of a certain field. It is nothing of the sort. It started at the result of the meeting of a certain Body which took place near the

Estate two or three days prior to the strike. When the strike did occur it was for an increase of wages. It had nothing to do with the measurement of a field. A general appeal for increased wages was made. Several of the men came to the City and saw the Commissioner of Labour and myself, and I think it is on record that the wages were not the real cause of the trouble. What they wanted was the dismissal of a driver by the name of Bambola. I told them that I will visit the Estate and go into the matter, and asked that certain representatives who were in the City should meet us at the Pay-office on the estate when we would consider the allegations made against the driver. They had alleged that Bambola was responsible for the management not allowing a small increase which had been promised by the Deputy Manager, Mr. Warwick. The meeting took place and the men were there, but nothing was said about the measurement of the field. It never cropped up although we spent half an hour or more at the meeting. We enquired into the whole matter, and it was denied by Mr. Warwick that Bambola had prevented an increase of wages as had been alleged. He stated that wages are fixed by Mr. Payne, the Manager, and cannot be altered without his permission. I would just like to tell the hon. member that I think it is fortunate that a good lot of his remarks are not published because if it gets out that a member of this Council can make such remarks it will injure the good name of the people who are trying to carry on business in this Colony under somewhat very difficult circumstances. He has not, I know, done his own race any good at all by his present attitude. He is doing them actual disservice.

Mr. JACOB: I do not think the hon. member is in order to refer to any particular race; he should refer to me personally.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member, I am sure, will keep within the limits that are proper.

Mr. AUSTIN: When I referred to race I simply meant his own people.

Mr. JACOB: I represent a constituency in this Council and not any particular race. I represent the North Western District.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure, the hon. member accepts that and means nothing derogatory in his reference to race.

Mr. AUSTIN: I think he is doing his constituency a disservice by carrying out a policy that is purely selfish and personal. The measurements of the field at Pln. Nonpareil to which he refers are quite correct and not as given by the hon. member.

Mr. JACOB: There again I have not given any measurements. I have read two documents supplied by the Commissioner of Labour, one dated 5th October stating that the field is 12 acres and the other dated 24th October stating that the said field is 12.15 acres, while the records supplied to me from the Estate's records show that the field is 12.67 acres. Three distinct figures supplied by two distinct parties. I am just the bearer of those figures. Further I have in my hand a sworn statement by four labourers which reads as follows:—

On Tuesday morning the 6th September, 1938, between 9 and 10 o'clock all the labourers came out to hear what Mr. Warwick, the Manager, had decided about wages. The previous Wednesday the Manager had offered 10 cents per hole, that is \$1.20 per opening. The previous week he paid 11 cents per hole, that is \$1.32 per opening. The labourers refused to work and thereafter went on strike.

The labourers did not see the Manager on Tuesday morning, the 6th September, so they marched with a drum to the railway line and back, after which each person went to his home.

About 3 o'clock the same afternoon the labourers again marched with the drum to Fredericks factory and returned, after which each person again went to his home.

About six o'clock that same evening the labourers assembled again and decided to walk to Georgetown and lay their grievance to the Labour Commissioner and the Man Power Association as the Manager had said nothing. When the crowd reached between the office and the hospital and Assistant Superintendent of Police (Don't know his name) asked where they were going. They replied to Georgetown to the Labour Commissioner and the Man Power to have their matter settled. The Assistant Superintendent told the crowd they can't go, and clapped his hands. A body of policemen immediately came up with fixed bayonets and stood across the road. The Assistant Superintendent again asked the crowd if they were not going back home. The crowd again answered that they want to go to Georgetown. The District Superintendent of Police thereupon ordered the policemen to charge on the crowd. The policemen with fixed bayonet charged on the crowd wounding some of the people. Up to then the crowd was peaceful and orderly; afterwards they pelted bricks.

We make this declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and according to the Statutory Declarations Ordinance, Chapter 255.

This affidavit dated 8th September, 1938, refers to conditions existing on the 6th September, and I am just the bearer of the statement.

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. member should confirm them.

Mr. AUSTIN: I do not see much difference in that. The measurements were given and the labourers were properly paid on the measurements made out by the estate. The estate is not likely to endeavour to make money out of labourers on the small question of the measurement of fields. That is absurd, and I think the hon. member knows that. He had been connected with the Sugar industry at one time, and, I think, it is due to him to a great extent that some of the best properties in Essequibo are not now in cultivation. As regards Pln. Albion, he made a correct statement, which is rather curious, that the wages do vary according to weather conditions, distance and other conditions. The wages at Pln. Albion were fixed at a certain rate, but without asking for an increase the labourers all went on strike due entirely to agitation. One of the agitators went so far as to threaten to murder the Manager. Like the hon. member, I have a sworn affidavit to support my statements. The wages were slightly increased at Pln. Albion and that increase is still being maintained. I maintain, sir, that these strikes were started without the people knowing what they were actually striking for. Further, the strikes were instigated by what one Colonial Secretary described as "pestilential agitators."

Mr. JACOB: To a point of correction. The hon. member said one of the best properties on the Essequibo Coast closed down through me. Fortunately one of the ex-Directors of that company is present in the Council and can bear me out. I was only the Secretary and had no voice in the management of that concern. It was due to a variety of circumstances; chiefly lack of capital caused that estate to be abandoned.

Mr. SEAFORD: I would like to

endorse the remarks made by the hon. Nominated member, Mr. Austin, but before I do that I desire to say that the hon. member for North Western District rather amuses me when every time he gets up to a point of correction he declares: "I am here to represent my constituents" or words to that effect. A few moments before that he declared: "I am here to represent these poor people, and I am going to do it to the utmost of my power from my seat in this House." Whether he was referring to his people in the North Western District when he said that, I do not know. He has got up and quoted an affidavit from people whom he represents. Are they the people in the North Western District? The hon. member has a very short memory. If he cannot remember what he has said within a few minutes after he has spoken, it is no wonder that statements made by him are so misleading. His memory is so very bad he cannot help it. (laughter).

Mr. JACOB: I wonder whether the hon. member is addressing the Chair?

THE CHAIRMAN: As far as I know.

Mr. SEAFORD: I can address the Chair and look at anybody in the Council as I like. The cat can look at the king. I am not going to beat about the bush. The labourers were asked before the Commissioner of Labour in Georgetown whether they had any trouble or dispute over wages, and they said: "We have no trouble about wages, we are satisfied." They were asked the same question before the District Commissioner on the estate in my presence and they repeated the same reply. I would like the Commissioner of Labour to state now before I carry on, how long after the dispute started they brought up the question of wages, and I ask him also to say who put that into the heads of those people.

Mr. LAING (Commissioner of Labour and Local Government): I really cannot say who put the idea into their heads, but certainly they did make a request for an increase of wages not, however, at the time when the hon. member was in my office with a deputation of workers.

Mr. SEAFORD: They went there a considerable time after the strike had started. I think, therefore, if the hon.

member has a statement placed in front of him, he should take the trouble to verify that statement. He cannot come here and make statements unless he knows they are correct. I say "cannot", but he "does" unfortunately. I am perfectly satisfied that the majority of people on the estates are happy and contented. There are a few who are not perhaps happy, and why? It is because they have had notions put into their heads about this or that. They have been very badly advised. They have been misled and made absolute dupes of for certain reasons. There is no getting behind that. If it was a question of wages as we have been told, I do not think the hon. member for Berbice River and the hon. member for Western Berbice would have got up here and stated what they did. It has shown that the representations made in this Council by members on behalf of these people who are not of their constituency were incorrect and misleading. I am not going to waste the time of the Council further.

Mr. MACKEY: I did not hear any of the previous speakers make reference to Pln. Port Mourant particularly. When the strike started there, the hon. member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford) and myself went on the estate. The cause of the strike was not through a reduction of wages at all. There had been no such question whatever.

Mr. LUCKHOO: I am afraid I would have to take some part in the discussion on this matter, as the result of my personal acquaintance with the men involved in the strikes on the Corentyne Coast and those taken before the Magistrate for breaches of the Criminal Law. I may state that as far as the management of the estates were concerned, every consideration was given to the representations made by the labourers, who felt they had a grievance against the Estate Authorities. Further than that, every opportunity was given them to lay their complaints before the District Commissioner for Berbice, who investigated some of those complaints at his office and in every case went upon the scene in order to get firsthand information from the parties concerned. As far as I am concerned, it is within my personal knowledge that a good many of those cases which had been brought before the Court were for breaches of the

Criminal Law and were the result of bad advice given by somebody behind the scene, because it came out in evidence that a good many of those people had been advised by other people, not actually resident on the estates, to cease work and intimidate other labourers from carrying on their lawful occupation. With respect to ejection from the estate those men were given ample opportunity to vacate and those who did not at the proper time were taken before the Magistrate and the Court gave the parties the further opportunity of leaving the estate within a certain time. Some got 7, or 14, or 15 days to get out. But this has been brought home very forcibly to me in the course of the Magisterial Enquiry that the people charged had been insolent to those placed in authority over them. They defied law and order in that particular locality, and incited other people to commit acts of violence. No sane individual will uphold such misconduct on the part of the labourers; therefore those labourers were taken before the Court and there was a full and impartial enquiry into the circumstances of the cases. I am in a position to state that these people openly defied the Estate Authorities taking any steps against them, and in a good many cases there was open violence and assault in the presence of responsible persons on the estate. A good many people explained to me that they were intimidated from pursuing their lawful occupation on account of the threats of violence used by those agitators on the estate. Such things could not be allowed to exist as they caused a great deal of disruption of trade in that locality. Shopkeepers have come to me and represented that their sales had considerably decreased on account of the attitude taken up by the labourers. People, who had dependents and were willing to work, were forced to remain at home without beneficially employing themselves one way or another so as to earn some measure of livelihood for themselves and their children. Evidence was given before the Court that the attitude of the people no doubt resulted from bad advice. From what I have heard the Man Power Citizens' Association had been advising them to take up a certain attitude in this matter. That action on the part of that organisation has caused a great deal of unrest, brought more poverty among the people there, and dis-

turbed the harmony that had existed between the people of that district and the management of those estates. One Manager who had occupied that position for thirty odd years was openly insulted by young people—boys between the ages of 18 and 25 years. It seems that the trouble was confined to young boys who, armed with sticks, went on the estate and tried to create a disturbance on the estate which was once a peaceful community. It has done immense harm to the people in that district. They have now seen the error of their ways and have gone back to their peaceful occupation.

The remarks made by the two hon. members who were present at Pln. Blairmont have satisfied me that there was no question of decrease of wages there, but that the unrest was due to the insolence of those boys, two of whom actually carried out a violent assault on an Overseer. Had I thought for a moment that there was any merit in the complaint of the labourers, I would have made it my duty to place those facts fairly and squarely before Government. From my professional knowledge and what took place in open Court, I am unable to support the action of those boys, and I think the Estate Authorities concerned treated them with the utmost leniency.

Mr. DIAS: I do not want to take part any further in debates of this nature, because personally I regard them as most deplorable having regard to all the circumstances—deplorable because opinion seems to be all on one side that what has occurred is the result of the bad advice of one irresponsible individual. I cannot conceive any man who claims to be a responsible individual egging on these people to do what they did. There must be a motive in all these cases of people giving advice, and what has struck me as being most peculiar is that the complaint made by the hon. member for North Western District (Mr. Jacob) has all been against the employers. He has not uttered one word of condemnation against the labourers for whom he is pleading.

Mr. JACOB: To a point of correction. I merely replied to statements made here yesterday and this morning. I propose to answer certain other statements just made.

Mr. DIAS: I expected that instead of throwing the blame on one side he would have publicly condemned the disgraceful behaviour of those people, who have burnt canefields on the estate and adopted other means of ruining the property of the proprietors of estates, and who have done everything to damn what little hope there is for the industry, but there is all talk about eviction and prosecution. That is playing with words and trying to fool the people. It is decidedly an attempt to justify the acts of ignorant people, who do not know better and have become victims of bad advice. I do not know if the hon. member was in the Colony when these troubles were going on and if it is so then to that extent I would absolve him, but if he was in the Colony then I blame him as I do the others. If he was not in the Colony then I would make one request of him to do nothing or permit no one in his Association or anywhere else, if he can prevent it, to set fuel to fire when it is already burning, and to do nothing which will cause injury either to the Colony or to the individual himself. As the representative in the Council of a particular constituency and of the Colony as a whole, it behoves him to endeavour to create a peaceful atmosphere between employer and employee. I happen to know—in fact I should say I imagine though it is a fact—that thousands of dollars were short-distributed in wages during the time these unfortunate people were out on strike on the bad advice of others. May I suggest to the hon. member to take into consideration when commenting on the statistical results of the Customs Department how much has been lost in that way by the money which was put out of circulation? It is an important factor in arriving at a decision one way or another.

It is a pity that this organisation, which can do very much good in this Colony if properly conducted, is at the moment bearing a very bad name. You hear that everywhere. I have come into contact with people who say that this Association is bringing about the downfall of the labourers on the estates because in their simplicity, or innocence perhaps, and the result of other reasons the labourers fall easily into the grip of those, who seek to advise them, and go about doing wrong things. If the hon. member can do anything to put a period to the disas-

ter which faces the Colony in this regard, he will be doing the Association and the Colony a service. I express the hope that he will take the steps that lay in his power to bring about a peaceful atmosphere, to bring about that state of affairs which existed hitherto between employer and employee. In view of what has been the case during the last few months I doubt whether this is the proper time to have a debate on this question, but since it has taken place I speak now for the last time, and I hope the hon. member will do everything in his power to put a stop to this ridiculous state of affairs which is going on in this Colony.

Mr. JACOB: I would like to correct an erroneous impression which seems to have crept into this debate. The name of the Man Power Citizens' Association has been brought into it. I desire to say that when the trouble occurred at Plns. Bath and Blairmont last year, the Man Power Citizens' Association was not around the scene at all. The hon. member for Berbice River and the hon. member for Western Berbice, the hon. member for Demerara-Essequibo (Dr. Singh) and myself were called in as ordinary representatives of the people. There was no Association represented there, and the documents I have submitted to this Government will bear proof of that. Those documents were submitted by me in my personal capacity as a member of the Legislative Council, therefore so far as Plns. Bath and Blairmont are concerned that Association can be ruled out of the picture entirely. As regards the trouble on the Corentyne Coast, the Association had begun to function then. I was absent from the Colony but heard of the trouble while in England. With regard to the trouble at Plns. Nonpareil and La Bonne Intention on the East Coast, Demerara, I was in the Colony, and as an officer of that Association I was consulted. That Association has never encouraged any strike, any disorder. In fact it has denounced disorder and strikes. It has not defended those people who had been charged for disorder and strike except in the few isolated cases where they were charged with disorderly behaviour only. The Association is being blamed and very wrongly in certain quarters. The Association is endeavouring to organize labour on a Trade Union basis as

is done in England and other European countries, and when that Association begins to function properly those who are now condemning it will turn round and praise it for doing good work.

As regards the remarks of the hon. member for Eastern Berbice (Mr. Luckhoo), I agree with him that those responsible for creating disorder and trouble should be dealt with and very severely too. Neither I nor the Association has anything to say against that, but I cannot agree with the statement which has fallen from his lips that it is right and just for persons to be evicted from estates by giving them one or two weeks' notice. A case has been referred to Government from Pln. Nonpareil, where labourers who have been evicted have nowhere to go; they have growing crops on the estate and also cattle and other live stock. If people are turned off the estate with no other place to go to and with nothing in their pockets though they have cultivations, what are they to do? I am not surprised that in some cases these people resort to some sort of violence. It is human nature. These are facts we have to face. It has been brought to the notice of those concerned that men with a family of six or seven children, who had been evicted from the estate, had walked from one part of the Colony to another without getting employment. Desperation may lead some people to do something bad. Can this fact be denied, that these people who have been evicted cannot get work on any other sugar plantation in this Colony? They have even changed their names and yet cannot get work on any other estate. Those are things I cannot countenance, and I do not expect any hon. member of this Council to countenance such an attitude. I termed it yesterday as being disgraceful and I—I had better not repeat it. It is a heinous thing to turn out on the road unfortunate people who have nowhere to go. I have attempted at all times to state all sides of the question and I denounce violence being resorted to so as to achieve one's right.

Mr. SEAFORD: I just want to make one comment. I think it would have been better if those people, who have been turned off the estates and cannot find work elsewhere, had been advised of the condition of things before instead of being told

to strike and do damage. Not a single person has been turned off an estate unless there has been good reason for it. Some went and set fire to property. There has been very good reason for it in every case. Government can enquire into the cases at any time it desires.

Mr. JACOB: I cannot allow that statement to go unchallenged. May I ask what are the reasons for the eviction of those persons at Pln. Nonpareil?

Mr. LAING: Accusation has been made that the wages of workers on sugar estates have been reduced. It needs a particular knowledge of working conditions on sugar estates to be able to arrive at a decision as to whether wages have been actually reduced or not. When there is a dispute which leads to a stoppage of work the charge is usually made that there has been a reduction in wages, and if you accept the statement of one side only you will no doubt come to the conclusion that such a reduction had taken place, but the hon. member for North Western District (Mr. Jacob) has said in reference to Pln. Blairmont that there had been a change in the system in regard to drawing down cane tops. It is certainly in connection with these changes in system and changes in working conditions and weather conditions in the field that there has been a change in the rates. I do not think the hon. member is quite correct when he says that there had been actual reductions in rates, that is that the rates have been reduced in such a way as to reduce the earnings of the worker. The rates naturally are subject to fluctuations in accordance with the working conditions. Weather and other conditions make the work sometimes more difficult than it has been, perhaps, the previous week, and there you get the prices increased, or on the other hand a reduction in the rates of pay if less difficult. If anyone examines the pay-list, as we do monthly, he will find that the fluctuations in those rates do not make any difference in the earnings. I think after all what we are principally concerned with is the earnings of the worker.

As regards the dispute at Pln. Nonpareil, the hon. member is not correct in saying that it was in connection with the rate paid in a certain field known as

Enterprise No. 2. That aspect of the dispute did not come to my notice until some weeks after the dispute had been in progress. As the hon. member on my left (Mr. Austin) stated, the actual grounds which were represented to me by a deputation of the workers were that a certain driver was disagreeable in his attitude towards them and that they desired his removal. Later the question of wages did arise and the Trade Union to which those workers belonged represented that the field was actually larger in the opening than was represented by the estate. In these matters there is only one way of adjusting such a dispute, and that is to call in an independent and impartial person to make a decision. The District Commissioner, who is an officer of my Department and is an independent and impartial person, went to the field and measured it. He found that the measurements agreed with those of the Estate Authorities. The hon. member himself has stated that in one field the rate paid is \$1.32 per opening and in another \$1.20 per opening. That statement is quite correct, but he did not say that one field contained thirteen 3-rod beds to the opening while the other only had twelve 3-rod beds to the opening. That of course explains the difference in the rates of pay in those two fields. That was the subject of dispute, and an impartial person measured the field and found it had twelve 3-rod beds and not thirteen as represented. The same thing applies to the acreage of that field. The Trade Union, of which the hon. member for North Western District is a member, asked whether I would check the measurements of that field. I may state that it is not the measurement, in my opinion, which would affect the rate of pay per bed, but at the same time I wish to see everything that is possible done to satisfy both sides. The District Commissioner therefore measured that field by the method employed by the Sugar Industry in this Colony, and as far as I am aware no Estate Manager in this Colony employs a Sworn Land Surveyor to measure a field in which workers are engaged. The measurements are made with a chain. The District Commissioner went to the field and measured it with a chain, the correctness of which was previously ascertained. His measurements were checked by the Department of Lands and Mines and found to be correct.

The position then was, that the Trade Union maintained that the field was 12.67 acres whereas the actual measurement with the chain disclosed 12.15 acres, and if the four-foot drains were excluded it was just under 12 acres, as the Estate Authorities said it would be.

As regards the dispute at Pln. La Bonne Intention, the hon. member is correct in his statement that the chain was brought to my office and the Inspector of Labour was asked to measure it. The measurement was made at my request by the Commissioner of Lands and Mines, because there was no means at my disposal for measuring such things and I wanted it to be as correct as I could. It was communicated to the Union and I then learnt for the first time that the Inspector of Labour was asked to measure the handles. The hon. member did not give any reason for wishing the handles of the chain to be measured, nor did he state that there had been any irregularities in measuring with the chain, and I instructed the Inspector of Labour that it was not necessary that the handles should be measured. There was no statement made that the handles were used in measuring, and I considered it was not my duty to supply him with any information of that sort, as that information the hon. member could himself obtain by the use of an ordinary office-ruler. At Pln. Albion, the hon. member says, there had been a reduction of rates. There was a dispute in respect of the rate of pay for a particular kind of field work. Neither the workers nor the management could agree, and therefore I suggested, and my suggestion was accepted, that there should be arbitration. That arbitration proceeded and as a result the rate for the work in that particular field was increased. The workers were not actually offered any reduction in the rates they previously received, but it was found on submission to arbitration that the rate in question was one which should be increased. There were similar circumstances at Pln. Port Mourant. After a very lengthy and careful enquiry into the rates paid by the estate, and with the assistance of the Trade Union we arrived with the consent of the management at some general increases which were given to the workers concerned. I think those are all the points that the hon. member has raised.

The matter then dropped.

Item—16 Class III. Officers, \$11,997.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the amount be carried out at \$12,581. The increase is necessary, as when the Estimates were drafted provision was only made for the minimum salary of the officers, whereas some of the officers are actually drawing a larger salary.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I do not know to whom these Class III. officers relate, but I understand Government has decided just *ad hoc* to put thirteen persons in several departments from Class III. to Class II. It did seem very *ad hoc* indeed. Is that the way to give promotion, to have 100 persons in Class III. some of whom are Juniors in that Class but more efficient than those at the top, and to just take out the first thirteen and give them promotion? It seems rather a slipshod way of doing it, and surely an enquiry should have been made of the Heads of Departments and the promotion given according to merit. It is inconceivable that the first thirteen are the best thirteen in those different departments. I think Government may consider the possibility of differentiating at least. I speak from inside knowledge of some of these departments, where there are Juniors who practically cannot be done without and are doing the work which none of their Seniors can be found to do. By this method of promotion these fellows will go on doing senior work and not get any promotion. I think some better method than that ought to be found by Government. It is too lazy to take just the first thirteen officers of a Class for promotion. A fellow is lazy and should be dismissed, but he gets promotion because he is in the first thirteen of the Class.

Motion put, and agreed to.

Item—Crews and Boathands, \$6,924.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the item be carried out at \$7,008. The addition of \$84 is to make provision in connection with the Bain Gray Report already referred to.

Motion put, and agreed to.

The Council resumed and adjourned until the following day at 10.30 o'clock.