

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 1]

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

20th Sitting

Tuesday, 10th April, 1962

---

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

*The Assembly met at 2 p.m.*

*Prayers*

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

*Present:*

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

*Members of the Government  
People's Progressive Party  
Ministers*

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

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

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

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

*Parliamentary Secretaries*

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

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

*Other Members*

**Mr. S. M. Saffee** —*(Member for Berbice—West)*

**Mr. G. L. Robertson** —*(Member for Leonora)*

**Mr. M. Bhagwan** —*(Member for Essequibo Islands)*

**Mr. J. B. Caldeira** —*(Member for Pomeroon)*

**Mr. V. Downer** —*(Member for Berbice—East)*

**Mr. M. Hamid** —*(Member for Demerara—Central)*

**Mr. D. C. Jagan** —*(Member for Suddie)*

**Mr. H. Lall** —*(Member for Corentyne—West)*

**Mr. M. Shakoor** —*(Member for Corentyne River)*

*Members Constituting the Minority*

*(i) People's National Congress*

**Mr. L. E. S. Burnham, Q.C.** —*(Member for Ruimveldt)*

**Mr. W. O. R. Kendall, Deputy Speaker**—*(Member for New Amsterdam)*

**Mr. J. Carter** —*(Member for Werk-en-Rust)*

**Mr. E. F. Correia** —*(Member for Mazaruni-Potaro)*

**Mr. N. J. Bissember** —*(Member for Campbellville)*

**Mr. W. A. Blair** —*(Member for Berbice River)*

**Mr. R. S. S. Hugh** —*(Member for Georgetown — South)*

**Mr. J. G. Joaquin** —*(Member for Kitty)*

**Mr. R. J. Jordan** —*(Member for Upper Demerara River)*

**Mr. C. A. Merriman** —*(Member for La Penitence — Lodge)*

**Mr. H. M. S. Wharton** —*(Member for Abary)*

*(ii) United Force*

**Mr. P. d'Aguiar** —*(Member for Georgetown—Central)*

**Mr. S. Campbell** —*(Member for North West)*

**Mr. R. E. Cheeks** —*(Member for Georgetown—North)*

**Mr. E. E. Melville** —*(Member for Rupinuni).*

**Mr. I. Crum Ewing**—*Clerk of the Legislature*

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS  
**APPROPRIATION BILL**  
 BUDGET DEBATE

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now resume the debate on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill intituled:

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

The hon. Member for Georgetown South (Mr. Hugh) was, I think, near the end of his speech when the House adjourned last evening. If the House agrees to an extension of his time he may now resume his speech.

**Mr. Burnham (Ruimveldt):** I move that the hon. Member be granted a further 15 minutes to continue his contribution.

**Mr. Wharton (Abary)** seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

2.15 p.m.

**Mr. Hugh (Georgetown South):** As you rightly said, Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment last evening I was about to complete my contribution to this debate. I was then speaking on the duties on wooden beds and metal beds. The duty on wooden beds in Order No. 15, which is the modification to Order No. 5, is 16% preferential and 52% general, but the duty on metal beds is 20% and 36% respectively. If my memory serves me right, this duty on wooden beds was at the instance of the last Government. I believe that the reason given for this increase of duty on wooden beds was that it would encourage many people to use local beds thereby creating employment for local cabinet makers. But when one looks at this difference of 36% preferential on wooden beds and 20% on metal beds, one comes face to face with these facts: metal beds, with a 20% duty on them, will come in at a rate and a

point that will enable them to compete with the local manufacture of wooden beds, so the intention to increase the duty on wooden beds is nothing but mockery or hypocrisy.

As I was saying last evening, perhaps too often, this Government should feel ashamed for allowing itself to be pressurized to such an extent that it was forced to modify its tax proposals, which were submitted on January 31, and to revert to what I call the most iniquitous tariff which existed before January 31. All of this talk about interest in the workers, the Government's desire to promote industries and to introduce protective tariffs must be reduced to facts. I cannot see how this Government can continue maligning and abusing Capitalists, Colonialists and Imperialists of the past and then, after a little pressure, resort to adopting what the Colonialists, Capitalists and Imperialists have done.

I notice that there is an absence of any tax on the winnings obtained from gambling. I am rather suspicious of this, because I believe I have heard that my hon. Friend on the other side has a family syndicate and they invest in lotteries. If people can win £10,000 easy money, I do not think they should find it hard to part with a few pence by way of taxation. I suspect that the present Government or most of its Members are opposed to gambling for social reasons, but it strikes me as queer that a Socialist Government should overlook this type of taxation. I hope that some consideration will be given to this form of taxation before we are through with this Budget.

I observed from the Estimates that revenue from Customs Duties will be responsible for nearly 50% of the revenue. One wonders how this Government can be aiming at Independence when it is still depending on others. This Government says "Independence in 1962", and my party agrees with that. But this Govern-

[MR. HUGH]

ment says Independence in 1962, and yet it expects approximately 50% of its revenue from Customs to run this country competently. The policy of this Socialist Government, as it calls itself, must be translated into deeds. Let us see what the Members of this Socialist Government intend doing, because that is the only way in which we can judge them. There has not been a clear adumbration of policy from that side of the House, and I am sure that the Members of the Government will agree with this. In the Customs Tariff one sees that there is tremendous confusion regarding the policy of this Government.

Hon. Members of the Government talk about the protection of industries, protection for the sake of protection and so on. I notice that in the modifications of the Budget Speech at page 10, paragraphs 32-33:

"The current tax holiday provisions for the encouragement of new enterprises are excessive and of doubtful efficacy in promoting the industrial development of British Guiana. These privileges not only allow a complete tax holiday for 5 years, but also allow all capital expenditure incurred during these five years to qualify both for initial and depreciation allowances after the tax holiday period comes to an end. My own feeling is that if foreign enterprises wish to come here they will do so when it is to their advantage—which means when the opportunities for making profits are sufficiently large as not to be seriously affected by questions of taxation. It must also be remembered that in a great many cases the benefits of these tax exemptions do not accrue to the companies or their shareholders but to foreign Governments which are thereby enabled to tax the profits originating in British Guiana without having to allow for double taxation relief. I therefore recommend that the whole of the existing Section 2 be withdrawn and replaced by a new provision under which pioneering businesses which are primarily concerned with mining, manufacturing or processing activities will be allowed to write-off 70% of any capital expenditure incurred during the first five years of their operation in British Guiana as a

charge on their current profit. This would also mean that any dividend paid by such companies would be taxable irrespective of whether the company as such is chargeable to tax or not. The existing privileges of companies which have already been granted tax holidays will of course be protected.

33. The existing provisions relating to initial allowances introduced in 1951 provide for an allowance of 40% which is in addition to the depreciation allowance (normally 10%) which is given in the first year. These provisions are unduly generous and involve a serious loss of tax (particularly in the case of foreign companies), which averaged \$500,000 in recent years. It is therefore proposed to reduce initial allowances for non-tax-holiday companies to 20% from the existing 40%."

Yesterday the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources said that the people then in the Government were responsible for chasing investors away. I have my own view about that, but I am not here to support or deny that statement. It is their business, and it is for them to get out of it. This Government will admit that this is not enough to attract the capital it talks about from overseas. One would imagine, and it is not too late for the Government to do it, that it would state its policy on priorities clearly and let the people know its policy on this or that industry. Let the people know its policy towards mining, manufacturing and so on.

No one expects, or no one ought to expect, in this modern day and age that concessions will be given willy-nilly but, at least, investors overseas would like to see the list of priorities. I would urge this Government to take a more practical and positive approach in all of these matters, and stop playing politics at all levels. Let the Members of the Government get down to the real business of the Government, and not merely do things to ensure a future victory at the polls.

There is nothing more I care to say now, but I shall await another opportunity to deal with the 1962 Estimates. I

shall crave this opportunity, however, to deal with one item under Social Development. I notice on page 77, Ministry of Education and Social Development—I am referring to the several grants to charitable and social organizations. I see here—Grant to the Ursuline Convent for the St. Ann's Orphanage, \$2,800; Grant to Dharam Sala, \$10,000 and so on. I am not in a position to say whether this grant to the Dharam Sala is adequate or too much, but I have had the opportunity to move among the people there and I am not satisfied that the conditions are good enough.

**Mr. Speaker :** Let us leave that until we are in Committee of Supply.

**Mr. Hugh:** I shall reserve my comments until we are in Committee of Supply.

2.30 p.m.

**Mr. Saffee (Berbice West):** I wish to say how disappointed I am in my colleagues on the other side in their opposition of this Budget. From what we can see, they have been scraping the barrel all the time to find grounds for criticism. Our country today is faced with the inescapable situation of finding money to run it, to finance its recurrent expenditure and to make a contribution also to its Development Programme. Whichever Government is in power, whether it is the People's Progressive Party Government or the People's National Congress Government, it will have to search to raise money to meet the necessary requirements of the country.

What is the position today? I heard my friend, the hon. Member for Georgetown South (Mr. Hugh), quibbling about a few cents here and a few cents there. What about the bigger issues? He said that nearly half of the revenue on the recurrent estimates comes from customs duties. But that is not quite accurate. If you were to glance at the Estimates, on page iii, you would see that under cus-

toms and excise, \$27,882,000 is estimated for out of a total of \$58,459,675. That is not quite half of the Estimates, but let us take it for that. We must ask ourselves the pertinent question: What is responsible for this? What is responsible for this state of affairs?

He wants to give the impression that it is the responsibility of the P.P.P. Government. This is absolutely false; this is absolute nonsense. I wish to tell him that this is the result of Colonialism, the result of colonial rule which they, on the other side, are begging and kicking up a dust that we should not get rid of. It is a fact that \$27 million will come from customs and excise duties. Who is responsible for it? Let us rule out this revenue and what will we be able to replace it by? What will be put in the place of customs and excise duties? That is the inescapable situation. [**An hon. Member:** "We have put you there to change it."] Yes, we are here to change it, but we are not magicians. We will not be able to change it. This is an accumulation of backwardness. This is an accumulation of over a century, and it will not be possible for the P.P.P. Government to clear this up and put things right in four or five years. Get that straight. And no Government, even with magicians, will be able to do this.

The Government in its effort, earnest and sincere, to find money to carry out this programme sought to resort to certain modest taxation. As I said, our country is in a very backward state with regard to finding money. The situation which faces us today is whether our countrymen are prepared to make a contribution, to make a sacrifice, at this time so that we may lay the foundation for future economic progress in order that those who will come after us will find the task a bit easier. Our friends on the other side say, "No." They shouted and galloped on the streets, and paraded.

What the P.P.P. Government did was to ask the people of this country, rich and poor—let me put it that way—to

[MR SAFFEE]

make a contribution. All the experts who have come here have told us that we have to raise more and more money. I would like to quote from the Development Programme which was presented by the then honourable Financial Secretary, Mr. F. W. Essex.

**Mr. Speaker :** What year?

**Mr. Saffee:** 1959. The Development Programme was for 1960/1964. It states in paragraph 9:

“Increasing production

I wish to say that this was not a P.P.P. man or Minister. He was a foreigner, an honest and sincere man doing his task. It is written here:

“Increasing production and, therefore, the national income depends largely on the rate of investment (or capital formation) in both the private and public sectors and it will obviously be in the interest of the country to raise the money required for its development from within the country as much as possible. In the period 1948-1951, net capital formation averaged 17% of the net national product, but of this investment foreign capital accounted for 63% and domestic saving only 37% (private 26% and Government 11%). In comparison net capital formation during the period 1954 to 1957 averaged 26% of net national product and was composed of 67% foreign capital and 33% domestic savings . . .”

The reality of the situation is that all along we have heard all the various financial experts say that we will have to raise more and more money locally in order to meet our financial needs. I would like to quote from paragraph 47 of the same Report. It states:

“The part of the financing which does not add to the public debt is estimated therefore at \$38.2mn. The loans which would be required to complete a \$110mn. programme total \$71.8mn. . . .”

In other words, \$71.8 million will have to be borrowed to finance this Development Programme of \$110 million. I

want to quote from the Budget as presented by the hon. Minister of Finance on the 31st January. In paragraph 55, it states:

“There is a gap between the cost of the original programme and the foreseeable sources of finance of the order of \$18mn. Moreover, because of increased costs of labour and materials, the cost of the original programme has been inflated by some \$25mn. in order, therefore, to complete the original programme as planned, which the Government considers inadequate for the needs of the country, additional finance to the tune of some \$43mn. has to be found.”

It is clear, therefore, that more and more money is needed to carry out our Development Programme. Where are we going to get this money from? Are we to continue borrowing at the rate at which we are borrowing, piling up interest year after year? What is the position today? Let us look at our 1962 Estimates at the amount which is provided for servicing our loan and interest charges. In 1960, it was \$5,764,804—

**Mr. Speaker:** What page are you quoting from?

**Mr. Saffee:** Page 106, Head 58—Public Debt. In 1961, it increased to \$6,724,743, and in 1962, it is estimated that we will have to meet \$8,216,387. Mr. Berrill who came down sometime ago and recommended this Programme, estimated that at the end of the Programme in 1965, our sinking fund for interest charges will amount to around \$12 million. What is the position? Are we going to continue to borrow at this terrific rate, burdening ourselves with interest charges, or are we going to make a little sacrifice so that we can ease these heavy debt charges which we have to meet year after year?

2.45 p.m.

Our friends on the other side of the Table say “Let us borrow” and burden ourselves with interest charges. They

say that we must not make sacrifices and squeeze a little here and there. This Government is doing its best to raise money to finance its Development Programme. In its effort to generate more and more capital we have seen within a few years a remarkable change and improvement in our export of domestic product. In 1960 our export of domestic product was to the value of \$120 million; in 1961 it was \$125 million. Our party feels that unless we put more and more money into the productive sector, so that we can generate more and more capital, this Government will find it increasingly difficult to meet its recurrent expenditure and social services. But what do our friends say — “Do not increase taxation to provide for our social services.”

Let us look at the records — how many schools have been built; how many cottage hospitals and health centres have been provided within the last three or four years. Look at how much money has been spent on our road programme and sea defences — more than at any period in the history of this country. Some people feel that providing a few jobs here and there is the only evidence of development, but we have to be realistic. This is no time for sentiment but for serious examination of our financial situation. When Government entered into the contract with Grupo del Conte for the construction of a road from Parika to a point opposite Bartica, we heard criticisms and suggestions that the contractors did not have the equipment or the necessary financial ability to do the job. But because of Government's determination to carry on with the Development Programme we have seen today that the contractors are not only capable of doing the work, but are going to complete the road 10 months earlier than estimated. That is the sort of criticism Government gets in this House.

What about the Cuban market? Our rice production is increasing year after year, and we have a large surplus. Are we to throw it overboard? When this Government secured a market in

Cuba for our rice the cry of the Opposition was that the Cubans were robbers who did not pay their debts; have nothing to do with them; Cuban money is blood money. But within 11 months the Cubans have bought \$8 million worth of rice from this country. That is the sort of criticisms we get in this House.

On page 3, paragraph 8 of his Budget Statement the Minister of Finance says:

“ . . . To translate these facts into figures: revenue in 1962 is not expected to be more than \$2mn. higher than in 1960, but recurrent expenditure will be some \$15mn. higher—\$2½mn. more in debt charges; \$2mn. more for agriculture, drainage, irrigation and land settlement services for development projects; \$1½mn. more on the maintenance of sea defences, roads and buildings; \$4mn. more on educational institutions and social services; together with \$3½mn. more for increased rates of remuneration to Government employees.”

The Minister of Finance is in a better position to know the financial position of the country than most of us in this House, if not all. It is a question of bridging the gap which has caused the whole trouble. That is where the trouble started — the bridging of the gap between estimated revenue and estimated expenditure for 1962. Government announced certain taxation proposals to bridge the gap so that the country's affairs could be carried on. Members of the Opposition took objection to those proposals, and as a result we had the very unfortunate situation developing on the 16th February. Where has that carried us? Has it done anything to help to solve the problem which faces us? Can it help to ease the burden which is not on the Government alone? Government is here to govern, but it is the duty of every responsible citizen to face the situation and to contribute towards the country's development. Paragraph 49 of the Budget Statement says:

“49. With revenue at \$58.5mn. and expenditure at \$65.6mn., there will be a deficiency of revenue over expenditure of \$7.1mn.”

**[MR. SAFFEE]**

The Minister of Finance went further to show how the necessary funds could be raised by certain new taxation proposals but, apparently, Members on the other side of the House did not agree. Some suggested that Government should borrow money to bridge the gap. One of the new tax proposals is the Capital Gains Tax which the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River (Mr. Jordan) defended yesterday. I personally do not see anything wrong about such a tax. The hon. Member quoted from the Budget Statement but omitted to quote paragraph 81 which I will quote for his benefit. It says:

"81. The capital gain will be defined as the excess of the value of the property at the time of disposal over its value at the time of acquisition, or at January 1, 1956, whichever is the later date—sales for full consideration providing conclusive evidence of this or, in their absence, valuation at market prices (e.g. for estate or gift-tax purposes). Gains from the sale of furniture etc., of which the value on sale is less than \$5,000, will be exempt; as will be also the gains from the sale of owner-occupied houses, the proceeds of which are in greater part re-invested in another principal residence within twelve months . . ."

In other words, if one sells the house in which he lives and uses the proceeds within 12 months to buy another house for his personal use he will not be liable to the capital gains tax. But if one is trading, buying and selling houses as a business proposition, and makes a profit, what is wrong about a tax on that profit? The same applies to a person's income.

3 p.m.

He said that he would have to pay 45%, but that is not true. The tax will be levied on the same basis as income tax — a maximum of 45%. It is not true to say that an individual will have to pay 45% on the capital gains.

**Mr. Speaker :** Time!

**Mr. Bhagwan** (Essequibo Islands): I beg to move that the hon. Member be allowed to speak for a further 15 minutes.

**Mr. Robertson** (Leonora) seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Saffee:** I was saying that the capital gains tax is just and reasonable. Those people who are engaged in buying and selling properties and making substantial gains will have to pay taxes like everybody else. There is nothing wrong in that, as far as we on this side of the House can see.

My friend the hon. Member for Georgetown South was criticizing the Government yesterday for not doing enough for the dairy industry, and he mentioned that only \$20,000 was provided for that purpose. There, again, we are faced with a similar situation. When the Government says that there is enough milk to meet the needs of consumers in this country and it would be in the interest of the people to make use of our local product; when the Government attempts to put a tax on imported products which compete against our local products, we hear the rantings from the other side of the House. Some hon. Members want new industries to be developed, they want progress, a better standard of living, increased salaries and so on, but how are we going to get these things without further taxation? When the Government seeks to give protection to our local products and local industries, certain hon. Members say that it is wrong, immoral and so on.

The hon. Member for Georgetown South also said that the Government has to face a deficit in connection with edible oil, and it is not doing enough to encourage the production of coconuts in the country. I would like to point out to him that his statement is absolutely wrong. This Government has taken very serious steps to increase the coconut production

in this country, and it has done everything possible to encourage farmers to plant more coconuts. When one looks at the 1962 Development Estimates at page 1, Head 1 — Agriculture — one sees “Item 13. Bonuses to Producers”: The allocation for 1960-1964 is \$210,300, and in 1961 one can see that \$33,650 was spent. This money was paid to the farmers by way of bonuses, so how can my hon. Friend say that the Government is not encouraging the production of coconuts in this country?

I would like to say that what this Government has done in respect of agriculture within the past three or four years has never been done by any other Government in the past. If the hon. Member criticizes the Government for not doing anything for agriculture, he is not conversant with the facts of the situation. They have criticized us more than once for devoting most of the money allocated for the Development Programme on agriculture and so on. [**Mr. Hugh:** “Do not misrepresent the facts.”] They accuse us of doing too much for one sector in agriculture, and they say that we are not doing enough. They are most inconsistent.

Further, in the Development Programme one will see the efforts the Government is making to develop the country and to create jobs for the unemployed. One will see a continuous rise in the expenditure under the Development Programme. In the 1960—1964 allocation one can see, Head XII, Public Works, \$26,143,770; Drainage & Irrigation, \$29,364,345; Education, \$4,100,000; Industries & Credits, \$13,000,000; Land Development, \$6,749,400; Post Office, \$2,296,339; Transport & Harbours, \$8,111,270, etc. What merit is there in the criticism that Government is devoting too much for agriculture and so on? The figures in the Estimates can show what the Government is doing.

**Mr. Hugh:** On a point of order —

**Mr. Saffee:** As far as I am concerned this is a balanced Development Programme, and every phase of the economy of the country has been given careful consideration. The Government has been advised, and it has taken every practical step to see that the development of this country is carried out on a proper basis. I would like to say that when one looks into the whole picture, one can come to no other conclusion than that this country needs more capital and a bigger Development Programme in order to push us forward. But what is the position? What are the hon. Members on the other side saying? They want all of these things, and some of them think that things will fall from the moon. They must remember that one will only get out of life what one puts into it. If they want the country to develop, everybody will have to work hard to develop it. We do not have godfathers abroad who will give us money, so we will have to make the necessary sacrifices. This is the situation that some hon. Members are not prepared to face.

In countries like British Guiana where people have to face a shortage of capital, a similar situation will arise. They cannot find enough money to put into their Development Programme in order to relieve their unemployment and to create better social services for their people. In India the people had to face a similar situation, but some of us do not want to face facts. There is no way out of it other than by tightening our belts in order to make a better British Guiana. If we are not prepared to do so, then no godfather is going to come from overseas to help us. Nobody is going to give us millions of dollars to spend. There is no other way out of this situation.

I wish to conclude by quoting from a book written by Douglas Jay entitled *The Socialist Case*. Page 3 of the book states:

“In fact economic inequality is in itself bad. It is bad because it propagates a false scale of values: a false

[MR. SAFFEE]

servility on the one hand, and a false complacency on the other. It is impossible to deny that inequality destroys freedom, independence, self-respect, and integrity. To some extent, of course, these evils are inevitable, since to some extent inequality is inevitable; but they are evils to be reduced to a minimum, and not virtues to be glorified.

But besides all this, inequality is evil because it is unjust. It is an intolerable injustice that one man, and one man's children, should have five times as much of the blessings of life as another man and another man's children, when neither he nor they have done anything to earn or deserve them."

3.15 p.m.

What we have been trying to do is to bring about a more equitable distribution of wealth in this country and to ask those who are in a more fortunate position to contribute a little more to the country's development. In so doing, we have been blasted, cursed, deemed wicked people and so on. But history will tell that we are doing what we are doing in the interest of the Guianese people—to bring about better living standards, to carry our country forward. We are quite certain that no reasonable man will deny this, but history will tell.

**Mr. Bissember** (Campbellville): I have, in my hand, the Speech from the Throne made by His Excellency the Governor in this honourable House immediately after the last General Election on the occasion when hon. Members of this House were being sworn in to run this country for the next four years. The first paragraph of that Gracious Speech reads as follows :

"History-making is a phrase which comes all too easily to the lips. Nevertheless, this phrase may justifiably be used today. For to you will fall the opportunity and task of assisting at the birth of a new and independent nation with all the consequences which this entails for your people and for the world."

I refer, particularly, to the commencing words of the first paragraph, "History-making is a phrase which comes all too easily to the lips", and the second line, "This phrase may justifiably be used today". This is, indeed, an historic occasion, being the first year of this present Government's administration of this country. History was, in fact, created when, on the 31st January this year, the hon. Minister of Finance introduced in this honourable House what is now known as "the famous Budget Speech".

History had been created then because, never before in the history of the Legislature of this country—not even in the days of colonial imperialism, and one has seen all the implications—has a Budget been introduced and all the taxes foreseen in that Budget withdrawn as a result of intimidation, a strike, rioting and looting in this country. Had it not been for the incidents which followed the 31st January this year, we would have had introduced in this country an iniquitous Budget which sought to choke and rob the working-class people by taking from the very working-class people whom this Government says it is representing, nine-tenths of the duties it had hoped to realize.

Perhaps, the members of the Government know very well why they had to withdraw those aspects of the Budget which affected the working class. But history has really been made because never before has there been a spontaneous uprising of the working-class people in British Guiana; never has there been a more spontaneous uprising by the entire Public Service of this country, against a Government which professed and continues to profess that it intends to raise the standard of living of the inhabitants of this country.

The members on the Government side, especially the back-benchers, will agree that the action taken by the working-class people of this country is similar to that taken in India when Kaldor

brought his iniquitous Budget. It is the same man Kaldor who has been the engine behind this Budget who went to India and caused the Finance Minister there to resign from office when his Budget was introduced. The Finance Minister here, who has introduced this Budget, has not resigned. In fact, the Government, being as barefaced as it always is—this Government which has always been deceiving the working-class people of this country—prefers to substitute a new Budget, although the members call it modifications to the original Budget, because the working-class people whom it says it represents have realized that it no longer represents them, and the time is coming when they shall show their wishes at a General Election. [**Hon. Members:** “Hear, hear.”]

British Guiana is a large country. It is a country with a population of about half a million and its resources are immense. Its coastline borders a sea teeming with fish, lobsters, prawns and shrimps. I do not know whether the hon. Minister partakes of such delicacies as lobsters. [*Laughter in the Public Gallery.*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order in the Public Gallery!

**Mr. Bissember:** It is a land of many waters, mighty rivers. Its minerals are many and varied; its forests provide the wood necessary to house the entire population of this country. Yet, this beloved country of ours has not been developed. One is inclined to agree that this country has not been developed—I say this on behalf of my party—because of past colonial rule. [**Mr. Wilson:** “You know that?”] — But let us examine what attempts this Government, which has been riding the horse since 1957, has made to develop the resources of this country. Let us see what it has done so that the inhabitants will have a better standard of living.

One knows the classic rôle a colony plays. But can the Government show us tangible, concrete evidence of one effort

on its part since 1957? Can it show us anything it has attempted to do since 1957 to tap the resources of this country, both human and natural? Our natural and human resources are very extensive. The Government has done nothing for the human resources by way of training people in British Guiana or making working conditions better—not even for the civil servants—so that these people will be the very assets it desires them to be when this country achieves Independence.

We of the People's National Congress supported the Motion for Independence. We still do and have always done so from the very inception of the People's National Congress. Those on the Government side will remember that during the last election campaign, we did not hide the fact that we wanted to be rid of British colonial rule. We did not hide the fact that we thought that the time had come when this country richly deserved an Administration made up of Guianese people, unfettered by any rule from abroad.

But when we supported Independence, we thought that one of the first things the Government would have done was to have started a training scheme, using the human resources of this country, whereby Guianese people would be equipped to take over the responsibility when we do get Independence. However, the Government has done nothing about training our boys and girls. Has it brought down any experts to find out the available skills in this country, ready to be used in the best interests of the people of British Guiana? I indict the Government for having failed on the first step—to get an important scheme going before Independence comes to us. Apart from the fact that it has done nothing, I know for a fact that this Government, rather than bringing down experts to train our people, has sent 40 of its strong supporters to Cuba, to be trained in what, I don't know.

[MR. BISSEMBER]

3.30 p.m.

They have sent 40 youths to Cuba to undergo training. Personally, I would refuse a free trip to Cuba or Red China, but I am told that my friend, the hon. Member for Essequibo Islands (Mr. Bhagwan) recently returned from a trip to China and must know what wonderful things exist there today. It is this attitude of the Government, which has leanings towards the Eastern European countries and is sending youths to be trained in Cuba, that has scared foreign capital away from this country, because by inference it is allying itself to the Communist bloc. It is no use saying what a wonderful place Russia is and what a wonderful place Cuba is when there is wholesale rationing in Cuba today, when poor people cannot even buy butter in the shops. Does Government want us to follow the economy of Cuba? Does it want that kind of living to be experienced in British Guiana?

Why not get experts, not necessarily from the Western bloc, but experts who do not necessarily belong to the same kind, the same clan? I refer to "the same kind" because in the course of the debate on the Governor's Speech we heard a lot of talk by Government Members about people of their own kind. It was Kaldor who went to Ghana and submitted a Budget which caused some people to be put in gaol for 10 or 12 days without any charge being laid against them. It was in Ghana where a man who arrived two days after the Kaldor Budget was announced was put in prison with a bullet in his leg. That will not happen in this country so long as the P.N.C. exists. — [An hon. Member: "Looting."]. I will deal with looting in a moment when I come to Police. Mr. Speaker, I am accustomed to interruptions; they do not interfere with my trend of thought. When I come to deal with the Police the hon. Minister of Home Affairs will reply to what I have to say.

For a country to be free—I refer to this because every speaker on the Government side spoke about freedom. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowman) spoke about freedom and independence. The Members of the Government want Independence, but they must realize that for a country to be free, for a country to be independent, its people must stand on their own feet, and to achieve this there are two necessary prerequisites. There are two things the Government must realize. The first is that in an under-developed country like British Guiana, before it can really achieve true economic independence, apart from political independence, the people must have the will, the desire and the feeling to create a situation in which they can stand on their own feet. Secondly, there must be competent organization, efficient Government, in order to ensure true economic freedom in this country. My painful duty is to submit that both of these requirements are sadly lacking in this Government. There is not the organization or the competence in the Government to create that state of society wherein the inhabitants of this country can say when Independence comes that "We are standing on our own feet, and we are going to make the best of what this country offers us".

Instead of that, Members of the Government make speeches in this Chamber criticizing, sometimes very personally, Members of the Opposition. Sometimes they make speeches which they intend to use merely for the purpose of creating disunity and confusion in this country. If we are to inject in our countrymen the desire to run their own country we must consider how we are going to develop this country economically, socially and politically. We heard the hon. Member for Western Berbice (Mr. Saffee) say that Government did not want to borrow money because of the high interest charges, but in my humble opinion it is not a question of not borrowing money but of not being able to borrow money, because of lack of confidence in the Gov-

ernment by the people of this country and in the outside world. Foreign investors will not come here to invest their money because of fear of expropriation and confiscation. The economy of this country is fast crumbling. Government should attract investors to this country so as to develop in the people of British Guiana a spirit of contentment and the will to produce more. [Mr. Benn: "Argentina."] My friend, the Minister of Natural Resources always thinks of dictators in other countries. He refers to Argentina.

3.40 p.m.

It is necessary to create a feeling of real confidence. If one attempts to analyse the lack of confidence in this Government, one can go on talking for the next two days. As a result of the flamboyant speeches which certain Members of the Government make when they visit countries where the poor working-class people are suffering today; as a result of their actions or attitudes, the people who are willing to invest money in British Guiana are afraid that the Members of this Government are aligning themselves not with a Socialist economic bloc, but with a Communist economic bloc. They talk of a Socialist economy, but I wonder how many of them around this Table know what is a Socialist economy?

An article appeared in *The Evening Post* about an economist in India, and it says what the Indian Government means by a Socialist economy. The Indian Government pursues a Socialist policy—a policy which does not chase away private enterprise; a policy which does not scare away capitalists. As a matter of fact the Indian Government has been able to use investments from private investors in a unified system—a system where there is an arrangement between the Government and private investors whereby private capital goes hand in hand with governmental industrial schemes; whereby private companies are able to work together for the betterment of the working class in India.

The Members of the Indian Government do not get up and say what a great man Khrushchev or Castro is. They have a desire to improve the living conditions of their people, and they are prepared to work hand in hand with private capitalists. That is the reason why they can boast today of a mixed economy in India. What kind of Socialist economy do we have in British Guiana? We have a kind of Socialist economy in this country which is clearly illustrated in the hon. Premier's speech in America. When the hon. Premier went to the United States of America—I think it was on the occasion when he had the privilege of speaking to the Fourth Committee Conference of the United Nations—he said: "I am a Socialist, but that must not stand and will not stand in the way of the economic development of my country." Is that what he means by a Socialist economy? What does he mean when he says: "I am a Socialist, but I will not allow my Socialism to stand in the way of the economic development of British Guiana?" Are we on this side of the House to understand that Socialism from their point of view is opposed to economic development? That is clearly the implication. Are we to understand that, because he is a Socialist, his brand of Socialism is different from the brand of Socialism the Americans are conversant with, and he would not allow it to stand in the way of the economic development of this country? He meant something else; he meant not Socialism, but Communism.

There has been Socialism in India under the Nehru Administration from 1947, and Nehru has never said a word about preventing foreign capital investment in that country. Why is it that our good Premier had to make such a speech? I would like some clarification on this matter. If I have misquoted him and what I have said is false, I would like him to get up and say that he did not make that statement in America or used words to the effect. That is the kind of

[MR. BISSEMBER]

thing which scares away would-be investors from this country. When they hear such statements coming from the hon. Premier of this country, what does he expect them to do? [Laughter.]

It is no use sitting down over there laughing and saying: "We do not have any money. What efforts have the Government made to find the money? What efforts have the Members of this Government, genuinely, made to encourage investors to come to this country since 1957? [An hon. Member: "Increase taxation in order to get money."] The hon. Member suggests that taxes should be increased in order to get money. He represents the working-class people, and the taxes which the Members of this Government are trying to have confirmed in this House will affect the working-class people from whom the Members of this Government have withdrawn.

I have spoken on the capital tax and other Members have spoken on it. Taxation is good, and any Government will have to tax people; but do not start off in your first year of rule under internal self-government to tax every available avenue. If Government has any competence and organization, it will not endeavour to tax every item in one year.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Kaldor told this Government that it would be looking for trouble, but the Members of this Government did not take his advice. Every Government should know how to prepare its schemes. Every Government knows how to prepare its Budget, but the P.N.C. Members on this side of the House will not remain quiet and allow a deceptive Government—a Government with so-called working-class Leaders—to ride continuously on the backs of the working-class people. When they ride on the backs of the working-class people, they create a new elite class in this country where there will be a top class, and the working class will remain the dogs of this country.

Some Members of the Government talk of special preferences. Let them abolish special preferences-----

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the words were "special privileges".

**Mr. Bissember:** I am referring to the word used in the Budget, "preference". There must be no inequality because certain Ministers are talking against inequality. They are talking about the inequalities of Colonial rule. Do not let us perpetuate what Colonial rule has done in this country, but make a new class of preference and, in fact, create a new privileged class in this country.

3.50 p.m.

When we speak of social equality, we are, in fact, speaking of political democracy hand in hand with social democracy. We are not speaking of one type of preference for Mr. A, because he happens to be the Premier and one type of preference for Mr. B, because he happens to be a good boy in my party. Let us abolish all that, and then we will have true equality in this country. The races here will have no grouse and will realize that the Government is a truly nationalist Government.

The last speaker mentioned something about the Grupo Del Conte. I know for a fact — and I am speaking here not with any desire to abuse my privilege — that one of my constituents went to the Grupo Del Conte office in search of employment. There was a man employed outside to look at every person going to the office to seek employment, and before my constituent could get near to the entrance of that office, this gentleman said to him, "Where is your party card?" [Laughter.] What party card was he asking for? It is nice to sit over there and laugh, but these things cause trouble and disruption in this country when you behave like that and laugh instead of investigating them. In other words, this gentleman

was told, "You cannot get employment here because you have not got a P.P.P. card"—[**An hon. Member:** "Why didn't he show his P.N.C. card?"]—They would have thrown him out of the room right away if he had shown his P.N.C. card.

I wish the Minister concerned would investigate this matter and not just say it is not true, for there are many cases; but there has got to be a limit to this kind of thing if you are talking about unity. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowman) yesterday said that they were always talking about and appealing for unity, for a getting-together of the working-class forces of this country. Is that appeal really genuine when a man stands at a door of an office where Guianese go for employment and tells them they can get no work because they have no P.P.P. cards? Is that the kind of unity you want? Is that the appeal you wish to be heard by the urban working-class people?

He also went on to say that the leader of the urban working-class people never attempted to educate them. We educated them all right, but we educated them before the Election. Then the P.P.P. went and re-educated them and told them, "Don't vote for the working-class leader; vote for the capitalist group." That is the kind of education they wish us to give to the working class. Whether we win an election or lose, we shall continue to fight for the working-class people of British Guiana.—[**Mr. Wilson:** "Marriage with the U.F."—I hear the hon. Minister of Communications talking of marriage with the U.F. What happened to that big marriage before 21st August in Georgetown North and Georgetown Central? The honeymoon is over now so you have gone to the Court and got a divorce.

They are talking about marriage now, but in 1952 the People's Progressive Party got out there with the capitalists and fought against the

McDavid tax. Was not that a marriage? They sit in this House and castigate the People's National Congress for something with which it had nothing to do. If they knew anything of the philosophy of my party — [*Interruption.*] — In 1952, some of our members were still studying in England. In 1953, they said it was a good thing the British troops came to save the capitalists. Now, they sit over there in the Government Benches and say it was a good thing the British troops came and saved them after February 16. They allied themselves with the capitalists in 1952 to fight against the soft drinks tax. We are fighting the working-class case, and that is why when they seek to introduce any kind of iniquitous Budget like the one they attempted on the 31st January, they will have to be prepared for a working-class uprising again in this country. It is the democratic right of a working-class people to stand up and fight so that taxation will not be inflicted on them without their having a say in it.

On page 2 of the revised Budget Statement, in the paragraph relating to paragraphs 32 and 33 of the Budget Speech of the 31st January, we find this:

"... Private investors will be invited to participate in Government industrial enterprises."

You have statements like that—bald; not coming out of the shell. What does the Government mean by that statement? What industrial enterprises does the Government have in mind to attract private investors? What type of industrial undertaking does the Government intend to ask private capitalists and foreign investors to participate in in this country? If you do not make it clear to them; if you do not tell them what kind of industry you have in mind; if you do not tell them what kind of concessions you are going to give them or what guarantees, if any at all, how are they going to come? You don't just say, "Come in and participate in this industrial concern." You must tell them all these things. But perhaps this is a convenient time ———

**Mr. Speaker:** For what?

**Mr. Bissember:** I was under the impression that it is now time for tea.

**Mr. Speaker:** The clock in the Chamber does not say four o'clock as yet.

**Mr. Benn:** What, man, are you hungry?

**Mr. Bissember:** The Minister of Natural Resources asks if I am hungry, but I would tell him that I like my cup of tea in the afternoon. Though it is a relic of the colonial past, I shall continue to have my tea and fight for the working-class people of the country.

I was making the point that it is time the Government made it clear to investors, local and foreign, what it intends. People in this country would like to invest some of their money which they have been saving since the days of indentured labour or of slavery. There is the example of Mr. Weithers with his soap factory. Come out and tell would-be investors: "I want you to come into this concern. How much money are you willing to invest? These are my terms. These are the concessions for the first year; these are the concessions for the second year; these are the concessions for the third year. These are the guarantees I will give you if you invest your money. These are the guarantees I will give you against this talk of expropriation." The Government says it will not expropriate, but there is such talk in the country. Satisfy the investors. Tell them that this is a Socialist Government and that there is no question of expropriation in British Guiana.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is now four o'clock, time for the suspension of the sitting.

*Sitting suspended from 4 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.*

*4.30 p.m. -- On resumption.*

**Mr. Speaker:** At the suspension of the sitting the hon. Member for Campbellville (Mr. Bissember) was speaking. He

has utilized his time to the full. If he wishes to continue I would suggest a Motion.

**Mr. Blair (Berbice River):** I move that the hon. Member be granted an extension of 15 minutes to continue his speech.

**Mr. Joaquin (Kitty)** seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Bissember:** I am indeed very grateful for the indulgence of the House in allowing me to continue my address. But before I continue I would invite my friends on the other side of the Table — now that the marriage between them and the capitalists before August 21 is over — to look outside and see their erstwhile friends on the street. This Government is trying to give the false impression to people overseas and in this country, that the working-class people of British Guiana did not oppose the Budget which it presented here on the 31st January. Government has tried to give the impression that the capitalists are the people who caused the uprising, when it knows as a matter of fact that the working-class people of their own volition spontaneously rose up against the iniquitous so-called working-class Budget. If Members of the Government would just look outside they would see that no member of my working-class party is taking part in anything that is happening out there. Those people were their friends before August 21; they were arm in arm. Those were the people they allied themselves with to prevent the working-class people in the City of Georgetown having their voices heard through the polls on August 21. However, the honeymoon is over, and now the trouble starts.

I repeat that this Government has not been able to make any demographic surveys—in fact no surveys at all to ascertain what are the potentialities, human and otherwise, in this country in

order to arrive at an arrangement between private investors and the Government for the economic development of this country. After the Budget Statement on the 31st January we saw what took place in this peaceful City of Georgetown, a situation undoubtedly created by the vicious taxation proposals, which led to the declaration of a state of emergency which still exists. Why was it necessary for this Government, which professes to be a Government for all the people of this country, to have to resort to creating the present emergency?

Those of us who had the privilege of standing in the corridor of that building over there (the Magistrate's Court) when the poor working-class people were demonstrating in Georgetown, will say that they were a peaceful lot of people walking up and down the streets with placards, genuinely appealing to the Government not to pursue its vicious Budget. They were quiet and peaceful people fighting for their rights under Democracy. Perhaps, under this Socialist Government they had no right to do what they did prior to the withdrawal of the Budget. There was no attempt by any person to interfere with this building or to do anything undemocratic. I stood up there with three Magistrates and we saw civil servants and other Government employees pass by, and a remark was made that they were a peaceful people fighting for their democratic right to live in this country.

But that was the kind of thing which caused this Government hastily to send for British troops. For three days the demonstration went on without looting, no disorderly behaviour anywhere, and no person was charged for interfering with a Minister or going into a Government Department and creating a nuisance. But this working-class Government which chased out "limey" troops in 1953, sent an S.O.S. for British troops to be sent to this country. For this Socialist Government this is a period of the greatest austerity for, as the hon. Member for Western Berbice (Mr. Saffee) said, the

colonial past has left this country poor with a lot of debt to pay, but if Government wants to maintain its stand on Independence, where was the necessity to call in imperialist troops to suppress its own people whom it says it is representing?

I understand that this Government has to foot the bill for the upkeep of the troops in this country. There are what are called tropical allowances to these imperialist troops. Where is the Government going to find the money to pay these troops to protect Members of the Government in this country? Is it going to ask the taxpayers to pay more taxes so as to pay for these troops? That is the kind of hypocrisy we have in this country, a kind of hypocrisy which makes one wonder whether this Government is in fact what it says it is. It says it has no money. It has a Police Force and a Volunteer Force which carried on for three days and are still on duty in this country. But by calling in British troops this Government is by inference saying that its Police Force is not capable of maintaining law and order in this country. How is it that the Minister of Home Affairs (Mr. Rai) eulogized the Police Force; said they were a loyal set of men who did a good job during the period of crisis? How is it that Government is keeping British troops here under a state of emergency and at the same time saying that the Police are loyal?

4.45 p.m.

When the hon. Minister of Home Affairs said that the Police were loyal, the hon. Premier's Private Secretary, an expatriate from Trinidad — I have never met the gentleman, but this post is in the Estimates and he is paid \$720 a month — made a statement questioning the loyalty of the Police Force in this country. We have the hon. Minister, whose portfolio includes the responsibility for the Police Force, saying that the Police are loyal, and we have also the Secretary of the P.P.P., the Party in the Government, questioning the loyalty of the Police.

[MR. BISSEMBER]

Mrs. Janet Jagan, Secretary of the P.P.P. and wife of the Premier, is reported in *The Gleaner* in Jamaica as having questioned the loyalty of the British Guiana Police Force. When the Premier's Private Secretary and the Secretary of the P.P.P., the governing Party, make these statements, they are calculated to impair the loyalty of the British Guiana Police Force—they can have no other effect.

Sometimes I feel like asking the Premier and some of his colleagues to muzzle the mouth of their Private Secretary. I remember speaking on this subject some time ago when a certain hon. Member from that side of the House said: "Why is the hon. Member for Campbellville attacking this gentleman? He does not want a job; he is a rich man with a yacht." The next week I saw that \$720 a month was provided for the man who wanted no job! Is that the Guianization this Government talks about? Is that the type of Guianization some people believe in when they bring an outsider to this country and make him the Premier's Private Secretary?

I wish that certain hon. Members will realize that by their very behaviour their own supporters will find them out; they will find them out very soon. I remember referring to that before. This Government has created something in this country for which it will certainly regret. The day will come when the very weapon the Government used on August 23 will turn back and seek those on the Government's side.

I notice that we have to approve of big sums for the Police Force. The Police are in fact a loyal group of people in this country, and it corroborates what the hon. Minister of Finance said when he eulogized them and indicated what a good job they are doing. They will continue to do a good job in this country despite what type of Government is in power, if those who control the administration of this country during this critical period

of its history will not open their mouths and interfere with matters which are strictly the concern of the Police. It is this kind of thing that makes the ordinary man in the street get up and say that this Government is opposed to this and that, because the Government is interfering with matters concerning the Police here and there.

I will relate an incident today which I did not relate on the last occasion— [An hon. Member: "A lie."]—It is no use saying it is a lie. Some hon. Members will know it is not a lie.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think you should address the Chair.

**Mr. Bissember:** It is no point in saying it is not true. A certain incident occurred on the East Coast where a report was made by the Public Works Department to the Police. The Police, in their usual, loyal and dutiful attitude, detailed a detective to investigate the matter. Some stones, the property of the inhabitants of this country, were put at a certain spot by the P.W.D., and a certain individual and her agents were seen removing the stones from the P.W.D.'s heap. This individual and her agents were questioned, and in her presence the stones were removed by the P.W.D., but she did not protest. There was enough evidence to prosecute her. She paid a visit to Georgetown the following morning, and what do we hear? She had an interview with the hon. Minister of Home Affairs; the Minister called for the statement the Police took from her; sent her to a Deputy Superintendent of Police, who is not stationed in East Demerara Police Division, and the next thing one hears is that the woman is not to be prosecuted by the Police and that a policeman is charged for insulting the woman. That is the kind of discrimination or ministerial interference which will lead this country to national disunity. That is the kind of ministerial intervention or interference

that takes place when a party supporter is involved, and then some people say that the Police are not doing their duty.

—[**An hon. Member:** “Who says she is a party supporter?”]—The hon. Minister will tell you who says she is a party supporter. The woman was allowed to go free, and nothing more was heard about the investigation. An officer rang the Superintendent of Police on the East Coast and everything was all right.

We are all striving for national unity, and we are all striving to stop nepotism, corruption and discrimination. I beg the Ministers of this Government not to repeat this sort of behaviour, because it will lead to more trouble in this country. Do not stand in this House and talk about unity and encourage the working class to join with you, when Members of the Government are doing the opposite to what they are saying. If the Police are not to be allowed to investigate matters; if the process of inquiry cannot be carried out without ministerial interference, it will create in this country anarchy, lawlessness and a state of utter disorder. I ask in all sincerity that this particular incident will not be repeated.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time!

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move that the hon. Member be given a further 15 minutes.

**Mr. Joaquin** (Kitty) seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Bissember:** I feel very strongly on this matter, and I hope my hon. Colleague and Friend will look into the matter and call a halt to this kind of ministerial intervention that is taking place in this country. It maybe that there are other cases which cannot be traced directly to his Ministry, but it is known that other Members of the Government have got in touch with his Ministry and have tried to pollute the course of Police

investigations in this country. I ask that this type of intervention be stopped, because there might be grave repercussions in this country if it is permitted to continue. You may preside over and govern, not a country where peace and tranquility prevail, but you may find yourself governing a country where you will have riots, civil disobedience, civil strife, racial antagonism, etc., and the British troops will not be able to control the situation. Rather than spending a lot of money to pay the British troops, this Government ought to have used the money in other avenues whereby we would have had a better country on August 16 — we would have had a country where everybody would be happy to live in it.

The members of the P.N.C. do not only talk of unity, but we practise it. We on this side have always said that our intention or desire is to create a feeling of Guianese nationalism. If the Members of this Government do not succeed in the time they have at their disposal to create that feeling of Guianese nationalism, let me tell them that they will never succeed in running this country for the benefit of its inhabitants. This is an important matter to be faced. When they attack us on the P.N.C. side, they will only be creating racial tension.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources said that we on this side of the House have done our bit to create racial tension in this country. I ask them over there, what troubles are the hon. Premier now having with regard to racial factions in the P.P.P.? Race is causing trouble in the P.P.P., and some of them are still talking about doing something to stop racialism. I wonder who was ever asked to remarry his wife under Hindu rites, and let her wear a sari before she goes back to the constituency which he represents?

5 p.m.

He is not here now. I am wondering further—[*Interruption.*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please! Personal matters of such a kind should not be — What is happening to this House? Even when the Speaker says, “Order”, hon. Members continue with their giggle. When the Speaker is on his feet, he expects the House to be silent and everyone looking at him to hear what he has to say. If this behaviour continues, I shall have to use my democratic and, indeed, my parliamentary right to adjourn the House until hon. Members learn to behave. I was making the point that what the hon. Member for Campbellville just said is a personal matter relating to the affairs of a Member of the House and it should not be permitted to be part of his speech. I am, therefore, calling on him to withdraw the remark.

**Mr. Bissember:** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw what I said.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let there be no further reference to the matter.

**Mr. Bissember:** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary castigated us and said that we are responsible for racial tension in this country. But do not blame us on this side when there are incidents and those on the Government side are doing nothing to stop this feeling in the country and bring the major races together. The hon. Member is absent, but I meant him no ill will when I mentioned what I mentioned, which I withdrew subsequently.

The members of this Government have to show the entire electorate of this country that they are interested in everyone. They come here to run the Government, representing not only P.P.P. supporters but the entire length and breadth of the country, and I beg them again to try and heal the racial rifts which exist in British Guiana. It would not make things any better by printing things like the petition to the United Nations with a racial slant, nor would we succeed by adopting measures like the Congress Paper of 1956. We cannot get on either, by saying that negro Policemen shot Indians.

Let us get down to the job of bringing the people together, not by talking and meeting our supporters and saying that we are doing a wonderful job, but by acting. This country belongs to every ethnic group living here. This country is not for one particular class or group of people. Let us appreciate that and if we do so, we will show our appreciation by appropriate acts and action when the occasion arises.

There is one Head in the Estimates — Deeds Registry — on which I should like to speak. Those of us who have had occasion to go to the Deeds Registry on business would readily have observed that, in that department, there is a heap of mess. There is hardly enough room for the clerks to work properly; there is hardly enough room for the members of the public who go there on business; there is no proper accommodation for the civil servants who are engaged in that technical department of our Civil Service.

I wish the Minister concerned will look into conditions at the Deeds Registry and see what can be done to clear up the mess there because it is, in my humble opinion, one of the most important departments in the Civil Service where people are asked to handle matters of a highly technical nature, where business is transacted which has to receive the attention of Her Majesty's judges. It is time, therefore, that something be done to relieve the confusion and chaos there. I observed, with much satisfaction, that a new officer has been appointed Organization and Methods chief, and I hope the Minister concerned will see to it that something is done immediately to relieve the stress and burden under which our civil servants there have to work.

The next Head in the Estimates on which I wish to speak is, “Attorney-General”. I know the hon. the Attorney-General has assumed office there only in October last year or sometime before

that, and I hope that whatever comments I make this afternoon in this House will be noted and investigated by him and by those concerned. I have had close association with that office for 1¼ years — 1960 and early 1961 — by going there daily, and I want to say that in that important office in the Public Service, things are not as they should be. There again, the Organization and Methods Officer can look into the conditions and see how they can be made better. For instance, there is the question of staffing. We are hoping to achieve an independent nationhood shortly. It is, therefore, very important that we have set up a proper legal administration, that the Law Officers Department should be properly staffed, properly equipped and should have the personnel it needs to run it. If it is a question of funds, I ask the Ministers to do their best to see that that department, which is so important, is looked after immediately.

There is another point which I wish to make on that department, and this concerns the system of recruiting officers to fill the various positions. Those who have to deal with the administration of justice in this country will know how important each individual officer in that office is, what duties he has to perform, how wide and varied is his scope of activity. It becomes of great importance, therefore, that the right type of officer is recruited into that department. It must not be said that because a person has a high academic degree he must be given precedence over another applicant for a vacant post there.

As I understand it, the factors to be taken into consideration when recruiting officers into a department, are, first of all, ability; secondly, competence and academic qualification. Experience, of course, is something which is very necessary. You cannot have three or four qualified men working in that department for four or five years, advising Government departments and prosecuting in the Courts, then suddenly one morning, when an import-

ant vacancy arises, you bring a man straight from university and say, "Here is a job for you. Do it." I am told that a certain gentleman has just been recruited into that department, into a high office, because he has achieved high academic qualifications—a Master of Laws degree.

Academic qualification is good, but it should not stand before experience—people who have been doing the work for all these years, who, because of lack of funds or pressure of work, could not go to London for a refresher course and take the Master's degree. The yardstick should not be only this degree. If there are men who have been doing the work all the time, do not bypass them for a man who might have come from London with a Master's degree.

The Attorney-General will agree that the complex and varied matters which have to be attended to by legally trained officers are things which call for tremendous experience and not just academic qualifications. I hope that those concerned will look into this and see what can be done because it must be remembered that not so long ago, Sir Archie Marshall, a British High Court judge who visited this country and called at the Attorney-General's Chambers, said that the Law Officers in that department are, in the majority, immature.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you going to be much longer? Your time is running out.

**Mr. Correia:** I beg to move that the hon. Member be given another 15 minutes to continue his speech.

**Mr. Kendall** (New Amsterdam) seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Bissember:** I am grateful, sir, but I promise I shall not be long. This is an important department about which I am very much concerned. As I said, an independent nation should have a proper legal administration. What has the Government done to meet the criticisms

[MR. BISSEMER]

of that High Court judge when he made that statement to which I referred a few moments ago? You have to try and get mature minds in that department. You have to try and see whether the material you have there, which has been working very well for the last five years, cannot continue to work without your having to bring a man who has just left university.

Some of the members of the Government do not appreciate the significance of what I am saying, but I trust the hon. the Attorney-General will look into this and, with funds available from Government, will attempt to do something to meet such a criticism and make it attractive for experienced officers with some ability. We are rapidly moving away from this transitional period, and that will make me say a few words on the Civil Service.

5.15 p.m.

It seems to me that this Government has not appreciated, or has not been able to recognize the fact that there will be grave administrative implications and responsibilities following the achievement of Independence in this country. If it has realized those two facts it would have taken some steps to train our young civil servants so as to prepare them for the various diplomatic services which this country will have to undertake with Independence. A diplomatic service is something which an independent country must carry. I do not know who the Government intends to appoint as Ambassadors, but I know who is likely to be made an Ambassador to a particular country, and the hon. Member knows to whom I am referring.

The point is that we must have trained persons to assume the responsibilities and to run the machinery of the diplomatic service when this country becomes independent—persons who are Guianese, and who have not left the country

10 or 15 years ago—men who are working in the Civil Service now, and who can do something for the benefit of this country. There should be a training scheme for civil servants so that they may realize that they are not just robots, not mere tax collectors, but an integral part of the Government of this country. Inject into them the idea that they have a role to play when this country gets Independence. If the Government itself endeavours to get civil servants to realize how important they are, and to realize that they are the people to carry the responsibility when we have Independence, we can safely close our eyes and say that our own Guianese civil servants will be there to lead and work in the various Departments when Independence comes. Not only that, Government will have their loyalty, and a trained and satisfied Civil Service will give better service than two or three untrained civil servants. Let us create opportunities for our Guianese civil servants and not look outside to bring people from abroad. Let us have faith and confidence in our own people. Let us manifest it by giving them the opportunities which they richly deserve.

An independent country without a trained Public Service is a country which will never succeed in its public administration. A country which does not have the necessary material to run its diplomatic service is a country which is not worthy of being independent. I and my party appeal to those concerned to look into the possibility of starting immediately a training scheme whereby our civil servants will feel that they are a part of the machinery of Government. Let us try to wipe out that strained relationship between the Government and the Civil Service which reached a climax on the 16th February. Let us not try to antagonize them but endeavour to create an atmosphere in British Guiana in which, by our actions, deeds and speeches, our general behaviour, people outside and in this peaceful country of ours will say there is in fact a Government which truly re-

presents all sections of our community, a Government which is not corrupt and which does not believe in nepotism, a Government which can really govern the entire Guianese nation. [*Applause.*]

**The Attorney-General** (Dr. Ram-sahoye): It is interesting to hear the observations which have been made by the hon. Member for Campbellville with respect to the administration of justice in the Attorney-General's Ministry. We on this side of the House realize the absolute need for a strong and efficient system of justice in this country. This we do not have to be told, but we also realize that the quality of our legal system depends upon the quality of the men called upon to administer it. It therefore follows that it is essential, if the administration of justice is to mean anything in terms of sovereignty, that every effort will have to be made by the Government to attract and retain in the Legal Service men of learning, ability and integrity, and men given to sacrifice, and that money will have to be spent to provide them with the material which is necessary if they are to make any significant contribution to the development of the legal system.

It is with this objective in view that the Estimates to which my learned friend, the hon. Member for Campbellville, referred were laid before this House. The Estimates include provision for additional staff for the Attorney-General's Chambers. The Attorney-General could not be expected to be responsible for legal matters, to be the Chief Legal Adviser of the Government, and to be the leader of the Bar unless he is assisted by learned men. New posts have been created, but they have been created in the expectation that they will be filled by persons who deserve to be appointed to them. They are being filled in order to assist in the preparation for the heavy tasks which will face us with Independence. In the past we dealt in this colony only with municipal problems. Probably, in a matter of months we will have to deal with problems not only of law but of international trade and

probable representation at the International Court of Justice. Those problems cannot be tackled except by men who are learned in the law and trained in particular subjects.

My learned friend referred to an appointment in the Law Officers' Ministry, the appointment of a man who has distinguished himself with honours at the Bar and has taken his Master's degree, and who at great sacrifice has decided to work in the Attorney-General's Ministry. There should be no criticism of this. The days when lack of qualifications was at a premium, and when incompetence was a privilege, are now passing from this land. The hon. Member should be proud to know that we can attract into the Public Service of this country such a man, and it does not matter that some person who may have been in the Service before has not been appointed, for every man will have his chance to qualify and to equip himself to hold higher office in this country.

It is not true that Government is not making any attempt at training, but it is sometimes difficult to find men to train in the Attorney-General's Ministry. The Attorney-General would be unable to provide training facilities for officers unless they have at least a first degree. Therefore it is incumbent on the members of the Legal Service themselves to try to attain the minimum qualification if they are to be helped along the line. This is why it sounds so unreasonable to my mind to hear criticism levelled at the appointment of persons who have studied and who have mastered their profession with distinction.

Reference was made to some remarks by Sir Archie Marshall. Incidentally, he told me after he read the *Evening Post* of a particular date, that he had said no such thing, and I accept his word. But what can we expect? We have in the Attorney-General's Ministry very young men performing the most onerous duties

## [THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

of State. Heavy responsibility has fallen upon them to provide this country with legislation, with legal advice, with advocates in all the cases brought by and against the Government, to provide Government Departments with advice on various matters, some of which hardly impinge on law, but which are sent to the Attorney-General's Ministry in order that further action could be taken in a civil manner. Those officers have done a wonderful job. Those who work and make their contributions need not be afraid of not being placed in positions where they will hold higher office in the Judicial and Legal Service in this country. There is no need for them to worry about their future prospects, because the test is as it should be—merit and contribution.

I am aware of the delicate situation in the Registry of the Supreme Court where members of the Public Service, the Judges and members of the legal profession, are working under the most depressing conditions. I am aware that there is need for more staff, and there is need to make conditions of service more attractive even to junior members of the staff. These points are being considered right now by the Government, and it is hoped that at a very early date some satisfactory solution will be found to present problems in the Deeds Registry. We do not use mob rule; we do not use rule by violence. We realize how important it is to this country to have a sound and efficient system of justice. We know what it is for justice and law and order to be broken down for just a few hours, as we witnessed on the 16th February, 1962.

5.30 p.m.

That is why those of us who belong to the legal profession have the greatest contribution to make to the welfare of the people in this country at the present time because, without law and order, without justice and an independent judiciary, a man can descend to a position where he is no more than an animal,

Nevertheless, I am grateful for the observations which have been made by my learned brother, the hon. Member for Campbellville, and I can assure him that whatever decisions are taken with respect to the achievement of an efficient and fair system of justice, steps will be taken to give such justice to the best of our learning and ability.

**Mr. Cheeks** (Georgetown North): This is a privilege I am having here for the first time to participate in the debate of this country's Budget—I should have said this country's Budgets. I have noticed that, in trying to prepare its Budget, the Government has tried to do certain things. I propose, in the course of my speech, to examine what the Government has tried to do and to show what it has really done.

First, I must say that the conditions under which this House is meeting to debate the Budget are conditions which I would certainly prefer not to have existed. We are debating a Budget while the Emergency Order and a Proclamation Order are in force. It reminds me of the occasion when Kings came to Parliament with armed guards. It also reminds me of the occasion when Oliver Cromwell went to the Parliament, took up the Mace and said: "Be gone." Of course he had an armed body of soldiers behind him.

The Members of this Government have tried to convince us that the existence of the Emergency Order does not in any way restrict anybody from doing what he or she wishes. The fact that the Emergency Order exists seems to be ever present in one's mind and it is not, I urge, necessary now for these Regulations to be in force. One wishes to speak and feel that one has complete freedom when one is discussing the country's Budget.

When the Government is preparing its taxation policies there are several goals which must be kept in mind. Taxes are raised, first, for providing the Gov-

ernment with revenue; secondly, for the purpose, as admitted by this Government of making what it calls certain social adjustments or bringing about some form of equality in the general economic arrangement. Another aim in taxation is to protect the industries at home. Those are the three main aims in taxation. It appears that these three aims: The raising of Government revenue, the principle of social and economic adjustment, and the protection of industries are carried out by this Government in a contradictory manner.

If one takes, for instance, the particular goal of raising revenue one will see, on the one hand, where the Government has tried to raise revenue by imposing a tax on certain goods, by imposing a property tax, a gift tax, a capital gains tax on property and on business, but at the same time it has adopted certain policies which, in the present undeveloped condition of our economy, make it impossible to obtain such revenue from the sources which are available. I wish to point out that even though it has imposed measures which will bring in revenue for the Government, its general attitude is such that it will restrict the means by which revenue could be obtained in this country.

With respect to the question of social adjustment, I think that Government is not giving us a clear picture of things. It is trying in its fiscal policy to prevent a recurrence of what took place in February last, and it is trying to do that in a very clumsy manner. It has stated that it is removing the tax on consumer goods. It certainly has removed the tax on certain major consumer goods because it wants to create the impression that it is making life easier for the working-man. The Government was accused, when the first Budget appeared, of seeking to oppress the working class and, of course, that is exactly what Government has done. In the first Budget the Government attacked everybody in the hope that by drawing attention to the more oppressive taxes

levied on the propertied class, the working class would have said: "We have been taxed, but the rich people have been taxed more heavily," and would have accepted the unjust imposition. Government was trying to separate the working class from the other classes.

If I may refer to the remarks made by the hon. Member for Suddie, he specifically pointed out that Government had designed certain taxes for particular purposes: the tax on property, the gift tax and the capital gains tax. He claimed that these taxes were not levied on the working class. He also referred to the National Savings Scheme as not taxing the working class, meaning that a man who was in receipt of a salary of, say, \$300 a month was not really in that class.

The Government's policy or aim is quite clear. It must divide the people, if it must rule them. It must keep the working class apart from the others, because what Government saw in February last was a combination of all classes: the working class, the middle class and the propertied as well as the business class. Everybody rose up against the Government on that occasion. The Government does not want that to happen again, but its effort in this direction is only superficial. I do not think that the working-class people will allow themselves to be fooled.

If one were to examine the income tax proposals one will find that Government has given \$50 more on the amount not taxable for a single person. That means that a person who is working for, say, \$15.40 per week will have to pay a small tax. Does the Government feel that \$15.40 a week is too much for a single person to earn? The Members of the Government should give some thought to that. I would not say that the tax will be high, but I know that a person who is working for \$15.40 a week is almost certainly living in debt. In fact there are persons who are working for five or ten

[MR. CHEEKS]

times that sum who are living in debt. If Government is going to take even a small amount from the person who works for \$15.40 a week, when I add it to what he will have to pay by way of indirect taxation, it will be clear that it is doing the working-class man something similar to what the first Budget did to him. The Government is merely doing the same thing in a different way.

If one were to look at the figures in the income tax proposals, one will find that a man who has a wife and two children and is working for \$175 a month will also have to pay a small amount of income tax. He has to pay rent; he has to give his wife and children at least three meals daily; pay school fees, and provide them with clothes as well as medicine—he has to provide them with the various requirements of daily living. I do not think it is fair for Government to call upon such a man to pay income tax at all. Even although the tax is small, such a man should not be asked to pay; while Ministers of the Government and Assemblymen sit back and forget the days recently passed when they earned and lived on low wages.

5.45 p.m.

All they say now is that the revenue must be obtained and everybody must pay. But as the immortal Shakespeare said:

“But 'tis a common proof  
That lowliness is young ambition's ladder,  
Whereto the climber-upward turns his  
face;  
But when he once attains the utmost  
round,  
He then unto the ladder turns his back,  
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base  
degrees  
By which he did ascend.”

The Ministers of the Government are turning their backs to the ladder and scorning the base degrees by which they did ascend. But they must not forget that the patience of the working-class people is not inexhaustible. It took the

events of February 16 to teach them that a community of men and women who are living almost on the very brink of starvation, among whom there is a large unemployed force, will not and cannot be compelled to save. I sincerely trust that they have learnt their lesson thoroughly.

The items in the Budget Statement on which they have decided to keep the taxes are the items which they have decided a man can do without. They have decided. Who are they to decide? They must decide what the working-man must use. They forget that the working—man like any other man, must have his recreation. Certain social and eating habits have already been established, and if they are to place a high tax on a particular item which the working-man is accustomed to using, all that they will be doing is forcing that working-man to spend more money on that particular item.

In other words, taxes which are intended to be progressive—because that is the modern tendency—must be so arranged that they take more out of those who can pay more. But taxes on certain goods which, by virtue of social custom, the working—man uses and will continue to use, cease to be progressive and become regressive, for the working-man will continue to use those goods, and the tax will be taking a much higher proportion out of his pockets than out of the pockets of the man who is receiving a higher income.

I wish to refer next to the contradiction in Government's treatment of this business of taxation. Government wants to encourage industry. That is a laudable measure if any Government uses its fiscal policy to encourage industry. In the case of coffee, this Government has decided to carry the customs duty to 75 per cent—the duty on coffee beans and imported coffee, Nescafe and instant coffee, has gone to 75 per cent. Government, in that way

is protecting the coffee industry here. Not that we have much of a coffee industry, but one can appreciate a policy which is desired to protect a potential industry even though the Government allowed much of the crop to be destroyed last year.

I spoke of the contradiction in Government's policy. You will notice that in case of another potential industry, the manufacture of soap flakes, Government has brought the duty down to 6 per cent. I have no complaint at all against any attempt that this Government makes to reduce the cost of living and make the cost of a particular article as low as possible. But it makes conditions so hard for a potential industry. It reduces the customs duty so low that the foreign article can enter the country almost free. A mere 6 per cent tax is levied in one case and in another case, as in the case of coffee, the percentage is carried to 75 so as to protect a potential industry.

I cannot understand how the Government can be so inconsistent. If you want to protect local industry, if you want to make it possible for potential industries to spring up in the country so as to relieve unemployment and increase the total productivity of the country, you must have a clear-cut policy. You must assist industry. As long as the article is one which can be produced here, the Government's policy should be a clear one with respect to the treatment to be meted out to those who wish to start industries. But it does appear that, in the granting of any kind of concession, except in certain phases of agriculture, the Government's policy of opposition and hostility to private enterprise is paramount all the time. That is one of the things which are preventing this country from getting nearer to prosperity.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowman) said that influential persons were advising would-be investors

not to invest money here, and he was urging that this was the main reason why capital was not flowing into this country. This point has been dealt with, and I expect that my hon. Friends on that side of the House will say, "Oh, talk of something else; bring something else." But it will bear repetition even though Members on this side have already said it. It is not advice from any influential person or persons in this community that will prevent capital from coming here. It is the behaviour of the spokesmen of the Government; the fault lies in the actions of the Government of the country; it is in the nature of the Budget drafted for the first home-rule year; it is in the words of the various Ministers when they go abroad; it is in the Government's declared policy. Those are the things which are keeping capital out of this country.

You will admit that an undeveloped or underdeveloped country cannot lift itself by its own bootstraps without outside help, and yet, by your words and deeds, you erect a wall to prevent that capital investment from coming here. Then, you look for scapegoats; you look for persons to blame when your own actions are, in deed and in fact, responsible. The industrial nations, which alone can help you, are the nations that you antagonize. You use words which make it impossible for them to trust you, and then you say that they will not help.

What really is preventing capital from coming here are answers such as this which I will quote. I know that newspapers do not always tell the truth. [**Hon. Members:** "Hear, hear."] —I have had experience of that. But answers like this will never bring capital here. I am quoting from the *Evening Post* of April 3:

**“Question:** Are you a Communist?

**Answer:** I never say yes or no to that question . . .”

**Mr. Speaker :** If the hon. Member wishes to quote from that particular document, he must also say who is the questioner and who is the person answering the question.

**Mr. Checks:** The questioner in this case is Lord Lambton, and the person who is giving the answers is the hon. the Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** What is the date of the publication?

**Mr. Checks:** *Evening Post* of Tuesday, April 3. I am quoting from page 4.

**Mr. Speaker:** Please proceed now.

**Mr. Checks:** I quote:

**“Question:** Are you a Communist?

**Answer:** I never say yes or no to that question. I think that there are different types of Communists who try and do different things. There are, for instance, Tito and Stalin.”

[**An hon. Member:** “Tito.”] You must pardon me if I cannot pronounce these Russian names correctly. [*Laughter.*]

**Mr. Speaker:** “Tito” is Yugoslavian.

**Mr. Checks:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could be excused if I did not even know that. But I do know that Marshal Tito is the President of Yugoslavia. What I should have said was that I accept the correction from the hon. Gentleman on the Government side that the pronunciation of T-i-t-o is “Tito” and not “Tito”.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think this is an appropriate time for the Leader of the House to move a Motion for the suspension of the relevant Standing Order to enable the House to adjourn.

**Mr. Benn:** As agreed with the hon. Members of the Opposition parties, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 9 (6) to enable the sitting to be suspended to 8 p.m.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

*Sitting suspended from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.*

*8 p.m.*

*On resumption —*

**Mr. Speaker:** When the sitting was suspended at 6.30 p.m. the hon. Member for Georgetown North was addressing the Assembly. He may now resume.

**Mr. Checks:** At the adjournment I was referring to some of the things which, in my opinion, have been keeping investment capital from coming into this country, and I referred to a question and answer quoted here. I say that this is the kind of thing which really has kept capital out of this country, The Premier was asked: “When do you think British Guiana should be given Independence?” The answer was “This year.” If the Premier has to walk the streets to his office with armed bodyguards; has to keep this country in a state of emergency, and refuses to do away with British troops, I do not see that his answer “This year” makes any sense, but so as not to appear to be drawing a red herring across the trail I would like to refer to another quotation along the same lines. I refer now to another Press Conference which took place in the U.S.A. I propose to quote from the magazine *Guiana Times* which I know is very much read by Members of the Government. I quote from page 38 of that magazine:

"Mr. Spivak: Are you or are you not pro-communist?"

Dr. Jagan: Well, Mr. Spivak, let me put it this way: There is a great deal of confusion about this whole question of British Guiana. . . ."

That is the kind of thing we get. The hon. gentleman who is Premier of this country is unable to give a direct answer to a simple question, and he leaves the questioner to judge whether he is a Communist or not by studying his record. When one studies that record one can come to only one conclusion. I will say further, that if, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowman) said, you were to make a list of the persons who are responsible for keeping capital out of this country, I think the person whose name should head that list should be the hon. the Premier himself, and following in line are those hon. Members who make it their duty, both at home and abroad, to let it be known that they are admirers of that system of government which is opposed to that of the Western Democracies — opposed to the group of countries which have by far the greatest bulk of the world's wealth.

In reply to this argument the hon. Gentlemen on the Government side usually ask "Why is it that for all the years when there was no Socialist Government in power, all this great amount of capital did not flow into the undeveloped countries?" This is the answer: It is only since the end of the last war that the great industrial countries began to turn their attention seriously to development of the under-developed territories. It was only during the 1940's that the spirit of international humanitarianism really began to take root in the minds of economists and rulers in the metropolitan industrial countries, and it was during that decade that the battle lines were drawn between East and West. It should not be surprising, therefore, if the wealthy countries of the West should prefer to give assistance to those under-

developed countries which have shown by their systems of government that they were likely to remain within the Western fold.

There is no doubt that if this country had clearly and unequivocally aligned itself with the Western Democracies from the time that we began to have more and more control of our own affairs, the great needs of this country would certainly have had a better chance of fulfilment, and the capital equipment, without which no undeveloped country can hope to become industrialized, would have come here in greater quantities. There is no doubt that the gross domestic product of British Guiana would have been increased, and the average income per head would have been much higher. There is no doubt that the unemployment problem would have been beaten, because where industries rise employment flows. Where you remove unemployment you remove one of the chief sources, if not the only real source of misery.

8.15 p.m.

It is during that same decade, the 1940's, that the growing need of trade unions was felt and the gap between those who received wages and those who received profits began to lessen. I wish to say that the words and actions of the Leaders of this Government are preventing capital from coming to British Guiana. Therein lies the contradiction in the policies we are asked to accept. The statement is made at all times: "We want capital."

In paras. 32 and 33 of the amended Budget Statement one reads:

"... Private investors will be invited to participate in Government industrial enterprises."

Government speaks about repealing the tax holiday legislation, and yet some hon. Members speak about encouraging private enterprise. What effort is being made to establish private industries here?

[MR. CHEEKS]

All kinds of obstacles are being put in their way. That kind of behaviour cannot encourage foreign investors to come here. That type of behaviour will lead to nothing more than what is being done here at the moment, and it will only result in increased unemployment. There will be no means of raising the wages of the lowest income group to anything higher than starvation level, if something practical is not done very soon. We have just seen an effort made to raise wages, and we know that the Members of the Government had to retire behind the smoke-screen of the perpetual shortage of money: "They will pay, subject to the availability of funds". [An hon. Member: "Arson, too."] — Arson by the P.Y.O. Government was compelled to hide behind a smoke-screen and seek refuge in the proviso: "subject to the availability of funds." We know that Government will have to find the funds to pay the people.

It is known that certain groups have received their money, but others have to wait on the results of the Whitley Council. Those Government employees who fall below the salaries in scales B 8, 9 and C—Messengers, Watchmen, Nurse Aids, Nurses, Rural Postal Assistants and many others are still in the same position in which they were when they went on strike. This is the behaviour of a Government calling itself a people's Government. But, Mr. Speaker, experience should have taught this Government the lesson that irritation occasioned by broken promises, hunger and want will rage in the minds of suffering people beyond the medicine of words.

I have already spoken about the constructions in this document. I wish to refer to para. 3 on page 1 of the first Budget which reads as follows:

"Many colonies and former colonies know, to their cost, that foreign investment and foreign aid in the past have

often meant no more than the creation of new sources of supply to suit the needs of the foreign powers: ..."

This Government expects factories to be laid down here by the East German industrialists, I believe. We are told that these factories will be paid for mainly with goods produced in the factories. I will ask the question: Is it not, by this procedure, tying the economy of this country to that of East Germany which is setting up the factories? Is it not a case, therefore, that, if in the past our country was tied in a colonial relationship to the Western countries, we are being tied now in the same relationship to Communist countries? In this case the burden will be much harder to bear because these countries are much poorer? Does it not mean that we are being tied in the same relationship to a metropolitan country of another type? It means, as in the words in the Budget Statement:

"...that foreign investment and foreign aid in the past have often meant no more than the creation of new sources of supply to suit the needs of the foreign powers: ..."

**Mr. Speaker:** Time!

**Mr. Campbell** (North West): I beg to move that the hon. Member for Georgetown North be allowed to speak for a further 15 minutes.

**Mr. Melville** (Rupununi) seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Cheeks:** The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources referred to the fact that in Trinidad a large number of consumer goods were being taxed; he stated that taxes were being raised on certain consumer goods, and he wondered what the capitalists would do over there. But he did not tell us that in Trinidad the Customs Import Duties

have been only now raised to a figure of 6½%, whereas in British Guiana there are taxes ranging between 20%, 30%, 40%, 75% and 100%. The average here must lie between 40% and 50%. In comparing us with Trinidad, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources did not tell us, as will be seen from page 14 of this Budget Speech, that the British Guiana Airways had suffered a loss of \$84,000 last year.

In the case of Trinidad, where the B.W.I.A. was purchased, a profit of \$1M was made last year. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Natural Resources did not tell us about all of these things. In fact those are some of the things this Government will try to hide from the British Guiana public. The Members of this Government do not want our people to know the truth about things. They want the people to know their truth only, but the people of British Guiana will soon let them know that they have no place for Government's brand of truth.

I would like to refer to another quotation. This time it is one which appeared in *the Graphic* newspaper of Tuesday, 10th April, 1962, at page 1. I think that the sums of money which are referred to in the Appropriation Bill before us must include the payment for Government advertisements and Government announcements in the various newspapers. Here we can see, out of the blue, a Ministerial decision. I will quote:

**"BAN ORDERED ON A  
NEWSPAPER**

The Council of Ministers have banned the official purchase of the Daily Chronicle by any Government office. And no more Government advertisements will appear in the same newspaper.

The ban is contained in an order from the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Trade and Industry to heads of Departments. It is dated April 5.

The memorandum states: "I am directed to inform you that the Council of Ministers have decided that no paid advertisements or Government notice should be published in the Daily Chroni-

cle and that official subscriptions to that newspaper should be terminated.

You should therefore ensure that your department ceases to purchase the Chronicle newspaper for official use."

This is not the beginning. The beginning took place ever since. This is merely the variation of a pattern which is being set to indoctrinate the people in Marxism—Leninism. The hon Premier is smiling at the moment, but his Government cannot stand criticism. That is why, in other countries where that type of philosophy prevails, there is censorship on newspapers — the newspapers are owned by the Government, and only what the Party wants published is allowed to be published.

8.30 p.m.

Now, I will invite the Members of the Government to find out from the people whom they are trying to stop from reading this newspaper, if they really want to stop reading it. I know the Government will say it does not want to stop people from reading the newspaper, but, by withholding announcements, advertisements of vacant posts in Government departments, and so on, it is denying the readers of that particular newspaper the privilege and the right of seeing announcements published there.

Whose money is being spent? The money is not theirs. It is the Government's money, the people's money, and the Government has no right to decide which newspaper the people must read. The Government will say that this particular paper is banned from Government offices and if the people want to read it, they must buy it outside. But the paper which is going to be supplied, from all accounts, in the Government offices is the *Thunder*.

I do not know if I have gone too far in my prognostication, but, I believe, very soon the *Thunder* will be a daily paper. By having banned the *Chronicle*, which is, at the present time, the most influential of daily papers, the Government is paving the way. What-

[MR. CHEEKS]

ever you want—Government announcements, tenders for various supplies which the Government may need, and various other things which the Government announces to the public and which we must read — you will find in *Thunder*. There you have political power being used to stifle free thought and to squelch industry. [Mr. Ram .Karran: "Distortion."] It is a distortion, indeed, if you try to silence the truth as the Government is trying to do now. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, if I say that this act is an immoral one and is a denial of a right hitherto possessed by the people of Guyana, and enshrined in our Constitution.

I would like, now, to refer to another aspect of this Budget, and to make a few points on education. On page 81 of the Estimates, there is a sum of \$305,552 provided for grants to Aided Secondary Schools. On page 85 of the same document, I see the amount provided for Queen's College is \$289,088. I do not want anyone to imagine that I am saying that this is too much for Queen's College, but I would like a comparison to be drawn. Whereas 14 schools in which there are no less than 8,000 children are receiving a grant of just over \$300,000, one school with just over 600 children is receiving a grant of just under \$300,000. [Mr. Kendall: "That is Socialism."]—The wide gap is its own commentary, but that is not all.

Although the contribution of this Government to the private secondary schools is so meagre, the Government wants total control of admissions to these schools. I do not think that is fair. The members of the Government should find out what is the cost of maintaining these schools and then they will see, to their surprise, that although their contribution seems very large to them, it is,

indeed, negligible. Then, let them measure the extent of their control by the proportion of their contribution.

But we believe that the reason for their attitude in this matter is not merely to control admissions so that, as they say, persons who are deserving of entrance into these schools will enter there. Behind the plan—[*Interruption.*]—I heard a Member on the Government side putting a word into my mouth. I believe he knows what it is, but there is undoubtedly some other purpose. Whatever they do, they do according to plan. We know the monumental thoroughness of these people's organization. They do not do anything just for the sake of doing it. Every word they use, every move they make, falls into a pattern. It is part of the great Communist plan to destroy religion, and in every facet of their life, in every department of their activity, there is the development of this plan. So you will see that in their proposal to control admissions to these schools, they are making it possible for schools of a particular denomination to enrol children among whom there may not be one child of that particular faith. When this happens, we shall be very near the beginning of the end of religion in the private secondary schools.

I wish also to refer to page 80 of the Recurrent Estimates, but before I do that I must point to a claim which this Government makes. It always says that it is not right for Government funds to be spent to provide employment for persons of one religion or of one group to the exclusion of persons of another group. If it is to be that way, I do not think that anybody will disagree with it, but that is not by any means the whole story. Suppose you accept the Government's argument for the sake of argument. It says that it is not fair for Government funds to be used to provide employment for persons of any particular faith to the exclusion of persons of another faith. However, if you look at

page 80 of the 1962 Estimates, there is an item under "Other Charges"—Teaching of East Indian languages. I wonder if Government funds are being spent there, and I wonder who is going to be employed there and to the exclusion of whom. These questions answer themselves.

I notice too that in the overall picture of expenditure on education, on page 80, the total to be spent on the primary schools, if I were to include the amount to be spent on the Government Training College, is just about \$7 million. If you were to add up all the amounts which are to be spent on all other aspects of secondary education — technical education, grammar school education, extra scholarships, domestic science — you will get something like only \$1½ million. This sum of \$1½ million includes Queen's College grants, Bishops' High School grants, grants to private secondary schools, grants to the various domestic science centres and, as I have said, all the various branches of secondary education in its widest sense.

No one is complaining that the grant assigned to the primary schools is too much. In fact, it is too little, but the proportion in regard to the grant to secondary schools is worrying me. I wonder how much Government expects to get out of a secondary education system into which it puts comparatively so little.

I would like to make one more reference. Perhaps, this Government is really having a hard time with respect to its supply of money. — **[Mr. Ram Karran: "Arson!"]**—I would like to ask at what time does it intend to fill certain vacancies—

**Mr. Speaker:** May we have a Motion before you proceed further?

**Mr. Campbell** (North West): I beg to move that the hon. Member for Georgetown North be allowed to speak for another 15 minutes.

**Mr. Melville** seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

8.45 p.m.

I know of cases in the past where men in power have kept certain posts vacant so they may receive the benefits of income from those posts. I am not saying that this Government is doing exactly that, but I wonder what are the reasons why posts such as the head-teachership of the Broad Street Government School have not been filled. I do not know if this particular post has been filled within the past few days or hours, and the appointment has not reached the light of day, but I know there are also certain other vacancies which may be tied to that, and there is a suggestion that there are political considerations involved in those vacancies. I would not like to charge this Government with that, so I will leave it there.

Before I close I would like to associate myself with a certain statement made by the hon. Member for Campbellville (Mr. Bissember) who referred to the fact that persons have been applying for work at the office of Grupo Del Conte and have been asked to produce their party cards. It may appear strange but two persons have informed me of a similar experience which they have had, and asked me to do something about it. I agree with that hon. Member when he said that rather than scoff and cry "Shame", Government should investigate those complaints. There are other cases involving small contract work. I am not saying that Ministers of the Government are directly responsible, but persons who have the nod of Ministers, party members in charge of the particular offices, are the guilty ones. Those persons are the cause of a lot of bad relationship between the various groups that comprise our population. I therefore associate myself with the hon. Member's suggestion that the Government

[MR. MELVILLE]

should not deride these representations but should thank Members of the Opposition for bringing these things to its notice and investigate them.

**Mr. Wharton (Abery):** I am sure that if I were to pose the question to Members on the Government side: "In your present position, what do you most desire?" I am sure the reply would be "Independence." Then I would move from that point and endeavour to point to a train of circumstances which seems to be worrying this Government over the seeming difficulty in attaining that goal - Independence. First of all confidence, the ideal which has been mooted by the previous speaker, is what the Government lacks with the people of this country, and where there is no confidence, the road to Independence becomes most thorny and difficult.

The train of circumstances which continues to operate in the minds of the inhabitants of this country, whether they are supporters of the Government or of any other party, may be itemized in this wise: (1) Independence carries with it the freedoms --- freedom of speech, religion and so forth --- and we are reminded that it was the Premier himself who, at Maracai, voted against the freedoms. [Interruption.] Of course there are some people who are more voluble in their seats than on their feet.

Secondly, it was the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn) who not so very long ago gave utterance to the idea that "it is easier to stop tomorrow than to stop communism." Thirdly, it is reported that our good friend, the hon. the Attorney-General, made reference to the possibility of Christmas, 1961, being the last that may be so enjoyed by the inhabitants of this country. And so I can continue with the train of utterances by Members of the Government, and even from their back-benchers, and

show what is responsible for the lack of confidence in the Government on the part of the inhabitants of this country.

In the Budget Statement, on page 18, paragraph 56 we read:

"... But we have immediate problems to face: (1) the economic position of the country; and (2) the financial position of the Government."

Then in paragraph 57 the Minister of Finance continues:

"57. With regard to the first, there was a capital outflow in 1961. Indeed, there is evidence that it started earlier --- perhaps as early as 1953. I do not propose to deal here with this capital flight, except to say that there was absolutely no justification for it..."

Can we think of any country in which the inhabitants are endeavouring to take their money away from their country without any justification? We can trace it back not only to the utterances of the Ministers of the Government but also to their actions. Reference has already been made to several of their actions which seem to cause a lack of confidence in the Government. The hon. Member for Georgetown North (Mr. Cheeks) ended on such a note, and I would be most happy to find that the Government is in a position to refute that statement.

That brings me to another point. Not only is there a continuous outflow of capital but every day we read, and those who have the opportunity to travel to the airport see that not only is capital moving out of the country but that people themselves suffer from such fear that they are endeavouring to go to a place where their spirits may be at rest. I know it has been said by Members of the Government that those people are going away on holiday or in search of employment, but not that they are afraid of what is taking place in this country. They say that some of them are going to pursue higher studies, but I am in a position to state categorically

that fear of what may yet happen in this one-time peaceful country of ours — fear of the worst — is responsible for both the outflow of capital and the outflow of its citizens.

Although it has been aired over and over again, I am sure what I am about to say as regards the incompetence of the Government can bear repetition. I want to touch, at this point, on the educational system of this country as propounded by the present Government.

9 p.m.

When we look at page viii of the Estimates, we find that \$65,585,248 will be spent on development in this country, but from that amount only the small sum of \$8,327,058 will be spent on education.

**Mr. Speaker:** We are not dealing with Development Expenditure at the moment. We are dealing with the Recurrent Estimates.

**Mr. Wharton:** I am sorry, sir. Anyway, it is not 12½% of the total amount. When we consider that Jamaica spends 17% of its total revenue on education, is there any wonder that we have not the necessary skilled officers in this country, particularly when this Government is thinking about Independence? On this point I wish to elaborate by saying that, so little thought is given to the educational system in this country, the Government does not see the necessity for having a Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education to give us information on this very important item in this House — [An hon. Member: "No Minister of Education is here."] — But Government is most voluminous in saying that it is trying to educate the people in the various sectors.

Government is spurning day by day the idea of the Imperialists having spent so long a time in this country, and it gives one the impression that the suffering we

endure today is due to their presence in this country. But what do we find? This Government is still relying on the Imperialist method where education is concerned, because Government maintains that it is not absolutely necessary to educate the people in this country to any great extent. Of course, I can see the point in that: keep the people in ignorance, and we will keep ourselves in power.

In the past teachers have suffered very much from a financial point of view, and it was only in the year 1944 that the Government of the day saw the necessity of increasing the meagre salaries which then prevailed. In the year 1959, what do we find? The hon. Minister of Education in commenting at Queen's College on education and its value said: "Education is not in the productive sector." I am wondering whether it is not important to educate the people in this country in all of the various sectors. I am wondering what we will do when Independence comes. Are we going to import talent and still maintain the idea of Guianization, or are we going to prepare now — the preparation should have begun long ago — by training our boys and girls to fill the various posts which will eventually be created?

I am trying to see whether I can find a point in the educational system, as propounded by the present Government, on which I can give some favourable comment. Perhaps I should refer to the idea of integration. The Government has begun to do a bit of integration in certain services, but I would like to change the term "integration" and use the word "fusion". There was quite recently a fusion of the Co-operative Department and the Social Welfare Department. This fusion has so far resulted in confusion in that Government has failed to educate the officers so that they would be able to perform either or both of the

[MR. WHARTON]

services in the Social Welfare Department and the Co-operative Department. Government is not satisfied only with that bit of confusion, but it has gone a step further and has added to that fusion a little more confusion by integrating the Friendly Societies with the Co-operative Department and the Social Welfare Department.

I shall tell you now of my own experience on the West Coast of Berbice to show that since this integration started there has not been any work done where the Children's Co-operatives in schools are concerned. As a matter of fact, may I state that prior to the integration there were trained Co-operative Officers responsible for the working of the Children's Societies. I can say that these Children's Societies progressed by leaps and bounds, but when the integration started the trained teachers were removed and either nobody came to take their places because they feared the confusion which they would have created, or that when they approached the schools they found that the Societies lacked proper supervision and had either died or were dying slowly. I know that the question of Co-operatives for children was a most important idea; it was a most important movement, and the children took to it so well that parents gave them all the support they needed. The children saw the necessity of saving for a purpose, and that enthusiasm has been killed by integration through lack of proper education.

This Government has actually decided to have British Guiana withdraw from the University College of the West Indies. I think the idea is to set up a faculty in this country, but I am wondering whether the Government has thought of the faculties for the teaching of medicine, engineering, agriculture, mining and so on to mention just a few subjects. If Government is sure that it will be able to find the personnel to train

our boys and girls to fit into these sectors it will be all right. If Government were to be asked what it most desires at this time, it would say Independence.

9.15 p.m.

Everyone knows that one of the most difficult undertakings is to find professors to train students in the subjects I have already referred to. Since the University College of the West Indies has, in Trinidad, part and parcel of itself, the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, I am wondering, as this country is particularly agricultural, what will this Government do to secure the training of our boys and girls in that particular field. I take it that withdrawal from the University College of the West Indies also means withdrawal from this College which is known to be the best in the world in tropical agriculture.

These are some of the things that worry me and when I think of the fact that Government's education programme is so geared to reduce primary school teachers to a one-year course of training at the Government Training College; when I think of the fact that in order to produce a good teacher at least three years of good training would be absolutely necessary; when I think of the fact that Education Officers on being sent to inspect schools are given strict warning to pay attention to the one-year trained teachers, I begin to wonder whether or not Government is serious about this training which is being given to the young teachers. The mere fact that Education Officers are instructed to pay strict attention to these one-year trained teachers makes me conclude, and would make any reasonable individual conclude, that the Government is satisfied that training for one year in this work would be unable to produce a good teacher.

What could we expect but to find that the standard of education in the schools would be gradually lowered; that

it would be most difficult for our children to rise to such standards as would enable them to enter secondary schools; that they would be unable to assimilate the higher forms of education since the foundation which, from now on, would be laid in the primary schools would be very poor indeed. I wonder if this is what Government had in mind when it decided to withdraw from the U.C.W.I. Perhaps, it saw it will have no need for its existence, it will have no need for the continued enjoyment of the privileges which are to be found there because it realized that it will be producing poor stuff which would not be able to enter the University.

**Mr. Speaker :** Time!

**Mr. Merriman** (La Penitence-Lodge): I beg to move that the hon. Member for Abary be permitted a further 15 minutes.

**Mr. Blair** (Berbice River) seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Wharton:** At this point, the fears of the people of this country are bound to grow — this fear from without and fear from within; fear for the present and fear for the future. It is because of these fears that our people are not only taking their moneys out of the bank, but are also running away from the country and doing all that lies in their power to show their objection to the form of Government which we have today.

Much has already been said on what took place on February 16. I was not here but, in Berbice, I listened over the radio to all that transpired.—**Mr. Wilson:** “In the safety of the rural areas.”]—Thank you. But I can assure you that I was most alarmed because I think I have lived long enough to realize that the last thing I would

have expected teachers to do was to go on strike. A constant dripping wears away a stone and, since these teachers did go on strike, let us endeavour to trace the reason.

First of all, I am satisfied that the teachers, themselves, feel that they are in jeopardy and that their future is not assured. I know that teachers are still in doubt as to what will really transpire in the future since it appears that it is the intention of Government to seize all the schools. Most teachers have chosen that vocation because of certain loves which they have — the love of their district, the love of education, the love of assisting in training the younger generation and lastly, the desire for making sure that they assisted in the arduous duty of producing good citizens for the future.

But these teachers see, to their dismay, that the future is dark. They see the possibility of bonds being handed to them in place of cash. They see the possibility of dark horses coming like bolts from the blue and assuming senior positions in places where they have given all their lifeblood. Teachers — go on strike in British Guiana? Unheard of! I am sure that the Government is bound to reflect upon the fact that the most docile of the citizens of this country have risen up in arms against it.

One point which I would like to make is this: that it would be the duty of all and sundry, regardless of political persuasion, to see to it that this cleavage of the various races in this country is mended. I am satisfied that it is not enough, as has been mentioned by one speaker before me, to go to bars and restaurants to see unity of the races. I know that where the drinking of spirits is concerned, there is nothing like disunity because when one begins to have one's drinks one looks neither to the right nor to the left. Therefore, I see no reason why that point should have been made by that speaker.

[MR. WHARTON]

You have only to go along the streets, you have only to meet in public places, to see the sharp line that is drawn between the races. This has only been the case since the political factions began to fan the flames of disunity. I am satisfied that it may be a difficult thing to get the races to unite as they should, but, with hard work on all sides, I am sure the peace and harmony which existed in the past would again find favour with all.

Back to this point on education, I am wondering if the time is not yet here when there should be the possibility of free secondary education for all. Reference has been made to Trinidad. It was said that Dr. Eric Williams has already got free secondary education for all in Trinidad. But it has not been of sudden growth. It was gradual. Dr. Williams and his Government have been carrying on a sound and progressive form of Government, and now they have reached the stage where it is possible to have free secondary education for all.

9.30 p.m.

Free secondary education for all! Those of us who know anything of Trinidad also know that there is comparatively little unemployment in that island. There are so many minor industries encouraged and assisted by the Government that nearly everyone in that country is able to earn a living. Then the training which is provided in the schools in Trinidad is so diversified that a boy or girl can leave school today and find employment tomorrow, because of the education received in school. Unfortunately, that is not the case in British Guiana. Unemployment is at its peak here, and our system of education cannot meet the needs of the outside world. When our boys and girls leave school they have to go to learn some trade and spend some years before they can begin to earn money.

Rather than drive away or discourage those who would spearhead minor industries in this country, the Government should encourage them to establish new industries and so provide employment for others. I read a report in one of our newspapers not very long ago—I think it is the very newspaper which this Government has banned — that a certain individual, a progressive Guianese, was in consultation with Ministers of the Government for the establishment of a dual industry for upwards of ten months, but up to the present moment it seems to me that the Government is bent on discouraging that individual from establishing that industry whereby, if my figures are correct, about 300 persons may be able to gain employment. Those are circumstances which lead to disappointment and frustration. Those are circumstances which cause the people of this country to lack faith in the Government, and which are responsible for the outflow of capital, of personnel and of everything. I wonder what next can be done to persuade the present Government to try to regain confidence which seems to be eternally lost

**Mr. Speaker:** Time!

**Mr. Joaquin:** I beg to move that the hon. Member be granted an extension of 15 minutes to continue his speech.

**Mr. Blair** seconded.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Wharton:** I wonder what this Government intends to do in order to regain public confidence. We on this side of the Table are rather anxious that the fair name of this country should be regained, and we are prepared to give every ounce of co-operation to the Government to assist it in regaining that fair name, but it all depends upon Government's desire to make use of our co-

operation to the full, so that British Guiana may yet again be on the onward march.

May I at this stage make reference to the slow progress of the Government in the matter of building schools? At the beginning of every school term we find that hundreds of children are turned away from the available schools because of lack of school places. I am not satisfied that Government is making serious efforts to build schools which will not only provide more accommodation for children of school age but more employment for teachers, and help to relieve the grouse of teachers that they have been working for years without promotion. Government is sleeping on this matter, and I want to impress upon it the absolute necessity for immediate action in the building of more schools. With more school places our children will be able to gain entrance to start their education at the right time, and not only will parents be happy and think in glowing terms of the Government, but our educational system will at last be off to a good start, and perhaps our teachers will begin to regain confidence in the Government.

Let me end by saying that this Budget Statement has been written by a world-famous economist, Mr. Kaldor, but it has sparked off great dissension among all ranks in this country.  
*9.40 p.m.*

It has been revised, and yet there is so much room for improvement. In spite of the fact that we should not be debating this matter for the second time, and in spite of the fact that Government's attention has been drawn to many flaws in the Budget, I have my doubts, and I hope my doubts are incorrect, that the time is not far distant when there will be further corrections and further reliefs so that the people of this country will have less fear than they have today.

**Mr. Robertson (Leonora):** As a result of what has been said in this Chamber over the past few days, I can say that there is still a remnant of the old order in this House — it is an order that wants no change. It is common knowledge that customs and thoughts of men are terribly slow to change, but change they must. If they do not change, then they become obstacles in the path of advancement. That is exactly what we are seeing in this Assembly today. When one thinks that, in a House constituted as this, one would have healthy criticisms and observations, one gets a tirade of abuse and distortion. — **[Mr. Burnham: "Who gave the tirade of abuse?"]** — One can actually see the venom coming from the lips of hon. Members during their observations in this House. We can feel the poison, the hate and grudge that come streaming forth from their warped and twisted minds.

If we are to remain in this House to be treated to the observations that we generally get, with a few exceptions, from the other side of the Table, then I do not believe that this Government will ever be able to do any good for the people in this community. Let us look at the type of opposition we are receiving. These reactionary elements are doing immeasurable harm to the interests of British Guiana and its people. Let us take the first speaker on the Opposition Bench yesterday, the hon. Member for Werk-en-Rust. He treated us to all of the evils of the Government; he told us that the country is passing through its darkest days and the usual stuff about lack of confidence in the Government which is causing the exodus of several people, from this country. He mentioned that the Government has failed to attract capital, and that even the American Mission has been kept from coming here because of the actions of this Government. We are getting this kind of speech all down the line. We

[MR. ROBERTSON]

are getting nothing new from the various speakers. Some hon. Members will endeavour to insert a little bit here and there, but they all go back to the same old things.

The hon. Member for Werk-en-Rust tried to tell us of all the evils on the part of the Government; why the people are going away; why we cannot get capital and so on. We know why, but the hon. Member is pretending that he does not know. He knows as well as I do why we cannot get capital for investment in this country.

Let me give this House an idea of some of the intrigue that takes place against this Government. The hon. Premier went to the United States of America where he met President Kennedy and had discussions regarding capital for the development of this country. During the time those discussions were going on in the United States, individuals in this country got in touch with, of course, a great Australian called Schwartz, who is the leader of the Christian Anti-Communist crusade, and they were able, through certain papers in the United States, to publish that the American Government should not give the hon. Premier one cent.

9.50 p.m.

I am certain that hon. Members of this House saw that article, which was republished in the *Guiana Graphic*. Now, they are going further. If you go back and read day before yesterday's *Graphic*, you will see that pressure is being put on the United States Government and the United States Government is now putting pressure on the Colonial Office in the United Kingdom to prevent this country from getting Independence this year. These are things which take place all the time.

These people go on to talk about fear — all down the line to the last speaker, the hon. Member for Abary.

He made some reference to "fear". I would say that ignorance breeds fear and suspicion. These people, inside this House and outside —

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members of this House are referred to as "hon. Members" and not as "these people". [Interruption.] Does the hon. Member for Ruimveldt (Mr. Burnham) wish to say something?

**Mr. Burnham (Ruimveldt):** I apologize, sir.

**Mr. Robertson:** The entire Opposition are telling untruths all the time. They have told those lies so often that they begin to believe them themselves. They cannot stop lying. They dare not.

**Mr. Speaker:** Just one moment. I have already indicated that it is against parliamentary rules for any Member of the House to charge another with "lying" or "telling lies". There are other ways in which a Member can indicate that another Member is not giving the correct information. But the word "lie" and its associated words are all banned from parliamentary assemblies.

**Mr. Robertson:** I beg to withdraw the words. They continue with these untruths all the time. They dare not tell their followers the truth of what is taking place in the Government. If they do, I do not believe they will have very many followers after that. We have hon. Members in this House distorting facts. From the time this debate started, we have been listening to every speaker and each speaker distorted the facts. There are so many things which they tried to tell us which are untrue.

After the hon. Member for Werk-en-Rust (Mr. Carter) had concluded his speech, the hon. Member for North West (Mr. Campbell) spoke. I

have to excuse him because very often he does not really understand what is being said in the House. But yet, he parroted the usual line — no confidence in the Government, we cannot get money, we are godless, and so on. Of course, lest the hon. Member forgets, I would like to remind him of a verse in the Scriptures which says that not all those who say, "Lord, Lord" shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, because we do know of the actions of the supposed Christians today.

Plenty of hot air is blown about Christians, but if we were to take what the supposed Christians have done and are doing, we will see that there is nothing that has done more harm and evil to humanity than people who profess to be Christians. If we were to go back to the early ages, we can attribute the setting up of the Inquisition to the Christians. But even if we come down to this age, we see it was the Christians who invented the atom bomb. It was they who threw the atom bomb on the pagans in Nagasaki and Hiroshima. The Christians are responsible for the two World Wars. So when they say these things and tell us that we are godless, people see and know clearly that they use Christianity as a blind. That is what they do.

I do not intend to go further with the speech by the hon. Member for North West. But we have the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River (Mr. Jordan) who came next.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. Member is turning to a new point raised by another hon. Member, perhaps this is a good opportunity for us to adjourn until tomorrow. I think the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River wishes to make an announcement.

**Mr. Jordan** (Upper Demerara River): In view of the fact that this House is still in the throes of this very important Budget debate, I would have no objection to the postponement of the debate on the Motion I moved.

**Mr. Speaker:** So that, tomorrow, we will continue with the Government's business as the first item on the Order Paper.

**The Minister of Natural Resources** (Mr. Benn): I am very grateful to the hon. Member for Upper Demerara River for his co-operation. I should like to give hon. Members an idea of the times of sitting tomorrow in view of the fact that we will have distinguished visitors to the Chamber. We will sit as usual from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m., with the usual half hour break, then from 4.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. and resume at 8 p.m. This has been done after consultation with the leaders of the two Opposition parties. I now move that we adjourn until tomorrow, 11th April, at 2 p.m.

*Adjourned accordingly at 10 p.m.*