

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Thursday, 5th January, 1961

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour, Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. D. M. Hedges

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

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

} *ex officio*

The Honourable Dr. C. B. Jagan —Member for Eastern Berbice
(Minister of Trade and Industry)

„ „ **B. H. Benn** —Member for Essequibo River
(Minister of Natural Resources)

„ „ **Janet Jagan** —Member for Western Essequibo
(Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)

„ „ **Ram Karran** —Member for Demerara-Essequibo
(Minister of Communications and Works)

„ „ **B. S. Rai** —Member for Central Demerara
(Minister of Community Development and Education).

Mr. **R. C. Tello** —Nominated Member

„ **F. Bowman** —Member for Demerara River

„ **L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.** —Member for Georgetown Central

„ **S. Campbell** —Member for North Western District

„ **A. L. Jackson** —Member for Georgetown North

„ **E. B. Beharry** —Member for Eastern Demerara

„ **S. M. Saffee** —Member for Western Berbice

„ **Ajodha Singh** —Member for Berbice River

„ **Jai Narine Singh** —Member for Georgetown South

„ **R. E. Davis** —Nominated Member

„ **H. J. M. Hubbard** —Nominated Member.

Mr. I. Crum Ewing—Clerk of the Legislature

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

ABSENT:

Mr. W. O. R. Kendall—Member for New Amsterdam—indisposed

Mr. R. B. Gajraj—Nominated Member

Mr. A. M. Fredericks—Nominated Member—on leave

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

The Clerk read prayers.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 4th January, 1961, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. KENDALL INDISPOSED

Mr. Speaker: I have to announce that the hon. Member for New Amsterdam, Mr. Kendall, is indisposed and has asked to be excused from today's meeting.

ORAL ASKING AND ANSWERING OF QUESTION

EXPENDITURE ON BUILDING AND REPAIRING SCHOOLS

Mr. Bowman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Question No. 5 standing in my name on the Order Paper. Will the Minister of Community Development and Education tell this Council how much money, if any, was spent by Government from Colonial Development and Welfare grants for building and repairing schools in the Colony from the time the Colony started to receive Colonial Development and Welfare grants, and how much was spent from the revenue of the Colony for the same purpose over the same period?

The Minister of Community Development and Education: Mr. Speaker, the sum of \$1,668,424.36 was spent from Colonial Development and Welfare funds during the period 1945-1959 for the building of primary schools. During the same period the Government spent out of local funds the sum of \$2,019,784.41 for the building and maintenance of Primary Schools. This latter figure does not include the amount spent by the Government out of local funds for the maintenance of Government-owned and Government-controlled schools.

ORDER OF THE DAY

DEVELOPMENT ESTIMATES

Mr. Speaker: Council will resume the debate on the following Motion:

"Be it resolved: That this Council approves of the Estimates of Development Expenditure for the year 1961 which have been laid on the Table and recommended in the Report of the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council dated 23rd December, 1960, totalling twenty-three million, nine hundred and eighty-eight thousand, four hundred and one dollars as detailed by Heads in the undermentioned Schedule and of the projects thereof being financed from the Development Fund established under the Development Fund Ordinance, 1954."

Hon. Members, I do not think there is any necessity for me to read each item in the Schedule. This is the Motion of which the Schedule is part. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, was speaking at the adjournment yesterday. He may continue if he so wishes.

Mr. Tello: Mr. Speaker, at the adjournment yesterday, I had informed you that I proposed to develop a small point I made, and I desire to do so now. Like the hon. Member for Demerara River, I would like to point out that it is not realistic to try to minimise the importance of C.D. & W. Grants in relation to this Development Programme. I think he was quite correct in pointing out that the part C.D. and W. Grants play in our Development Programme is a rather substantial one. As recorded in the Schedule, we find that the contribution to this year's programme is \$10.184 million, and that is not a small amount especially when one realizes that it represents 43 per cent. of the total Development Budget for 1961; and in ratio, it is 74 per cent. of the contribution by revenue.

The Development Budget, as I see it here, is distributed for Agriculture, Civil Aviation, Health, Housing, Lands

and Mines, Land Development, Public Works, Rural Self Help, Social Welfare, Amerindian Development and even miscellaneous; so the coverage is very wide, and it is just as wide as it is deep. This is one part of the Development expenditure that is a pleasure to us and would not, at any time of the history of British Guiana, cause any worry as regards repayment. So that any attempt to minimise the importance of this contribution is a rather silly one.

I do not doubt, with the advent of independence, we may develop, economically, to such an extent that we, at some stage of our history, might be granting aid to other now underdeveloped countries. What is clear, is the contribution that would be made from C.D. and W. Grants, but I am not quite clear on what would be the contribution from current revenue, because at page 14 of the hon. Financial Secretary's Budget Speech, it says:

"The 1961 Estimates of Development Expenditure as now presented to Council call for provision of \$24 mn. The funds immediately in sight for financing this expenditure are \$9.5 mn. from Colonial Development and Welfare Grants, \$2.5 mn. from a local loan to be raised early next year, most of which will be taken up from Government-controlled funds, and \$8 mn. from the Exchequer Loan — a total of \$20 mn. These funds together with the programmed revenue contribution of \$3 mn. and, say, \$1 mn. in prospect from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the Credit Corporation . . ."

What the Financial Secretary, himself, has stated is that there is prospect of our getting a contribution from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. That is only a prospect, and I hope that the prospect would be realized. What he has made very clear is the fact that the revenue contribution must be restricted or minimised to a programmed contribution of \$3 million.

We have just completed the discussion on the current Budget. We have listened to the hon. Financial Secretary pointing out that there is no possibility—in fact less probability—of contributing \$3 million from revenue to the Development Programme this year, but two years ago that was the burden of the argument. At the time when the Financial Secretary pressed this Council into accepting increased taxation on commodities like potatoes, we listened to the Minister of Trade and Industry advising his colleagues and others that it was not intended to change the eating habit of the population or to have any injurious effect, but to encourage people to use more local foods. The public protested against the increased taxation at the time, but we were told that it was imperative to enforce the new taxation because it was necessary to contribute \$3 million towards Development Expenditure.

We recall that even the minor luxuries that women and children use were taxed, and the Government said that the money was needed for the Development Programme. At that time we were some distance away from the Elections, and it was quite easy to pressure us into accepting increased taxation. What has brought about this change today? The Development Budget is still in progress; we are in the heart of it this year, but we are allowed a tax-free Budget when Government knows that it cannot meet the \$3 million for contribution towards the Development Programme.

Fortunately, we have the C.D. and W. Grant to fall back on. Whether our revenue contribution is here or not, we hope to get something from the International Bank for Reconstruction. The C.D. & W. Grant is the only solid thing we can rely on. Of course, certain members have been talking about obtaining money from countries at cheaper rates of interest. I have no doubt that, possibly, given a chance, they may be

[MR. TELLO]

able to raise loans, but I believe in the bird in the cage—it is more valuable to me than 100 outside.

My hon. Friend the Member for Demerara River is not so sure that the hon. Members can raise these loans from abroad. I read in the newspapers that quite recently the Monarchy of Ethiopia was seriously threatened. I am not as versed in history as others, but I like to look at that Monarchy and consider that the decendants can be traced back to the days of Solomon. Probably this is a coincidence. What I have observed is that when Ethiopia trifled with loans from Russia without strings, we find invisible strings encircling the throne, and it was nearly lost by intrigue as well as by people not recognizing the strings that were attached.

As far as I know, those who are willing to assist British Guiana financially have no designs on this Colony. I believe that they will assist us, so that we will arrive at the stage of Independence qualified to take our place with dignity alongside of others. I am not so sure that the people who desire to loan us money at a low rate of interest have the same objective. The price tag is not put on everything one buys so that one can see it. In many cases we pay more for a commodity than is publicly stated on the price tag.

If it is true that the Government can get money which would be helpful to this country, let it go and get it. I would welcome the development of this country, but let us watch where the money is coming from. What do we have at the moment? We find that last year \$25 million was allocated for Development Expenditure. If we are to expand our programme and raise more loans to accelerate it, the first thing we must do to justify this step is to satisfy British Guiana that we are capable of handling the money now entrusted to us.

I have my doubts here, because of this \$25 million allocated up to the end of March—I cannot find any later report on the Development Programme, and even if there was one it would not make much difference—only \$2.36 million was spent—less than 10 per cent. after a period of three months. In the Drainage and Irrigation Department \$7.842 million was allocated and only \$7.800 million was spent. In the Public Works Department 13 per cent. of \$5 million was spent. Between these two Departments: The Public Works Department \$4.57 million and the Drainage and Irrigation Department \$7.06 million — nearly \$12 million, nearly \$11¼ million was left idling. What is rather painful about this is that while there was available more than \$12 million to be spent in these two Departments more than \$11 million was left idling, and during that same period the Departments found it necessary to retrench workers.

What is the value of the Development Programme if Government has millions of dollars available — the Government who is advocating this Development Programme so as to rid the Colony of unemployment — and is retrenching workers in two important Departments thereby contributing to unemployment? Why leave nearly \$11½ million idling?

I feel that the development of any country should be to the benefit of the masses who live there. If the Government is going to hoard millions of dollars — the very thing it criticizes in capitalism — then its case is ten times worst, because it does not have the profit motive to offer as an excuse. Can this Government enjoy the confidence of anyone to allow it to embark on a bigger programme when it has been unable to spend \$25 million in a year? The money should have been spent in the interest of those who are unemployed. All these other schemes of agriculture and farming depend to a great extent on the working-man.

We have seen that most of the expenditure on the Development Programme is on the productive sector. Where are the peasants and farmers looking for a market? First and foremost in British Guiana, but they may find a large army of unemployed people hungry and willing to buy their produce but without the wherewithal to pay for it. What is the object of this great Development Programme? Is it the intention to have starvation where plenty still exists? Is it the intention to keep millions of dollars voted for the Development Programme in the Treasury while thousands remain unemployed? Is it the intention to have the peasants and farmers putting their hearts and souls into increasing production only to find a glutted market because the people are unable to purchase what they produce? The fact remains that there is a large army of unemployed people anxious and willing to work so that they can buy what they want.

In the introduction of the Development Programme I supported the placing of emphasis on the productive sector. I still feel that it is correct. Since we have agreed that the Government should spend money in the productive sector, what has Government done to provide a market for the produce which will come from thousands of new acres of land? As far as I know Government has not yet even engaged a Marketing Officer. We have been hearing that we were going to get a suitable man, and there was some little hope here and a snag there, but eventually we did not get the right man. But when criticizing previous Governments at the street-corners the P.P.P. always knew what were the ills of the country. Their leader, Dr. Jagan, knew the cure for every ill, but since 1957 he has been worried and confused. He has lost every prescription he once had for those ills.

This Development Programme is not one which has been thrust upon them; they were advised on it and they must

have known that if we produce we must sell. Farmers are disappointed at times when their crops are lost through drought or flood, but they accept the work of the Almighty and are not angry. They become frustrated when they are told to produce abundantly, and when they do so they find that no new markets have been found for their produce. We are told that there is an abundant market in Venezuela and in many other places besides the British West Indies, but we have not yet seen them; they have not materialized. But in the meantime we are asked to approve of a Development Budget of nearly \$24 million.

Last year's budget of \$25 million has not carried us very far. I expect that this year, with the General Election in the offing, there will be feverish spending by Government, but it is a cruel and wicked thing to withhold the spending of development funds which could provide many people with much needed employment, until it is more convenient politically to spend it. They are the evil people the Bible speaks of. The wrath of heaven shall come down upon them.

It is said that we must never regard the Press as an authority. I quite agree, but it is also said that there is never smoke without fire. I am told that the people who have taken over the *Guiana Graphic* can be relied upon for their impartial presentation of news. I have read in the *Graphic* that there has been a steep rise in house rents and, coincidentally, it also affects Georgetown. A substantial sum is being voted here for housing. What is Government doing—perpetuating the capitalist system and putting rents beyond the means of the poor man? Is that how public funds and C. D. & W. funds are going to be spent? At one time we thought that the policy of the P. P. P. was to put an end to the capitalist system, but now that they are the Government it is just the other way around; they are perpetuating the capitalist system. I am now wondering where the capitalists are, and who are the defenders of the masses.

[MR. TELLO]

Without the slightest excuse rentals in Government housing schemes have been stepped up. I hope that the Press is not accurate in this case, and that it is merely a rumour. I hope that the Minister of Labour, one of the great champions of working women especially, will not allow the cares of housewives to be increased by higher rentals imposed by Government.

I must say that I had qualms about the benefit of the take-over of the Demerara Electric Company's plant. Money is being provided in this programme, I suppose, for rural electrification. There is certainly great need for carrying electricity to the rural areas, but I would like to be very frank in what I propose to say, which will be recorded and can always be used for or against me. I observe that Government is embarking on political patronage in the appointment of certain people to serve on the British Guiana Electricity Corporation. Anyone who has the courage to speak very frankly will observe that apart from the three persons imposed upon the Corporation as part of the agreement of sale, the other members are just P.P.P. supporters, and while I have some regard for those gentlemen and for my friend who has been appointed Chairman of the Corporation — he has the ability and capacity for the job, but he knows full well that political patronage always has its price. I only hope that we shall not stand aside and say that it is necessary to criticize him for allowing himself to be the cog in the political wheel of the Majority Party.

Mr. Hubbard: The hon. Member is accustomed to looking into everybody's face and seeing himself.

Mr. Tello: I wish I could look at you — my ambition has never soared so high. I hope this early indication will not becloud what is behind the scenes, and that there is some silver lining behind this dark cloud of political patronage. I am not criticizing the ability

of the appointees to the Corporation. I believe that some of them do have the ability and do qualify for such an important office, but I have seen in other places great men lose their greatness as a sacrifice to political honour and political esteem.

Only this morning some people came to me to make their first complaints against the take-over. They pointed out that two deposits are now necessary for a meter. They say that when you apply for electricity service you are asked if you have a refrigerator. If you have one the deposit for the meter is \$10, but if you do not have a refrigerator it is \$5.

Mr. Hubbard: The hon. Member is misinformed as usual. That situation has existed for a number of years.

Mr. Tello: I am very much obliged to the Chairman of the Corporation for the information. It seemed to surprise the public; probably it was one of those conditions which were never imposed until this new rigid control took over.

However, we are asked to approve of a Development Budget for 1961. It is unfortunate that this year, especially being election year, it must go on record that the Financial Secretary did not arrange our expenditure in such a way that one could be satisfied that the coming elections have had no influence on this Budget and will have no influence on the Development Programme as a whole. I have seen that the elections have certainly influenced the Recurrent Budget to such an extent that the Colony's contribution of \$3 million to the Development Programme is no longer to be made. I have also seen that the possibilities are that the carrying out of the Development Programme in 1961 may be seriously affected by the fact that this is election year.

However, I hope that all my fears will prove to be wrong, and that every man and woman in the country will give

the fullest co-operation to the Government to make the Development Programme a success, for, while some people regard it as a political stepping-stone, I look upon it as an economic stepping-stone not only for this generation but those to follow.

I remember that in 1954, speaking at Buxton, I said that the Development Programme which the people were then advised to reject because it was national bribery, could form the basis on which any loyal elected Government could build, and with that faith I look forward to the success of this Programme and to a more realistic application of the funds.

Mr. Speaker: Any more speakers?

Mr. Jackson: It is true we have heard a great deal during the course of the debate on the Recurrent Budget while in Committee stage. The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing, in reply to some observations made by me with respect to the appointment of a medical superintendent of the Mental Hospital, said they had inherited 150 years of either misrule or Government problems and that it was not likely or possible for them in three years to undo what was done by people before them. It is true they have inherited problems, some economic, some social and some political; but we were only given one side of the picture. It was not said that along with the evil things which they had inherited were a great deal of good things which could have balanced, either entirely or largely, the evils of the past.

In mid-July, 1956, there were, out of a total labour force of 164,600 persons, 29,600 unemployed; and if we were casting our eyes in the gallery, since we have been debating the Budget and the Development Programme, we would have seen a number of young people who could have been gainfully employed rather than coming here every day and listening to the debates. It is not that we do not want them to listen to the debates,

but we feel that their presence here is an indication of the fact that some of them are unemployed; and it is hoped that as they come here daily and listen to these debates they would ask themselves a rather positive question—whether or not they have been done well by the Government of the day.

Of the total unemployed, 70 per cent was of the age group under 41; 22 per cent was under 21 years of age; and 8 per cent, which is the residue, was above 41. It is clear, therefore, that our labour force population which is unemployed consists of young people whom this country would be looking to as men of the future and men who would make a solid contribution to the country's well-being.

But, in addition to that number which was found in 1956, must be added thousands who have been leaving school year after year from 1956 to 1960. I have been inclined to the view that while we are going to agree that many of our problems are of long standing, our unemployment problem is not as long standing as some of those other problems. It appears to me that with the eradication of malaria sometime after the end of the Second World War, our unemployment problem became larger on the horizon; so while we can contend that between 1957 and now we have had this large body of unemployed people, it does not appear to me that the problem is so very grave that it could not have been tackled in a positive manner.

In 1954, there was a Development Programme which involved \$44 million; in 1956, there was a Programme which involved \$78 million. So that between 1954 and 1960, there was an amount of \$122 million which this country had at its disposal for development purposes. Can it be argued that any preceding Government, prior to 1954, had this amount of money to spend upon the development of the country; and that is apart from the provision made in the Recurrent Budget year

[MR. JACKSON]

after year. A total of \$122 million has been allocated towards the development of this country between 1954 and 1960—seven years—and if these young people who come here every day to listen to the debates would——

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment! I should be very grateful if the hon. Member would refrain from making particular reference to persons in the gallery. There is a very great principle involved. If Members of this Council would be always making reference to persons here, it would tend to call for an approbation or otherwise from those persons. I, therefore, ask Members to refrain from referring to persons in the gallery.

Mr. Jackson: I did not intend to seek the approbation or otherwise of the persons in the gallery. I have been trying to point out, to all who are within the precincts of this Council, the position. I would, therefore, refer to Members of the Council. If Members of the Council would recognize the fact that over the seven-year period this country has had \$122 million for development projects, it seemed that with that large sum of money we could have tackled, more vigorously, the problem of unemployment. The situation became worse since the present Government took office. We know that there was a degree of recession in the bauxite industry, but that recession no longer remains with us; and it appears to me that the situation, as regards the bauxite industry, has completely recovered, and that it is likely that the Company would re-engage, if not all, a large percentage of the people who were laid off temporarily.

In the sugar industry, if my information is correct, at Pln. Port Mourant there were 308 persons who were added to the number of unemployed in 1956; at Pln. Ogle, about 300 persons were added to the 1956 number; and the problem is growing worse because of the degree of

mechanization which is being introduced in the industry. Perhaps, when the Demerara Sugar Terminals are in full operation, many more people would be thrown out of employment. But when one examines industry and commerce, the picture does not appear to be as bad, in that commerce has not been known, largely, to have much retrenchment; and even if there were much retrenchment in commerce and in the sugar industry, it is the duty and responsibility of the Government to take care of the people who are unemployed. And it must be said that between 1957 and 1960 the unemployment problem has not been any better than it was in 1954, even though we have had this large sum of money put into our Development Programme.

It is said that housing is not one of the sectors in our economy which is productive, and from time to time we on this side of the Council have always criticized the view that housing is not a productive sector in the economy of the country. Good housing is productive of many virtues; it is productive of the best men and women to be found in the society of any country; it makes men of stature and quality; it makes many aspire to becoming better qualified people; it makes women the type of people who can command the respect, integrity and admiration of all concerned.

On the contrary, bad housing produces all the vice that can be found in this world; it is responsible, if not in the entirety in almost the entirety, for the evils which surround us daily. Perhaps it is correct to say that many of the crimes which have been committed sprung from bad housing conditions. It is clear how erroneous it is for people to contend that housing in any programme is not part of the productive sector. Bad housing interferes with the health of the people and the wealth of the country. As a matter of fact some people believe that the greatest resource in any country is the human resource, for without the human resource no attempt can be made to enrich a country.

Some people say that the State must own the means of production, and one wonders what is meant by the means of production which the State should own. By itself the land can produce nothing until the human resource can utilize it. If one is to accept the premise that the State must own the means of production, then it is the responsibility of the State to take care of the means of production which it owns.

When we examine the Development Programme as it was up to last year, 1960, it is **our duty to draw to the attention of Government** the extent to which it has not taken care of the people who are unemployed. In the Report which is published to the end of June regarding the Development Programme for 1960—64 appears this summary: "There were 21 heads for which the sum of \$26 million was allocated for expenditure in 1960. At the end of June for the first half of the year \$5,903,932 was spent"—that is **less than a quarter of the amount allocated to be spent in 1960**. In greater detail the amount spent from April to June was \$3,663,947.

Is this the policy of a Government which claims at all times that it has the well-being of the people at heart? Is this the policy of a Government which maintains that because of the degree of unemployment it cannot find money to give better remuneration to the people whom it employs? The people are continually saying that their salaries and conditions of work in the Service are not as good as they ought to be. This Government continues to say that it cannot give more money to its employees because of the extent to which there is unemployment, yet it spends, deliberately no doubt, less than a quarter of the amount allocated to be spent on the Development Programme during the first half of the year. We must ask the question: Will Government be able to spend the difference between \$6 million

and \$26 million by the end of December, 1960? It is unlikely that this large sum of money would have been utilized before the end of 1960.

I said that the Government inherited **economic, social and, perhaps, political** problems. I also said that while it inherited those problems it also benefited **considerably in several ways** that could offset those problems during the time the members of Government were in power. They have inherited all of the Development Grants that we have heard about. They have inherited the Black Bush Polder Scheme as well as other schemes which will bear fruit. They have also inherited what they will get from the Manganese Company.

The amount to which I have just referred is **not part of the \$122 million** which was allocated for development in 1954—9. **This \$26 million is an allocation for the 1960-64 Development Programme**, so that we can add it to the \$122 million and we will have \$148 million over a period of seven or eight years. Is this not something which could go down in history as a wonderful bit of heritage for the Government of this country? **Some members of this Government** talk as if this amount is a mere pittance.

When the matter is analysed, it will be found that they have not devoted their attention to things in such a **manner** as to benefit all of the people in this country. It is clear that they have not devoted their time to the question of solving the problems of this country. If I remember correctly, immediately after they took office we were told in the Press and over the air that there was something wrong with the Housing Programme. It is true that certain inconsistencies have been found in that connection, but were those inconsistencies enough to justify the abandonment of the Housing Programme which was started by the Interim Government? **While the abandoned the Housing**

[MR. JACKSON]

Programme, the workers on the sugar estates were benefiting from the policy of housing which was started at the same time the Interim Government started its Housing Programme. I am sure that the number of houses erected by the sugar workers exceeds the number erected by the Government.

In the Development Programme for 1960 the sum of \$5 million has been allocated for housing. I would like the Government to say how many houses have been erected in 1960 out of the allocation for 1960-61? If there are no houses erected, then that is something which must go down in the history of this country. Here again Government has failed to grapple with a vital problem — the problem of housing. This is something to be deplored. Here you have a growing population, particularly on the young side; the Government has money to spend on housing the people it says it loves so much, but nothing is done in the matter.

I am convinced that one can find several houses where parents and children are packed together like sardines in a tin. When people are huddled together they cannot breathe clean air. I am sure the Government will realize that it is for it to tackle this vital problem, so that we will be able to eradicate some of the evils in our society today. Nothing which members of the Government say can remove the fact that they have not tackled the problem of housing as it ought to have been tackled. However much they criticize the Government of 1954-57, the fact remains that in that period of time many houses were built. We see the evidence of that when we visit the housing estates owned by Government. I challenge the present Government to show that it has put up a quarter of the number of houses put up by the Interim Government in 1954-57. When you condemn what there is

you must show that you have done as well or better, and I am sure this Government can never claim to have done better in the matter of housing.

In the field of housing and unemployment it is to be regretted that the Government did not, as part of their programme, make a serious attempt to remedy what it found, and if it had not the money one would be willing to excuse Government, but in view of the financial assistance it has had it cannot be said that it has done well. If Government had spent the money as allocated it would have been able to provide more employment and more housing accommodation for the people whom we represent in this Council.

Government say that its land policy is intended to relieve unemployment, but does one who is unemployed embark on the cultivation of a crop because one is unemployed? It may be true to say that it is a policy which we hope will relieve a certain amount of unemployment, but it calls for more than the providing of land and drainage and irrigation facilities. According to the type of crop being cultivated there must be financial assistance for the farmer from the time he starts cultivation until he reaps his crop, for no hungry man is able to cultivate land. It is said that a hungry belly cannot stand.

Mr. Speaker: An empty bag cannot stand, and a full bag cannot bend.

Mr. Jackson: I thank you very much, Sir. Here we have the two conditions applicable, for we have an empty bag which cannot stand, but we hope never to reach the stage when the bag is so full that it cannot bend at all. In Surinam, the Government's land policy embraced financial assistance to the farmer throughout the period of cultivation and reaping, and if this Government ever thought that its land policy would be

the means of relieving our unemployment situation it ought to see quite clearly now that its policy has failed completely. It has not been able to produce any evidence that it has been able to find employment for 25 per cent. of the unemployed people it found in 1956. I am sure the number of unemployed people has increased considerably. When there is a vacancy anywhere hundreds apply, only to be disappointed. For instance, when the Medical Department advertises for nurses about 1,000 apply for 20 vacancies. One wonders whether Government ever take stock of these figures which appear in the Press every day, and whether it is satisfied to know that large numbers of people are unable to find work. Any Government which sits as callously as the present Government does in the face of unemployment must be charged with incompetence and lack of vision, and it is said that "Where there is no vision the people perish." I am sure that the people of this country are perishing because there is no vision with the present Government.

Mr. Beharry: We are asked to deal with the Development Estimates for 1961, but before I do so I propose to deal with development generally. What is the Development Programme we have had from his Government? Is it really development; are we moving forward or backward as far as this Government is concerned? Let us examine the issue factually on the basis of figures. The present Government assumed office late in 1957 and began working in 1958, in which year this Council was asked to vote the sum of \$27,438,000 for the development of British Guiana. We are always hearing that this Government is greatly concerned about providing employment for our people; we are always told that this Government is much concerned about increasing the national income and developing the economy of this country. But what is the pattern we shall unfold? What is the historical pattern of development under the present Government?

In 1958 this Council voted \$27,438,000 for the Development Programme, but how much of that sum did this Government spend? It spent \$19,881,000. This Government which talks about looking for money to develop British Guiana is not capable of spending whatever money it has. In 1959 we voted \$25,307,000 for development expenditure, but in that second year in office this Government spent \$18,997,000 on development, one million dollars less than it spent the previous year. This progressive Government is spending less money on development year after year. I, therefore, do not see why this Council should be asked to vote \$24 million for development expenditure this year. This Government is incapable of spending that amount of money. It has never in any year spent the sum allocated for development expenditure.

Of the \$24.7 million voted for development expenditure in 1960 the Financial Secretary states on page 12 of his Budget Speech that \$16.8 million will be spent. Why, then, should we vote \$24 million for 1961? I cannot understand what is happening in this country. How long is this Government going to continue fooling the people by putting a lot of figures on paper? There has been a progressive deterioration year after year. That is the history of the Development Programme of British Guiana under the present Government led by Dr. Jagan who says he has not got sufficient money to spend on the development of this country, and that there can be no development unless we can get loans at cheap rates of interest. I shall deal with the question of loans at cheap rates of interest later.

Let us first examine whether this Government is really capable of spending money to develop this country. Some people do not understand how to spend money and the use of money. Every year since this Government has been in office it has spent less money on development. Which way is the Development

[MR. BEHARRY]

Programme going forward or backward? The correct answer is that it is going backward. We hear over the radio and we read in the newspapers that this country is not getting sufficient money to spend on development, yet this Government spends every year less than the sum voted for development expenditure.

That is the history of development under this present Government. You can find information as to the expenditure in 1958 in the Report of the Accountant-General for 1959 which shows that we earmarked \$27,438,000 and we spent \$19,881,303. Every year this Government has been spending less money for the development of British Guiana, yet this Government knows and realizes that this country is plagued with the cancer of unemployment and under-employment. Is this fair to our people and to the economy of the country? I cannot see, from what stretch of imagination, that this is fair. Money is available. It is there to be spent. If money was not there I would say that the Government is to be excused; but the Government is incapable of spending the small sum of \$24 million this year. We are called upon this year to vote \$24 million for this Development Programme when these people could only have spent \$16 million last year. Is it because we want to give it away, because it is **Election year**, or because we want to fool the people in the rural areas?

The hon. the Financial Secretary, in his Budget Speech, said that the expenditure of \$24.7 million was provided for last year, but British Guiana was only able to spend approximately \$16.8 million. I say that the Government is not capable of spending money. It has been making a lot of excuses that it could not develop British Guiana unless it got money to borrow from outside at a cheap rate of interest. Money is given to this Government by the **Western World** and it cannot spend it, yet it is

making excuses that it cannot get money to borrow to improve the unemployment situation. "Borrow" is a fashionable word, particularly in this country.

I heard the Minister of Community Development and Education make the remark yesterday that we should be allowed to borrow money from sources other than the Western World because when we borrow from the Western World we pay more than 6 per cent. interest. We are borrowing only \$73 million at 6 per cent. out of the total Development Budget of \$110 million. People do not know that we are to receive \$22 million free. If we borrowed \$110 million at 2 per cent. interest this country would have been developed at a disadvantage in that we would have to pay interest at the rate of 2 per cent. on \$110 million. Here is a case where Government borrows \$73 million at 6 per cent., and is going to receive \$22 million free, gratis and for nothing. That is what the entire argument boils down to.

If we had borrowed that money \$110 million—from **Russia or from any** other country at 2 per cent. interest, this country would still have lost. If we were to pay 6 per cent. interest on \$73 million, the interest would only be \$4,380,000 and we are to get \$22 million free. British Guiana is given this money free, for five years, from C.D. & W. Grants.

I want the people who only like to use words to know that the word "independence" connotes responsibility. The burden of any Development Programme, when this country gets independence, will fall on every single taxpayer in the country. Today, we can enjoy a Development Programme financed from taxation not only from people in British Guiana, but people in the United Kingdom; but some people just use words and do not look at the realities of the situation.

When this Government took office in 1957, the national debt of this country was \$54,620,000. This year, the national debt will be \$97.9 million; and yet we hear more and more talk about borrowing money. It is not that we want more money to borrow. They use the term to fool the people so that they can catch more votes. This Government, since it took office, has not been able to spend the sum of \$24 million in any one year. The Progress Reports of the Government have shown that it has been spending less and less money each year. I cannot see why, this year, they cannot remain true to form and go on spending less and less. There is this talk about purchasing the Electric Company. These people cannot spend even what we give them. It is a pity I had not the opportunity to speak on the Budget Statement as a whole. I am so sorry I missed the opportunity to show how they could not even spend the money that they earmarked from year to year.

In 1958, this Government spent \$19,881,000 when it should have spent \$27,000,000. Out of the \$19 million, \$2.874 million was from C.D. & W. grants. In 1959, when it should have spent \$18,997,676, it only spent \$14 million, out of which \$4½ million was a C.D. & W. grant. In 1960, when it should have spent \$24.7 million, it expects to spend \$16.8 million, \$4.8 million is supposed to be a C.D. & W. grant.

Let us examine the Development Budget. The Government is asking the Legislature to permit it to spend \$23,988,401, \$10,184,000 is supposed to be a grant from the C.D. & W. funds — nearly 50 per cent. of it. What we are certain about this Government is that every year, for the purpose of painting a nice picture to the people of this country, large figures are earmarked, but when the year comes to an end, it is just like running a race: you are hoping to win but when you come to the pole you find you are last. How long is this Gov-

ernment going to continue to fool the people of this country? How long will it continue in office only to put figures on paper instead of work? How long is this Government going to continue making excuses? History will recall that this Government is a Government of excuses.

I wish to remind hon. Members of the "Opposition" that it would be highly unrealistic for us to allow a Budget of \$24 million to go through, because this Government cannot spend this amount. If we take the amount spent in 1960 as a criterion, then I think the Government would be capable of spending about \$16 million. Obviously I can come to no other conclusion than that, because year after year the Government is spending less and less. A big amount is inserted in the Estimates because this is the Election year. I am against voting the sum of \$24 million this year, because it is unrealistic in the context of the development history of this Government. I hope I will receive the support of Members of this side of the Table.

I repeat that this Government has no ability to spend such a large sum of money. We get the same excuse all the time. Every time a new Development Programme is introduced in this Council we hear the hon. Financial Secretary telling us — of course. I do not blame him because he is not the Political Leader in this Council — about technical difficulties and so on. This Government has been spending less every year, and I accept no such excuse.

In his Budget Speech the hon. Financial Secretary said :

"With this small surplus in sight and the need to find \$3M annual revenue contribution for the Development Fund, the Government has deliberated whether it should propose the introduction of additional taxation to improve the budget position, but has reached the conclusion that this is inadvisable at present for two reasons. First, the indications are that

[MR. BEHARRY]

taxation may have reached the stage where any worthwhile increase in revenue can be raised only by increasing the tax burden on industry or on the lower income group of the community.

I do not see the reason for these remarks. What are we going to raise taxes for? Sir, I am reading from pages 9 and 10.

Mr. Speaker: The Development Estimates begin at page 14.

Mr. Beharry: This statement is relevant in the sense that it is dealing with the carry over of revenue from the Colony to Development Expenditure. I referred to page 9, and I say that there is no reason why we should impose further taxation. We are supposed to find \$3 million from our revenue to contribute towards the Development Programme. I feel that the imposition of further taxation in order to obtain money for development is unnecessary, because the Government is unable to spend what it has on paper at the moment.

I hope that hon. Members will see my reasoning. It is very good to have it on paper that British Guiana has \$24 million for her Development Programme in 1961, but in the context of the reality of the situation the Government is spending less every year. We do not have men in the Government with the capacity to spend this money in order to develop the country and relieve unemployment as well as under-employment.

Mr. Campbell: I have been puzzled by the amount of money unspent by this Government year after year. We were asked to give our blessings to a certain amount of money, and the money has not been spent. I think it should have been overspent and not underspent. We are now asked to give our approval of \$24 million for this year. This \$24 million is a lot of money to many people, but to others it is nothing. I feel that

the \$24 million should be spent on one project. We should be talking about millions of dollars for one project, and that amount should not be expected to cover the whole country.

Perhaps \$24 million may be too much for our Government to spend in one year, judging from the fact that it was unable to spend the allocations given to it. I am not a businessman; I do not know the tricks of trade and business; but I know that money allocated to be spent on projects to develop the economy of the country ought to be spent. The matter should be expedited as quickly as possible.

It is alleged that the Government does not have enough specialists, or people with sufficient knowledge to handle certain projects. We are told that we need more surveyors and so on. On the other hand we are told that there must be Guianization, and that expatriates must be kept out. In the same breath we are told that we do not have enough Guianese to do the job. I believe there is too much politics in this matter, and we should have a more practical approach to our problems.

Mr. Burnham: How did you get here?

Mr. Campbell: I got in.

Mr. Speaker: Do not interrupt him; there is no special privilege for any Member in this Council. You were allowed to speak without interruption.

Mr. Campbell: I will refer to page 2 of the hon. Financial Secretary's Budget Speech where he said, "The Manganese project went into production this year and its exports should total about \$3 million in 1960". I am very glad to hear that, because it is in my constituency.

I have mentioned here already that when the Manganese Company starts to produce and Government begins to col-

lect royalties, the **greater part of the revenue should be ploughed back into** the district by way of developing what I would call the "forgotten province". We will not have to get C.D. & W. funds for the development of the North West District, because it will be able to produce the necessary capital to assist in building roads, providing medical facilities, and everything that goes in the name of progress in these modern times.

I notice in the Development Estimates at page 32 that \$150,000 has been allocated for Land Development. This strikes me as a very small experimentation in making garden plots. This does not strike me as Rural Development, for we should be talking of millions of dollars to extend the roadway to the hinterland where we have fertile lands. If we get good roads that fertile land can be made available to people along the coast; people from the West Indian Islands and even people from Europe. It is a practically uninhabited section of the country with one person to the square mile, and for the last three years I have been telling the Government about its neglect until I am disgusted. A start has been made with a little experimentation, but I am not satisfied with that.

I want to see a real opening of the interior by the construction of access roads so as to enable the people to develop the lands not only in the North West District but in other districts. There was an allocation of \$150,000 to be spent on experimentation here and there. Of the total sum voted for development expenditure last year the sum of \$8½ million was unspent. That sum can be spent in the North West District instead of the paltry sum of \$150,000 for experimentation which cannot help anybody.

There is a crisis facing the farmers of the North West District at the moment. The price of coffee, the main crop of the district, has dropped from \$1 to 30 cents per lb. which is below the cost of produc-

tion. In addition to that the coffee trees are subject to "blight" disease in the swamp lands, and cockles and other pests are destroying the ground provisions. The only hope for the farmers is to resort to the hills. Surveys have confirmed that there are hundreds of square miles of fertile land above sea level.

I would suggest to the Government the diversification of crops on the hilly lands in the North West District which can produce the best cocoa, coffee, citrus, coconuts and cattle. If these things are properly planned the North West District could make a substantial contribution to the economy of the country. I do not propose to go over the ground covered by previous speakers as to why money voted for development has not been spent, but I would ask Government to embark upon some real development which would benefit the entire country and not, as has been charged, only certain sections of the population.

I have heard charges of racialism being made on both sides of the Table. I would like to see my country run by men who take a pride in the land, men who are loyal to their country and not to foreign ideologies and other stupid things. I am not satisfied with the allocation of \$150,000 for development in the North West District. The Minister of Trade and Industry promised half a million dollars or more as a start, but this allocation is not even a quarter of what was promised. It has been suggested that there will be all-out spending on development this year because of the coming elections. Why should that be done only at election time? Is it to catch votes?

Mr. Speaker: The Development Estimates, as approved by this Council, provided for an expenditure of \$24.7 million in 1960, and the Development Estimates, for which approval is now sought, provides for an expenditure of \$23,988,401, a little less than was voted for last year.

[MR. SPEAKER]

The question as to how much of this money will be spent is still in the air, but the sum to be voted is approximately the same as that voted last year.

Mr. Campbell: That is all right, provided Government spends the money sensibly, and spends it during the year, not allowing it to overlap. I do not think I have anything more to say.

Mr. Burnham: As I understand it, these Development Estimates are but another annual phase of the Development Programme which was introduced in this Council in November, 1959 for the period 1960—1964, and which was dealt with in Sessional Paper No. 5 of 1959. I recall that there was a sort of perambulatory debate on that Sessional Paper, when the Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karra) remark that the absence of debate and criticism from this side of the Table was proof of the fact that the Programme was accepted and acceptable. Then I remember saying elsewhere that the Elected Members of the Government were patting themselves on the back for having produced such an excellent Programme, which they said the "Opposition" could not criticize or attack.

On that occasion, however, it is to be noted, there was some misunderstanding, as to when the debate on the Development Estimates would start, and perhaps, too, some Members on this side of the Table did want to give them an opportunity to show their mettle—an opportunity to execute the Development Programme. Since then, however, we have had at least one year with this Programme, and many of its weaknesses have become more obvious, and many of the false premises and assumptions upon which the Programme itself was based are now apparent.

Reference has been made to the fact that the allocation last year was of the order of \$25,967,850, and that up to the end of June only \$5,903,932 had been spent, and the Financial Secretary, on behalf of the Government which are showing some slight degree of realism on this occasion, estimates that the spending on the Development Budget for 1960 will be only \$16,810,455. I doubt whether that amount will have been spent, and if that amount is in fact spent, whether it will have been properly spent. I think that the Government have been unfair to this Council to ask for an allocation this year practically as great as last year's — an allocation of \$23,988,401 — without explaining to us why they believe, after their record of the last three years, they can consume, so to speak, nearly \$24 million in 1961.

It may well be, though I doubt it, that the machinery is in such a position at the moment as to be able to absorb this sum of \$24 million, but I think that basic courtesy to our intelligence dictates that there should have been some explanation with respect to the underspending last year.

I see no reason to believe that the factors which were present and causing that underspending last year will not be absent, which absence will permit them to carry out the Programme as planned — as outlined in the Budget Statement and as set out in detail in the draft Development Estimates. Government cannot, for one moment, argue that it is unaware of its underspending because it is the Government that presented the figures to us.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry, the real head and leader of the Government, is the real person responsible for the Development Estimates. A

least, I heard him say over the radio, certainly, a few months ago, that there had been terrific underspending. In fact, I understand he got hot around the collar when two Presses — one a daily and the other a weekly — got hold of information regarding the underspending before the Progress Report was officially published; and in one of the Government's broadcast — in one of his weekly Press Conferences where he is wont to explain Government's policy — he did say that he was going to ask the Financial Secretary to have the procedures overhauled. He did not condescend to particulars at that conference, and neither he nor the Financial Secretary has condescended to the particulars of any overhauling.

May I, *en passant*, express the view that it certainly smacks of incompetence or neglect that the leader of the Government did not recognize that the procedures needed overhauling until nine or 10 months of the year 1960 when this Development Programme was supposed to have been thought out and adumbrated since the year of our Lord, 1959. We are prepared — I, for one, am prepared — to pardon ignorance and to forgive incompetence, but I am afraid that I am not so tolerant when impudence intervenes, because this is nothing short of impudence to come here and ask us to vote \$23,998,401.

It is most useful to consider for a while, on the basis of the last Report presented to Members of this Council, what was happening last year and compare it with what they are hoping to do this year. But, perhaps, before we go into that detail, I may be permitted to observe that this Development Programme about which the Government had been crowing so much, is based on the Report by an itinerant economist named Berrill, whose suggestions were accepted "lock, stock and barrel". I think the Report was criticized by another itinerant, a Mr. Peter Newman; and then the leader of the Government said that the

Berrill Report was no good. He did not tell us that in November, 1959 —

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear him say that here.

Mr. Burnham: He told me Tuesday that he will say so tomorrow at eight. You will hear the leader of this Government saying tomorrow that he does not agree with Berrill. Why did he not say that in 1959 when the Development Programme was being discussed and debated? Why did he permit his lieutenant, the Minister of Communications and Works, to expand his chest measurement and tell us that the Programme was so good that the "Opposition" could find no holes in it?

It is clear that the Berrill Report and its child, the Development Programme, are both based on the premise of the acceleration of our agricultural production *simpliciter*. The Berrill Report starts off from the major premise, spoken or unspoken, that the economy of British Guiana not only has been agricultural in the past but, for a long time, will continue to be agricultural. I shall attempt to illustrate the thesis as I proceed to examine, not only the estimates which are before us today, but the estimates with respect to the whole Five-Year Programme. And it is disappointing to find that a Government, such as the present Government, should allow itself to be bamboozled and misled by Berrill; for, certainly, I remember in 1953, during the short-lived Government of the People's Progressive Party of which I was then a member, that the major criticism by the Elected Government then of the World Bank Report and the recommendations with respect to economic development in British Guiana, was that the latter were based upon the presumption that British Guiana's economy will, for a long time, continue to be agricultural, and it was in the best interests of British Guiana and its inhabitants, that British Guiana should be agricultural. It is, therefore, a little startling, in view

[MR. BURNHAM]

of that earlier experience and discovery, that this Government was prepared to accept what were the major terms of Berrill's recommendations six years after.

If one looks at the Programme, one recognizes that over 50 per cent. of the Programme is allocated to agriculture, and the greater part of that 50 per cent. allocation is intended directly to release more arable lands for rice farming. It was in 1960, I think on the 22nd January, that the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry, in reply to certain observations by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, said there is no fear about the rice market so far as British Guiana was concerned because, number one, efficiency was hoped for; number two, we produce an infinitesimal amount of the total world's output of rice; and number three, our Eastern competitors in the very near future will not be able to get their workers to work for a pittance and so under-sell British Guiana's rice. These are the reasons he advanced why we should have no fear about our being able to sell our rice. That, of course, was in the teeth of an observation by the then Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, that world prices in rice were falling.

Apart from that, it has been remarked by the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry, on more than one occasion in this Council and outside, commenting on the profits that rice makes, that that crop is a marginal one. The statistics of our country for 1958 have disclosed that the contribution to the gross domestic product of rice was in the vicinity of 5 per cent. In these circumstances, how on earth could this Government have embarked upon a Development Programme which spends 50 per cent. of the available funds on agriculture, and the greater part of that 50 per cent. on clearing lands or developing lands on which rice will be grown?

It would appear that the optimism of the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry with respect to our markets has not been justified; but even if that optimism had been justified, one has to ask oneself: Are we not laying up for ourselves a lot of trouble in the future as did Ceylon when, some years ago, the Government of that country accentuated agricultural development for the purpose of rice production? We have the lesson of Ceylon before us. I am led to the belief that Miss O'Loughlin was correct in her analysis that the extravagant spending from development funds for the production of rice is expenditure not for economic reasons, but for political and/or social reasons. It may be attractive at the moment. It may be attractive for a year or two, but what is going to be the result?

There is noticeable in the Programme as set out in Sessional Paper No. 5 of 1959 and laid on the Table on the 5th November, 1959, in the Estimates for last year and in the Estimates for this year, an important omission.

We have been told by the members of this Government that, tied as their hands were, as a result of the concubinage between themselves and the Officials of the Colonial Office, they had to borrow money for the development of this country at high rates of interest. It is not indicated that they do not propose to pay back the money which has been borrowed; it is not indicated that they do not propose to service these loans, but we are told how expensive these loans will be to the taxpayers of British Guiana. We are told that a large sum of money will be spent, but yet we see no provision made for a Planning Unit to ensure that this expensive money is properly spent.

In Surinam, as I pointed out in my contribution to the Budget last year in January, it has been found necessary in the light of the country's own experience and that of other countries to have a Planting Unit of experts to advise them

and to compile data. I pointed out that the major section of the Development Programme in Surinam also had their separate subsidiary Planning Units, and the work of these Units was co-ordinated and supervised by the Super-Planning Unit so to speak.

In 1957 from this exact position I suggested to this Government the necessity for a Planning Unit, and the necessity of having a team of experts—not peripatetic ones like Berrill who merely writes travelogues. I would like to see a team of experts employed for a reasonable period. Nothing came of my suggestion, and nothing has come up to now. No doubt if we are to be blessed with a reply from the Government we will be told that “in recent times it has been able through the good offices of the United Nations and one of its Agencies, to have the services of an expert in Soil Chemistry, an expert in hydro-electricity, and several other experts.” However those experts came for a temporary period; their services might have brought a certain amount of good, but certainly not the maximum good in view of the fact that there is no continuation of the investigations and compilation of data.

Perhaps the Government will tell us why it has refused the benefit of the experience of other underdeveloped countries undertaking development programmes. Why should British Guiana, unique in many other respects, be unique in the respect of not needing a Planning Unit? It is assumed by some that the institution of a Planning Unit would necessitate a large army of expatriates. Such an assumption is not valid, and even if it were valid that is no reason for not setting up a Planning Unit.

It was observed by Mr. Newman, for instance, that no sufficient attempt had been made to utilize the expert services which are available locally — to use local material. I say this not to flatter, but the present Financial Secretary is one of the persons whose services can be used in-

stead of having him here explaining things about the structure of the Civil Service. He is an expert in the field of economics. There are other Guianese inside and outside of British Guiana who are qualified, but because of the absence of opportunity they have been seeking employment elsewhere. I am inclined to think that even the material which we have available and is not being used will be insufficient for the purpose which I envisage. But it does not matter if we should have to get material that is non-Guianese and that is expensive. It is a fact we shall have to face, while our Government should be making arrangements and preparations for the training of Guianese who can eventually take over the entire responsibility.

We will no doubt be lectured, if we are able to get a reply from the Elected Government, on the evils of Imperialism. There will be repeated the statements made in 1950 at Liverpool by Lord Trefgarne. We will also be told about what the Economist, Castro, said about underdeveloped countries. We will be regaled with facts which we all know — unpleasant facts. I am sure, however, that this Government will not be able to tell us what positive attempt it has made to institute an Economic Planning Unit, and what positive attempt it has made to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of Guianese to perform the duties that will fall upon their shoulders in the staffing of an Economic Planning Unit within the next 10 years.

I may express myself differently from the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara, but there is one point on which we are *ad idem*: that the Government is more notorious for its ability to talk rather than its ability to do. How can the Government at this time—some are lawyers, some are dentists, some are transport workers, some are ex-teachers—undertake a big Development Programme? Is it not the epitome of conceited ignorance to undertake a Develop-

[MR. BURNHAM]

ment Programme of this size without expert advice? That was done in Jamaica, Trinidad, Ghana and so on.

I should like to ask the Government, how is it that it is fouling a Development Programme which is at least \$90 million smaller than the one which it originally proposed? In 1958 when the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara was a member of a World Touring Team, he together with the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry, with great fuss worthy of Gilbert and Sullivan, left these shores for the United Kingdom and said: "We want \$200 million to develop British Guiana". The Minister of Trade and Industry admitted in the debate on the Development Programme that he told the people in the United Kingdom that "the situation was explosive". He said: "The situation is explosive, and unless something is done immediately and urgently we cannot take the consequences". Excellent rhetoric of the highest order. They came back in 1958 and the titular as distinct from the actual Leader of the Delegation whom they congratulated for his services to the country, the then Governor Sir Patrick Renison, made a remark "that you cannot get Development Funds on Guesstimates".

In 1959 the Minister of Trade and Industry journeyed without his erstwhile companion to ask for \$200 million. Again he threatened to get money at 2 per cent, 1 per cent, or no per cent. At the present moment I am not interested in examining the *pros* and *cons* of this percentage, for whatever interest you pay, or whether you pay interest or not, the essential things are (i) to recognize your needs; (ii) to set out a proper programme, and (iii) to execute the programme efficiently.

How was this Development Programme, part of which these Estimates are drafted? There was a round robin sent to all Heads of Departments — I wonder whether the Chief Secretary re-

ceived his round robin? Anyway, there is no development work to be done in the Chief Secretary's Office — I think there is demolition work to be done there. Heads of Departments were asked to submit figures of what they wanted; these figures were then pruned and cut by Mr. Berrill and the Government, and then they arrived at this \$110 million Development Programme. We should have expected this Development Programme to lay the basis for the development of our economy along specific lines. The Programme which is not only short term in its aims but also long term has turned out merely to be a Programme that is intended to be a palliative. Grow more rice, give a few more people some more land, and hope for the best, trusting God. It is good to trust in God, but it is also good to make some effort. Heaven helps those who help themselves.

Those are the people who, first of all, had the temerity to ask for \$200 million when they cannot spend the allocation on the basis of \$110 million. Now for the statement by the Financial Secretary. Let me confess immediately that I am no economist. If there is one virtue I possess it is that I know when I know not. I am no statistician; I am no expert in the field of public finance, and, if sometimes I ask of the Financial Secretary certain naive questions, I hope he will pardon my ignorance and enlighten my darkness.

For instance, last year it was proposed to spend \$25 million. It turned out that, apparently, Government could not consume the \$25 million, and the revised estimate is \$16 million. Can Government tell me where the \$9 million has gone? I would like to know. I ask where the \$9 million has gone because, perhaps incorrectly, I have made a false assumption that there was available the sum of \$25,967,850 when approval for that expenditure was sought. Therefore, if Government has not spent that \$9 million, what is its difficulty about financing this year's programme, which difficulty the

Financial Secretary has alluded to on page 14 of his Budget Speech? The Financial Secretary says there that he can be sure of only \$20 million this year. He says that the funds immediately in sight are \$9.5 million from Colonial Development and Welfare grants, \$2.5 million from a local loan to be raised early this year, and \$8 million from the Exchequer loan. I am not interested in where the money comes from. I am not here to say whether it is blood money or not, or that we must thank the British Government for it. I am not interested in those moral aspects.

Mr. Speaker: Then, do not mention it.

Mr. Burnham: It is necessary to mention it in order to explain why I do not dwell on it. I see no mention of the unspent funds from last year, and I assume that the Financial Secretary will not come during 1961 with supplementary estimates, and say he wants some re-votes for work that was not done last year under the Programme, because he certainly knows now what works were not done, and there should be provision for doing those works in the programme for this year.

At this stage perhaps it is apposite to remark that, assuming that the Financial Secretary is right that he can only find \$20 million, this Government is carrying on a policy of talking and fooling the public. For consecutive years Government has under-spent. Its highest expenditure under the Development Programme has been \$19 million. If Government can only find \$20 million, why does it talk about \$24 million which it cannot spend? There has been no explanation as to changed circumstances, increased expertise, greater efficiency, overhauling of procedures, to lead us to believe that what happened in 1960, 1959 and 1958, will not recur in 1961.

I am a firm believer in a country paying for a large part of its development. I think that too many politicians

in under-developed and undeveloped countries are prepared to be mendicants. Too many want to be always borrowing money without making any attempt to raise the money. I agree, therefore, with the Government's policy which was set out to my knowledge at least three years ago, that part of the Development Funds must be provided by the country, by the Government from revenue surpluses. The Financial Secretary, carrying out the policy of his Government, would like to get his programmed revenue contribution of \$3 million, but is not realistic in the circumstances, for he says in his Budget speech:

"While for the reasons given in my discussion of the 1961 revenue surplus, there is virtually no 1961 revenue contribution to the Development Fund in sight, and the I.B.R.D. loan has not yet been negotiated to finality, there is a good possibility of financing an additional \$4 million, to make a total of \$24 million, from additional Colonial Development and Welfare grants, a larger drawing from the Exchequer Loan, a better revenue outturn than now budgeted, and the I.B.R.D. loan."

If it is Government's policy that this country should contribute to its Development Programme, and if it is agreed that the Development Programme will pay for itself eventually; that it will pay high dividends as a result of the development of the economy and the increased prosperity it will bring in the foreseeable future, that should have been present in Government's mind when it was drafting its recurrent estimates. It is no sense coming here just eight months before the General Election and saying "Look here boys, there will be no increased taxation except that we will touch the pools a little bit, although we do not expect to get much more from them."

The hon. Member for the North Western District (Mr. Campbell) remarked that we wanted less politics and fewer politicians. I think what he wanted to say — and I would agree with him — is that the mere political motive to appear popular should not be the dominant

[MR. BURNHAM]

consideration when one is dealing with the affairs and future of a country. The fact that elections are likely to take place in August of this year should not in any way have contributed to the Government being satisfied with having no revenue surplus which it could contribute to the Development Programme. I am not suggesting that Government should tax potatoes again. I have clearly in my mind where Government could have raised extra revenue, but I am not here to advise Government in those respects. The role of the "Opposition" is not the role of the pedagogue.

Mr. Speaker, I am about to go on to another topic, and perhaps in view of the time it may not be asking you too much to adjourn at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: You may let us know what is your next topic.

Mr. Burnham: I was going to deal with a comparison of the projected works a comparison between the projected

works for 1961 and those projected in 1960, and I was going to show cases where Government has not spent one cent or even made a beginning in 1960. I propose to deal with that, not head by head but running through the majority of the heads.

Mr. Speaker: I have been noting very carefully the various heads dealt with.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary: I move that Council adjourn to two o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and I hope we will be finished with these Development Estimates by five o'clock. If we do not, I shall propose that we sit again in the evening from eight o'clock.

Council adjourned at 5.01 p.m. until the following day, Friday, 6th January, 1961, at 2 p.m.