

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Thursday, 11th February, 1960

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. D. M. Hedges

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

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

} *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).

Mr. **R. B. Gajraj** — *Nominated Member*

„ **W. O. R. Kendall** — *Member for New Amsterdam*

„ **R. C. Tello** — *Nominated Member*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

„ **R. E. Davis** — *Nominated Member*

„ **A. M. Fredericks** — *Nominated Member*

H. J. M. Hubbard — *Nominated Member*

„ **A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.** — *Nominated Member.*

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

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

ABSENT :

The Hon. B. S. Rai, Minister of Community Development and Education — on leave.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh — Member for Georgetown South.

The Clerk read prayers.

MINUTES

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

PAPERS LAID

The Minister of Natural Resources: (Mr. Benn): I beg to lay on the Table the

Report of the Director of Audit on the Accounts of the Ham and Bacon Factory for the years ended 31st December, 1956, and 31st December, 1957.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS
(REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS)
(AMENDMENT) BILL

The Financial Secretary (Mr. Essex): I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Executive and Legislative Councils (Remuneration of Members) (Amendment) Bill, 1960.

ORDER OF THE DAY

BILL—FIRST READING

The following Bill was read the First time:

A Bill intituled: "An Ordinance to amend the Executive and Legislative Councils (Remuneration of Members) Ordinance, 1953.

BRITISH GUIANA RICE
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Speaker: Council will now resume consideration of the Bill intituled:

"An Ordinance to amend the British Guiana Rice Producers Association Ordinance."

Mr. Benn: I beg to move that the Council resolve itself into Committee to consider the Bill clause by clause.

Agreed to.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Clause 1. — *Short Title.*

Agreed to.

Clause 2. — *Amendment of Section 2 of Chapter 250.*

The Attorney-General (Mr. Austin): I beg to withdraw the proposed Amendment to this Clause in the list of Amendments which has been circulated. An amendment is not necessary.

Clause 2 passed as printed.

Clause 3. — *Amendment of paragraph ACQ of Section 4 of Chapter 250.*

Mr. Fredericks: Rice is one of the three major industries on which our economy is almost wholly based. We are reminded of this year after year by the hon. the Financial Secretary who, in his Budget Statement, has pointed to the effect of a bad rice crop on the economy of this country. Consequently, it is extremely important that we should be very careful in proposing amendments to existing legislation. I submit that the reason put forward by the Minister does not justify these Amendments. The reason he gave was that he would like to provide for elections to be held later this month. I feel that notice of these proposed Amendments should have been given long before to allow ample opportunity for study by the people directly concerned in the rice industry. From the proposed Amendments it appears to me that the whole idea is to limit elections to the Council of the Rice Producers' Association to rice farmers only, to the exclusion of the millers. This, I fear, will result in a conflict of interests between millers and rice farmers who should jointly contribute to the progress of the industry. If these Amendments are passed today the logical consequence will be an amendment of Section 4 of the Rice Marketing Ordinance.

Mr. Benn: I am sorry to interrupt. I do not know if the hon. Nominated Member is speaking on Clause 3. He

appears to be speaking about amendments generally.

The Chairman: I think he is speaking on Clause 3.

Mr. Fredericks: I was trying to show the effect of these Amendments — how far-reaching they would be — but if the Minister wants me to confine my remarks to Clause 3 I will do so. I think it would have been the correct thing for him to state clearly what is his over-all intention, and I would have helped him along if he had only made it clear. As he wants to limit my remarks I will try to meet him more than half way, with your permission, Sir.

The Chairman: I am presiding over this Legislature.

Mr. Fredericks: I said “with your permission”, Sir.

The Chairman: However much the Minister might like to limit you, if I do not stop you, you can go ahead.

Mr. Fredericks: Before the Minister proceeds with his Amendments I would suggest that the word “producers” be replaced by the word “farmers”, which would more or less give him what he wants in paragraph (c) of Section 4 of Chapter 250.

The Chairman: You have no objection to paragraph (c) except for the word “procedure”?

Mr. Fredericks: No, Sir.

Mr. Benn: I am afraid that that is not the intention of the Bill. I did say, when I was speaking on the Second Reading, that one or two Amendments ought to have been made, and that another mistake crept into the Amendments which were proposed. In the list of Amendments paragraph (b) of Clause 4 refers to “one member (who shall be a rice farmer)”, but the intention is not to restrict election to the Council of the Rice Producers’ Association to rice farmers. All

persons engaged in the rice industry will be able to elect whom they want on the Council, whether they are rice farmers, millers or manufacturers.

Mr. Fredericks: The Minister asked me earlier in the debate not to proceed further, but that is exactly what he is doing now.

Mr. Benn: I say that another mistake has crept into the Bill and I will ask for an amendment.

Mr. Fredericks: The Minister should have informed the Committee before.

The Chairman: That is really playing with the situation. This is a Bill which you want to get through. If it is intended to amend something which would correct a mistake, it would save us a lot of time if he would say what the mistake is.

Mr. Fredericks: I have to know what he intends before I can withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Benn: I said that the intention is not to exclude millers from the Council, and that millers can be elected; therefore it would be unnecessary to remove the definition of the term “rice producers” from (c) of Section 4. I said further that a mistake crept into the amendment, and I intended to ask that (b) of Clause 2 of my amendments be amended in order to remove the provision “who shall be a rice farmer.”

The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan): It is true to say that the B.G. Rice Producers’ Association had recommended to Government that the Bill be amended to provide for a Farmers’ Association, but because of the representation made by the Members opposite, Government has decided to accede to their wishes. Some of the points raised, and which are not excluded completely, are that manufacturers and landlords would be entitled to become elected to the Council or to the District Association.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, we made a point yesterday afternoon, that the desire to rush through this Bill was very unwise.

The Chairman: That was yesterday afternoon. We are now on today.

Mr. Jackson: Yes, Sir. The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry said that this is an attempt to meet the views expressed on this side which had not been fully met. The intention now is to include other people, and it would be interesting to hear the Minister say what amendments he made as a result of acceding to our wishes, and let us have some time to study them, because we may find that there are some other mistakes when we relate them to the Ordinances governing the rice industry.

The Chairman: The hon. Minister of Natural Resources said that some mistakes had crept into the amendment. What may save us some time is if he would tell us what those mistakes are—they may be typographical or something like that.

Mr. Benn: One of the mistakes is on page 2, at Clause 9. There appears:

“The British Guiana Rice Producers’ Association (Special Provisions) Ordinance, 1959, is hereby amended by the substitution for the words ‘15th February, 1960’ and ‘15th March, 1960’ wherever they occur of the words ‘31st March, 1960’ and ‘30th April, 1960’ respectively.”

That should read:

“The British Guiana Rice Producers’ Association (Special Provisions) Ordinance, 1959, is hereby amended by the substitution for the words ‘15th February, 1960’ and ‘15th March, 1960’ wherever they occur of the words ‘30th April, 1960’ and ‘31st May, 1960’ respectively.”

In other words, the 30th of April will take the place of 31st March and the 31st of May will take the place of the 30th of April.

Mr. Fredericks: Before we proceed, Sir, would the hon. the Attorney-General

explain the term “rice farmer” as it appears under Clause 2 (b) on the sheet of amendments? I understand the first part of the definition, but not the second part which states “. . . or which is otherwise lawfully occupied by him.”

The Chairman: That has been knocked out. Clause 2, as has been printed in the Bill, was passed.

Mr. Davis: I wish to move an amendment, a copy of which I now hand to the Clerk: an amendment to Clause 4.

The Chairman: We have not got to that yet. If there is nothing else, I will put the Amendment. The question is, that the word “producer” in the first line of Section 4 (c) of the Principal Ordinance should be replaced by the word “farmer”.

Mr. Fredericks: Sir, in view of the explanation of the Minister of Natural Resources, I ask leave to withdraw that Amendment.

Clause 3 passed as printed.

Clause 4.—*Amendment of section 5 of Chapter 250.*

The Attorney-General: I beg to move an amendment to Clause 4, in the form cyclostyled and circulated to Members, subject to a small variation. The effect is that subsections (2) and (3), of Section 5 as proposed and set out in the printed Bill will be replaced by subsections (2) and (3) on the cyclostyled sheet, with the exception of the words in parenthesis “who shall be a rice farmer” in the first line of (2) (b), which is to be left out to meet the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks’ point. The Amendment reads:

“(a) by the repeal of subsections (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6) and the substitution therefor of the following subsections —

“(2) The members of the Council shall be —

(a) the Director of Agriculture or his duly authorized representative;

- (b) one member of the Committee of each District Association appointed in accordance with the provisions of the regulations, and
- (c) four other persons elected by the members appointed under the provisions of paragraph (b) of this subsection at a meeting held in pursuance of the regulations.

(3) If any person appointed under paragraph (b) of the preceding subsection ceases to be a member of the Committee of a District Association, his appointment as a member of the Council shall cease to have effect without prejudice to anything previously done by him in pursuance thereof, and the Committee of the District Association of which such person was a member shall appoint another of its members in his place."

By the substitution for the beginning of paragraph (b) of Clause 4 as follows — which is in the circulated sheet — "(b) by the repeal of subsections (8) and (9) and the substitution therefor of the following subsections", which are subsections (8), (9) and (10) printed in the Bill; and by the insertion of paragraph (c), which is the third amendment in Clause 4 — "(c) by re-numbering subsection (10) as subsection (11)".

The point about this Amendment is that, apart from the matter which was referred to by the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry a short time ago of replacing "rice producer" for "rice farmer", it was found when the Bill was drafted in the printed form, this extremely complicated arrangement did not, as drafted, quite reflect the intentions of the Rice Producers Association. When the draft was gone into a second time by them, the request came that it should be re-drafted to make the intention of the Amendment clearer.

The new Amendment (c), which is "by re-numbering subsection (10) as subsection (11)", is because we are no longer deleting the original subsection (10); it remains in the Ordinance and then the new subsection (10) in the Bill will become subsection (11). It is purely

a drafting matter to put the subsections of this long and complicated section in a proper order.

Mr. Davis: I beg to move an Amendment to Clause 4 (a) subsection 3 by the substitution of the word "six" for the word "four" in the fourth line. My reason is that I have based this Amendment on what was the original Bill No. 5 which was laid over. Since then, the hon. Minister has moved this other Amendment with certain changes. At the time, I did not quite fully appreciate it although he told me that he would take out the words "who would be rice farmers"; so my Amendment is really based on what was the originally proposed Amendment to the Ordinance.

I also wanted to move the insertion between the words "be" and "a" in the fifth line, of the words "a landlord of rice lands or a manufacturer of rice who shall also be".

The Chairman: Which one are you talking about? Your first Amendment affects paragraph 3, line 4, as printed — that the word "six" be substituted for the original word "four". Your second Amendment is: "each of whom shall be a landlord of rice lands or a manufacturer of rice and who shall also be a member of a District Association."

Mr. Davis: What I think would be more desirable so as to make it less confusing, is to re-word my Amendment to what is now the latter Amendment by the hon. Minister. I can do that if I am given the opportunity. I would like to vary that Amendment which I circulated to this: that the Amendment to the Amendment, as laid over by the Minister of Natural Resources, to Clause 4, subsection 3 be amended as follows:

"Six other persons (each of whom shall be a landlord of rice lands or a manufacturer of rice and who shall also be members of a District Association)".

My reasons for submitting this Amendment are these: I think it is elementary and quite necessary that all categories of rice farmers or rice

[MR. DAVIS]

producers — call them what you will — should be able to have a say in this Ordinance and to be supported by Statute. That is important.

I had remarked to the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry that it was he who first gave recognition to what is now known as the Rice Millers Association; he said so the other day and I agreed with him entirely. My point is that he is not bound to do so by Statute, and I think it is an essential part of the organization that all categories of rice farmers or producers should be recognized accordingly. The day may come when, perhaps, he may change his mind about the recognition of what may now be regarded, by some, as a mere trade union. The behaviour of the members may cause him to frown on their association as such; so we cannot only legislate for a period, as there may come a day when his successor, if and when that ever occurs, may not care or be inclined to afford recognition to the Rice Millers Association. Then the rice millers will not have the right by Statute to be heard. It is for this reason that I think it might be well to have this integrated in the Ordinance.

The Minister of Trade and Industry has referred to the fact that there is friction between rice farmers, on the one hand, and millers and landlords on the other. I have heard it said that the Rice Farmers (Security of Tenure) Ordinance secures the landlord, but that is not the case. In my view it offers definitely greater measures of security to the tenants. It was framed with that intention, and it does just that. I accept the statement by the Minister of Natural Resources that it is the intention to reduce the number of District Associations from 13 to 12. Therefore, 12 rice farmers as such will elect six landlords or millers, but the point I wish to stress is that the rice farmers will have, in effect, complete charge of the industry through their weight of numbers. However, with the Amendment proposed I am of the opinion that all categories of rice producers

will feel that they have a say on the Council of the Association and the right to make their contributions to the industry as they have done in past years.

Mr. Fredericks: I would like to support the hon. Nominated Member's Amendment. I observe that the Minister is very anxious to rise, and I can anticipate more or less that he wants to draw attention to the definition of "rice producer" which includes a manufacturer or a landlord, but the point made by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, is that it is quite possible that a manufacturer, miller or landlord may not be able to get on the Rice Marketing Board owing to the fact that he may not be elected to a District Association. Therefore I would like to support my friend's argument, but I am inclined to go a bit further. Just as it is necessary to have a manufacturer or a landlord I think the rice industry could benefit by having persons on the Board who are totally unconnected with the industry. Therefore I would suggest an amendment to paragraph (a) (ii) of the hon. Member's Amendment by the substitution of the words "four of whom shall be landlords of rice lands or manufacturers of rice, and who shall be members of a District Association."

Mr. Davis: I accept that Amendment.

Dr. Jagan: I think there is a great deal of confusion about the purpose of these Amendments. As I said previously, the purpose of this Amendment is, firstly, to give representation to persons in certain districts and, secondly, to make the Council of the Rice Producers' Association representative of the views of the people in the districts. In the Amendments proposed today Government does not insist that the Association should become a rice farmers' organization as such, because one can very well appreciate the point that the rice farmers themselves may want a benevolent landlord or miller to represent them.

I think Members are confusing the Rice Producers' Association with the

Rice Marketing Board, because they talk about representation. It is on the Rice Marketing Board where millers' interests are really in dispute, if one may so describe it, because one can appreciate that the Board fixes not only prices for rice which it purchases but also the minimum price for padi. In fixing the minimum price for padi the Board allows for what is called the miller's margin. So that one can appreciate the point of view of the millers that they should have representation on the Rice Marketing Board. But one can argue that even on the Rice Marketing Board the millers may not be represented, because the minimum price fixed for padi is only a guide.

We are dealing here only with a producers' organization; what is in the interest of rice producers as such. We are not dealing with marketing at all. We want to get into the Council people who are representative of the farmers, or technical persons like the Director of Agriculture whom the farmers may want, but here Members are seeking to impose on the Council landlords or manufacturers. Of course there is this difficulty which I do not think Members have looked into. They say that six persons, four of whom shall be landlords or manufacturers of rice, shall be members of a District Association, but there is no guarantee that those persons will be members of a District Association, because they need not be elected. So that that proposition is fallacious and cannot work.

One Member suggested that if we allowed two members here it would permit of two Ministers getting on the Board. I can assure him that we do not intend in future to have Ministers sitting on the Rice Marketing Board, so that the hon. Member can remove that from his mind if that is what is worrying him.

I would also like to assure Members that in the Bill to amend the Rice Marketing Ordinance, which will come before

the Council shortly, it is being proposed by Government that provision should be made for three millers to be members of the Board, one from the Rice Development Company and two others who, it is hoped, will come from the Rice Millers' Association. There is no provision in the existing Ordinance for any miller to be on the Board, so that what Government is proposing is something far better than what exists at the present time. In other words we are trying to make the Rice Producers' Association a producers' body concerned with the production of rice. If millers and landlords are elected to the Association by the farmers they will sit there by right, chosen directly or indirectly by the farmers.

On the other hand, I can see the argument being put forward that millers should be represented on the Rice Marketing Board. There is no such provision in the Ordinance, and Government is providing legislation which will permit millers to be represented on the Board. So there should be no fear that the Government, in introducing this Amendment, is trying to take away rights from landlords and millers.

Mr. Fredericks: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources in his opening remarks referred to the confusion on this side of the Table about the purpose of the Amendment. I can assure the hon. Minister that there is no confusion. We are saying clearly—and perhaps more clearly than he does—that we would have saved a lot of argument this afternoon had he stated quite clearly what was the purpose of the Amendment.

As I said earlier, he should have changed the word "producer" into "farmer"—actually he said at a later stage that he intended to change it later on, so my changes would have been unnecessary. Now he is saying that it should be the Rice Farmers' Association in the Ordinance. I agree: change the title. He will have the backing of this Council if he changes it and calls it by its more appropriate name.

[MR. FREDERICKS]

He said it represented the needs of the people in the Districts—the manufacturers, the landlords and the farmers. This confirms my fear that it would affect Section 4 of the Rice Marketing Ordinance.

I was not here when the Minister of Natural Resources made his speech on the Second Reading—

Mr. Benn: To a point of order. The hon. Member is saying that certain things were not said, and now he is saying that he was not here.

The Chairman: He said he was not present when the Minister spoke on the Second Reading, and therefore he is not aware of what he said. Surely he is perfectly in order.

Mr. Fredericks: As far as I am concerned, I am quite willing to help the Government, but the Government must say what they want. From this Amendment it was clear that Section 4 of the Rice Marketing Ordinance must be changed, and ultimately I can visualize the Rice Marketing Board as a co-operative for the rice farmers' benefit alone. If the Minister says so, we will know.

Mr. Beharry: I rise to support the Amendment moved by Mr. Davis. The Minister of Trade and Industry has just stated that to include landlords and manufacturers in this Association would mean there would be no guarantee that either landlords or manufacturers would be elected. That explains the burning desire of the Minister to include them, if there is no guarantee that they would be elected.

I say that this Bill has been designed purposely—and I emphasize the word 'purposely' to isolate landlords as well as manufacturers. Sugar and rice are the two most important agricultural commodities in this country. An Association represents the sugar industry—the

B.G. Sugar Producers' Association—in which representation is made in respect of this commodity from the planting through the manufacturing to the marketing stage. There is no separation of the manufacturers from the planters, because the entire industry is looked upon as one integrated whole. The Association takes the approach that anything which affects the manufacturing of sugar would affect the planting, and so on.

Similarly, that which affects the manufacture of rice would affect the planting of rice, and hence the general industry. I do not see the reason for the desire to separate the manufacturers as well as the landlords. The only reason I suggest for doing so is because landlords are supposed to be wealthy people, and so are the manufacturers. The argument may be: "We must try to disassociate these two categories from the real peasant farmer. We don't need manufacturers politically, we don't need landlords politically." Why? Because they belong to the capitalist class, which believes in the ownership of property.

In fact, as the Government sees it, the title of the B.G. Rice Producers' Association stands condemned; it should no doubt be the B.G. Padi Producers' Association. I feel that if we introduce an Ordinance to that effect it would be better.

The Chairman: You can move an amendment to the Short Title.

Mr. Beharry: Mr. Chairman, I am merely making a criticism.

The Chairman: Well, I am afraid you cannot go back. If you say the title is wrong, then the short course is an amendment of it.

Mr. Beharry: You see, Mr. Chairman, this Amendment is asking that manufacturers as well as owners of land should be deprived of having a say in the Rice Producers Council; yet we find that the entire Ordinance is named after the

rice producers. I find it very difficult to disassociate manufacturers and owners of land on which rice is planted from rice farmers. But as I said, it is purposely being done: landlords do not have many votes, and manufacturers do not have many votes—I mean political votes. The industry, however, is what should matter to every single individual sitting in this Council, and if the industry is to progress, every section or every individual that plays a part in this industry, whether he be a manufacturer or not, should be included and so have a say in the production of rice.

The Minister gave the guarantee that no fear need be held that he will be on the Rice Marketing Board. But who can deny that the shadows of Ministers might be there. So when such a guarantee is given, it is just to try and put forward an argument that would satisfy the less well-informed.

I do not see why it has been argued by the Minister that manufacturers must sit on the Rice Marketing Board, but they must not sit on the Rice Producers' Council. The Board is a marketing organization. Why permit manufacturers on the Board and not on the Rice Producers' Council? He is a manufacturer and not a marketing agent, yet you make arrangements for him to sit on a Board which deals with marketing. I say it is time we stop playing politics with this industry.

Since the producers do not want the manufacturers and landlords, it would mean that landlords and manufacturers are not going to be elected. Why is there not a desire to include them? As I said before, time and history will prove my contention to be right. The ownership of property and the ownership of wealth are not considered too sacred, philosophically, in our country and it is the basis of the poverty of our people today. This is their philosophy, and it is because of their philosophy that this country is in this economic mess and will

remain in this economic mess unless we change our outlook.

As I see it, the rice industry cannot progress as any other industry until enterprising individuals in the private sector join hands with the ordinary peasant and they move forward together as members of the same industry.

Mr. Tello: I am supporting the Amendment because I am satisfied it is a contribution to justice. As I understand, this is a very important word — “producer”. I see it entailing the ownership and the occupation of land, the cultivation of rice and its manufacture. You have three definite sectors there, and where the rice producers in the farming sector are more in numbers, provision is already made in the Amendment offered by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources for the majority being rice farmers; and it is only fair that the other two sectors — that is, the owners and occupiers of rice lands, and especially the rice manufacturers — should be represented.

The hon. Minister of Natural Resources pointed out that what is necessary is to have rice millers on the Rice Marketing Board. I quite agree with him, but as long as there is the statutory provision for the association to speak for the rice producer, it is incumbent upon the Government to give the opportunity for expression of opinion to all sectors. It is either you ask the rice farmers to organize themselves into a voluntary organization like that of the rice millers and, probably, let the landlords take the same example, or repeal the entire Ordinance from the Statute Book. But as long as there is legislation—as long as you are going to make law to protect the industry—you must look at the industry as a whole. I am certain that I am correct in saying that provision should be made in the Ordinance for the representation of all sectors. It is definite in my mind—

The Chairman: You say you are definite in your mind, but did you look at the Ordinance?

Mr. Tello: It would appear that those who drafted the first Ordinance thought likewise because this is what they have in Chapter 250:

“‘rice producer’ has the meaning assigned to it in section 2 of the Rice Marketing Ordinance, as amended from time to time”;

and “rice producer” means landlord, rice farmer and manufacturer.

The Chairman: Nothing more ?

Mr. Tello: I do not want to read the whole thing. It says:

“‘rice producer’ means—

(a) any landlord of rice land within the meaning of these terms as defined by section 2 of the Rice Farmers (Security of Tenure) Ordinance”;

The Chairman: Have you looked at that ?

Mr. Tello: No, but let me go on:

(b) any rice farmer who cultivates his own land or any land let or leased to him or which is otherwise lawfully occupied by him;

(c) any manufacturer”;

All I am saying is that whatever is the definition of landlord in that particular Ordinance, consideration was given in the definition of this term ‘rice producer’ to include the three most important sectors of production—landlord, manufacturer and rice farmer. I do not think this should be the subject of a lengthy debate. I feel, as long as we accept what the hon. Minister of Natural Resources told us, that there is no intention of turning the Rice Producers Association into a Rice Farmers Association, it is only correct that provision should be made to give the assurance that these three sectors would be represented; and I am sure those closely connected have sought this protection. And what is recorded in the *Hansard* has nothing to do with the application of the law.

Mr. Gajraj: I did not expect that there would have been so much discus-

sion and controversy over the passage of this Bill. It would seem that, from the contributions that have been made this afternoon, there must be some degree of misconception, perhaps some fear. I have heard many Members saying that provision should be made in the Ordinance for the two categories of rice producers, namely, the miller and the landlord, to be elected to the Rice Producers Association’s Council. My answer is that provision is there, for it states very definitely, that the rice producers of each district shall elect their own District Committee and one person from each of these Committees shall sit on the Council of the Rice Producers Association.

It is true that in the Rice Producers Association Ordinance, the term “rice producer” is related to the meaning given to it in the Rice Marketing Ordinance and, as such, it stands to reason that anyone who is a miller or landlord is entitled to stand for election and, in the democratic process, is entitled to be elected. But I know the fear that some Members have.

They fear that landlords and/or millers might not be able to poll enough votes from the members of a District Association to enable him or them to be elected. But one must not merely make statements like that and leave them there, because in these days one must look at the causes of these things. What has been the reason for the dissatisfaction, if one must use such a strong term, between the producer, who is the farmer, and the miller or landlord? It has been because, in some cases, the rice farmer has felt that he has been unjustly treated by the landlord or miller. Such widespread accusation would not be correct in every case, but there are cases where such a charge is justified.

I think it is true to say that there are many millers and producers who enjoy many good relations with tenants or farmers who bring padi to their mills. That is because they had been able to satisfy those people that they give a fair,

just and equitable return. I would urge upon this Council that these are days when we must urge our people to cooperate with one another while trying to make a better understanding between all the various categories, so that we may move forward in the interest of the industry in particular, and in the interest of the country in general. But if we were to continue to set up small segments in industry or in each problem that besets us, then we will continue to be faced with small pressure groups endeavouring to use their influence in what they might consider in the interest of the country but which might be considered by others as against the interest of the country. I think we must move forward from the stage of the past and try to get a better understanding amongst our people.

I cannot see, myself—and I know of a few cases in mind—where people who are in the category of millers or landlords living nicely with their tenants or farmers would not get enough votes cast for their election to the District Association. If they fail to get those votes, then it means something is wrong. In this democratic age one must try to build the confidence of the would-be leaders and those who are to put them into position. We have been talking in this Council and we shall be talking very soon again about constitutional reform, and in the light of what we all hope to get we have to build ourselves at home in every respect to justify the additional power we hope to get, and it is by means such as these that we must give people an opportunity to serve, not themselves but a larger group—in this case the interests of an industry that is of vital importance to this country.

Members of this Council must also realize that both the Rice Marketing Ordinance and the Rice Producers' Association Ordinance were not introduced by the desire or demand of the people engaged in the rice industry. Both bits of legislation were passed many years ago and were imposed upon the industry. We know that many people who were

engaged, for example, in the export of rice were very mad when the Rice Marketing Ordinance was passed. Similarly, many people in different parts of the country who had been getting together in groups in order to represent the cause of rice farmers, were very much annoyed when the Rice Producers' Association Ordinance was passed.

I know, and I think other Members who have spoken on this issue know, that for many years the rice farmers had been complaining that the Rice Producers' Association Ordinance did not fully meet the wishes and aspirations of the people, and we have here a proposal whereby the Council of the Rice Producers' Association will enjoy more direct representation by those elected by the electors in the districts, because under the present Ordinance the members of the District Associations appoint electors who amongst themselves select the members of the Council of the Association.

In the proposals before us the Council of the Association will consist of one elected member from each body, and I think the proposal by Government to include on the Council of the Rice Producers' Association a body of opinion which is not necessarily tied to those who are engaged in rice production, is a very useful measure at this stage, because it enables those elected members of the District Associations who sit on the Council, to work with others who may not have any direct interest in the rice industry but who, from their knowledge and experience, and perhaps their positions in the community, can help those elected members in arriving at perhaps better conclusions than they might have done by themselves. In other words, opinions which could be of use to the industry could be sought from the four members who are envisaged in the Amendment which has been moved by the Minister of Natural Resources.

If one were to accept the contention of my friends, the hon. Nominated Members, Mr. Davis and Mr. Fredericks,

[MR. GAJRAJ]

that the number should be increased to six, and that four of the six seats should be ear-marked for millers and/or landlords, then we would be leaving only two positions open for people who could give advice to the industry but who are not themselves connected with the industry, and thereby reduce the effectiveness of the idea by 50 per cent., without at the same time assuring us that the other four persons, who might be millers or landlords, would not be joined by millers and landlords who might be elected from the districts.

I think that in the Rice Producers' Association we should give an opportunity to all who wish to serve to go there, and to do so by means of election. We are moving away in this day and age from appointments through nomination. We want to give the people a more direct say in their own affairs, whether it be the running of industry or running the Government of the country, and as I urged earlier, it is my view that if persons who are in the minority categories, such as landlords and millers, realize how the country is moving and whither it is moving, they would get on better with the farmer category in the industry and present a more united front in the Rice Producers' Association.

I will not comment at this stage upon what the Minister of Trade and Industry said regarding proposals with respect to the Rice Marketing Board. When they are put before the Council I hope I shall be present and be able to make my contribution on the subject, but I would like to say that I have heard mention made here this afternoon of the economic mess in which this country is, and in which it shall remain if ideas such as those proposed by the Government continue to be put before us. My remark on that is that the economic mess, if there is a mess, is being encouraged and perhaps will continue to grow on us so long as Members of this Council and citizens of the country generally endeav-

our to play up to the public at large, and the world at large, the so-called ideological differences we have heard of from time to time. If they continue to say that capital is being driven away, that the rights of minorities are being trampled upon; that those who own property are going to be relieved of their property—if these things continue to be shouted from the housetops without proof, then we shall certainly be sending our own country into the depths of misery and Slough of Despond, and they will land us all in a worse position than we are. It will make the job of those who come after this Government much more difficult, and who are going to benefit? It is those who would like to see us disunited. We want the people of the country to benefit, and such benefit can only be achieved if we get together and realize that the key to the whole situation lies in the people of this country getting together and showing that we can manage our own affairs.

In the case of the rice industry I am sure that producers of all categories would wish to join me in expressing our appreciation of the many persons who over the years since these two Ordinances were put on the Statute Book of the Colony, have given of their time and service freely and voluntarily with the object of advancing the interests of the rice industry. People who are not rice producers have come forward and have served. But not because they have done so must we for all time penalize them to give of their time, their energy and their ability. We must make sure that in the same way as we want self-government for this country, in the smaller area of the industry we should try to do the same thing.

Would any small businessman agree that someone should be brought from outside to tell him how he should run his business? The answer is definitely, "no." He would endeavour to improve his own technique, to study and to learn, and to benefit from the errors of the past, and so try to make his business a better

run one and a more prosperous one. And so in the rice industry I look forward to the time when those who, like myself, have no financial interest or do not qualify in any of the three categories of rice producers, gracefully bow out and leave the industry in the hands of the producers who, by that time, will have had an opportunity to improve their knowledge, and will have qualified to take it by the helm and make a success of it.

Mr. Bowman: There are some of us who sympathize with certain Members when they support Government statements, because those people have an understanding with the Government. However, I think the argument adduced by the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara (Mr. Beharry) was clear and concise, especially when he made comparison between the Sugar Producers' Association and the Rice Producers' Association. According to my understanding, the existing Rice Producers' Association Ordinance provides for 24 members of the Council of the Association—nine landlords and millers and 15 rice farmers, which means that the farmers have a majority of six members. Why does the Government want to change that arrangement?

It is clear that it wants to make the Association 100 per cent. P.P.P. members because the P.P.P. caters for the majority. The landlords and millers are in the minority, and for that reason this Government does not care anything about them. I am revolving in my mind what is the real object. The Members of the present Government do not care about minorities; they only have regard for the masses. So long as they can satisfy the masses and so ensure their support, that is all that matters.

Why does Government want to separate and segregate the people concerned in the rice industry who have for years worked together to make the industry what it is today? What is the Government afraid of? Why does it want to change the present composition of the

Council of the Association? The answer is that it wants to make the Rice Producers Association 100 per cent. a rice farmers' organization, but that is only to fool the people.

All the members of the Government want to tell the rice farmers is "We have given you full control. There are no millers or landlords to say anything; everything is in your hands." The imputation is a sinister one. I borrow the hon. Member's phrase — time will tell, and these issues will be fought out. I give an assurance that we will fight the Members of the present Government tooth and nail. The issue will be decided by the people themselves; they are not fools as some people think they are.

Mr. Tasker: Like the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, I have no financial interest as a rice producer in this matter, and I might add that he has been persuasive in putting this case of the political franchise as applied to the rice industry. Everything that he said was proper and correct from the point of view of democratic processes and the election of properly constituted organizations. My trouble is that I think there is a serious fallacy in his argument, and that is why all his remarks fall within the terms of democratic processes for political franchise. But in that respect I do not believe they are necessarily valid, as he suggested, as a solution for the problems of one of our major industries; and here a confusion comes about that can be dangerous.

The hon. Member for Eastern Demerara earlier introduced the analogy of the sugar industry and compared it with the rice industry here. With reference to the Sugar Producers' Association, I think it is only fair to point out that there is one very big rider, and that is, sugar is essentially an estate or plantation industry, for reasons known to everybody, whereas rice is essentially a peasant industry; and there is a very considerable difference between them that should be made clear.

[MR. TASKER]

Nonetheless, the analogy is valid when it comes to the problem which the rice industry has to face at all stages of its production—from the preparation of the land and the growing of the crop right through to the final distribution of the finished product. In that case the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara had a point, because he showed that in the sugar industry there was one organization responsible for watching over the interests of that industry at all stages of its manufacture and its marketing problems. Although I think he did not mean it, he omitted to mention research, which I now add.

My concern with the point made by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, is this: when on previous occasions in the Public Accounts Committee and in the Finance Committee we considered the problems of research in the rice industry, I had always been given clearly to understand when I suggested that possibly these are matters which come within the scope of the B.G. Marketing Board, that this Board is concerned specifically with marketing. In other words, it was doing exactly what its title suggested—taking the finished product and obtaining, developing and maintaining markets for it at the best possible returns. If that is true, and if the argument is that the rice industry as a whole is represented on the Rice Marketing Board, then it seems to me that there is still a lacuna in terms of problems experienced in the rice industry. If those problems cannot be dealt with by the Rice Marketing Board, which is representative of the rice industry as a whole, it seems to me it can only be dealt with by the B.G. Rice Producers' Association, which, I understand, is supported financially by the Rice Marketing Board.

Whether it is a matter of specific interest to millers and landlords, or rice farmers it seems immaterial to me. The point here is: you have arrived at an Association which is fully representative

of the industry, and therefore should be considering all these problems of the industry, notably research and allied problems.

The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, advanced perfectly sound arguments in support of that, namely, that the rice millers and landlords should take their place like anybody else. This is, I suspect, where the fallacy comes in, because it is not a matter of political franchise; it is a matter of getting the best endeavours of an industry to work in one Association to the improvement of the industry concerned. If, as is well known, capital of that industry is largely, if not wholly, in the hands of so-called landlords, then it is farcical to imagine that landlords or millers are going to get support in elections through District Associations. So you are faced therefore with a frank recognition that they are going to be excluded from the Rice Producers' Association, and thus the industry would be still lacking at that level in the advice of millers and landlords.

I hold no brief for them, but I do feel, in the light of experience gained in other industries in the Colony, particularly the sugar industry, it would be a very grave mistake to exclude these two categories of producers from the one Association which I am given to understand is competent, and is, in fact, representative of the over-all interest of the industry. That seems to me to be a serious error, and for that reason I, personally, support the Amendment moved by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis.

Mr. Hubbard: I would first like to take the argument of the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, a step further. It is this, that if there is such hostility and disagreement between landlords and millers on the one hand and rice farmers on the other, then it seems to me that it will be impossible to get co-operation between these two sections of the industry.

In the circumstances, the most that can be hoped for is co-operation at the widest possible level, which is co-operation between the rice farmers. Although I am not competent to judge the extent of the existing differences, it would seem to me that if that is all the co-operation that can be expected, then this Government's proposals are very wise indeed. If you are going to impose the landlords and millers on the farmers, as has been suggested by the speeches I have heard, then you are not going to have a working Association at all.

For myself, I think that is not the case. On the contrary, there will be landlords and there will be millers who will be elected to the Rice Producers' Association. And if, because of hostility, that cannot be so, then it is better to have a constitution which does not impose people whom the majority does not want, and so you will get the widest possible co-operation. Let us accept the Government's proposals and see how they work. We have seen how the old arrangement has worked—it has not worked very well. Perhaps a further organization may become necessary to achieve the over-all balance and general co-operation in the industry as a whole, which is necessary to take it forward.

Mr. Tasker: Mr. Chairman, may I just qualify one point? The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard, has chosen to put one construction on what I have said. My point was briefly—and I made it absolutely clear—I do not believe the political franchise technique is the way to approach appointments to an Association representing a major industry. It is one way of doing it, but if you have problems which have been referred to by Members around this Table, and which are liable to cause a disturbance, then it is our responsibility to ensure that all the major interests are represented. This would apply to any country in the world. If you have an industry and one Association representative of all facets of that industry, you provide for a full representation on that

Association. I still maintain that it was entirely wrong to take this into the field of political franchise and to talk about democratic votes and all the rest of it.

If, in fact, it has been made clear by people far better qualified than I that certain important elements will not secure representation, then I am concerned with this and not necessarily how much political power these people will get.

Mr. Fredericks: The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, has made a sound and well-reasoned contribution to this debate. I rather regret, however, that he should have prefaced his remarks by saying that he had no interest in rice.

Mr. Tasker: "No financial interest..."

Mr. Fredericks: Financial or otherwise! I myself would like to say that I have no financial interest in rice, but that is no reason why I should not be directly interested apart from the fact that the matter is being debated in this Council.

The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, has treated this Council to another of his remarkable feats of oratory, in which one could not help but follow him to the last sentence.

He implied that we were not *au fait* with the definition "rice producer" as defined in the Rice Marketing Ordinance, and has stated, quite rightly, that a manufacturer or a landlord would be elected to a District Association. I was under the impression that that point was fully dealt with by the hon. Nominated Member on my right, when he said it was almost impossible for a landlord or a manufacturer to get himself nominated to that District Association; and my good friend, Mr. Gajraj, is an astute politician and should know that what the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, said is correct. He has pointed out that it is wrong; that it would be a bad thing for

[**MR. FREDERICKS**]

the industry; it would affect the industry adversely if small segments of the industry clashed between themselves, should there be a conflict of interest. He said there should be co-operation.

We agree with him that for the rice industry to maintain its place and increase its contribution to the country's economy, it is absolutely necessary that there should be harmony within the industry, and that harmony can only be achieved if proper representation is afforded at all levels. He has said that we are looking ahead to a new Constitution and we should not have any use for nominated members. We agree with him wholly.

He has stated that, for the present, it was necessary to have these nominated members on the Council of the Rice Producers Association so that the rice industry can be benefited by the members so nominated by virtue of their experience or special qualifications which can help the industry. We agree with Mr. Gajraj, but we would like, in addition to the farmers and to the nominated members, to make sure that there were manufacturers and landlords represented, because there seems to be no machinery whereby they can be elected at the level of the District Association. If the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, feels that four rice millers or landlords are too many to have, I am sure we will be quite willing to make a further amendment to have three members nominated — three members, each of whom shall be a landlord or manufacturer.

Mr. Davis: May I remind Members that one of the fundamental objects of the Rice Producers Association—and it is stated here clearly and emphatically—is for the protection, promotion and advancement of the interests of rice producers, generally. If we are to accept that as being fundamental to all categories of rice producers, then I think some of the arguments of our friends on

the other side of the Table, as well as some of those even on this side, will fall to the ground.

Members have spoken of the strained relationship between rice millers and rice farmers. I want to say—and I say this with a certain amount of knowledge—that the relationship is not nearly as strained as it used to be because the rice farmers and the rice manufacturers, particularly those who have small mills, each recognize today that they have a particular roll to play of vital importance to the industry; and that has been brought about by the operation of those 'monster' mills. I want to repeat for emphasis, that the strained relationship that was spoken about in this Council is not as it was a few years past. And may I make a further comment that there have been bad millers in the past but today, I think the Government may well have to provide protection for some of them as it is known and accepted that some of the rice farmers themselves have been guilty of or are perpetuating some practices which are far from desirable. However, be that as it may, I emphasize this fact, that the relationship between the millers and farmers is not as strained as it was a few years ago, and the rice farmers seem to recognize the necessity of keeping alive, the small rice miller.

It has been stated that these rice millers and landlords can go and win seats in the District Associations. Certainly, they have done so in the past and I take it that they may do so again in the future, but let us be realistic. There are nearly 200 rice manufacturers registered—there might be quite a few more landlords—but compared with the number of rice farmers, will it not be natural to see the average rice farmer supporting his brother rice farmer, except occasionally? It is for that reason I say there should be some provision for a limited number, even if this be only a token number. I feel on our Statute Book we should give recognition and protection to these millers and/or landlords.

As I listened to the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, I wondered how long will I have to hear him speak with his tongue on the other side of his cheek. I have had the privilege and distinction to sit under him as Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board and to see him hold the scales with equal poise, but I would express the view that his contribution today has shocked me. He was able to see that a person who is outside the realm of the industry can make a contribution to the industry, yet he believes that a body of men, who in the past have stood the financial heat and burden of the day, should not, any longer, have the right to make a similar contribution. It is, to me, a rather illogical argument and I really do not appreciate it.

One further point: The industry as such makes a monetary contribution to itself through the Rice Marketing Board. Funds are provided by the Board for the running of the Rice Producers Association, but this is what strikes me as being odd. The Rice Marketing Board gets some of its money from millers. As a matter of fact, the Rice Marketing Board has, as such, one of the most efficient check-off systems, if one can look at it in that light, because it gets its money directly from the industry, and here it is being suggested that these millers be denied, on the Statute Book, to sufficiently express themselves through their *bona fide* organization. I would say that that is an injustice—an injustice to those men who have, made in the past, and who I know shall continue to make, a substantial contribution to the rice industry.

I repeat the suggestion that if it is thought that number of millers and/or landlords would be a burden on the Association, a smaller number might be considered. But at the moment, until the proposed amendment of the Rice Marketing Ordinance becomes effective—these Amendments have taken years to reach this Council, and it may well be that the same thing will happen in the case of the Rice Marketing Ordinance—

let us protect the millers and landlords and see that they have a voice in the industry which is so near and dear to them.

I would like to compliment the hon. Nominated Members, Mr. Fredericks and Mr. Tasker, on the very useful contributions they have made to this debate, and to remark that it has taken a representative of the sugar industry to recognize, in the very clear, decisive and concise illustration he gave, what is the true position with regard to the rice industry. I could not agree with him more as to the necessity for urgent action in the field of research, and I would say that the earlier something is done in this direction the better for us and the industry.

To return to my main theme, I suggest that the Amendments proposed are a reasonable compromise, and I am appealing to the Government to see them as such and accept them in the interest of the industry.

Mr. Campbell: It is a pity that my sense of hearing is not working properly at the moment so as to enable me to follow the discussion this afternoon, but I have gathered sufficient to form the opinion that the Amendments proposed by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, are a fair compromise with Government's proposals.

The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, made a flowery speech on co-operation and the need for harmony, but how can we have harmony and co-operation when the very foundations of democratic life are being shaken nowadays? The basic things of life seem to be shaken. I did not quite follow his arguments, but I am supporting the Amendment moved by Mr. Davis.

Mr. Tello: After listening especially to the three Nominated Members, Mr. Davis, Mr. Gajraj and Mr. Hubbard, I am wondering whose advice we should accept. Mr. Hubbard thinks that rather than gamble with the possibility of continuous disagreement and the clashing of interests in the industry, it would be bet-

[MR. TELLO]

ter to make provision for an overall majority of farmers whose common interest would allow the smooth running of the industry in their interest. I do not know whether we should accept Mr. Gajraj's political philosophy that the time has come when we should exercise our democratic rights. I think Mr. Tasker has exploded that fallacy, but what I want to point out is that while Mr. Gajraj lauded the great need for the exercise of the political franchise and the free functioning of Democracy, he also pointed out that if the rice industry must live and flourish it is necessary that it should have the benefit of advice from people who are qualified to advise even though they are outside of the industry. I agree with him that the economic life of the industry is just as important, if not more important than the exercise of democratic rights, because Democracy can be its own enemy at times. I cannot see the industry flourishing on the simple functioning of Democracy to that extent, but I see the great value of his suggestion that in the interest of the economic life of the industry as wide a range of capable advice should be made available to the industry.

I conceive that that is necessary, but I am asking the hon. Member to agree also that those who are involved financially — Mr. Davis has told us that the millers and landlords bore the brunt of the financial aspect of the industry for a number of years — also have a great interest at stake, and would show a greater willingness to offer proper advice for the welfare of the industry. Mr. Davis has told us that relations between the peasant farmers and landlords have improved tremendously. I am prepared to believe that because, as a boy, I knew that the rice industry was looked upon as something negligible in the economic life of the country. I have seen it grow to command its place in the economic life of British Guiana, to become the second largest agricultural industry, and the third largest export industry. Therefore, there must have been some partnership between those engaged in the industry, some de-

gree of understanding and a common objective which has enabled the industry to achieve the importance it has.

To say that there is need for proper advice and not to cast your bucket where you stand and seek the advice of those qualified to advise within the industry, but to give preference to those outside the industry, is not being logical at all. So, like Mr. Davis, I hope that Government will give sympathetic consideration to the Amendment and, if necessary, substitute the word "three" for the word "four". I feel that we would be doing a great service to the industry. If it is said that there are strained relations between millers and farmers, and landlords and farmers, Government's proposals will only tend to increase the misunderstanding, because the farmers would take decisions without the participation of millers and landlords in arriving at such decisions. The result would be that they would become more suspicious of each other, to the detriment of the industry.

The hon. Member for Demerara River said that the farmers always enjoyed a majority on the Council of the Rice Producers' Association. The Amendment proposed provides for such a majority. Why then make it exclusively a farmers' Association? The hon. Member says that there is provision for the election of millers and landlords. In the same manner the political franchise also permits the election of what I would call capitalists, for the want of a better term, but in this Council do we see any elected representative of that class of person? I know that that is not the intention of the Amendment, but it might have that effect, and I feel that now that we see the mistake we should move to correct it.

As it is, these three sections of the Rice Producers' Association are working harmoniously together, and regardless of all the legislation we pass, we must make reservations for a clash of interests and misunderstandings, and we must endeavour to correct any faulty structure that exists, once this does not

impair the democratic rights of the majority. If this Clause is being amended to bring in outsiders into the industry at the exclusion of the upper bracket in the same industry, then the argument falls to the ground. How can you talk about self-government and still import people into the industry and make it difficult for people in the upper bracket to sit in the Council of the Association?

I am not a rice producer; I am certain I am right in regarding the contribution by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, through his Amendment, as a fair and valuable one, in the interest of all concerned in the industry.

I am aware that sometimes it is a waste of time pleading for the acceptance of amendments, but that apart, the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry did tell us today that it was because of suggestions from this side of the Council that Government decided to give further consideration to the Bill as at first envisaged; and so I feel hopeful.

Mr. Fredericks: I have listened attentively to the last speaker, and I must say that I do not agree that it is a waste of time to plead with the other side. I have always found the other side a bit amenable to reason, especially when they have been provided with an opportunity to sleep overnight on a matter; and I am hoping that this occasion would be no exception.

I, personally, would have been very glad for an indication from the hon. Minister about his reaction to our amendment, but I see him comfortably relaxed in his chair and I do not know what to expect.

"Four members should be the limit, or the Council might be weighted with too many manufacturers and landlords". I feel that the possibility of that is very remote. If we have some indication of the reaction of the other side to our Amendment, it may be possible to come up with another amendment to make sure that the composition of the entire Council would not be more than the four.

In other words, if there are four members already elected in the usual way who are manufacturers or landlords, then automatically the six members can be chosen from whoever the Council decides on. I commend that aspect of it to the Minister and ask that he considers it.

The Chairman: I propose to put the question, after waiting for so long.

The Attorney-General: I would say that this Amendment, if it is incorporated in the Bill, at any stage, should be slightly redrafted. If the amendment is carried, I will seek to amend the wording later on.

The Chairman: The question is, that the subsections (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6) of Section 5 of the Principal Ordinance be repealed.

Agreed to.

Motion affirmed.

The Chairman: The next question I shall put is Mr. Davis' amendment which was modified by Mr. Fredericks' amendment, that 2 (c) of the Attorney-General's amendment should be amended. I will put them separately, because there may be some in favour of six and some in favour of four. The question is, that sub-paragraph (c) be amended by the substitution of the word "six" for the word "four" in the first line.

The Committee divided and voted as under :

<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>
Mr. Bowman	Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Tasker	Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Fredericks	Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Davis	Mr. Saffee
Mr. Tello	Mr. Ram Karran
Mr. Jackson	Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Benn
Mr. Burnham	Dr. Jagan
Mr. Kendall—9.	The Financial Secretary
	The Attorney-General
	The Chief Secretary—11.

Amendment negatived.

The Chairman: There is no need now for me to put the other part. Next is the Amendment as moved — the balance of the whole thing as stated in the second Amendment.

“(2) The members of the Council shall be (a) the Director of Agriculture or his duly authorised representative; (b) one member (who shall be a rice farmer) of the Committee of each District Association appointed in accordance with the provisions of the regulations;”

and

“(3) If any person appointed

Right down to the word “place”; and the substitution for paragraph (b)—

“(b) by the repeal of subsections (8) and (9) and the substitution thereof of the following subsections—”;

And the insertion as paragraph (c)—

“(c) by renumbering subsection (10) as subsection (11).”

Mr. Tasker: I am a little puzzled by that Amendment. The Amendment which was being debated the whole afternoon has not been put to the vote. We have now, in fact, to vote on the Amendment which was debated so long. We have voted on a figure. The figure “six” has no attraction to me. What has happened is that we have been asked to vote for the substitution of one figure for another without any reference to the reasons why that figure was put forward.

The Chairman: The Amendment is to substitute the word “six” for the word “four” in the fourth line, and insert “each of whom . . .” I said from the outset that I will put them separately. We have heard that the word “six” should be substituted because they wanted “four of whom shall be landlords of rice lands or manufacturers of rice and who shall be members of a District Association.”

As I had pointed out, I told Members before that I will put the one for “six” first because there might be Members who might be in favour of “six” and might not be in favour of the other Amendment which is: “four of whom shall be landlords of rice lands or manufacturers of rice, and who shall be members of a District Associa-

tion.” That was the Amendment by Mr. Fredericks. I did not put “each of whom shall be a landlord . . .” because Mr. Davis had said, if I understood him aright, that he was in agreement with Mr. Fredericks’ Amendment — “four of whom . . .” As they were two distinct features I thought that I was making it simple for Members so as to give them an opportunity to say whether they agreed with “six” or “four”. There is no harm. If Members want me to put “four of whom . . .”, I shall do so. I thought as “six” had been lost, it will be useless.

Mr. Tasker: My point is that the balance of the Amendment seems to be integral to the Amendment as a whole. The figure “six” by itself has no attraction to me unless it is related to the balance of the Amendment.

The Chairman: I do not mind. I can put the whole thing if Members wish. To make it clear I shall put the whole Amendment as it is. “Six” has been lost. “Six” has been replaced by “four”, but I shall put the whole amendment again: “four of whom shall be landlords of rice lands or manufacturers of rice and who shall be members of a District Association.”

Question put, Council divided and voted as follows:

<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>
Mr. Bowman	Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Tasker	Mr. Gajraj
Mr. Fredericks	Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Davis	Mr. Saffee
Mr. Tello	Mr. Ram Karran
Mr. Jackson	Mrs. Jagan
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Benn
Mr. Burnham	Dr. Jagan
Mr. Kendall — 9.	The Financial Secretary
	The Attorney-General
	The Chief Secretary

—11.

Amendment negated.

The Chairman: I shall put the whole Amendment as proposed in the second Amendment, with the exception of the words “who shall be a rice farmer”.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in the Amendment I sent you I had at the bottom of Clause 4 (b) subsection 9 an original Amendment to Bill No. 5.

The Chairman: You mean in the Bill as printed? You wanted after the word "person" in the second line "only with the approval of the Governor in Council."?

Mr. Davis: I have already spoken on it, but I would like to have my views on it recorded. I do not propose to speak at great length.

The Chairman: You have about three minutes on it then you can return to it another time.

Mr. Davis: During the period of the Interim Government I have had the chance to look at the Ordinance — I refer specifically to the Mayor and Town Council Ordinance — and I saw that they used the same procedure; but the assent of the Governor in Council must be sought. That is why I felt like moving that proposal.

The Chairman: I shall put the Question.

Mr. Burnham: I do not quite follow what is the Amendment being moved by the hon. Nominated Member. I am in a bit of a quandary, therefore I am unable to exercise my vote. I have heard him almost *sotto voce* say something about Governor in Council.

The Chairman: I will tell you if you look at paragraph 9 of Clause 4 as printed. It begins with: "The Council may appoint some fit and proper person to be General Secretary. . . ." What he seeks to do is to insert after the word "person," the words "only with the approval of the Governor in Council; so that the whole thing would read:

"(9) The Council may appoint some fit and proper person only with the approval of the Governor in Council to be General Secretary of the Association and

such other officers and servants of the Association "

Mr. Burnham: Without expressing my point of view I should imagine that the approval of the Governor in Council should be more relevant to the dismissal than to the appointment of the Secretary, if I remember the Minister's remarks on the Second Reading of the Bill.

The Chairman: Anyway, that is his Amendment.

Mr. Hubbard: Perhaps I can lend some assistance. The fact of the matter is that Government now proposes an Amendment to leave Section 9 of the Ordinance as it stands — that the General Secretary shall not be dismissed without the approval of the Governor. The hon. Member is seeking to amend that by adding the words "in Council."

Mr. Benn: The original amendment of the Bill had left out the question of the dismissal of the General Secretary of the Rice Producers' Association. The Principal Ordinance says that the General Secretary shall not be dismissed without the approval of the Governor. The printed Bill had left that out.

Mr. Burnham: Is there any Member of the Government who can explain what this is all about?

Dr. Jagan: The Minister has already explained it.

The Chairman: I did not appreciate that it was so plain.

Dr. Jagan: The Bill was published on the 23rd of January, and Clause 4 (b) (9) read :

"(9) The Council may appoint some fit and proper person to be General Secretary of the Association and such other officers and servants of the Association as may be necessary, and may pay any person so appointed such remuneration out of the funds of the Association as the Council considers adequate, and may dismiss any such person."

[DR. JAGAN]

There were certain fears expressed regarding the dismissal of the General Secretary by the Council of the Association.

The Chairman: Is there not an Amendment by Mr. Davis seeking the insertion of certain words in subsection (9) of the Bill as printed?

Dr. Jagan: The printed copy I have of the hon. Member's Amendments refers to Clause 4 (b) (9) of the printed Bill which I have just read. The object of the hon. Member's Amendment is not to have the General Secretary dismissed by the Council of the Association. Provision is being sought by him to secure for the General Secretary what rights he now has under the Principal Ordinance, that is, if he is to be dismissed it must be with the approval of the Governor. That point was met after representation was made to the Minister, by seeking the deletion of the Amendment proposed in the printed Bill. It means, therefore, that the provision in the Principal Ordinance stands. But what the hon. Member is now proposing is that in the place of the Governor, the Governor in Council should be substituted.

The Chairman: That is precisely what I said. I have the Amendment by Mr. Davis which seeks the insertion of the words "only with the approval of the Governor in Council" between the words "person" and "to" in the second line of subsection (9) of Clause 4 of the printed Bill. If Mr. Davis did not mean that he must say so.

Mr. Davis: In view of the remarks made by the Minister of Trade and Indus-

try I now ask to be allowed to withdraw that Amendment.

Mr. Bowman: There seems to be some conflict regarding the reasons for the Bill.

The Chairman: In your mind?

Mr. Bowman: Not in my mind, Sir, but the Government's.

The Chairman: As far as the mind of the Mover of the Amendment is concerned, if there had been any conflict it has been removed.

Mr. Bowman: I am referring to Clause 4, subsection (9). I say there is conflict of intention where the Objects and Reasons are concerned. We find the Government trying to take away from the Governor the right to nominate persons to the Rice Marketing Board.

The Chairman: Are you moving an Amendment?

Mr. Bowman: Yes, I want to delete the word "appoint" in that subsection and in all subsections in which it appears, and substitute the word "election".

The Chairman: I think we had better go back into Council and adjourn. I had hoped that we might have been able to finish the Bill, but it does not seem as though we can do so this afternoon.

Council resumed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary (Mr. Hedges): I move that Council adjourn until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Council adjourned accordingly.