

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Thursday, 16th June, 1960.

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Deputy Speaker , Mr. R. B. Gajraj	}	<i>ex officio</i>
Chief Secretary , Hon. D. M. Hedges		
Attorney-General , Hon. A. M. I. Austin, Q.C.		
Financial Secretary , W. P. D'Andrade (acting).		
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. W. O. R. Kendall		—Member for New Amsterdam
R. C. Tello		—Nominated Member
F. Bowman		—Member for Demerara River
„ L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.		—Member for Georgetown Central
A. L. Jackson		—Member for Georgetown North
„ 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 :

His Honour the Speaker, Sir Donald Jackson—on leave
Mr. S. Campbell—Member for North Western District — indisposed
Mr. E. B. Beharry—Member for Eastern Demerara
Mr. A. M. Fredericks—Nominated Member
Mr. A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.—Nominated Member.

The Clerk read prayers.

PRESIDING IN THE ABSENCE OF
THE SPEAKER.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, since the last meeting, Sir Donald Jackson, our Speaker, again left on his mission to the West Indies and, as a result, His Excellency the Governor has appointed me to preside during his absence. I will now call upon the Clerk to read the Letter of Appointment.

The Clerk read the Letter of Appointment as follows :

"11th June, 1960.

Sir,

In pursuance of the provisions of section 38 of the British Guiana (Constitution) (Temporary Provisions) Order in Council, 1953, I hereby appoint you to be the Member of the Legislative Council to preside at the sittings of the Council during the absence in The West Indies of the Speaker, Sir Donald Jackson.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(sgd.) R. F. A. GREY,
Governor".

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Friday, 3rd June, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

LEAVE OF MEMBER

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Under announcements, I have a telegram sent by the hon. Member for North Western District, Mr. Campbell, who is ill and unable to travel for today's meeting of the Council. Leave of absence is therefore granted to him for today.

MR. BURNHAM, QUEEN'S COUNSEL

Under this Head, I am sure that hon. Members will also wish me to take the opportunity, on their behalf, to offer

our hearty congratulations to the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, upon his having been appointed a Queen's Counsel. [*Cheers*].

The hon. Member is one of four of the leading lawyers in this country who have been so honoured. I feel that the Council itself must share somewhat in this honour since the hon. Member for Georgetown Central is a Member of the Council.

Mr. Burnham: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

PAPERS LAID

The Financial Secretary: (Mr. D'Andrade, acting): I beg to lay on the Table the

Report of the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on 26th February, 1960. and also the

Report of the Inland Revenue Department for the year ended 31st December, 1958.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, the hon. the Financial Secretary has laid the "Report of the Meeting of the Finance Committee held on 26th February, 1960" and in accordance with Standing Order No. 42 (7), I must now put the Question to the Council "That the Report of the Finance Committee be adopted."

Question put, and agreed to.

Report adopted.

We shall now continue the laying of Papers.

The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan): I beg to lay on the Table the

Report entitled Industry for B.G. by E. A. Tenenbaum and members of the staff of Continental-Allied Company Incorporated.

The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan): On behalf of the

Minister of Natural Resources, I beg to lay on the Table the

Annual Report of the Director of Agriculture for the year 1959.

The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai): I beg to lay on the Table the

Local Government (Valuation of Property) Regulations, 1960 (No. 14), made under section 39 of the Local Government (Valuation of Property) Ordinance, 1959 (No. 5).

ORAL ASKING AND ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS

COMMERCIAL SITES AT HOUSING ESTATES

Mr. Kendall: I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing Question No. 13 listed in my name on the Order Paper:

How soon will the Government allocate the commercial sites at the Campbellville and Ruimveldt Housing Estates as recommended in 1959 by a Committee of the Central Housing and Planning Authority?

Mrs. Jagan: The recommendations for the allocation of commercial sites in the Campbellville and Ruimveldt, as well as La Penitence Housing Estates were received from the Estates Sub-Committee of the Central Housing and Planning Committee by the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing during 1959.

The Minister referred to the Committee a number of doubtful cases for further consideration, on more than one occasion. As the difficulties were not satisfactorily resolved, the Governor in Council decided that the matter should be referred to the Central Tender Board for final adjudication in respect of those disputed recommendations.

It is expected that the Central Tender Board will complete examination of the allocations shortly.

Mr. Burnham: As a supplementary, would the hon. Minister tell me how many disputed allocations there were, how they came to be disputed, and by whom?

Mrs. Jagan: There were a number of allocations which were considered by the Ministry to be in doubt.

Mr. Burnham: As a further supplementary, may I ask on what basis they were considered to be in doubt?

Mrs. Jagan: There were certain suspected irregularities?

Mr. Burnham: May I further ask what were the suspected irregularities? Were they that certain P.P.P. members did not get allocations?

Mrs. Jagan: The answer is, no.

Mr. Burnham: What were the suspected irregularities?

Mrs. Jagan: I am not, in this Council, permitted to reveal certain recommendations to Executive Council, or the discussion of the Executive Council.

Mr. Burnham: How did these suspected irregularities come to the hon. Minister's attention?

Mrs. Jagan: In the interest of the public it was felt that certain irregularities required and deserved much further consideration.

Mr. Burnham: The hon. Minister has not answered my question.

Mr. Jackson: As a further supplementary, have those irregularities come from the functions of a statutory body?

Mrs. Jagan: The consideration of tenders is not necessarily a function of the statutory body.

Mr. Jackson: In view of the fact that certain allocations went before a statutory body and certain irregularities were found by the Ministry of Labour, Health and Housing, would the hon. Minister say if this Council is entitled to know whether that body is capable of functioning any longer?

Mrs. Jagan: That is not for me to say.

Mr. Burnham: May I ask whether the hon. Minister does not propose to have the Central Housing and Planning Authority investigated in view of these irregularities?

Mrs. Jagan: As I said, the matter was referred to the Central Tender Board.

Mr. Burnham: I am asking whether the hon. Minister does not propose to have an investigation into the Central Housing and Planning Authority, which is established under Chapter 181?

Mrs. Jagan: The matter will, no doubt, be considered by the Central Tender Board.

Mr. Burnham: I am asking the Minister whether she does not propose to have an investigation into the Central Housing and Planning Authority?

Mrs. Jagan: It is quite possible that the Central Tender Board would agree that there were irregularities or that there were no irregularities.

Mr. Jackson: And if the Central Tender Board ignores the irregularities, would the hon. Minister say what course would be taken or whether she proposes to take any action?

Mrs. Jagan: It is left to be seen. The Central Tender Board is looking into the whole question. I await its recommendations.

Mr. Burnham: How can the Central Tender Board look into irregularities? Is it not true that the Central Tender Board only examines and awards?

Mrs. Jagan: The Executive Council of British Guiana, in its wisdom, referred this question to the Central Tender Board.

Mr. Burnham: As a further supplementary question, may I ask under what statutory authority was the Tender Board asked to consider irregularities? (*Mrs. Jagan did not reply*). Silence hides unwisdom.

ERECTION OF GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, NEW AMSTERDAM

Mr. Kendall: I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Communications and Works Question No. 14 standing in my name on the Order Paper:

Will Government state how soon the following new buildings will be erected in New Amsterdam: (1) The District Commissioner's residence? (2) Administrative Building? (3) Fire Brigade Station? (4) Post Office? (5) Telephone Exchange?

The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran): The answers to the hon. Member's questions are:

(1) The District Commissioner's residence—Tenders will be invited during this month for submission before a date about 15th July. It is expected that actual construction should be started in August and will be completed in approximately 6 months.

(2) The Administrative Building—Tenders will be invited by 1st August for submission before a date about 31st August. It is expected that construction should start in September, and that the building will be completed for handing over by mid-September, 1961.

(3) The Fire Brigade Station. — The necessary drawings will be completed during this month, but in view of the pressure of work on hand, it will probably not be possible to have the Quanti-

ties and Contract Documents prepared for some months. Efforts are being made to secure the services of additional Quantity Surveyors, and it is hoped that it will be possible for construction of this building to start towards the end of this year, and be completed in approximately 9 months.

4. New Post Office. — It is regretted that owing to shortage of staff in the Public Works Department it has not yet been possible to prepare a design for the building. It is therefore unlikely that construction will commence during 1960.

(5) New Telephone Exchange Building.—The design, bills of quantities, construction drawings, etc., have been completed. The question of financial provision for the construction of the building is under consideration, and as soon as funds have been made available an advertisement inviting tenders will be published.

Mr. Burnham: As a supplementary question, may I ask why funds were not provided for the construction of the new Telephone Exchange building in New Amsterdam in view of the fact that we have a new telephone system in operation?

Mr. Ram Karran: I indicated some time ago in this Council that Government is still considering the cost of the new Telecommunications building and of the whole system. This is one of the matters under consideration. Obviously, funds are not available because of the fact that Government has spent much more than was anticipated on this scheme.

Mr. Jackson: A further supplementary question. In view of the fact that the hon. Minister knows that equipment ordered for the new Telephone Exchange in New Amsterdam is lying down in London and storage charges are being incurred, is it not advisable that funds be made available to erect the building

as an even greater priority than the other buildings to which he referred?

Mr. Ram Karran: Government is considering all aspects, and as soon as allocations are made construction of the building will be commenced.

Mr. Burnham: As a further supplementary question, may I find out when those allocations are going to be made?

Mr. Ram Karran: I said, possibly in 1961.

Mr. Burnham: If you are still there.

Mr. Jackson: As another supplementary question, may I ask whether the construction of the new Post Office building could not have been given priority to those mentioned in reply No. 1, a Post Office being a place where people work, and not a residence?

Mr. Ram Karran: Alterations have been made to the Post Office building in New Amsterdam, and the situation is slightly improved. The reason for the building not being ready for construction is the shortage of staff in the Public Works Department.

Mr. Jackson: As a further supplementary question, may I ask when those alterations were made to the existing building?

Mr. Ram Karran: I cannot give the exact date, but they were made recently at the instance of the Director of Posts and Telecommunications.

Mr. Jackson: May I ask the Minister to examine his answer again because I know differently. Is it not a fact that there is a proposal to make those alterations, but they have not yet been made?

Mr. Ram Karran: My information is that alterations were made. The Ministry has approved of sums of money for those alterations, but I cannot say definitely whether the work has been carried out or not. The hon. Member perhaps

[MR. RAM KARRAN]

knows better. The fact is that the new building will commence some time in 1961, and that the delay is due to shortage of staff.

Mr. Jackson: In view of the fact that construction of the new building will start in 1961, and in view of the fact that the money which has been approved for the alteration of the existing building has not been spent, would it not be wiser to start the new building now and avoid expenditure on the existing building?

Mr. Ram Karran: It is not possible to start the new building now because the plans are not completed.

Mr. Jackson: Will the Minister say when the preparation of the plans will be commenced or completed?

Mr. Ram Karran: It is not possible to say when the preparation of the plans will be commenced, but it is hoped that they will be completed in time for the construction of the building to be started in 1961.

Mr. Kendall: Under this Head I sent in a question in six parts. There was one dealing with primary schools under the Ministry of Education. I wonder whether the Minister has had sufficient time to reply to that question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As far as I am aware, we put on the Order Paper those questions to which Government has indicated its readiness to reply. If the hon. Member's question is not on the Order Paper it shows that Government is not yet ready to reply to it.

NO PROPOSAL TO ALTER METHOD OF PAYMENT OF GRATUITIES

Mr. Jackson: I beg to ask the hon. the Chief Secretary Question No. 15 standing in my name on the Order Paper:

Is the Government aware of the

existence of widespread uneasiness among officers in the Public Service resulting from a current rumour that it is the intention of the Government to alter the method of paying gratuities to officers reaching the retirement age? If it is not the intention of the Government to pay such gratuities by and through the issue of Government Bonds, will the Government take urgent steps to deny there is any truth in such a rumour?

The Chief Secretary: (Mr. Hedges): The Government is aware of the rumour, published in one of the local daily newspapers, that it is the intention of the Government to alter the method of paying gratuities to officers on retirement, by paying such gratuities in Government bonds instead of in cash.

The Government wishes to deny categorically that there is any such proposal under consideration or contemplated.

RENTS FROM GOVERNMENT HOUSING ESTATES

Mr. Jackson: I beg to ask the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing Question No. 16 standing in my name on the Order Paper:

How much money by way of house rent has been collected by the Government for the years 1958 and 1959, and for the first five months of 1960, on housing estates, exclusive of Land Settlement Schemes, and what amounts are outstanding as uncollected rents for the same period of time?

Mrs. Jagan: Statement of rents collected in Government Housing Estates (exclusive of Land Settlement Schemes) in respect of rental apartments and rental purchase houses for the period 1958—

Rental Apartments

1958	\$251,749.07
1959	\$384,976.78
1960 (to 31.5.60)	\$175,074.58

\$811,800.43

Rental Purchase Houses

1958	\$327,169.24
1959	\$419,030.64
1960 (to 31.5.60)	\$136,885.77
	\$883,085.65

Accurate information on the arrears of rent is available up to the 31st March, 1960.

The position is as follows:

<i>Rental Apartments</i>		
<i>Arrears at 31.12.59</i>	<i>Collections on Arrears</i>	<i>Arrears Outstanding</i>
\$42,578.54	\$29,789.15	\$12,787.39

Rental Purchase Houses: (Capital, Interest, Maintenance, Rates and Taxes).

<i>Arrears at 31.12.59</i>	<i>Collections on Arrears</i>	<i>Arrears Outstanding</i>
\$79,632.94	\$21,440.58	\$58,192.36

Further returns will be prepared at the end of June, 1960.

COST OF GENERATING UNITS

Mr. Jackson: I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Communications and Works Question No. 17 standing in my name on the Order Paper:

Will the Government say what is the cost of the two generating units recently purchased, and whether the cost of these was paid for outright or upon an agreement of sale? If upon the latter condition, will the Government say what are the terms of the agreement under which they were purchased, and whether the Government has fulfilled its obligations under those terms of the agreement?

Mr. Ram Karran: The total cost of the two generating units recently purchased by Government, including a two-year supply of essential spares, is \$344,896.15 (B.W.I.) The units were paid for outright.

NOT MORE THAN THREE QUESTIONS ON ONE DAY

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members are aware that we have in our

Standing Orders a restriction that only three questions may be asked by any hon. Member on one day. It will be observed that on today's Order Paper there are four questions listed in the name of the hon. Member for Georgetown North. My position in the Chair precludes me from permitting the hon. Member to ask his fourth Question, but through inadvertence it is already on the Order Paper. If it is the wish of the Council that the hon. Member should be permitted to do so I would have no objection.

Mr. Hubbard: I move that the hon. Member be allowed to ask his fourth Question.

Question put, and agreed to.

COST OF MISSIONS BY GOVERNMENT MINISTERS

Mr. Jackson: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and Members of the Council for that decision. I now beg to ask the hon. the Financial Secretary Question No. 18 standing in my name on the Order Paper:

What is the cost, giving details, of the several missions undertaken by Ministers of the Government and their advisers to various parts of the world, including the British Commonwealth, between the 1st of January, 1958, and the current month?

The Financial Secretary: The cost of the several missions undertaken by Ministers of the Government and their advisers to various parts of the world during the period 1st January, 1958, to 17th May, 1960, was \$67,077. The details are as follows:

1. Delegation to Colonial Office to discuss financing the remainder of 1956/60 Development Programme. Visit of Minister of Trade and Industry to United States on return journey, June, 1958

Ministers of Trade and Industry and Natural Resources, and Financial Secretary. \$ 8,734

[THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY]

2. Delegation to Colonial Office to discuss 1960/64 Development Programme Finance and Trade Mission to United Kingdom. June, 1959.
Minister of Trade and Industry and Permanent Secretary, and Financial Secretary. \$15,480
3. West Indian Conference, Virgin Islands. July, 1959.
Minister of Labour, Health and Housing and Acting Financial Secretary. \$ 1,656
4. Mission to United States of America to arrange loan by International Bank for Reconstruction & Development to Finance Credit Corporation. March, 1960.
Minister of Trade and Industry, Attorney-General, Financial Secretary and General Manager, B.G. Credit Corporation \$ 3,035
5. Constitutional Delegation. March, 1960.
Ministers of Trade and Industry, Natural Resources, Community Development & Education, Attorney-General, Financial Secretary and Deputy Chief Secretary. \$21,110
6. Visit to India and Japan and also to East Germany and Italy to observe Land Development and Light Industry and related matters. April, 1960.
Minister of Natural Resources and Permanent Secretary. \$ 9,972
7. 15 other missions during the period. \$ 7,090

RICE TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. Burnham: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry Question No. 19, standing in my name: What are the prices to be paid by Cuba for British Guiana rice?

Dr. Jagan: During my recent visit to Cuba, I discussed the possibility of expanding the market in that country for British Guiana products, including rice. The Cubans expressed an interest in buying rice from British Guiana and I undertook to arrange on my return for samples and prices to be sent to the National Institute for Agrarian Reform, Havana,

Cuba. The Rice Marketing Board has been asked to take the necessary action. Until these matters are completed it will not be possible to say what prices will be paid.

Mr. Burnham: Supplementary. May I ask whether the relevant authorities in Cuba did indicate what prices they would be prepared to pay normally?

Dr. Jagan: As I said, they would like to have samples and to find out what prices are being requested by the Board; but what they would be prepared to pay, I cannot say at the moment. I do know that they are purchasing rice from the United States, and rice from the United States carries a pretty heavy price in relation to what we sell it for in the West Indies.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Will the hon. Minister tell us what quantity of rice is imported by the Cuban Government from the United States?

Dr. Jagan: I am told the quantity is in the vicinity of 50,000 tons. A very large quantity is imported.

WHITLEY COUNCIL TALKS ON F.U.G.E. CLAIMS

Mr. Tello: Sir, I beg to ask Question No. 20, standing in my name. When the talks between Government and the Federation of Unions of Government Employees concerning the payment of minimum basic rate of pay led to a cessation of work in December last, it was agreed as a condition of resumption that the entire situation would be urgently reviewed by the Whitley Council, but despite this assurance there has been to date no meeting of the Whitley Council to examine the matter. In view of this (a) Will Government state why they have not honoured their part of the agreement? (b) Do the Government have any intention of honouring this agreement, solemnly undertaken? (c) If so when will the meeting of Whitley Council be summoned?

The Chief Secretary: A meeting of Whitley Council for Government Employees was held this morning, Thursday, 16th June, 1960, to discuss the memorandum submitted by the Federation of Unions of Government Employees on the question of minimum basic rate of pay and related salary scales.

Mr. Tello: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that it was undertaken to review this matter urgently, can the hon. the Chief Secretary say why there was this lapse of nearly seven months?

The Chief Secretary: There was, in fact, a lapse of four months. We received a Memorandum from the Federation of Unions of Government Employees on the 29th of January last, and there has been conducted since that date exhaustive examinations on the Memorandum, first of all by the Government statisticians, and afterwards by the Finance Secretariat.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Would the Chief Secretary state whether there is considerable dissatisfaction among the workers employed by Government because Whitley Council has not made any decision regarding their fate?

The Chief Secretary: We are trying to be as quick as we can, but it takes time. It must also be remembered that during this time the Constitutional Talks in London took place.

RICE TRADE WITH CUBA

Dr. Jagan: May I, Mr. Speaker, make one correction to the statement I made just now in connection with the quantity of rice imported by Cuba?

Mr. Burnham: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: under what item on the Order Paper is the hon. Minister speaking?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have passed Question No. 19 and we are now on Question No. 20.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: There is nothing wrong with the Minister's making a correction if the Council so agrees. We can revert to Question No. 19.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Can the hon. Member point out the Standing Order under which we may do so?

Pause, as Mr. Jai Narine Singh consults the Standing Orders.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member may spend a little of his leisure time looking for it, because the half hour allowed for Questions is already up.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: All right, Sir.

RAISING OF A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Tello: I would crave your indulgence, Sir, to raise a matter of privilege. Just now we have been honoured by the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry —

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I say that it is laid down that a Member of the Council should consult with the Speaker before entering the Council, so that the matter can be raised. In the circumstances, I cannot allow the matter to be raised.

Mr. Tello: I would ask, then, that Standing Orders be suspended to allow me to do so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker. It cannot be done at this stage.

CONTINUANCE OF GEORGETOWN ELECTRIC SUPPLY (CONTROL) ORDINANCE

Mr. Ram Karran: I beg to move the following Motion.

“Whereas the Georgetown Electric Supply (Control) Ordinance, 1959, came into force on the 18th day of June, 1959; and

Whereas section 11 of the said Ordinance provides that the Ordinance shall

[MR. RAM KARRAN]

have effect for a period of not more than one year from the date of its coming into force, that is to say, up to and including the 17th day of June, 1960, but that it may be extended by resolution of the Legislative Council; and

Whereas it is expedient that the said Ordinance be continued in force for a period of one year;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Georgetown Electric Supply (Control) Ordinance, 1959, shall be extended for a period of one year up to and including the 17th day of June, 1961."

It is one year since this Council passed the Resolution providing for an Ordinance to make available electricity for Georgetown. One of the provisions of the Ordinance is that it may be extended year by year as the necessity arises, by resolution of this Council.

As I indicated when the Bill was being debated, this is a simple and non-controversial matter. It was agreed on by hon. Members that whatever electricity is available should be controlled in such a way that it is ensured that there is maximum utilization and that it is distributed in such a manner as not to create any hardship. It does not involve policy—the policy of this Government has nothing to do with this measure. I repeat that it is a simple matter that has to do with extending the life of this legislation. That is why I am saying as little as possible, and am now asking Council to adopt this Motion to extend the time of the Ordinance which embodies the powers referred to.

Mr. Saffee: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion affirmed.

PENSIONS (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

The Chief Secretary: Sir, I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill intituled

"An Ordinance to make special provision for the office of Head Carpenter, Georgetown Hospital, to be pensionable."

The Head Carpenter in question is Mr. Marshall. He retired from the Public Service on 7th February, 1957, after attaining the age of 60 years, and was awarded an annual allowance under the provisions of Legislative Council Resolution No. LII of 6th July, 1951, which governs the payment of superannuation benefits to non-pensionable Government employees.

This allowance was calculated on the revised salary paid to Mr. Marshall in the scale approved for the post of Head Carpenter, Public Hospital, Georgetown, as recommended by the Salaries Revision Committee for Nursing, Allied and Subordinate Staff of Medical Institutions and The Palms. This was known as the D'Andrade Committee. That salary was at the rate of \$1,512 per annum in the scale B10: \$1,056—\$1,584 per annum.

The D'Andrade Committee's Report was submitted to the Legislative Council in January, 1957, as Sessional Paper No. 1 of 1957, and its recommendations were approved by Resolution No. L on 7th March, 1957, with effect from 1st January, 1955.

By Legislative Council Resolution No. IV dated 10th June, 1955, all posts with a fixed or maximum salary of \$1,584 per annum are eligible to become pensionable posts, but no post becomes pensionable until it is included on the Fixed Establishment in the Annual Estimates, and those Estimates are formally approved by the Legislative Council.

In implementation of Legislative Council Resolution No. L of 7th March, 1957, Mr. Marshall had been appointed to the upgraded post of Head Carpenter, Public Hospital, Georgetown with effect from 1st January, 1955, but the post itself was placed on the Fixed Establishment for the first time in the 1958 Estimates.

As Mr. Marshall retired before the post was actually shown on the approved Annual Estimates in 1958, he did not in fact hold a pensionable post at the date of his retirement, and so legally he is not entitled to superannuation benefits provided under the Pensions Ordinance, but only to those provided for non-pensionable Government employees under Legislative Council Resolution No. LII of 6th July, 1951, which does not provide for the payment of a gratuity and reduced pension.

However, it was clearly intended that the post of Head Carpenter, Georgetown Hospital, along with others with a fixed or maximum salary of one thousand five hundred and eighty-four dollars per annum should be made pensionable from 1st January, 1955, and this should have been done by indication in the 1958 Estimates. That was the intention, but, as far as can be ascertained, that was not done earlier, purely from inadvertence. It therefore seems just that Mr. Marshall should now enjoy his pension and annual allowance. I beg to move that the Bill be read a Second time.

The Attorney-General (Mr. Austin): I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Jackson: If there is any one who feels happy that this Bill has been brought here it is I. If it were not for the lapses and ineptness of the Department concerned, this matter would have been brought to the notice of Government almost two years ago. Mr. Marshall, according to the hon. the Chief Secretary, should have been put on the Establishment in 1957; he retired before that was done, but, because of what I would consider to be slackness on the part of the Department, that was not done. Therefore correspondence, of which I have knowledge, had to be sent to and from because of people who ought to have been more positive in their work. I refer particularly to the Medical Department.

This matter had reached a stage where we were told that Mr. Marshall

would have been placed on the Pensionable Establishment. That was more than a year ago, and the matter remained in the hands of the hon. the Attorney-General and his staff until now. Since that is the case, I must say why I feel very sorry that this matter, which has now been brought before us in the form of a Bill, has remained in the Attorney-General's Department for about eighteen months. It is to be regretted that personal matters of this kind should remain in a Department for such a long period. Mr. Marshall has been suffering from inadequacy of pensionable emoluments all along, and I would ask the hon. the Chief Secretary as well as the hon. the Attorney-General to deal more expeditiously with such matters in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does any other Member wish to speak on the question?

The Chief Secretary: There has, unfortunately, been some delay in dealing with this matter and it is regretted. However, I understand that Mr. Marshall is still in a good state of health. This Bill clearly is a non-controversial matter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Council resolved itself into Committee to consider the Bill clause by clause and passed it without amendment.

Council resumed.

The Chief Secretary: I beg to report that the Bill has been considered in Committee and passed without amendment. I now beg to move that it be read the third time and passed.

The Attorney-General: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

TAX (AMENDMENT NO. 2) BILL

The Financial Secretary: I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill intituled:

“An Ordinance further to amend the Tax Ordinance”.

The object of this Bill is to obtain legislative sanction to increase the stamp duties payable upon the issue of passports and other travel documents. The present rates of duties are \$3.00 for a passport; \$1.50 for renewal of a passport; \$3.00 for a collective travel certificate; and 50c for a travel permit. It is now proposed to increase these rates to \$5.00 for a passport; \$2.50 for a renewal for a passport; \$5.00 for a collective travel certificate, and 75c. for a travel permit. The comparable rates are: in the United Kingdom £1.10.0. for a passport; in Trinidad \$3.60; and in Jamaica \$4.80. I now beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

The Chief Secretary: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Council resolved itself into Committee to consider the Bill clause by clause.

Clause 1.—*Short title*—agreed to.

Clause 2.—*Amendment of section 9 of Chapter 298. No. 27 of 1955.*

Mr. Tello: I beg to move an Amendment to Clause 2 (a) and (b) by the substitution of the figures “3.60” for “5.00”, and “3.60 for “5.00”. I am offering these Amendments so that we can keep in line with Trinidad. We are not a greater travelling public than Trinidad, and, if Trinidad can be satisfied that 15/- is a reasonable ratio to the British £1.10.0. for a passport, I think we should accept \$3.60.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: When we take the standard of living and the earning capacity of the people of Trinidad and compare them with ours, I do not think we should go beyond what is charged for a passport in Trinidad. When we take into consideration the earning capacity of the people in the United Kingdom who are asked to pay £1.10.0. for a passport, I do not think we should go beyond what we are paying now.

As a matter of fact this is one of the Ordinances which has been benevolent to the people in this country. Today poor people are travelling to Surinam, the United Kingdom and Canada in search of employment because we have about 50,000 people unemployed at the moment. I do not see why the Government should try to get more from these people than what they are paying now. I think the Government would be well advised to accept Mr. Tello's Amendments. Any increase in the cost of a passport will press very hard on the poor man who has to go abroad in search of employment. Even the ordinary domestic servants who are going to Canada in search of employment have to be subsidized by Government, and yet Government is trying to extract from them a sum of money that they cannot afford. I think it is unkind for Government to ask these people to pay more for their travel documents.

The Financial Secretary: I should like to point out to the hon. Member that the stamp duty on a passport in Jamaica is \$4.80. In Trinidad it is fixed at \$3.60 but this amount was fixed in either 1955 or 1956 and it is not at all unlikely that Trinidad will see fit shortly to increase its rates too. I think the rates are due for a revision.

It is difficult to see how a passport which is valid for five years at a cost of \$5.00 — \$1.00 per year — and \$2.50 for a renewal for a further five years can be an undue hardship on anybody when, in fact, a travel document is such an insignificant part of the total cost of travelling.

Mr. Burnham: I wonder whether the hon. the Financial Secretary could assist us by indicating how much additional revenue would be raised by this new provision — I mean imposition.

The Financial Secretary: It is \$9,000 per annum.

Mr Burnham: Nine thousand dollars per annum! You will not even recover the money you have spent to publish the Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, there seems to be no other Member wishing to speak on this Question of the Amendment. We have an Amendment moved by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, to substitute the figure "\$3.60" for that of "\$5.00" in the printed Bill in subsection (a) of Section 2, and again a similar "\$3.60" for "\$5.00" in subsection (b) of Section 2. I shall put the Amendment to the Council. The Question is that the words of the Amendment stand.

Council divided and voted as follows:

<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>
Mr. Bowman	Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Tello	Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Jai Nauine Singh	Mr. Saffee
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Rai
Mr. Burnham	Mr. Ram Karran
Mr. Kendall.—6.	Mrs. Jagan
	Dr. Jagan
	The Financial Secretary
<i>Did not Vote</i>	The Attorney-General
Mr. Davis	The Chief Secretary.—10.
Mr. Deputy Speaker — 2.	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I shall now put the Question, that Clause 2 as printed shall stand part of the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Council resumed.

The Financial Secretary: I beg to report that the Tax (Amendment No. 2) Bill was examined in Committee and passed without amendment, and I move that it be now read the Third time and passed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

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

The Financial Secretary: I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill intituled

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

Ordinance No. 28 of 1953 which provides authority for the payment of remuneration, travelling expenses and subsistence allowances to Members of the Executive and Legislative Councils, was framed in 1953 when all Members of the Executive and Legislative Councils were nominated. In the result the Bill was framed to make provision for the payment of remuneration, travelling expenses, and subsistence allowances to Nominated Members of the Executive and Legislative Councils.

The purpose of the Bill now before Council is to widen the present legislation to provide for the payment of remuneration to Elected Members of the Legislative Council. Clause 1 of the Bill would seek to do this by widening Section 3 to cover Elected Members of the Legislative Council and by the deletion in Section 7 of the word "Nominated". Since the 27th of September, 1957, such payments have been made to Elected Members of the Legislative Council, and Clause 4 seeks to regularise these payments. I beg to move that the Bill be read a Second time.

Dr. Jagan: I beg to second the Motion.

[Pause].

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If no hon. Member wishes to speak I shall put the Question for the Second Reading of the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Council resolved itself into Committee to consider the Bill Clause by Clause, and passed it without amendment.

The Financial Secretary: I beg to report that the Bill was considered in Committee and passed without amendment. I now move that the Bill be read the Third time and passed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That disposes of the Government Business of the day. We will now deal with Private Members' Motions. The hon. Member for Georgetown South has a number of Motions standing in his name. I wonder if he wishes to take them in the order as they are on the Order Paper?

EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE PROFIT-SHARING

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Yes Sir. I wish to move the Motion standing as No. 5 on the Order Paper. The Motion reads:

"Be it resolved: That this Council recommends to Government the enactment of legislation whereby employees will share in the annual profits of employers".

This is indeed a very important way in which workers of the community should be and must be protected, and by workers I refer to every single category of worker, be he a cane cutter or be he a bauxite worker or be he a newspaper re-

porter or be he a white collar worker or an employee of a shop. Those are all workers—lawyers' clerks included. I am speaking as an employer. I own lands and I employ people. I am a professional man and I employ people. I feel that it is not only the capital or the brain investment that brings returns to those who invest their capital or put their brains in.

This Motion is most important above all. In British Guiana where the social security system is nil the sugar workers still work all their lives; at the end of their days they are like oranges which are sucked and the skins are discarded: they are no longer required or are taken care of. The bauxite worker has a very little degree of social security. The shop assistants, the newspaper reporters, the lawyers' clerks—these people have practically no social security as far as their lives are concerned, and I feel that we should protect these people by legislation.

In progressive countries like Venezuela or Uraquay or Argentina or Mexico, there is progressive legislation which protects the worker whether he is a labourer, or an unskilled or skilled worker. In Venezuela, with which I am well acquainted, the workers get 16 2/3% of the employers' profits. If the employer wishes not to declare his profits and to side-track it, then the law alternatively provides that the worker should be given the minimum of two months' wages—a minimum of eight weeks or sixty days' wages every year.

As I said, in Uraquay the social legislation is much more advanced, as well as in Mexico the percentage rise is much more and the social security system covers a wider field; and I feel that the money which will be paid to the workers in this country will be put back into circulation within a very short time of its getting into their hands.

This system of paying workers a minimum of two months' wages or 16 2/3% of the profits earned is not

limited only to those countries to the ordinary workers in private industry, but goes to Government and the Government pays at least a half month's wages outside of the social security system every year to its employees. It creates a tremendous boon in the country, puts large sums of money into circulation and everybody is happy.

Those sums of money are paid around November and December. Capitalists may have millions of dollars which can never produce more wealth without the sweat, blood and skill of those who work with them. Whether that skill is in cutting cane, loading punts or keeping books, the worker is as much responsible for the profits made by the undertaking as the person or persons who put up the capital for the creation of those profits.

Let me make it clear that this sharing in profits by employees has nothing to do with holidays with pay. A worker gets his holiday with pay in any case, as provided by law. After all the capitalist provides the money and lives in comparative ease, not risking his life as the worker has to do very often. A sugar worker has to cut cane or load the punts whether it rains or shines, and he works barefooted. The manager of the factory goes aback either in a jeep, a motor car or on mule back. The ordinary worker bears the brunt of the toil to produce the profits, and it is his right to share in such profits.

In framing this Motion I had in mind every category of worker—daily, weekly, monthly and yearly workers. They should all share in the profits of their employers. I say that Government should give serious consideration to this Motion as, so far, there has not been any comprehensive scheme for social security in this country.

Let us examine the situation with regard to the sugar producers in this country. The capital originally invested in the sugar industry was comparatively limited. Today the big sugar producers are extracting the sweat and

blood of the workers in the form of profits which they are investing in Canada, the United Kingdom and Africa, producing tea, tobacco and various minerals. It is not just and fair to the people who helped to produce these profits that that money should be taken out of the country while they remain here like sucked oranges.

I am asking the Government to accept this Motion and prepare the necessary legislation to protect the workers. There is very little legislation in this country for the social security of the ordinary workers. In the United States an ordinary worker earns from \$3 to \$4 per hour, and he works 40 hours per week. They do not actually work on Saturdays in the U.S.

This Motion should be accepted by Government and implemented as early as possible. In this country there is no such thing as a minimum wage. Sugar workers are at the mercy of their employers. It was said some time ago that sugar workers were earning \$3.12 per day. I should like to see that become their minimum wage, accepted by the sugar estate proprietors. I have great pleasure in moving the Motion and I hope Government will accept it.

Mr. Tello: I beg to second the Motion for the purpose of discussion.

Mrs. Jagan: I had thought that other Members would have had something to say on this Motion. I have examined this question and found that there is a wealth of information on the subject. Attempts have been made in other countries to put into effect these profit-sharing schemes, and with the little information at my disposal I have examined the efforts made by the Government of India to introduce legislation of this type. From what I have seen—and the amount of material available at the moment is not very extensive—the subject is one that requires very careful examination. It is certainly not one which we could just say off the bat. "Let us introduce legislation". I think it would be wiser to

[MRS. JAGAN]

consider the experience of other countries in this effort, and in particular what happened in India. From what I have read, the effort did not prove to be successful in that country.

On the limited information I have on the subject I would not wish to support the Motion or to condemn the proposal out of hand. Therefore, if the hon. Member is willing, I would prefer to suggest that a Committee be set up to examine the possibility of introducing such legislation in British Guiana. Perhaps the Committee would have, as its first task, to communicate with the Governments of other countries which have gone into the subject and examined it in detail. If the hon. Member would agree to a slight change in his Motion I think it would be worthwhile for us to go into it. I am suggesting that he change his Motion to ask that a Committee be set up to examine the possibility of introducing legislation whereby employees would share in the annual profits of employers.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Does the hon. Minister suggest a Select Committee of the Council or just a Committee?

Mrs. Jagan: I would suggest a Select Committee. However, I am quite open to other suggestions.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I think a Select Committee would be able to expedite the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does any other Member wish to speak before we go further?

Mr. Hubbard: I would like to say that this question of profit-sharing is a matter that many countries have been wrangling over for a very long time. At first blush it may appear that profit-sharing is an entrance to Eden for the working man, but on the other hand there is the fact that if we legislate to provide that workers shall share in the profits of an enterprise there can be no guarantee

that there will be profits from that enterprise. I feel sorry for our friends, the representatives of the Press, because I do not believe that the enterprises in which they work have had any profits for a long number of years.

I heartily support the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing when she says it is a question which should be carefully examined, and I would like to express my agreement with the proposition that a Select Committee would be able to collect the necessary information and make recommendations to this Council on what is really a very controversial matter.

Mr. Tello: While I accept the principle of profit-sharing, the matter of compulsory profit-sharing is another thing. The trade union movement is now embarking on a programme which includes the study of voluntary profit-sharing. I think a matter like legislation for compulsory profit-sharing requires much deliberation. It is quite true that a few countries have experimented with it, but the information we have about it is not very encouraging. The free trade union movement would much prefer that whatever is obtained by workers should be obtained by voluntary negotiations where that is possible. Right now the western world is trying to improve efficiency in industry and commerce so as to provide extra profit in which the worker would share.

If legislation is introduced to make profit-sharing compulsory, regardless of the amount of profits made or the actual investments made, this may adversely affect the negotiations in the succeeding period for better conditions and rates of wages for the employees.

I am very pleased to hear the suggestion that a Committee should be set up to examine carefully the subject-matter of this Motion.

Mr. Jackson: It was not my intention to speak on this Motion, but I am

forced to speak because the hon. Mover has accepted the suggestion that a Select Committee of this Council should be set up to consider the proposal contained in the Motion. It would be wrong to appoint a Select Committee for I have no guarantee that such a Committee would be in a position to make a broad examination of the subject as would be the case if a Committee were appointed from outside, so to speak. Persons would be able to present memoranda and to give evidence why it should or should not be done.

I heard the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing give concurrence to the thought of the Motion, and the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello—who is an official of the British Guiana Trades Union Council—in some respects also gave such concurrence. I think it would be generally agreed among workers that where payment of remuneration is done according to some schedule fixed by law, such as the minimum wage, the tendency has always been that the employers stick to rate fixed by law, when in truth and in fact more money could be paid to the workers. As a person who has been in the labour movement for some time I can say very definitely that I would prefer to have in the laws of this country no provision for the compulsory sharing of profits because I know that the sharing of profits can be successfully accomplished by bargaining and by the use of machinery which the movement of labour has at its disposal.

We have got to the stage where people are regarding the labour movement as part and parcel of the machinery to bring about profit-sharing, and it is therefore unfortunate that such a Motion as this should find support from some who represent labour and who talk about being labour champions in this country.

It would be the undoing of the labour movement tomorrow if the Mover's pro-

posal were made law. I am against any legal machinery for the sharing of profits. I believe that the labour movement has strength, and I believe that it has the quality of men required for the implementation of its aims; I also believe that the employers themselves realize that the labour movement can champion its cause and bring to the employees the progress which industry and commerce may enjoy. I am going to oppose this Motion because it cuts across one of the fundamental principles which makes it possible for the trade union movement to exist.

Dr. Jagan: Sir, as the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard, said a moment ago, the topic under discussion is one which has been looked upon in various places with a good deal of hesitation and in some cases doubt, for while it may appear to be good on face value that workers must share the profits, nevertheless, in some countries workers themselves have opposed this principle of profit-sharing.

Looking at it superficially one can see that such a thing is very good, very laudable, but it depends on what the workers are looking for. There are some workers who believe, for instance, in socialism and who are not merely interested in sharing profits but who want to see the end of the profit system as such; and consequently these workers who are class conscious, do not want at all to meddle in this business of profit-sharing.

In the early days when socialism was becoming a force in Germany, Bismarck, who was no friend of socialism, told the capitalists that they must treat their workers better. Bismarck indeed introduced what was the beginning of social security. In other words, here were workers developing a class consciousness to end the whole question of profits. Chancellor Bismarck comes along and very wisely says that unless

[DR. JAGAN]

the capitalist is prepared to give something to the worker it is likely that the socialist movement would become stronger and stronger and eventually the profit system would be removed. He was in fact the initiator of what we call social security measures.

This does not mean to say that social security measures and profit-sharing might not be a good thing living under the system as we do, but we must be careful that while agitating for profit-sharing the workers must be educated about what is good about socialism, about socialist theory and the necessity for bringing about an end to the surplus value which is extracted from the working people.

It has been said in some quarters that profit-sharing was something invented by capitalists to influence the workers not to agitate and struggle for better wages and working conditions. Some capitalists have taken the lead in this. "People's capitalism" is another form of profit-sharing, whereby the employees are allowed to take shares in the enterprise, often without having to put their hand into their pocket to do so.

As long as the working-class movement knows where it is going and what it wants, by all means, let us discuss this question of profit-sharing. But it must be appreciated that this can be regarded as a double-edged weapon, in that you can get the working-class becoming petty capitalists on their own, preserving the old order. Let us accept the fact that if the trade union movement is struggling as it should for better working condition and better wages, this is done with success at the expense of the profits. But you may develop such a system that the workers would be told, "Please do not engage in any struggle, because this may affect the profits which you may share later on."

We were told time and time again in this country that the workers are the

ones who suffer most from strikes. Whereas we know that the strike weapon is a weapon which the working class people have to resort to if, in the struggle, it becomes necessary—

Mr. Burnham: Hear, hear; like last year!

Dr. Jagan: We have always supported the strike weapon, but it depends on what people are striking for. We had the T.U.C. striking against Government for a minimum wage of \$4.00 or \$4.50 a day, but they did not strike against the private capitalists against whom they should be striking. That is the contradiction of the labour leaders in this country. They are striking against Government, but not against private industries. The private employers who are paying \$4.00 a day. [An Hon. Member: "Which one?"] Perhaps the bauxite industry. Can the same labour leaders tell us what the aluminium workers are getting in Canada? We are dealing here with one integrated industry and yet there is a differential in wages. Here, perhaps, we get about \$1.00 per hour or less as against \$3.00 per hour in Canada. I merely mention this to show that we have to examine this matter in the context of what our perspectives are.

Two labour leaders have spoken on this matter and we have not yet arrived at a proper analysis. They have been dealing with the question of whether profit-sharing should be voluntary or compulsory. By all means we want to have negotiation and bargaining in the trade union movement. If Government has embarked on legislation for minimum wages, it was due to the fact that in many instances the unions were either not willing to fight, or not capable of fighting for the workers. That is the reason why we would appreciate the trade unions taking on the task of carrying on the fight in order to improve the conditions of the working class.

I feel that the suggestion put forward by the hon. Minister of Labour.

Health and Housing is a sound one in the sense that this matter should be examined in all its ramifications in a Committee where the working class and other persons could be represented. The Committee could go into legislation applicable in other countries in order to find out the mechanics of the operation of a profit-sharing scheme, and after such examination something tangible could be worked out. I may say that several objections were made against the introduction of profit-sharing schemes in various countries.

For instance, it was felt in some places that profit-sharing would result in the prevention of strikes and improve the morale of the workers. That assumption has not really borne much fruit. Then there was the feeling that profit-sharing would give an effective incentive to greater efficiency and increase in output. This, also, was of a very temporary value. There was also the question of achieving a measure of flexibility in the total payroll enabling an automatic adjustment to the total remuneration of the workers in order to avoid frustration.

We know that sometimes when a business is not paying its way, some employers take the opportunity to lay off workers, so it was felt that if there was a scheme of profit-sharing it would assuage some of the difficulties which were generally met. This provision also has a doubtful interest in an economy which is falling. Taken as a whole, wherever this scheme has been introduced, it has not worked well. Even though, as I have said before, it has been introduced in many cases at the behest not necessarily of the working class, but by the capitalist class, it has not been successful in many countries.

I suggest that the hon. Mover of the Motion should agree that this matter should go to a Committee rather than a Select Committee so that everybody concerned in this matter can be represented and the matter examined in great detail.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh (replying) : I will accede to the request of the Govern-

ment that a Committee or Select Committee — whatever the Government thinks proper in this matter — should be appointed, but let us be realists and realize the true state of affairs in British Guiana. In 150 years, has any employer in this country, has the sugar company, the bauxite company or any big employer said “I have made a tremendous profit this year, and I will share 16 2/3% or 30% of my profits among the workers”? In 150 years that has not happened! Are we going to expect that to happen voluntarily? That would be something like magic not only in the minds of those who press for this voluntary system, but in the minds of the employers themselves. The Almighty would have to inspire the employers for such a thing to happen, and the Almighty hardly ever inspires employers to share their money. From the blood and sweat of the labourer the employers are able to put their money in the banks.

We have heard of the Labour Movement in this country. I scorn to think of what the Labour Movement is in this country when I think of the sugar worker. The sugar worker is not represented by the Labour Movement in this country. A few persons are feathering their nests while pretending that they are representing the sugar worker. It is a shame for people like us to say that we want to help the workers when we find ourselves in a vice. The sugar employer very astutely excludes those who wish to see the welfare of the sugar workers improve. The sugar employer very astutely gets rid of the militant man——

Mr. Davis: I rise on a point of information.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: He cannot rise on a point of information.

Mr. Davis: I rise on a point of correction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Davis: Has the hon. Member never heard of the M.P.C.A.?

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: My hon. Friend should realize by now that I was a member of the M.P.C.A. I was Vice-President of the M.P.C.A. The M.P.C.A. was a fighting force at one time; it was one of the biggest fighting forces in this country, but it is now owned by the Sugar Producers' Association. All those big men who say that they are protecting the sugar workers, let them understand that the sugar workers are not protected.

The people who are supposed to be protecting the sugar workers are hand in glove with the sugar employers. They are representing themselves instead of the sugar workers. They are only interested in receiving money across the table and are no longer interested in the welfare of the sugar workers. We have not had a strike at a sugar estate for a long time, because of the pleasant attitude adopted towards the sugar employers by the people who are supposed to be representing the sugar workers. But let me go back to the very important item I was dealing with.

The sugar employers would never share their profits among the workers, unless there is some form of legislation which compels them to do so. Let me tell the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry that I know what is done in a Socialist State, but it is very far from what I see in British Guiana. Let us get down to earth and do something for the workers while we can.

As I see it, the Socialist State may be a dream, but to come to the realities of British Guiana we are very, very far away from that. We want some degree of social security measures for the ordinary worker, whether he is a sugar worker, or a worker in a shop in Water Street. Not one of these employers will share his profits easily, but if there is legislation compelling him to do so it will have to be done. I am sure it can be worked out, because it is done in other countries where employers pay workers as much as two months wages every year.

We have no Social Security System for protecting the ordinary worker in British Guiana. Government must work at great speed in this matter, so that we can do something for the ordinary worker. I want to see the distribution of wealth in this country. Not only that; when a man dies and his estate is declared at \$5 million, \$3 million goes to the Government. During his lifetime and while his capital is working, let some be distributed amongst the workers as well. I am sure the Labour Movement of this country will become militant one day. It is not militant yet.

Mr. Tello: It is not as mad as you.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Mr. Tello has never represented the workers. He has represented himself and what he can get out of the employers for himself.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Just a moment. Will the hon. Member please take his seat while the Speaker is on his feet? Let it be understood clearly that much as the Chair gives Members liberty, because it is their privilege to speak whatever they consider to be their opinion or that of others outside of the Council, nevertheless, when it comes to imputing dishonesty or a lack of straightforwardness, the Member who spoke that way must be pulled up. He cannot be permitted, under the Rules of this Council or any other parliament, to indulge in such a matter. The hon. Member for Georgetown South has indicated that the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, in the course of his trade union activities, has never represented the workers but himself. I wish to call on the hon. Member for Georgetown South to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: He must withdraw what he said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have said that the hon. Member for Georgetown

South must withdraw that particular statement. It is not in keeping with the dignity of the Council.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh : Sometimes this Council has too much dignity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the hon. Member withdraw his statement?

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I withdraw my statement. Let me get back to the men in this country who have sold their souls saying that they represent the workers. They are incapable of being militant and of representing the workers. I am not making reference to any one individual, but they who laugh know they are part of this machine and they failed in the labour field when they, instead of representing the workers, represented themselves. The time will come when the workers will find out who are their friends; and this Motion seeks to work out a plan whereby the worker will be benefited in the long run.

Let me say in closing, I am in agreement with the suggestion that a Committee be appointed to examine the various aspects of profit-sharing. Sometimes in this very difficult task of making representation men give their services voluntarily, but let us not seek in this voluntary service things for ourselves. When we seek things for ourselves we are not giving services. Those who serve half-heartedly serve nobody at all. They serve the masters more than anybody else.

Mrs. Jagan: If I may put my Amendment into words—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, you cannot. A Motion was put and seconded. There was a suggestion by the Minister that the Mover may consider an Amendment to his Motion to bring in the question of a Committee. The Member said he was willing to accept it, but in terms of procedure he has not asked leave of the Council to have the Motion amended. The only thing before the Council is the Motion itself and I have no other alternative than to put the Motion.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Mr. Speaker, may I make an alteration with your permission?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, you cannot. If the hon. Member points out to me where I have the right at this stage to—

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: You have not put the Motion yet. Before you put the Motion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The debate on the Motion is completed.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: May I move the suspension of the Standing Orders?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Not at this stage.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: The suspension of the Standing Orders can be moved at any time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As a lawyer you are supposed to quote your authority. [Pause].

Mr. Davis: Your Honour, is there an adjournment?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, I am giving the hon. Member a few minutes more. [Pause].

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I can ask under Standing Order 26(2) for a decision of this Council as to whether the Amendment to the Motion can be put. I can ask you to do this. It says:

“26(2) A matter requiring the decision of the Council is decided by means of a question put from the Chair on a motion by a Member.”

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Read the first part of the Standing Order, please, sub-paragraph (1).

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: That is “subject to the provisions of these Standing Orders, it shall be competent...” I would say it is competent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am afraid I do not share the view of the hon. Member.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Can it not be done under sub-paragraph 7? It states:

“(7) If a Member desires to vary the terms of a motion standing in his name, he may do so by giving an amended notice of motion, provided that such amendment does not, in the opinion of the Speaker, materially alter any principle embodied in the original motion or the scope thereof. Such amended notice of motion shall run from the time at which the original notice of motion was given.”

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, but the hon. Member for Georgetown South must realize that there must be an application to present and move a Motion. It is well-known in the Rules of the Council that when the Mover replies, all further discussion on the Motion is ended; the only thing left is for the Question to be put. I do not claim to have a tremendous amount of experience in the Chair, but so far as my reading and knowledge go, we cannot, at this stage, accept any Amendment. If the hon. Member, in his wisdom, or any other Member of the Council, knows of such a provision I shall be very grateful to be enlightened.

Mr. Hubbard: Perhaps, the hon. Member had not finished making his reply.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am afraid I cannot stretch it that far.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn): I was wondering if it may not be permissible for a Member of the Executive Council to speak after the Mover has replied? I know under the Standing Orders it must be something which is derogatory to the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Council wishes to vote it is the prerogative of the Council, but I do not think in this particular case one can permit a Member of the Executive Council to speak on behalf of the Government because there is

nothing said in criticism of the Government; so that the only thing I can do now is to let us go on with the other business.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I was wondering whether an Amendment can be moved before the Motion is put.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am afraid you are in error. When a Member who has moved a Motion has replied, all further debate is ended, and when the debate is ended, the opportunity for moving an amendment is lost. Hon. Members, the words of the Motion are:

“That this Council recommends to Government the enactment of legislation whereby employees will share in the annual profits of employers.”

The Question is in the words of the Motion. As many as are of that opinion please say “Aye”; as many as are against please say “No”. The “Noes” have it.

The Motion is lost. The next Motion is No. 6 on the Order Paper.

LOANS DURING TERM OF INTERIM GOVERNMENT

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I beg to move Motion No. 6 on the Order Paper, which reads:

“Be it resolved: That this Council recommends that Her Majesty’s Government be requested to convert to an outright grant the loans made to British Guiana during the period of the Interim Government, that is from January, 1954 to August, 1957, and to waive any interest accrued thereon.”

I feel that when, in 1953, the British Government sent gunboats and soldiers with war implements here, and displaced the properly constituted Government of this country, it took on the responsibilities of direct government of this country from the United Kingdom. We then heard that the British Government was placing at the disposal of the people of this country a sum of \$44 million, but after a lapse of seven years we are now called upon to repay approximately \$20 million of that money with interest.

There can be no doubt that the British Government thought that if it poured money into the country at that time the people of this country would change and become what, under the British system, may be termed loyal subjects of the British Throne. That was the main object of the loan — to provide the people with full bellies and good homes, but neither full bellies nor good homes were provided for the people of British Guiana.

Whether the \$44 million came to this country or not, we do not know, but there has been a growing dissatisfaction amongst the people of British Guiana with their ties with the United Kingdom. Not only did the United Kingdom Government depose the properly constituted Government and Legislature of British Guiana, but it imposed upon the people a Legislature and an Executive Council of its own choosing, composed of men on whom the British Government relied 100 per cent. for a Government to take care of the affairs of the country as it thought fit, and gave them the reins to spend that money.

Can we really say that that money which came, or did not come, to British Guiana was actually spent in the Colony, and if so, was it spent in the interests of the people of British Guiana, or was it spent in the interest of the people and the Government of the United Kingdom? I am of the opinion that that money was spent in the interests of the people and Government of the United Kingdom. Part of it was spent in maintenance of British troops in this country to keep down the sentiments of the people of British Guiana, and for that portion of the money we should not be held responsible. It is claimed in some quarters that the money which came from Britain to this country was bribe money. Under the law bribery is a criminal offence. The fact is that the British Government thought that by spending money here it could bring the people of this country to its way of thinking.

I feel that the United Kingdom Government should be approached and asked to forego that money with good grace

and as a gesture of goodwill in view of the damage it has done to the hearts, souls and bodies of Guianese at a period when they had no voice in their own affairs. Those were trying times when that money came here, and I feel that the United Kingdom Government would view it, probably not in the most callous terms in which I have expressed it—that it was bribe money to keep us under subjection, which it has not been able to do—but as a gesture of goodwill which it would like to preserve amongst us.

If our statesmen made the proper approach I feel that it would meet with a sympathetic response, and a considerable amount of suffering and burden would be removed from the shoulders of the people of this country for the repayment of that money which in some quarters, is regarded as having been ill spent. I am asking this Council to accept this Motion and to vote for it. I feel that it is a Motion which all loyal Guianese should support in the circumstances.

Mr. Deputy Speaker [*after a pause*]: Since there has been no seconder, I declare the Motion lost. We will now proceed to item 7, a Motion by the hon. Member for Georgetown South.

RICE MARKETING BOARD AS A CO-OPERATIVE

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Thank you, sir. These matters are of very great importance to me. It is a principle for which I stand. Let me go on to move Motion No. 7 on the Order Paper which stands in my name. It reads:

“Be it resolved: That this Council recommends to Government the introduction of legislation to provide for the Rice Marketing Board to be converted into a co-operative organisation of rice producers of this Colony.”

This Motion embraces a very large percentage of the peasants of this country as well as the big Company which is operating at the present time in the rice industry. The rice industry has largely been built up by peasant farmers. It goes back to the early days when indentured immigrants were coming from India to

[MR. JAI NARINE SINGH]

British Guiana. They came from a country whose food habits embraced rice eating, and they started to plant rice in British Guiana. At the beginning very primitive methods were used for the cultivation of rice, and very small quantities were produced. Then came the first World War, and there was a great shortage of rice and other articles in the market. Those people who were engaged in the rice industry and who lived in areas capable of producing rice, were given an incentive to produce more.

A very small quantity of rice was being exported in those days, and then came 1939 and the Second World War. At that time the rice industry had expanded throughout the length and breadth of British Guiana, and had assumed national proportions. In the place of the primitive methods there were relatively modern mills producing a fairly good quality of rice at that time. But there were obvious defects in the standard of grades for exports, which very often did not meet the requirements of the export markets. Then the idea was conceived of having a single buying and selling organization, which is now the Rice Marketing Board.

In introducing the Bill for the establishment of the Rice Marketing Board, Sir Frank McDavid envisaged that it would be the best thing eventually to set up a co-operative organization for the marketing of rice in this country. But somehow, slowly in the process of time, instead of the system developing into one which would put it back into the hands of the producers, control by Government became stronger and stronger on the marketing side. Instead of the marketing Board operating wholly in the interest of the people producing the rice, it operated as a marketing organization, admittedly, but to a large extent to the exclusion of the producers from its control.

There has been constant dissatisfaction among rice producers over the way the Rice Marketing Board has been handling various aspects of the industry.

One has been the question of grades. The Board has been accused 101 times of grading rice to the dissatisfaction of the farmer. What is the system? The farmer dispatches his rice to the Board, and in his absence the Board officials take samples and grade his rice. The farmer has no proof, in accepting the grading, that it is his rice that has been graded seeing that he was totally absent from the scene. Can we say, then, that he is satisfied? If an error is made by the Board officials, then it is the farmer that suffers. This dissatisfaction has continued and neither the Government nor the Rice Marketing Board cares nor has lifted a finger or a voice to correct it. Arbitrary grading continues.

There are other sources of dissatisfaction. The farmer sends his rice to the Board. Nine out of ten times the weight of the rice which the Board acknowledges is less than that sent by the farmer. If he sends a bag weighing 183 lbs. he is very often told that he sent 170 lbs. or 150 lbs. The Board has not sought any means of remedying this grievance. What about the farmer? Has not the Board got a responsibility to the farmer? Should not the Board arrange to take the rice straight from the millers in the districts. The farmer is actually given less weight than he sends, and consequently he is feeling all the time that the Board is not operating in his interest.

The Board handles the entire industry. We have this problem of rice coming from the Corentyne, Essequibo and other districts and then being sent back to those places for consumption. It is time that the Board look into this system. Is the Board's administration so geared to work in the affairs of the industry, or is its superstructure so great that it can only sit in Water Street and conduct its business?

Certainly I do not feel that the Board has been operating in the best interest of the producers. It is not so in other countries, where you have producers' organizations taking hold of the marketing of their own produce. In

Trinidad the Cocoa Marketing Board is handled by the producers, and in British Guiana the Sugar Producers' Association handles the marketing of sugar.

I am sure that under a co-operative system the tremendous superstructure of the B.G. Rice Marketing Board can be eliminated and a system developed whereby the producers would be able to market their own produce.

How much of the profit from the operations of the Rice Marketing Board goes back to the Board? To my mind, none. And to my knowledge the Board is always losing money and is always having a big overdraft at the Bank. When it makes money it goes to a reserve and it never goes back into the hands of the producer. The other day the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, in this Council moved a motion seeking the creation of a fund for stabilizing the price of rice so that in difficult times the price would be maintained at a certain level. As a person who is himself engaged in the rice industry, he could see the pitfalls and the difficulties which the industry faced from time to time. He knew the feelings and anxiety of the producers. In the sugar industry in this country, which is operated largely on a co-operative basis—it is the producers who market their own sugar—there does exist a price stabilization fund to offset the results of difficult years.

All rice from the mills—other than what the farmers want—must go to the Rice Marketing Board. But can we say, for example, that, with this virtual control over the mills, the Board, through its big superstructure, has approached the American Government—through the I.C.A. Mission — or the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations for technical assistance for the industry? As you know, Sir, the United States has developed a very efficient way of producing rice at a relatively low cost because of the machines and the systems they use. I think that if the Board were operating on a co-operative basis missions to observe techniques and to seek technical

assistance would have gone to other countries already.

Sir, I propose to go on a little longer, but I am a little tired. Could we adjourn at this stage until tomorrow?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker : I am giving consideration to your request.

Mr. Burnham : Adjournment is a question for the Council and not for the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker : It is quite true that, according to our Standing Orders, as long as there is business before the Council the hour of Adjournment is five o'clock. However, one can appreciate the position in which the hon. Member for Georgetown South finds himself, since he has been on his feet off and on for a considerable period of the day. Since he has made this request, I do not think we should deny him the opportunity of coming back here tomorrow, or some other time, in order to continue his speech on this very important Motion. What I am wondering, is whether we would have enough business to occupy our attention tomorrow. The hon. the Chief Secretary is not here.

[The hon. the Chief Secretary joined the Meeting.]

For the information of the hon. the Chief Secretary, I should like to point out that the hon. Member for Georgetown South has requested that we adjourn the Council at this stage. He has not completed his opening speech on Motion No. 7 on the Order Paper, but he would appreciate the assistance of hon. Members in giving him an opportunity to rest for a while. I was wondering whether there was any need for us to meet tomorrow, or whether it is the wish of Government that we adjourn until next week.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary : We have no business for tomorrow, and I beg to move that the Council adjourns to a date to be fixed.

RELEASE OF THE TENENBAUM REPORT

Mr. Deputy Speaker : I think Mr. Tello wishes to raise a matter on the Adjournment.

Mr. Tello: Sir, I crave your indulgence to inquire why we have seen comments in one of our daily newspapers, "The Guiana Graphic", on a Report which was not laid in this Council until today. I wonder whether there was some leakage and certain information reached the newspaper, whether some person has betrayed his responsibilities, or some Member has abused the privilege of this Council. The document I refer to is Mr. Tenenbaum's Report.

Dr. Jagan : I was rather surprised myself when I looked at the newspaper this morning and saw a publication of a portion of the Report. I can assure the hon. Member that this was not done on my instructions, and I shall make inquiries to find out exactly how it got into the hands of the newspaper concerned.

Mr. Burnham : I appreciate what the hon. Minister has said, but the difficulty that faces us is that we have not got a copy of the Report up to now. Certainly there must be copies available for hon. Members. The laying of this document on the Table today is a mere formality. It is a farce *par excellence*. The "Guiana Graphic" had a copy of the Report in time to print a portion of it, but up to now I have not seen a copy on the Table although it is supposed to be laid by the Minister today. Can the Clerk show me a copy of the Report which is supposed to be laid today?

[*The Assistant Clerk left the Table to get the copy of the Report*].

Where is the Report? Up to now it is not on the Table!

Although I accept the hon. Minister's word that he did not give instruc-

tions to have the Report published in the newspaper, this is something that has been going on for a long time. The Questions asked by the hon. Member for New Amsterdam with respect to the Central Housing and Planning Authority were answered in the "Guiana Graphic" over a week ago, and I would ask the Minister concerned to show more respect for the privileges of this Council.

Mr. Jagan: This is not true. I received a copy of the Question dated the same day that the release was in the Press. In other words, it was printed in the Press the same day I received the Questions, and it was a reply to an article written in the newspaper. The matter was submitted to the newspaper the day before the Questions were received. The hon. Member can check the newspaper and see that what I am saying is correct.

Mr. Burnham : I do not know whether the hon. Minister received the Questions the same day she gave a release to the Press, but I know that the hon. Member's Questions were answered in the newspaper. I merely mentioned it *en passant*, as it seems to be a very unfortunate coincidence.

Mrs. Jagan : I have made it quite clear that the Questions were tabled on the day the release was published in the newspaper. The matter was submitted through the newspaper the day before, and was published in the newspaper. As the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing, I answered the questions raised by the Press, but I had no idea that a Member of Council was anticipating them.

Mr. Burnham : I always accept the word of a lady, but——

Mr. Deputy Speaker : When a Minister makes a categorical statement, then any remarks which would have a contrary effect to that statement should no longer be made in the Council. The Question is, that the Council adjourns.

Mr. Burnham : We have not yet heard why the Tenenbaum Report reached the newspaper before hon. Members received a copy.

Dr. Jagan : As I understand it, it was a matter of urgency in the sense that several people were interested in the Report. I am informed that very few copies came to the country, and that the Report was published by the U.S.A. authorities. I am told that one of the officers in my Ministry had given a copy of the Report to the Press with the understanding that it would not be published until after it was laid on the Table, in order that the general public would have an early opportunity of reading it. Provision is being made for further copies to be printed, and a copy will be sent to hon. Members as soon as possible.

Government feels that this Report is of such great importance to the public, that the Press should be asked to cooperate in printing it. It is felt that several items in the Report will be of interest to industrialists, so, rather than wait until all of the copies have been printed locally for distribution to hon. Members of Council, the few copies available should be given to the Press for publication, in the hope that everybody would be able to read the Report. It was not done with a view to any discourtesy, as hon. Members have implied. It is unfortunate that the Report was printed in the Press this morning.

Mr. Burnham : Can a document be laid which is not laid? That is the point I am making. As I understand parliamentary procedure, when a document is to be laid it should be laid on the Table. Therefore the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry had no right telling us that he was laying a document when there was

no document to be laid on the Table. Where is the document?

Dr. Jagan : I understand that it is the practice to lay one copy of a Report on the Table when enough copies are not available for distribution to hon. Members. Hon Members can always have access to the document laid.

Mr. Burnham : Yes, but where is the document?

Mr. Deputy Speaker : It is quite true that the practice has been to distribute copies to hon. Members simultaneously with the laying of the document on the Table. On the other hand, there were occasions in this Council when one copy of a document was laid on the Table for the information of the Legislature, and copies were subsequently made available to hon. Members.

The hon. Member for Georgetown Central asked for a ruling on what is meant by laying a document. As soon as a single copy of a document is laid on the Table for the information of the Legislature and handed to the Clerk, that completes the laying of a document. I understand that a copy of the Report has been sent to the Clerk of the Legislature and, since that is the case, the document is laid.

[At this stage the Assistant Clerk returned to the Chamber with a copy of the Report.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker : Council will now stand adjourned to a date to be fixed.