

# SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Tuesday, 17th February, 1959

The Council met at 2 p.m.

## PRESENT :

**Speaker**, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

**Chief Secretary**, Hon. M. S. Porcher (acting)

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

**Financial Secretary**, Hon. F. W. Essex.

} *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 Community Development and Education)*

**E. B. Beharry**

*—Member for Eastern Demerara  
(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*

**A. L. Jackson**

*—Member for Georgetown North*

**S. M. Saffee**

*—Member for Western Berbice*

„ **J. N. Singh**

*—Member for Georgetown South*

„ **R. E. Davis**

*—Nominated Member*

**A. M. Fredericks**

*—Nominated Member*

**H. J. M. Hubbard**

*—Nominated Member.*

Mr. I. Crum Ewing—Clerk of the Legislature

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

## ABSENT :

Mr. B. S. Rai — on leave.

„ Ajodha Singh.

S. Campbell — indisposed.

A. G. Tasker, O.B.E. — on leave.

The Clerk read prayers.

## MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on Saturday, 14th February, 1959, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

## ORDER OF THE DAY

## APPROPRIATION BILL

## BUDGET DEBATE

**Mr. Speaker:** Council will resume consideration of the Appropriation Bill in Committee.

**The Financial Secretary (Mr. Essex):** I beg to move that Council resolve itself into Committee to resume consideration in Committee of the Bill intitled

"An Ordinance to appropriate the supplies granted in the current Session of the Legislative Council."

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

Question put, and agreed to.

## COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

*Schedule.*

## AGRICULTURE

## AGRICULTURAL ENGINEER

**The Chairman:** When we adjourned last Saturday, we were discussing an Amendment moved by the hon. Member, Mr. Jai Narine Singh, that sub-head 1, item (20) — "1 Agricultural Engineer" — be reduced by \$1.

**The Chairman:** The Question is, that sub-head 1, item (20) be reduced by \$1.

Motion negatived.

**The Chairman:** The Motion is lost. We will pass on to the next item.

## TRANSPORT AND TRAVELLING

## RUPUNUNI CATTLE TRAIL

**Mr. Tello:** Under "Other Charges" — "Transport and Travelling", I wish leave, Sir——

**The Chairman:** Where is that?

**Mr. Tello:** On page 7, and if we refer to the top of page 9 we will see reference to the Cattle Trail.

**The Chairman:** Is that "Transport and Travelling"?

**Mr. Tello:** No, Sir. But it is the only head it can be brought up under. This trail was intended originally to allow free transport of cattle and other necessary things from the Rupununi District. During the discussion in Finance Committee we were impressed that Government was giving favourable consideration to this matter, but up to now, we have heard nothing more. One of my colleagues had raised it, but perhaps if we move a reduction of this head, it would enable the Government to give us an assurance that the sum for the maintenance of the Rupununi Cattle Trail would be put back into the Estimates, so that the Trail would continue.

**The Chairman:** Just a moment. For my own guidance, I do not want to go back to another item.

**Mr. Tello:** The only means of bringing it up is under "Transport and Travelling." It is not a head.

**The Chairman:** You are not going to bring it up again, or rather, refer to it again?

**Mr. Tello:** No, Sir.

**Mr. Davis:** I myself have tried to get the Government to make a statement and all I have been able to get from the Minister of Natural Resources is con-

temptible silence, in my opinion. I would like to voice my objection to this attitude, because I feel the matter is one of great importance. I do not know what the Minister or the Government has to hide. Why should the Minister adopt such a hush-hush attitude? Is it because Government is suffering from a certain amount of disquietude of mind for what I consider to be its misdeed in taking out from the Estimates this amount to keep open the Cattle Trail? It is, let us say, the only trail from the City to the Interior, on to Brazil.

Quite recently we heard the hon. Member for Demerara River (Mr. Bowman) urging this Council to recommend to Government the sending of a trade mission to Brazil, and more recently His Excellency the Governor suggesting to the Canadian mission that Canada should use British Guiana as the gateway to Brazil. But here it is that we are asked shortly after to approve of the deletion of this item from the Estimates. In other words it is not proposed to continue this vote of \$18,000 for the purpose of keeping the Rupununi cattle trail open.

As the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, has said, this matter was discussed in Finance Committee where the definite statement was made that the item would be recommitted and a definite answer would be given one way or the other. I do not know if it is in keeping with a policy, but we have had no further intimation on the matter, but a protracted silence. Early in this debate I tried to point out to hon. Members the situation that is likely to arise if the trail is not maintained, and I would like to stress one or two more points. The Rupununi is divided into two savannahs—north and south. By some tacit agreement between the ranchers in the district certain small and medium ranchers in one of the savannahs use air transport while this Company and other small producers use the trail as well as air transport.

It is true that a gentleman, Mr. Excel, who styles himself as a Fat Stock

Officer, came here and went beyond his terms of reference to point out that the bringing of cattle through the trail was not as profitable as the transportation of beef by air. His job was to judge the condition of animals and look after their preparation for marketing, but he delved into the field of economics and tried to point out that bringing cattle through the trail was disadvantageous to the producers. I say that his figures are completely wrong, and I am almost certain that the Minister of Natural Resources, being the careful man I know him to be, must have consulted his technical officers and found them to be incorrect.

In his diagnosis the officer in question omitted two important features. One mistake he made was to say that animals averaging 400 lbs. lost 60 lbs. in weight when brought through the trail. People who have had years of practical experience and know what they are talking about, say that the average loss of weight is 30 lbs., and that is the figure which has been accepted by the Department of Agriculture. It is the figure which was accepted by the *ad hoc* Committee on livestock on which I sat. Apart from that he did not take into consideration the offal and hides of the animals which come through the trail. When animals are slaughtered in Georgetown the offal and hides are completely sold and converted into money. It is true that the hide is sold at the low price of four cents per lb., but it is still worth something. Besides that the liver, heart, tongue, etc. have some value, but those figures have not been taken into account by Mr. Excel's recommendations. That is excusable, because he does not know sufficient about the set-up. The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry knows that hides have seldom been shipped to Georgetown because the price is only four cents per lb. while the air freight is 6½ cents per lb.

It is therefore a simple economic fact why hides are not being shipped to Georgetown from the Rupununi. The heart and tongue arrive by air in Georgetown in a

[MR. DAVIS]

fairly good state of preservation, but that is not the case in regard to liver, which deteriorates rapidly through excessive handling, and the Food Inspector sometimes condemns a whole shipment, and frequently as much as 60 per cent. is condemned. Mr. Excel did not take all these factors into consideration. Animals which come to Georgetown through the trail give a return of between \$15 and \$17 per animal above the amount recovered per animal from beef shipped by air. This is a statement of fact.

The next point I wish to make, and with as much vigour as I can muster, is the fact that it is my conscientious opinion that air transport cannot handle all the cargo that comes from the Rupununi. I tried to point this out to the Council before, and perhaps it would be well if I did it again. I believe that the air freight charge on beef is 6½ cents per lb., but it is dependent upon a continuous up-flow of freight. If that continuous up-flow does not take place the shippers have to pay for a charter flight which increases the freight rate per pound. The result is therefore an increase in the price of beef as it arrives in Georgetown, an increase in the cost of living, and as a natural follow-up my friend on my right (Mr. Tello) will make a noise in this Council for a cost of living allowance.

Another point I would like to make is that the air transport facilities will not be able to cope with any increased shipments of beef. I have seen no provision in the Estimates for an increase in the number of planes. It is my view that, if it is not possible to bring cattle through the trail, places like Tacama, Mara and New Amsterdam will find it difficult to carry on, and there is also our trade with Surinam. We have established a market in Surinam and we should try to keep it. The hon. Minister of Natural Resources knows that as well as I do. If trade between these places is cut off it will be a retrograde step. It must be again remembered that only three weeks ago this trail was used by Government for sending

eight or ten young bulls from Ebini to the Rupununi.

It is accepted that animals lose weight when driven down the trail. However, in consultation with Government and its technical advisers, large pastures with pangola grass have been established at Waranana. I understand that when the ranchers allow their cattle to remain there for a few days before shipment to Georgetown it is possible for cattle to regain as much as twenty to thirty pounds in weight. I do not know whether these facts have been placed before the hon. Minister, and I feel it is my duty to bring them forcibly before him so that Members of the Government will know what they are doing.

**The Minister of Communications and Works** (Mr. Ram Karran): What have they done?

**Mr. Davis:** I have already made the point that this trail is used by Government as well as small traders who are unable to pay high air freight rates for transporting sheep, horses, cattle and so on. Those are the points I would like to stress, and I hope that they will receive the consideration of the Government.

**Mr. Fredericks:** I would like to endorse what has been said by the hon. Nominated Member on my right. In Finance Committee, he supplied us with figures to show conclusively that bringing cattle through the trail is much more beneficial than by air freight from Lethem to Atkinson Field.

However, I do not agree with him when he says that there is not sufficient capacity in the B.G. Airways for the transportation of beef and cattle from the Rupununi. I have had the good fortune to travel to the Rupununi about two weeks ago, and I was surprised to know that on at least two return flights the planes were almost empty. I was told that this frequently happens. While B.G. Airways has the capacity to transport cattle to Atkinson Field, it does not have the facility to meet the needs of other centres like New Amsterdam, etc.

We have seen quite recently that the air freight on beef has been reduced very slightly. I believe that this is more or

less to lull the ranchers into a state of false security and, if and when the trail is closed, the freight will go up.

During the past few years this Government has spent a few hundred thousand dollars in locating a route from Georgetown to connect up with the Rupununi, and whether more than one route is possible is still doubtful. A cattle trail was located and opened at considerable expense to Government. If this \$18,000 is not included in the Estimates for the maintenance of this trail, it will become overgrown and blocked up with bush so as to prevent easy access from Atkinson Field *via* the trail to the Rupununi. I do not think such action will be advisable because the only other outlet is by using the B.G. Airways. It will be very unwise to close this trail, and I recommend to Government not to close it in order to save the paltry sum involved. I am sure that this sum could be saved from the actual surveying cost of the new proposed route without affecting the programme. I ask Government to leave the trail open.

**The Minister of Natural Resources** (Mr. Beharry): I do not agree with the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, that if Government does not continue to subsidize the Rupununi cattle trail the cost of living will go up.

**Mr. Davis:** On a point of correction. If the money is voted to keep the trail open, how can it be called a subsidy?

**Mr. Beharry:** That is not a point of correction. The hon. Member is too previous. I do not visualize the cost of living rising and the price of meat going up if Government does not continue to subsidize the upkeep of the Rupununi cattle trail. I would be the last person to subscribe to any increase in the cost of living. I have been a firm believer in producing more and making the items available to the consumers of this country at cheap prices. To produce more so that we can all share in the abundance of things at cheap prices will always be the policy of this Government.

I cannot follow the argument of the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis. If Government withdrew the subsidy it does not necessarily mean that the trail will be closed. I do not visualize that this trail will be closed. When the subsidy for this trail was made by Government I said that it was a move in the right direction. Government promoted the development of the cattle industry in the Rupununi Savannahs, and today the industry is on a sound footing.

For many years one of the largest companies in the Rupununi was unable to pay a dividend, but today it is in a position to pay a handsome dividend to its shareholders. The ranchers are therefore doing well financially. The cattle population in the area has risen because of Government's foresight in improving cattle and encouraging the ranchers to increase and improve theirs.

Some years ago the St. Ignatius Station was established, at considerable expense to this Government, in order to assist the ranchers in producing better breeds of cattle — breeds that would give more beef and make the industry economical as well as profitable. Government is not abandoning the ranchers in the Rupununi; Government is merely saying that the ranchers are now on a sound footing and it is high time for them to carry the upkeep and maintenance of the trail. Government has not decided to close the trail, or to prevent people from driving cattle through it.

The position is that the ranchers are in a position to take care of themselves, and that is the reason why Government has decided to withdraw this subsidy of \$18,000. In withdrawing this subsidy, I can assure the hon. Member that the Rupununi will get more than \$18,000 worth from the programme Government has been carrying on there. Government is endeavouring to make the ranchers more conscious of the need for producing better breeds of cattle, and it is accelerating a programme to increase the types of cattle in the Rupununi.

Today we have displayed our concern

[MR. BEHARRY]

in another direction in order to assist these cattle farmers. I do not think it will create an unnecessary hardship or too great a burden, otherwise I would readily agree with the hon. Member and ask that the item be included in the Budget. I ask this Committee to agree with me that it should not be included, for it is the duty of Government to assist people to the point where they can assist themselves.

**Mr. Davis:** May I be pardoned if I correct the hon. Minister in a certain essential? He speaks of "subsidy" again and again. There is no subsidy as I understand it, but money for a road to be maintained by Government.

**Mr. Beharry:** To a point of correction: it is not that Government spends this money on the trail; this money is given to ranchers and they keep the trail open.

**Mr. Davis:** It is not I who need correcting; it is the hon. Minister. He does not know his facts. This \$18,000 was handed to the Company as Government's agents, because if it was handed to the Public Works Department it would have cost Government three times as much to look after the trail.

Because of the fact that the road was being kept open the Company went ahead and did certain things, in consultation with Government. About 1955-56 this Company initiated the move to get Santa Gertrudis cattle into this country, and Government approached the Company to import some on its behalf too, which the Company did. Again, in 1956, this Company acted as Government's agents in bringing a number of Brahma cattle from Jamaica. When these bulls are put in the Rupununi they stray and other ranchers get the benefit of these bulls. After a time it was found that by reason of the fact that the Company and Government brought down these bulls, it was costing Government less.

All the credit to Government, but do not let us confuse ourselves as the Minister is doing. The Minister told us about

money being provided for cattle farming. The money provided last year, \$140,000, was for a programme concerning dairy cattle essentially. The Minister has come back this year with another programme calling for \$103,000, I think, speaking from memory. Again this is for dairy cattle. If it is not so, I challenge the Minister to tell us. Dairy and beef are two different types of trades, although they are both concerned with cattle.

**Mr. Beharry:** I think the hon. Member is a bit confused. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the hon. Member, but it is appreciated that what was earmarked last year for the dairy industry, was in a different programme. There are two types of animal that the Department has concentrated on, the beef type and the dairy type. The beef type is reared in the Rupununi savannahs and it is not true to say that Government joined with the Rupununi Development Company in order to import pedigree bulls into this country, after the Company had used its initiative in this respect. It was the other way around.

The Rupununi Development Company, representing the largest ranchers, having approximately 32,000 head of cattle, was encouraged by the Department of Agriculture to secure a few bulls of their own. The majority of the Santa Gertrudis cattle were brought here by the Department of Agriculture, and if the hon. Member is saying that all the ranchers needed to do was to bring bulls and let them go around the area, then the programme of the Agriculture Department would have been an easy one. All we would have needed to do was to buy a few hundred bulls and loose them in the area—the Department would not have needed to put up a Station there. We are encouraging cattle farmers to wire-fence their ranches, and we are carrying out a research programme, encouraging a rise in the production of beef, and so on.

I would like to reiterate that we are not closing this trail. I spoke to the Managing-Director of this Company with respect to this vote of \$18,000 that is to

be withdrawn, and he assured me that this would not close the trail. Some of the arguments I put forward today were also put forward to the Managing-Director. I am aware that at one time the Company was not in a position to pay a dividend, but in the past couple of years the ranchers could afford it. I do not see why we should still have to use taxpayers' money to assist people who are in a position to assist themselves today.

**Mr. Jackson:** One wonders whether the Government at any time will ever learn to display correct reasoning. In Finance Committee, when this item, the maintenance of the Rupununi Cattle Trail, was being discussed, the men who had a working knowledge of the situation drew Government's attention to the injustice which had been or would be done to those concerned by the withdrawal of the \$18,000 a year, and it was pointed out that this money was being used solely for the purpose of replacing bridges which were destroyed from time to time by the heavy rainfall which the Rupununi experienced.

Although Mr. Tasker and Mr. Davis gave justifiable reasons to the Government for the retention of the provision on the Estimates, it was not. Today the Minister has given reason why it would not prevail. It seems to me that the reason which he has advanced is that the Company is now able to pay dividends to its shareholders. But it goes further than that—to a time before his entry into the political field, when someone kept denouncing the provision as a waste of taxpayers' money and it should now be withdrawn. Now that the opportunity is afforded, those who felt thus have applied the axe, caring not for the result.

Thousands of people reside in the Rupununi area. Is it not the responsibility of Government to provide facilities for people who live in that area? There is no road from Georgetown to Vreed-en-Hoop, so Government runs a ferry across the river. There is no road leading to the Essequibo islands, but Government runs a steamer service. There is no

road to New Amsterdam, but Government runs a ferry service across the Berbice River. It therefore stands to reason that Government is responsible for the transportation of people and things.

Is it reasonable therefore, to say that the Rupununi Development Company is now able to pay dividends to its shareholders, and therefore the provision of \$18,000 is no longer necessary? It seems to me that the reasoning is very bad, for if the Public Works Department could not be given charge of maintaining bridges in the Rupununi because it would have cost not only three times' more but probably ten times' more, then the body responsible for doing it instead of that Department should not be thus treated, and it should be regarded that the workers up there should be given good road facilities. The difficulties which the Company experienced in the past are of no concern to the present Government.

It costs more than \$18,000 to maintain those bridges. If the Company did not pay dividends to its shareholders in previous years it is because it had to spend more than the \$18,000 to maintain the bridges in the Rupununi. The sum of \$18,000 is a mere bagatelle compared with the large sums Government spends in other directions. The hon. Minister says that the trail will not be closed. Certainly it will not be closed, but the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, said in Finance Committee that among the people who use the cattle trail are small ranchers who cannot afford to use air transport, and I am assured that many people use the trail not only for driving cattle but for other purposes. If, therefore, Government withdraws this subsidy of \$18,000 then it should spend the money in providing a road to enable people from the Rupununi to travel to other parts of the Colony to transact their routine business. Is it any wonder that the hon. Member for North Western District (Mr. Campbell) speaks about the injustices done to the Amerindian people? They live in large numbers in the Rupununi and would have to charter a plane to come to Georgetown. In cases of serious illness a plane is sent

[MR. JACKSON]

from Georgetown to bring the sick person to the Georgetown Hospital, but that is not good enough. Government should shoulder its responsibilities not only to the people in the coastal areas, but to the Amerindian population as well, and it is a greater responsibility because those people have been made to move from one part of the Colony to another to eke out a livelihood. This act of the Government is another bit of evidence of its failure to deal on a broad basis with the inhabitants of this country.

**Mr. Fredericks:** The hon. Minister has laid much emphasis upon the work which is being done at St. Ignatius, but while I do not claim to know everything about the Rupununi I did enquire, when I was there, about the three things mentioned by the Minister in connection with the experiments by the Department of Agriculture at St. Ignatius. The ranchers were dissatisfied with the work done at St. Ignatius, and it is only quite recently that they have seen some progress being made at that farm. Experiments with grasses are still in the experimental stage, and so far as the wiring is concerned this has not been implemented in any part of the Rupununi, I am told.

We have heard many reasons why Government should restore the amount of \$18,000, and I would suggest that it should levy a toll on each head of cattle passing over the trail, which would be a means of recouping the expenditure on the upkeep of the trail. It is only a suggestion. Members on this side of the Table are unanimous in their desire that the item of \$18,000 should not be deleted from the Estimate.

**Mr. Beharry:** I do not intend to speak at any length because I have already spoken on the question of assistance to the ranchers in the Rupununi. The hon. Member for Georgetown North (Mr. Jackson) said that it is a small amount, and asked why shouldn't Government assist the ranchers. We are going to spend approximately \$93,000 this year on St. Ignatius to assist the ranchers, and it is untrue to say that Government is being sectional in its agricultural development.

To say that the cattle trail should be kept open for the Amerindians to use is no justifiable reason why Government should spend \$18,000. The Amerindians can use the trail whether Government spends that money or not, for it will still be there for them to use, because it is not going to be closed. Being in a better financial position today the ranchers will keep the trail open and the Amerindians will still have the use of it. I cannot see that the Amerindians will be prevented from coming to Georgetown, and I cannot agree that Government should continue to subsidize people who can afford to help themselves.

**Mr. Burnham:** I have some sympathy for the Minister of Natural Resources who lacks his usual enthusiasm in replying to this particular debate, and I hope that my shrewd suspicion is not correct—that he is really with us but, for certain other reasons, he is defending this retrograde step by his Government. Taking the opportunity of the Committee stage to make a policy statement which should have been done on the Second Reading of the Bill, he was at pains to explain that Government was doing a lot for dairy farming and things of that sort, but unless I am more opaque than I thought I was, I know that Government will be spending this year \$36,000 less than it did last year on dairy farming extension. So I cannot see what is the purpose of all this talk about dairy farm extension when Government is going to spend less money, and why dairy farming extension should have been introduced into this debate on the retention of the cattle trail.

There is another thing that bothers me. The good Minister remarked that the ranchers have undertaken to keep the trail going; yes, to keep the trail going, but has he had any guarantee from those gentlemen that they will keep the price of beef where it is at the moment? They are businessmen, and if they have to spend more money if they feel that the trail is necessary, we must not credit them with being philanthropists as well, to hope that they will keep the price of beef at the particular point



where it is at the moment. Let us have the other guarantee, because if that is not forthcoming it will mean that the cost of living will go up.

**Mr. Beharry :** I do not visualize a rise in the prices of beef. Prices are usually regulated by supply and demand. There has been increased production in the beef industry, and we have been shipping beef direct from the Rupunumi to Gadeloupe and Surinam. There has been an over-production of beef. Immediately after this Government took office in 1957 one of the first acts of the Ministry of Natural Resources was to remove the embargo on the shipment of beef out of the Colony. When it was lifted there was a howl in the newspapers that there would be a shortage of beef because the Minister of Natural Resources had removed the embargo without even considering the normal requirements of the beef-eating community in British Guiana. But instead of there being a shortage, we have been exporting more and more beef, and I want to give an assurance that the cattle trail is not going to be closed. The ranchers are in a position today to take care of the trail. I am asking the Council to agree that the amount of \$18,000 should not be retained.

**Mr. Burnham :** The Minister was at pains to say that in spite of the removal of the sum of \$36,000 from the Estimates Government is showing an increased interest in dairy farming extension, but I am saying that that is not so, because there is a decrease in the vote. I want to know what guarantee he has that the price of beef is not going to be sent up. The lifting of the embargo against exportation is an incentive to raise prices, because better prices can be obtained outside, and more load is being put on the ranchers to maintain the trail. Can the Minister answer these questions?

[Pause.]

**Mr. Burnham :** It means that the Minister cannot answer.

**Mr. Beharry :** I have dealt with the question of beef already, and I believe

that supply will regularize the price. There is an over supply of beef at the moment, and I do not visualize that there will be an increase in the price of this item.

With respect to the Dairy Expansion Scheme—the hon. Member for Georgetown Central is pressing me for a reply, but there was an extensive debate on this Head already. It does not necessarily mean that because Government will be spending \$103,000 as against \$140,000 that the programme will not be accelerated. We have a large number of heifers at the Station for distribution. We hope to reduce expenditure by co-ordination and production efficiency.

I assure the hon. Member for Georgetown Central that the Dairy Expansion Programme will increase year after year. Last year we had doubled the quantity of milk than the previous year, and I want to assure him that this year we will make a record production over last year's supply.

**Mr. Burnham :** I am grateful to the hon. Minister of Natural Resources for assuring us that he, like the political Houdini of our times, by spending less money will achieve greater efficiency. Events will prove whether the Minister is right or wrong, but what I am alarmed about is the Minister's lack of knowledge of what is taking place in the meat market. May I inform him that meat that used to be 44c. per pound is now sold at 50c. per pound. Of course the Minister does not eat meat, and he may not know the price of this item.

**Mr. Beharry :** On a point of correction. I eat meat, and I do not know why the hon. Member should make that remark. Perhaps he is buying better cuts.

**Mr. Burnham :** The quality remains the same, but people are paying 6c. more per pound.

**Mr. Benn :** That is a lie!

**Mr. Burnham :** I shall ask the "Minister of Ignorance" to stand on his feet

[Mr. BURNHAM]

and speak. The cuts are 6c. per pound more, which belies the Minister's allegations that the supply is greater than the demand. We had better ask Mr. Davis about this matter, because he knows more about it than we do.

**Mr. Davis:** Can the hon. Minister of Natural Resources tell us where we can find the provision for improving the beef and cattle trade in this Budget? I challenge the statement about the commodity being in greater supply than demand, because I know that beef is getting scarce and the price in very many shops is now 50c. per pound.

**The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan):** How much are you selling it for?

**The Chairman:** Order, please. We will not make progress this way.

**Mr. Tello:** I would like to commend the hon. Minister of Natural Resources for his foresight when he accepted certain advice and lifted the embargo. It is now a little over a year since he has made that experiment. So far bringing beef and cattle by air has been successful; it has kept us fully supplied, and we have been able to capture a market outside of the Colony. I maintain that it is still in its experimental stage. I do not know whether the price of beef will be affected by our asking the cattle dealers to maintain the trail. The experiment is in too much of a youthful stage to assume that correctly.

Here is a dealer (Mr. Davis) in cattle and beef, and he warns us that we may lose our foreign trade in cattle between the Corentyne Districts and Surinam if the additional expenditure for the upkeep of the trail has to be carried by private companies. The hon. Minister should transfer the amount voted last year under the Head of Public Works. He must accept that it is the responsibility of the Government to maintain any road or trail frequently used by the public. To say that because the merchants of Georgetown have become prosperous and are paying big dividends Government must

consider taking off the railways or maintaining the roads to the East Coast, is going too far.

The hon. Minister of Natural Resources says that before the ranchers became prosperous the sum of \$18,000 had been set aside to subsidize the upkeep of the trail, but because the companies can now afford to pay big dividends they can take care of the trail themselves. Is the Minister endeavouring to block further progress by deleting this subsidy of \$18,000 from the Estimates?

Of course the hon. Minister of Natural Resources and the hon. Minister of Communications and Works are closely connected in this matter. I say that no progressive Government will gamble on sole transportation by an air service while it is still in an experimental stage. Yesterday we were told that the air service is still in its experimental stage and that it was necessary to have good connections with the interior and the coastland. It must be remembered that there is no obligation on the part of the cattle dealers to keep this trail open if they do not find it profitable to do so.

The working-class people fear and know from experience that the capitalists never carry extra expenses, and they lose no time in passing on the burden to the consumer. I think the hon. Minister should give this experiment a further trial for another year. It is better to spend \$18,000 and complete a good job than to gamble with the economic future of this country by trying to save this amount.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I am very much surprised at the attitude this Government has adopted regarding the maintenance and upkeep of the cattle trail. On the contrary I thought that Government would have taken steps to improve the cattle trail and make it a road to accommodate lorries. I am sure the hon. Minister has traversed the area and he knows that it is possible to build a road there.

There was a time when cattle came down the Demerara River and then on to

Georgetown. Today you have to take cattle to Tacama, then by boat to New Amsterdam and on to Georgetown. When that route is followed there is always a considerable reduction in the weight of the cattle. It is the duty of the Government to make every opportunity available to those persons who are interested in the development of the Interior and to make roads available for the cattle trade. The cattle trade could be used for extending roads in the interior. This is an area which has vast potentialities, and it is awaiting the plough as well as the coconut plants. I know that certain things that can be produced there cannot be produced in any other area.

I recommend to the Government that it will be in the interest of the Colony to keep the cattle trail in good condition, and to see whether something cannot be done to improve the trail. I hope that the time is not distant when we will be able to travel by road from here to Mackenzie, and from Mackenzie to Itoma, etc. These roads will pass very near to the cattle trail and they could easily be joined up. I am sure it is possible to build a road right on to the Rupununi. I speak from knowledge, and I can tell the Minister of the practical possibilities that exist in the area. The building of a road from Georgetown to Mackenzie is also a practical proposition that must be realized within a decade. If we allow the existing trail to deteriorate it will cost us much more to rebuild it later on.

I do not think that Government should ask private enterprise to carry the cost of the maintenance of the cattle trail, because it will only act according to its own judgment. If private enterprise fails to keep the trail in proper condition it will close automatically. Government is responsible to the community for the development of the Interior.

**The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Benn):** I beg to move that the question be put.

**Mr. Tello:** I do not know why the hon. Minister of Community Development and Education is so anxious to have

the question put. I beg to withdraw my motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to move that sub-head 1, item 17 — "Miscellaneous \$2,500"—be reduced by \$1. I am moving this Motion in order to say something as a result of certain information which I have received. It is true that water cannot rise higher than its level, and that man cannot rise higher than the level of his conscience. Therefore it is reasonable to admit that in our society one will find people whose mentality is high and others whose mentality is based on a slavish idea. You will find people whose mentality is on a high plane, and others who, because of ignorance or a belief that what they are doing is correct will —

**The Chairman:** What is the point?

**Mr. Jackson:** The point is that yesterday when we were discussing the re-designation of Agricultural Officers and Agricultural Instructors, I said I had a shrewd suspicion that the intention was to reduce the status of those officers. I have been informed that it is the intention of the Government or the Head of the Department of Agriculture that Agricultural Officers should learn to drive tractors in the performance of their duties.

**The Chairman:** Does that come under this Head?

**Mr. Jackson:** The sub-head is "Miscellaneous", Sir, and it can take in a number of things.

**Mr. Beharry:** The Member's ignorance is apparent. One cannot buy a tractor for \$2,000. This sum is for incidentals — like soap, brushes for the cleaning of the toilets, and so on.

**Mr. Jackson:** Mr. Chairman, whatever is under "Miscellaneous" can be charged at any one moment for some-

[MR. JACKSON]

thing, and I am saying that under this item, "Miscellaneous" this can happen.

**The Chairman:** You will have to convince me on this.

**Mr. Jackson:** It does relate to that, Sir.

**The Chairman:** It does not say so.

**Mr. Beharry:** Ice in the office water pitcher, and so on.

**The Chairman:** You may find some other Head, but I do not think you can raise it under this one.

**Mr. Jackson:** With all due respect to you, Sir; this is the point: these people are going to use their water pitchers.

**Mr. Beharry:** Once we live in a society where men are dependent on each other, and each man's activity relates to the social existence of the other, we can stretch that argument — that what is good for one section of one community is good for another section of the community.

**The Chairman:** If Ministers and other Members get up to speak when I am ruling on a question, I am going to give unbridled licence to everybody to speak, and they will never finish. If the Minister would like to continue, I would sit and listen.

**Mr. Beharry:** I am sorry, Sir,

**The Chairman:** Sometimes the debates last longer, when Members on one side or the other jump up, apparently to rule, and then I sit back and let them get along. Have hon. Members finished with the item?

[Pause].

#### PROGRESSIVE FARMERS' SCHEME

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 28 — "Progressive Farmers' Scheme"—by \$1. I anticipate this is the Scheme in which Agricultural

Assistants will work. I said on Saturday that I had a suspicion that the intention of the Minister and his advisers in changing the designation of these officers had something sinister in it which would not be in the best interests of the worker.

**Mr. Beharry:** I rise again to a point of correction. The hon. Member is asking for the reduction of sub-head 28, but if it is reduced, this would affect the model demonstration farms which we intend to set up all over the country. I do not know how he can bring in such matters as the designation of Agricultural Instructors. He is dealing with something already dealt with.

**The Chairman:** As far as I understand him, this is not altogether divorced from "Agricultural Instructors". If I think he is not speaking on the sub-head, I shall so say.

**Mr. Jackson:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In farming, whether progressive or unprogressive, we will have to use Agricultural Assistants, and in this Scheme, Agricultural Instructors will have to be used. Therefore the Agricultural Instructors, now designated Agricultural Assistants, will have to learn to drive tractors. That is something that is not part and parcel of the conditions of work of those people. Nothing should be done by the Minister or the Head of Department in any fashion to change the terms and conditions of employment of any officer, and I am suggesting that the Chief Secretary, under whose Portfolio this comes, is hardly aware of what is happening.

We have a right to defend them here. Any attempt made by the Minister of Natural Resources and the Director of Agriculture to make these men drive tractors is an infringement and involves conditions of which they are ignorant. There is no coverage if they suffer injuries through an accident. They do not come under the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance. Government would have to take a new look at the provisions of that Ordinance and ensure coverage before any of these officers sit in any tractor whatsoever.

That is important. It is all well and good for Government to say we must be patriotic and nationalistic —

**The Chief Secretary:** On a point of order. I do not quite follow the hon. Member. What he is taking to be an infringement in the conditions of employment of these people may not be one at all. As far as I am aware, there is nothing in the conditions of employment of Agricultural Assistants or Agricultural Instructors which says they shall not drive a tractor.

**Mr. Jackson:** They have never driven tractors before.

**Mr. Beharry:** This has never been brought to my attention before. I do not know where the hon. Member got his information from. We spent one hour or more debating the item, "Agricultural Engineers", during which time the hon. Member said that one Agricultural Engineer was insufficient, and I agreed with him. But a man must specialize in the handling of machinery before machinery can be handed into his care. I do not know why he is wasting this Committee's time.

**Mr. Jackson:** The Minister is not aware of the fact that these people will have to drive tractors. He has admitted that it is not part of the duty of Agricultural Assistants.

**The Chairman:** That should satisfy you.

**Mr. Jackson:** Thank you, Sir. I shall keep on looking at the situation.

**Mr. Ram Karran:** I wonder if the hon. Member has any objection to the Agricultural Assistants driving cows.

**Mr. Jackson:** Mr. Chairman, a cow knows a cow.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** May I at this stage ask what will be the acreage of the model demonstration farms, what is the nature of the crops to be grown on each farm, and whether the Minister

proposes at any given time in the future to let the public know the results?

**Mr. Beharry:** I really thought that the hon. Member for Georgetown South would have asked that the provision should be increased; instead, he just wants an explanation. But in answer to him: the crops are to be selected according to the agricultural economy of the district. If the economy of the district selected is dependent on rice, then the emphasis will be definitely on rice. The size of the crop will be dependent upon the funds available, and the type of crop will also be determined by the size of the crop. Rice-growing can be done in order to show people what can be achieved by scientific means, and generally, it can be shown how increased production of a specific crop would affect the economy of a district. I would rather say that the crop will be determined by the economy of the district, and the size of the plot by the type of crop to be grown.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I am a little surprised that the Minister proposes to have on these demonstration farms only such crops as are prevailing in the area. I thought demonstration farms were intended for the introduction of new crops and advanced agricultural methods. I am not entitled to move any increase in expenditure but I would suggest that such an increase would receive the whole-hearted support of Members on this side if it were put forward by the Government, because with \$400 for 40 farms nothing much can be done. Perhaps a portion of the \$18,000 withdrawn from the Rupununi trail might be put into this venture. It would require at least \$2,000 to establish these model farms.

Amendment withdrawn.

CENTRAL PRODUCE DEPOT, INCLUDING  
HAM AND BACON FACTORY—PROCESSING  
FACTORY

**Mr. Jackson:** I move the reduction of sub-head 29 by \$1 in order to make

[Mr. JACKSON]

some general comments on the Central Marketing Organisation. I am sure the Minister of Natural Resources is aware that all is not well with the running of that Division. Earlier I said that this Marketing Division was set up as a war-time measure, but since the war it has expanded considerably, and no attempt has been made by the Government to act in accordance with that extension. As far as I know there is only one sub-division outside of Georgetown, which is in New Amsterdam, so that it is not possible for the Marketing Division to reach the entire community to dispose of the articles it purchases from the farmers.

**The Chairman:** I observe that you mention New Amsterdam. You are therefore dealing with sub-heads 29 and 30.

**Mr. Jackson:** I said that there is only one sub-division, which is in New Amsterdam. I am not dealing with item 30 but simply pointing out that there has been no expansion for distribution, as there should have been if Government had given the question of marketing its proper consideration. What appeared to be a glut in several items of produce last year was not in fact a glut. The fact is that there was no proper system of distribution, so that commodities which had been purchased remained in Georgetown for consumption by the population in Georgetown, except for a small portion which may have been sent to New Amsterdam, if at all any was sent there. But it happened that out of real necessity the Division despatched some trucks to the East Coast late in the afternoon for the distribution of produce in order to save the lot from being thrown overboard. That is something which should never happen in a country like ours, and with a Government of the kind we have now in office.

There should be an organized system of marketing by which local produce could be sent to all parts of the country within a reasonable time, so that no one section of the community could be exploited by people who purchase food-

stuffs wholesale from the Marketing Division and return to the country districts to sell at retail prices over which there is no control. The position is that this Marketing Division, which was intended as a measure of relief to the consumer, is not in fact fulfilling its purpose. Because of this haphazard system of distribution it has cost Government \$40 per day to hire vehicles to transport these commodities to the East Coast. I think the time has come when the Minister should prepare some concrete proposal to remedy the situation which occurred last year. I make this suggestion in all sincerity.

I know that at the Government Produce Depôt there is a great deal of dissatisfaction among the employees, and I do not know if the hon. Minister has himself inquired or had some investigations made into the problems affecting the workers at that Depôt. I invite him to see that the workers there are given a square deal, and are given justice when they have cause to make any complaint.

**Mr. Beharry:** I know that the hon. Member has visions about marketing, therefore I put him on the Committee to assist me with the marketing of farmers' produce. What surprises me is that the hon. Member says that we only send produce to New Amsterdam, but we send it as far as Skeldon where a Depôt has been established. We try to distribute local produce to the greatest possible extent, and in addition to that we advertize in the newspapers requesting shopkeepers in the country districts to sell local produce as agents of the Government Marketing Depôt. The response to that appeal has not been very good, and arising out of the Committee I mentioned, active consideration is being given to whether the Government Produce Depôt should not be controlled by a Marketing Board in which the farmers would have a greater say in the marketing of their produce. I hope that in the coming year we may see this materialize to the benefit of the farmers as well as the consumers. I hope it will be possible to convert the Government Produce Depôt into a Marketing Board

on which there will be representatives of farmers and consumers.

**The Chairman:** Is the hon. Member withdrawing his Amendment?

**Mr. Jackson:** Yes, Sir .

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** So far as item (31)—“Wholesale Fish Market \$28,259”—is concerned, I see that there is a reduction by almost \$35,000. This is a matter in which I have considerable interest and knowledge. Earlier today the hon. Minister of Natural Resources gave us a long speech on the surplus of beef.

Of course the Minister knows that if there is a surplus of beef, it would be due largely to the amount of cheap fish available in Georgetown and other parts of the country. It is true that fish has been subsidized. The *Cape St. Mary* is here for three years on an experimental tour, and it is responsible for making fish available to us at a cheap rate. I am alarmed to hear that Government has decided to reduce this item because the *Cape St. Mary* is due to leave British Guiana in the near future.

In the light of the present unemployment and underemployment situation, if fish is not available in large quantities the price will go up. You will then find the price of beef, pork, chickens and so on going up. I wonder whether the hon. Minister of Natural Resources has viewed this matter with the concern with which I have viewed it, and whether he is prepared to reconsider the matter of replacing the full amount in the Estimates. At the moment we are paying four times the price people are paying for *red fish* in Trinidad; the Trinidadians are paying 19c. per pound and we are paying 76c. per pound. I doubt whether the Minister will be able to give us fish cheaper by reducing the provision made in the 1958 Estimates.

**The Financial Secretary:** Is the hon. Member talking about the reduction in the losses at the Fish Market, which he wants to increase? I am not quite sure.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I am not talking about the question of losses.

**The Financial Secretary:** That is what the vote represents.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I am telling the hon. Minister of Natural Resources that he will have to come back here asking for Supplementary Estimates this year. Do not tell us that you are trying to economize when there is no economizing at all.

**Mr. Fredericks:** The Fisheries Department of any country plays a very important and major role in the development of that country; its importance is recognized and emphasis is placed on this aspect of the country's development to the extent that in very many countries the Department is a separate one and not controlled by the Head of the Department of Agriculture. I am not suggesting that our Fisheries Department should be a separate Department. I, personally, am in favour of centralization, because it increases efficiency and prevents a lot of duplication of services. I think that ways and means should be found to help assist the small fisherman in the production drive.

The Industrial Advisory Committee has made concrete recommendations to Government which are intended to improve the fishing industry. I earnestly commend to Government the acceptance and implementation of those recommendations as early as possible.

I am of the opinion that the Fisheries Division is helpful in its limited scope, but very much more could be done in that Department. We know that separate establishments have been created in relation to this Department and they operate in several parts of the town. I feel that their offices should be located in one place in order to avoid duplication and save and expenses so far as accounting clerks and clerical staff are concerned.

The hon. Minister has just referred to the hon. Member for Georgetown North as a Member of the Marketing Committee. I, too, along with the hon. Member

[MR. FREDERICKS]

for Georgetown South have been placed on the Fisheries Committee, but I can tell this Council that the Committee has done very little work since its formation by the hon. Minister. I would strongly suggest that the Committee be scrapped, as I can see no useful purpose being served by its continued existence. If the Government would take my advice and form a new Committee on a different basis, it would be able to take constructive action to rehabilitate the fishing industry.

I am indebted to the hon. Member for Georgetown North for some of the observations he made last year when he was discussing the Marketing Division. He stated that there was a lack of discipline among the officers in that Department and he mentioned particularly the charge of drunkenness. I, too, have noticed a certain amount of drunkenness in that Department, and I would strongly suggest to the hon. Minister to have the canteen closed as early as possible, or to prohibit the sale of strong drinks on the premises.

The Wholesale Fish Market at present charges about 30% to 35% profit or excess on the price paid to producers and it still operates at a loss. I feel that the Wholesale Fish Market should be operated on a co-operative basis and run by the men themselves. I am sure the fishermen will be able to run it more efficiently, because any profit or loss will affect them.

**Mr. Beharry:** Everything possible is being done to increase the efficient production of the country. Our fish production has risen considerably. In 1957 the Government Produce Depôt bought 486,000 pounds of fish. In 1958 the Depôt bought approximately 900,000 pounds of fish. A great amount of fish was sold in the Municipal Markets, and approximately 1,000,000 pounds of fish passed through the Government Produce Depôt

This Council will recall that last year I asked Mr. Taylor of the I.C.A. to come here and teach our fishermen how to increase the catch of *red snapper*.

The Department had received information to the effect that there was a more efficient way of catching *red snapper*, and I decided to do something about the matter. I asked the American Consul in this Colony to see whether he could get an officer from the I.C.A. to come here and give us a demonstration. Mr. Taylor eventually came over and taught our fishermen how to catch *red snapper* in a more efficient manner. We were the recipients of all of the gear Mr. Taylor brought over with him. It will be seen that Government is doing everything possible to encourage the fishermen to produce more fish.

Sir, the facilities provided by the Government at the Wholesale Fish Market at La Penitence are numerous. The hon. Member for Georgetown South and the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, know that Government has provided a Rest House, a canteen, ramps, etc for repairing fishing-boats and fishing nets for the fishermen. Government has to subsidize all of these things in the infancy of the fishing industry.

The Marketing Section of the Fisheries Division was not established as a commercial organization to buy and sell fish for profit. Like the Government Produce Depôt, I visualize that one day it will be converted into a Fishery Board where fishermen can market their produce. The fishing industry has not yet advanced to a point where Government can hand it over to the fishermen. Government will endeavour to encourage the fishermen to produce fish on a co-operative basis, and when the time is ripe Government will hand over the Marketing Section to the fishermen so that they can handle their own affairs.

The country has 12 schooners fishing mostly for *red snapper*, some trawlers and over 500 small craft to catch fish to serve the community. Government will continue to encourage the fishermen to make the country as self-sufficient as possible so far as fish is concerned. This country is still a large importer of fish, and I think it is high time that we reduce our importation of this item.



**Mr. Burnham:** If there is a sufficient supply of fish, may I ask whether the hon. Minister considers setting up a canning industry? I understand that there is a lot of wastage still taking place as a result of bad distribution and, perhaps, if a canning factory were set up the fishermen would have somewhere to sell the fish immediately when it cannot be taken up by buyers in the market.

**Mr. Fredericks:** I heard the hon. Minister of Natural Resources refer to the facilities at the Fisheries Division. I was hoping not to be drawn into any elaborate discussion on this topic, but I must point out that the conditions and facilities referred to are hopelessly overcrowded. I think that Government should provide adequate storage facilities for boats, nets, and the amount of fish that can be caught.

The hon. Minister also mentioned something about Mr. Taylor coming over here to teach our local fishermen how to catch *red snapper*. That was done as a result of a recommendation from the Industrial Advisory Committee. I would earnestly ask the hon. Minister to try and implement the other recommendations of the Committee as early as possible.

The Industrial Advisory Committee feel that, if the fishermen themselves have a say in running that part of the Marketing and Fishery Section, they would be able to put it on a more business-like basis. One of the biggest drawbacks there is the lack of food storage.

I would ask Government to investigate this aspect of it as early as possible, and put proper cold storage facilities at the disposal of the fishermen.

**Mr. Beharry:** The hon. Member has suggested that we should investigate the possibility of canning; we will think of canning to take care of excess supplies. On the question of cold storage, I agree with him there is a real pressing need for this at the present moment. I know of two cold storage plants in this coun-

try: one which was put up by the hon. Member himself—and I do hope he will be able to provide some extra facilities—and that of the B.G. Fisheries, in Water Street. Negotiations are afoot with the B.G. Fisheries to get some of their facilities offered to our fishermen, and we hope our fishermen would be able to make use of them. That is all I can say at this stage, but I hope later on to be able to announce something more. This Company wants to go out of business, and it is possible that Government will do everything that it can to secure what is available, for the benefit of the fishing industry.

**The Chairman:** Are you withdrawing the Motion?

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** Not yet, Sir. Can he tell us, now that he has mentioned B.G. Fisheries, whether they will take over the tacklings and big equipment which are being practically given away at this moment? Or whether he intends to put to the services of fishermen the cold storage of B.G. Fisheries, Ltd.?

**The Chairman:** He said the matter is under consideration.

**Mr. Beharry:** I will appeal to hon. Members not to discuss this question, as I do not want to prejudice negotiations.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I beg to withdraw the Motion I moved earlier.

#### MILK PASTEURIZATION PLANT

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 32—“Milk Pasteurization Plant”—by \$1. We are now asked to vote \$95,600 by way of subsidy and otherwise. I do not know if milk is being thrown down the drain or if it is being fully sterilized. I heard that in 1958 it got to a point where milk had to be thrown away—the Minister can tell me if it is to the contrary. I also heard that it was the Government's intention last year to establish a condensery. I looked very carefully at the Estimates and I see no provision for it.

[MR. JAI NARINE SINGH]

Earlier in the debate the Minister told us that he had a very large centre with heifers ready for distribution for dairy farming. Obviously there is a going to be a tremendous surplus of milk everywhere, but no Government should wait until then to do something. It should not be like the cassava story. A proper foundation should be laid now, so that at the whims and caprices of changing conditions farmers would not have to walk the streets bare-footed, and have it on the conscience of the Minister.

Now that there are grandiose plans, let the Minister tell us what will be done about condensed milk or evaporated milk, or cheese, eventually putting \$4 million into the pockets of farmers.

**Mr. Beharry:** We dealt with this before. The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry is making every effort to get a condensery to process our excess supplies — and we are getting an excess supply of milk right now. I know that before the year is out we will get a condensery, and we will be able to process this milk.

**Mr. Burnham:** I think this shows the absence of dove-tailing between the Ministries of Government. Here it is, the Ministry of Natural Resources is increasing production, and the Minister says he knows efforts are to be made in a certain direction to process excess supplies. This Government must know the capacity for using fresh milk and must calculate what excess there will be over the demand. All we are being told here is that the Minister of Trade and Industry, whose mouthpiece the Minister of Natural Resources has now apparently become, is now looking into the question. This is not the stage for looking into the question; that should have been done long ago — *pari passu* with increased production. There should have been items of equipment for a condensery here already. But here we are, indulging in airy nothingness — “plans are being looked into.” We expect the Government would have said, “we have done XYZ and we will get results ABC” It is true you started late, but at least you must give the impression of efficiency.

**The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan):** Hon. Members want to know what is being done to take care of excess milk. I may tell them that we have contacted for equipment in this field none other than the Nestlé's organization who are very prominent in the milk business. Through their local agents some contacts have been made; I understand they have a factory in Jamaica and they are interested in setting up a factory in Trinidad.

Before one sets up a factory of this sort, one has to have a certain amount of data. I do not know if Members want us to go blind-folded to set up an industry.

The hon. Member referred to consumers in Georgetown. The need today is not over-production, but under-consumption. The fact is, the people in Georgetown continue to consume milk out of tins, and if they were to stop doing that, then there would be no problem of setting up either a condensery or for converting milk into other by-products.

Only yesterday we had discussions with the dairy people who came here from New Zealand. They were asked whether they would be prepared to set up a condensery not only to take care of excess of our milk here in British Guiana, but as a means of selling surpluses from their own country. Mr. Kennard, the Director of Agriculture, is now trying to work out all the details which, when available, can then be examined so that if it becomes necessary for Government to set up a factory, Government will have to approach manufacturers, whether in the United Kingdom or the United States, to see if they would be able to give financial backing on a cash or credit basis.

I want to tell hon. Members that we do not want to go into things without making proper preparations, because there is the danger of losing money that way, as we have been losing on certain concerns like the Rice Development Company or even the Milk Pasteurization Plant. Before that, they were re-combining powdered milk. We have to ascertain whether there will be a constant

supply of milk, and if there is not a regular supply of milk, whether powdered milk can be used to keep the condensery going when fresh milk is in short supply. It is all well and good to talk about setting up a condensery, but once a condensery is set up and Government begins to lose money those same Members will say that Government is wasting money. I would urge Members, especially those in Georgetown, to try to persuade their supporters to drink more pasteurised milk, for in that way we would have less of a problem and less loss.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I am still left in the air by what the Minister has said. We do not want the dairy farmers to be frustrated as the producers of cassava have been within recent times. At one time when there was a reduction in the price offered to dairy farmers there were tears in the eyes of those who spent their money and time in the production of more milk. Before the pasteurisation plant was established milk was sold at 8, 10, 11 and 12 cents per pint, but pasteurised milk is now being sold at 16 cents per pint. The pasteurisation plant has actually put milk beyond the means of the ordinary workers. It is cheaper to buy imported milk. Government must realize that milk is an essential item for the well being of the community, and the Minister must not confuse the milk problem with that of the Rice Development Company, the Anna Regina scheme and the Central Rice Mills. He was at one time a Director of the Rice Development Co., even for a short time, and he should be aware of the administrative headaches of the Company.

The production of milk in British Guiana is in the hands of small people who should be protected. It is no use asking people in New Zealand to establish a condensery here. They are not interested in developing British Guiana; they are interested in marketing their own products for the benefit of the people of New Zealand. We are interested in protecting and advancing the economic life of the people of British Guiana. The Minister of Trade and Industry has often expressed the hope that if Government

cannot get people from outside to develop industries in British Guiana, Government would undertake that development itself. Here is an opportunity. Government already has part of the necessary equipment at the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. All that is necessary is an addition to the equipment that is already there. I do sincerely request the Minister of Natural Resources to tell us if there is any likelihood of our having a plant for the manufacture of condensed milk in British Guiana. It is true that there is a condensery in Jamaica and there is to be a rival plant in Trinidad. There is some controversy about it between the two islands, but that is their business. British Guiana, with its vastness and its great potentialities, must have its own condensery, and we must make a determined effort in that direction. I am sure the Minister will accelerate the establishment of the necessary plant.

I do not think we should accept the Minister's statement that details have to be worked out. The Department of Agriculture must at all times be able to make available to the Government all the data acquired from year to year and over a long number of years. The Department should have been working for years on the seasonal production of milk and the necessary data should have been in the hands of the Minister 10 months ago, because he has been in office 18 months and should have had the information at his finger-tips.

**Mr. Tello:** I am extremely disappointed that the Minister of Trade and Industry should at his time be telling us that he is studying data. Something is radically wrong with the dove-tailing of these Ministries. In his annexure to the Governor's Speech the Minister of Natural Resources says :

"The dairy industry will be expanded still further in an effort eventually to replace imports amounting to some \$4 million annually. But emphasis will be placed on reducing costs of production, by the use of more efficient breeds under the Dairy Expansion and Artificial Insemination Schemes; improved management of cattle; the cultivation of more nutritious grasses; and stimulation of consumption of local milk."

[MR. TELLO]

Stimulation of production of local milk is the emphasis in the last line. That statement covers the whole question of production. Government anticipated an increased production of milk and for that reason we were asked to vote sums of over \$133,000 to complete a scheme to avoid frustration, but we find that somebody has broken down there. The Minister of Natural Resources has fulfilled his obligation; his plan is complete, at least on paper, but in the matter of finding a market we find that the distribution system has not only broken down in the milk industry but also in the rice industry and ground provisions, and someone who is more qualified than I am to speak in the matter of the fish industry will say that the system of distribution in that respect has been found wanting.

After a bold programme has been arranged for increased production we hear that Government is now studying data. Why, when the production scheme was being thought out, consideration was not given to the question of finding a ready market and improved distribution? I am disappointed about it. I do not know if the best thing is a condensery, but what I do know is that something is radically wrong with the planning, and if we continue in that short-sighted policy and incomplete planning we cannot avoid frustration.

**Mr. Burnham:** I am a bit surprised and confused by the remarks of the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry. At one time he says that the problem is not over-production but under-consumption, and at another time he says that before we can have the condensery we have to get data. If it is a question of consumption then do not let us have a condensery for a long time, but find ways and means of selling milk and encouraging people to buy it.

On that aspect of the matter I would like to observe that while some of the people of Georgetown may agree with the Minister of Trade and Industry that a bottle of milk is better than a bottle of Bank's beer, the price of a bottle of pasteurised milk, standing as it does at

16 cents, is so high that though some people may be prepared to consume more milk they do not have the means. Perhaps we may hope for closer co-operation between the two Ministries taking place, and perhaps they can put their heads together to adumbrate some policy and find some means whereby the cost of production can be reduced to encourage more people to drink more milk in Georgetown, and then we shall not have to worry about a condensery.

But on the other hand the Minister of Trade and Industry did not seem to entirely disagree with the prospect or the thesis that a condensery is a good thing for British Guiana. I do not know whether he did not disagree openly because the Minister of Natural Resources had already committed him to it, but I am going to assume that he did not disagree because he really did not disagree. The Minister of Trade and Industry has been the most brilliant agitator this country has ever produced. He has criticised previous Governments for having failed to do anything. This Government has been running for 19 months, and from the day he took over his Ministry the Minister of Natural Resources has been telling the people, through the Press, about the great plans he has. Certainly his colleague must have been aware of those plans. Since 1957 the Minister of Trade and Industry should have been aware of the plans of the Minister of Natural Resources to increase the production of milk.

The hon. Minister of Natural Resources has been at pains to tell us that the production of milk last year was greater than it was in 1957. Is not the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry aware of that fact? Certainly from last year he could have instructed his technical officers to start collecting the necessary data.

It seems to me that what has really happened is that either the Minister of Trade and Industry is putting his deadening hand on the condensery, or he never thought of it before. I believe that there is more in the mortar than the pes-

tle—one Minister producing the milk and the other Minister will not find the condensery. Does it take all of this time to get the data? The P.P.P. Government was here since 1957, and we could have got it in 1958. The answer is most unconvincing. If the Minister of Trade and Industry will confess his manifold sins and weaknesses and promise us that he will get down to his work with his colleagues and his mouthpiece, we shall be satisfied.

**Dr. Jagan :** I pointed out to the hon. Member that for a long time milk was in short supply.

**Mr. Burnham :** Up to now?

**Dr. Jagan :** The hon. Minister of Natural Resources and I went and begged the people to produce more milk. We had to resurrect the service which was suspended. The hon. Member is living in a dream world and he does not know what is happening. I said before that one has to know precisely what type of factory one wants, the economic output, how much milk will be consumed and so on before one embarks on such a project.

The hon. Member does not seem to understand the point about under consumption and over production. Milk is said to be over produced because it is under consumed, but it is not really over produced in this instance. If the people in Greater Georgetown area were buying milk from the Pasteurization Plant instead of drinking evaporated milk, tinned milk or Banks beer for that matter, things would have been much better.

The hon. Member referred to the price of milk. Milk is sold at 16 cents a pint, but Banks beer is sold at 25 cents a bottle. I do not disagree with the hon. Member's suggestion that a condensery should be set up, but the point is that everything must be properly planned beforehand. I have already said that if private enterprise fail to do certain things Government will have to consider doing them. I suppose we could find money by selling one of the estates of the hon.

Member for Georgetown South to establish a condensery.

We know from the tight Budget this year that it is virtually impossible to raise money to do things which should have been done long ago. We have \$4 million for the Boerasirie internal works. We need a lot of money to —

**Mr. Kendall :** Cease operation for the time being.

**Dr. Jagan :** We have to pay interest on the money all the time. I would like to set up a lot of things—

**Mr. Burnham :** So said you in August, 1957.

**Dr. Jagan :** Let us face facts. If we cannot get money from England or elsewhere we will have to do the best we can to help ourselves. We have tried to get money from the World Bank—

**Mr. Burnham :** Go East, young man!

**Dr. Jagan :** I will take you along.

**Mr. Burnham :** No thank you.

**Dr. Jagan :** I have said that if private enterprise are willing to embark on some of these industries, Government will give them the data required. Private enterprise will not set up a factory merely because of hearsay. They want specific data whether it is Banks beer, Plibord or something else. These things take months of preparation, and we who are spending Government's money have to be very careful because of the failures of the past.

**Mr. Burnham :** Cut out your trips!

**Dr. Jagan :** I can assure hon. Members that there is no disagreement on this side of the Table so far as the setting up of a secondary processing industry is concerned. The Agricultural Department is burdened with many of these commercial undertakings. Not so long ago, before the previous Director of Agriculture took up his new post, there was a confer-

[DR. JAGAN]

ence to bring all of these commercial undertakings outside of the sphere of the Agricultural Department, and put them into the hands of a commercial undertaking so that they would be run on a businesslike manner with businessmen at the head. We hope that that will be done in the very near future. If they want to set up a condensery either jointly with private enterprise, or wholly as a Government venture it will be left to them. In the meantime we are carrying out these investigations in order to assist the people.

The hon. Member for Georgetown South said that the people in New Zealand are not interested in the development of British Guiana, and that they will not set up a factory here because they are interested in developing industries in their own country. He should know that today there is a great need to find markets outside, not only in New Zealand but in other countries. When they cannot sell their finished products outside, they do not mind selling their raw materials to a country which would give them an opportunity of disposing of them rather than having a surplus.

Hon. Members should not desire this Government to rush headlong into things and lose thousands of dollars, because many things that have been done before were not properly planned. I would be the last person to see this Government losing large sums of money so far as the taxpayers are concerned.

**Mr. Burnham :** Maybe I did not understand the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry when he laid down his thesis on under consumption and, apparently, he did not understand me. The point I made about the question of under consumption was that the price was too high for many an ordinary person to buy milk. If you know anything about the habits of milk consumption you will realize that though a tin of evaporated milk costs twice as much or more than a pint of pasteurized milk, the tin of evaporated milk will last longer. That is my personal experience. My experience is connected

with a refrigerator, and the experience would be worse for those who do not have a refrigerator. You cannot keep a bottle of pasteurized milk for as long as you can keep a half tin of evaporated milk.

It is no sense saying that evaporated milk is more expensive and people are still buying it. The point is that it will keep longer and the money will last longer. You will have to consume all of the milk when you use pasteurized milk. I thought the Government would have addressed its mind to tackling the problem of under consumption by finding some means of reducing the cost of pasteurized milk to the consumer either by a reduction of overhead expenditure — to give you some idea, all of these fancy accountants in the department are unnecessary—and/or a subsidy.

I cannot accept that the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry does not understand the point I was making. The Minister is wont sometimes to say things which have the habit of boomeranging, and on this occasion he has been his usual self. He says that it takes months to carry out the necessary investigations. The Party in power had nineteen months to carry out the necessary investigations, and from his own words he stands convicted of doing nothing with respect to the condensery.

As I said before, we are going to give the Government a further chance. We are happy to hear that the Minister of Trade and Industry and his colleagues do not disagree on the question of the condensery, and that any disagreement is limited to statements in the Press.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh :** I beg to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**The Chairman :** The question is, that Head 3 — Agriculture — be carried out at the figure of \$ 1,840,368.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

Council resumed.

#### MR. CAMPBELL'S ABSENCE

**Mr. Speaker :** I want to announce that since this Council resumed today I have received a letter from the hon. Member for North West District, Mr. Campbell, stating that he has not been able to attend today's meeting because of indisposition. I am sure hon. Members will wish him a speedy recovery so that he will be able to take his place at our sittings on another day. It is now five o'clock; it is time for adjournment, and I want to hear from hon. Members what time we should resume.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Chief Secretary :** I beg to move the adjournment of this Council until 8.15 p.m.

**Mr. Burnham :** For how long?

**Mr. Speaker :** Until about ten o'clock.

**Mr. Tello :** Last week we had a terrible disagreement and certain Members walked out of the Council because they could not get any refreshment. The following day we came back here and even worked on a Saturday morning. Today, without any warning, you are making new arrangements to work from 8.15 until later.

**Mr. Speaker :** If hon. Members are not here they should inquire about what has taken place in their absence. Before we adjourned the meeting on Saturday last, the question was raised as to whether we would sit on Monday night. It was also mentioned that nothing definite should be decided except with the consent of the Members. No one can be arbitrary and say to hon. Members that they must sit for a specific period. At the time there was some indecision, and no agreement as to what time we should go on to was reached. That is what took place on Saturday.

I remember that some mention was

made about the likelihood of sitting tonight, but it was realized that no one could fix any time for the Members of this Council outside of the regular time. It is the business of the Members of this Council to decide what time they will sit. I repeat that at the time of the adjournment Members could not make up their minds, and we said that we would decide on Monday as to whether we would sit on Monday night. I cannot nor do I wish to force Members to sit at times outside of their wishes. If they wish to sit at 7, however inconvenient it is for me as Speaker of this Council, I will be here punctually, even if Members come late.

**Mr. Tello :** Can we not make up our minds on definite hours at which we would sit?

**The Chief Secretary :** I have no idea how long the debate is going to take, but perhaps we can meet afterwards and work something out.

**Mr. Speaker :** If Members wish, I will adjourn *simpliciter* and if they wish to sit tonight, they can reach me on the telephone.

**The Chief Secretary :** I move that we adjourn now and resume at 8.15 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker :** Do Members agree to that? I notice there are vacant seats, and I hope I shall not be told by some Members that he was not informed.

*Council adjourned accordingly.*

#### RESUMPTION

Council resumed at 8.20 p.m. and resolved itself into Committee to resume consideration of the Schedule to the Bill.

#### ANALYST

**The Financial Secretary :** I beg to move that the Schedule be amended by the insertion of the figures \$54,892 under Head 4 — Analyst. In the Appropriation Bill there are no figures in the Schedule, and what I am seeking to do is to amend the Schedule by inserting those figures.

## SCIENTIFIC OFFICERS

**Mr. Gajraj:** I think the hon. the Financial Secretary is quite correct. May I at sub-head 3—"Scientific Officers", \$6,888 — move a reduction by \$1 in order to make a few comments? I know that the ordinary functions of the officers and the technicians of the Analyst Department are to some extent confined to the analysis of foods and drugs in accordance with the Food and Drugs Ordinance. That is how we have milk samples and other things sent to the Analyst for testing and for the issue of certificates in terms of the Ordinance.

I have moved a reduction of the item because of a development which has recently come to my notice with respect to rice and padi. For a long time the rice farmers of this country have been complaining that it was necessary to have an independent authority in the industry to decide upon grades of rice and padi. It is well known that there has always been a considerable amount of opposition to the Rice Marketing Board, as the sole buyer, grading rice itself, and the Board has very often said that it was quite anxious that an independent authority should be set up by Government to decide upon grades.

It has always been the view of the Board that this particular aspect of grading should be done by the Department of Agriculture, and that is how our thoughts have been running until now, but very recently I have learned that in the neighbouring territory of Suriname the Government has for many years undertaken to be the impartial arbiter of grades in so far as padi and rice are concerned. I have recently seen evidence of the fact that this work is done by the Analyst Department in that country, for the Ordinance for the protection of rice farmers lays down specifications as to quality in so far as colour, percentage of broken grains and so forth, and in the case of padi the specifications range from the percentage of husk, foreign matter, discolouration, chalky grains and so forth. This job is done by the Analyst Department which issues the certificates, so that

there can be no dispute between buyer and seller, and anyone who has either rice or padi may submit his sample, pay the prescribed fee, and obtain a certificate of standard or of grade.

It struck me when I learned of this arrangement, that perhaps it was a policy which this Government might pursue, because in the past there has always been the fear that if an independent grading of rice or other grains should be undertaken by our Department of Agriculture it might need a very large staff to cope with the demand, but my information is that in Dutch Guiana there was no necessity for such preparations in the Analyst Department because of its staff of scientific and trained men who were able to deal with all cases. In fact it is not meant that everyone who has a bag of padi or rice would go to the Analyst Department for a certificate of grade. In most cases, when the negotiations between buyer and seller reached the stage that there was some dispute as to the grade, only then the Analyst Department came into the picture, because it functioned more or less as a Board or court of appeal in order to resolve any deadlock between the negotiating parties.

I make mention of it with the hope that the thoughts might remain with the Members of our Government. I think it is something altogether new and they may be able to give it some consideration, and perhaps we may have at some future date, some time during the year, plans whereby this very controversial subject may reach the point of greater fulfilment.

For some time the people have been clamouring for independent grading of rice. I believe you will find in a report of the Rice Committee, presided over by His Excellency the Governor, a recommendation that Government should set up an independent grading facility for the industry.

**Mr. Tello:** I intended moving the reduction of this Head but for a different purpose. It has something to do with the point raised by my hon. Friend. I am directing a query to the hon the Chief Secretary because it concerns the ques-



tion of Establishment. I am informed that one of the Scientific Officers attached to the Analyst Department does not hold the necessary qualifications for his post. I understand that he holds what is known as a "General Degree in Chemistry". I note from an advertisement in the Official Gazette dated 28th April, 1956, that it was necessary to have an Honour's Degree in order to fill the post, but the holder of the post merely has a General Degree in Chemistry.

Possibly the answer to my query will be that, in the light of post-war conditions, Government had to make a compromise by appointing someone with qualifications below the desired standard because of the lack of travelling and training facilities. This is a very important job. I hope the information I have received is incorrect and that this officer possesses the necessary qualifications set out in the advertisement. But if my information is correct and he was employed to do this important job because of uncontrollable circumstances, I should like to know whether he would be given an opportunity to qualify himself to fill the post.

If this Scientific Officer, who is a key officer in that Department, does not possess the necessary qualifications for the post, he cannot demand respect from his colleagues above and below him. He would be incapable of training the Assistants who have to work with him, and he would be unable to supervise them properly. In the circumstances there would be a weakness in the Department, and it would be lacking in its true service to the Colony. I have brought up this matter here because it is all over the streets. I think this is the correct place to settle it.

**The Financial Secretary :** I am not quite sure how this matter affects the Appropriation Bill, or what relevance it has on the topic we are discussing.

**Mr. Burnham :** The Speaker will rule.

**Mr. Tello :** We want to vote a

salary for someone who is properly qualified to fill the post.

**The Chairman :** Do you wish your Motion for the reduction of the item put to the vote ?

**Mr. Gajraj :** I was hoping that some Member of the Government might have said a word or two on the matter.

**The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Mrs. Jagan) :** That Department falls under my portfolio, and I do not think there is anything to say. You are the Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board, and I think the proper thing for you to do is to approach the Department as Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board.

**Mr. Gajraj :** The hon. Minister seems to be speaking directly to me.

**Mr. Ram Karran :** On a point of order. Is the hon. Member the Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board ?

**Mrs. Jagan :** I want to suggest to the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Gajraj, that, as Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board, it would be proper for him to approach the Department in the usual way. I do not think this is the correct place to approach me on this matter, and I see no need to comment on it. At the moment I know that the Analyst Department is fully occupied. It would be necessary to expand the Department in order to undertake more work.

**Mr. Gajraj :** That is why I said that I was putting the matter before the Government, because only Government would know whether the officers in the Department had enough work to do. As Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board I have no place in this Council. As a Nominated Member of this Council, I feel this is the proper place for me to bring any matter affecting the Government.

The Rice Marketing Board is a statutory body, and in due course it will take what action seems fit. But in this Coun-

[MR. GAJRAJ]

cil I do my duty as I feel it should be done.

**Dr. Jagan:** The hon. Member, having failed to grasp an opportunity at this afternoon's Session, is now seeking under the Head of Agriculture to say what he should have said on the Second Reading of the Bill.

**Mr. Gajraj:** I object to that statement, because the hon. Minister cannot look into my head to know what I am thinking.

**Mrs. Jagan:** You must attend all of the Sessions.

**Mr. Tello:** I do not think that the Members of the Government should have dealt slightly with the matter I have raised, because there is a principle involved. I know that in other Departments a compromise was made, and people without the required qualifications have been appointed to fill certain posts. If that is the explanation in this particular case, let us put it on record. If that is not so, let us hear the whole story.

**The Chief Secretary:** I am afraid that I cannot carry the qualifications of every member of the Civil Service in my head because there are about 10,000 of them. When the hon. Member has a point like this, it would be very much better for him to see me in my office rather than raising it in this Council.

**Mr. Gajraj:** I beg to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### CHEMICALS AND APPARATUS

**Mr. Tello:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (3) — "Chemicals and Apparatus" \$5,000—by \$1. I notice that there is an increase of \$2,000 over the amount provided last

year. I wonder whether Government anticipates the hon. Nominated Member's point, and is now making preparation to obtain the necessary apparatus to assist the rice industry? I hope I have anticipated the Government correctly. I should like to make another observation. I am reliably informed that the cryoscope used in that Department for testing milk to see whether it contains water is no good. I am informed that in 1957 the instrument was sent to be repaired at a heavy cost to the taxpayers; it returned in December 1957, and all through 1958 the Department could not get this important instrument to work properly. I hope that the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing will look into the matter.

This is a matter that affects the health of the community. Very often people are charged with putting water in milk, and this causes a lot of trouble. We know that milk is the prime diet for children, adults and especially a sick person whose resistance may be low. Bad milk can affect the health of people for the balance of their lives. I understand that a substantial sum of money had been voted to repair the cryoscope, and I hope that the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing will look into the matter as early as possible.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I have visited that Department twice, but that was not brought to my attention. I assure the hon. Member that I will make inquiries.

**Mr. Beharry:** The Milk Pasteurization Plant has a laboratory for testing milk.

**Mr. Tello:** It is not reliable.

**Mr. Burnham:** May I inquire from the hon. Member under whose portfolio this Department falls, whether there are more than one cryoscope in the Department?

**Mrs. Jagan:** I will make inquiries.

**Mr. Burnham:** The hon Member said that she had visited the Department twice, and I thought she would have looked around to see what is there.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I was not looking for cryoscopes on those occasions.

**Mr. Burnham:** I wonder whether the hon. Minister knows what is a cryoscope.

**The Chairman:** That is not germane.

**Mr. Burnham:** If the only cryoscope in the Department is always under repair, then the certificates issued by the Analyst for people who have been convicted of having water in milk have been farces and the people may have been wrongly convicted.

**The Chairman:** When I said it was not germane I was referring to whether the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing knew what a cryoscope is.

**Mr. Burnham:** So many people have had to pay fines for unreliable analysis by the use of other instruments!

**Mr. Tello:** I beg to withdraw my Motion.

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 4 — Analyst — be carried out at the figure of \$54,892.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

**The Financial Secretary:** I beg to move that the Schedule appearing as the Appendix to the Finance Committee Report be inserted into the Bill, which contains the Heads and not the figures.

**Mr. Gajraj:** Does that mean that the figures put into the Report will be taken individually?

**The Chairman:** If Members wish them individually.

**Mr. Gajraj:** I do.

**Mr. Burnham:** Yes, very definitely. Otherwise the result would be that the Heads would be moved twice, and for a Government with no money that would be ridiculous.

**The Financial Secretary:** The Schedule carries no figures now, but what it says in the Standing Orders is that there should be a Motion that the revised Schedule in the Finance Committee Report should be accepted as the Schedule to the Bill.

**Mr. Burnham:** Which number, please?

**The Financial Secretary:** I am sorry. No. 43. It is just a question of convenience, but the end result is the same. I merely took the other way.

**Mr. Burnham:** Then, Mr. Chairman, I submit that under Standing Order 43 (9) we have been amiss so far, and the Financial Secretary has been doing the wrong thing.

**The Financial Secretary:** For the past three years—

**Mr. Burnham:** While that is so, *communis error non facit legem!* Now that we have our rules of procedure, the proper thing would be to call the Heads one by one.

## AUDIT

### OVERSEAS AUDIT

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I see sub-head 3 says, "Contribution to the Establishment of Director-General, Overseas Audit Service." I think in Chapter 69 of our Laws there is provision for a fixed sum of \$4,800. Will the Financial Secretary give us some information of the Overseas Audit Office, and how its work affects British Guiana?

**The Financial Secretary:** I think this is probably the fourth time I have explained this vote in this House. The office of the Director-General finally audits the Colonial Accounts, and this is because of the present responsibility of the Secretary of State for the Colonies for the finances of the Colonies. The expenses of this office are spread over the colonial administrations. The amount of money which is paid by each individual territory used to be determined

[THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY]

by the amount of revenue of that colony but, as I explained here some weeks ago, the amount has been revised, because of various other factors such as the number of Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes, outside amounts, commercial accounts and so on. In other words, the revenue of the colony is not in itself a true indication of the amount of work to be done on behalf of the Colony. I do not know if there is anything else Members would like to know.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I just want to know if the Director-General has ever challenged any items presented to him, and when he did so.

**The Financial Secretary:** Well, the Report of the Director-General is laid in the Council and, the hon. Member can look at it. Every year, by law, the Report is laid in this Council. In fact, I think one was laid only about two weeks ago.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** Has the Director-General any influence with, or is he consulted when we are seeking a loan from the Colonial Office?

**The Financial Secretary:** No, Sir.

**The Chairman:** The Financial Secretary has explained sub-head 4—

**Mr. Burnham:** I feel, Sir, that according to Standing Order 43 (10) it does not need to be done in any particular order.

**The Chairman:** But it should not go backwards and forwards.

**Mr. Burnham:** This special sub-order does not envisage such strict adherence to chronological order. If you so rule, Sir, I shall not insist.

**The Chairman:** The Question is, "That Head 5 — Audit — be carried out at \$151,697".

Agreed to.

## CENTRAL HOUSING AND PLANNING AUTHORITY

### PLANNING OFFICER

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move a reduction by \$1 of sub-head 1, item (1)—"Planning Officer", \$7,200. I do so for the purpose of having a certain matter clarified. It would appear that housing in British Guiana is a subject of triple control. There is the Minister of Housing, to whose control one can raise no objection, but there are also the Central Housing and Planning Authority and the Housing Department. The Central Housing and Planning Authority has at its head a Chairman, while the Housing Department has at its head the Commissioner of Housing. Very frequently there arises this difficulty, that where the Central Housing and Planning Authority may make a decision as to policy, that decision may well be ignored by the Commissioner of Housing in his capacity as the person in charge of the particular Housing Estate. I therefore feel that the time has come when there should be some amendment of the respective Ordinances.

Of course I appreciate that the Housing Department was set up at a time when money seemed to be no object, and efficiency not particularly regarded; when the only intention was to build as many houses as possible. But this dual control sometimes causes a great deal of difficulty, and very often is a source of embarrassment to the Central Housing and Planning Authority and, I am sure, also to the Commissioner of Housing. It is not a matter on which I speak for the purpose of criticising Government trenchantly, but rather to bring it to the notice of the Government so that this anomalous position may be remedied as early as possible.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I would like to inquire from Government whether a new series of houses are to be built under the Development Programme.

**The Chief Secretary:** The item under consideration deals with salary. It has

no relation to the building of houses.

**Mr. Burnham:** May I inquire from the Chief Secretary what are the duties of the Planning Officer whose salary we are expected to vote? I should have thought that he had to do with the planning of houses. If I am wrong a reduction can be moved under another Head.

**The Financial Secretary:** It can be dealt with when we are considering the Development Estimates.

**Mr. Burnham:** I merely wish to observe, with the leave of the Chair, that the Planning Officer is concerned with housing. In the first place he is connected with the Central Housing and Planning Authority, and in the second place I think his planning has to do with housing. If, however, he has to do with the planning of bridges then we can consider this question under another Head.

**The Chairman:** As far as housing is concerned I rule that it should not be dealt with under this sub-head as long as there is a proper Head. This item relates to salary.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I do not see any other Head under which it can be raised.

**The Chairman:** I have already ruled on that.

**Mr. Tello:** We are seeking your guidance, Sir.

**The Chairman:** You have studied the Estimates and there must be somewhere where housing can be dealt with.

**The Financial Secretary:** I do not see how these Estimates can contain any provision for housing which, under the Development Estimates, starts in 1960.

**Mr. Burnham:** It is true that this Head does not have provision for the building of houses, but may I observe that this is the Department which is responsible for the administration of the Department which is responsible for the

erection of houses, and as far as I know these officers superintend the building of houses.

**The Chairman:** It may well be that the item "Planning Officer" means what it says. I do not know what he actually does, but he is not a building officer. If your remarks are confined to planning it will be all right, and I have so ruled.

**Mr. Burnham:** You will recall, Sir, that when I moved a reduction of this sub-head I brought certain matters to the attention of the Government. I have not heard what the Government's reactions are.

**Mrs. Jagan:** Your observations have been noted.

**Mr. Burnham:** It seems that one has to beg for courtesy at this time of night. In the circumstances I ask to withdraw my Amendment.

#### BUILDING INSPECTOR

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I beg to move a reduction by \$1 of sub-head (5)—Building Inspector, \$2,400—in order to inquire as to the number of houses which are now being inspected by this Department.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I am sorry I do not know the number of houses which the Building Inspector inspects, but I would explain to the hon. Member that the Building Inspector inspects houses in connection with building applications made to the Central Housing and Planning Authority. If the hon. Member so wishes I could get the information and pass it on to him at another time.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** We should get some information with respect to the general condition of the Government Housing Estates. I refer particularly to the Costello houses. I think we should have some information as to the general condition, including painting, of the Government Housing Estates at Campbellville, Lodge Village and

[MR. JAI NARINE SINGH]  
Ruimveld, East and West.

**Mrs. Jagan:** Under this Head the Building Inspector inspects building when people apply for permission to extend their buildings or to build. As far as I am aware the Building Inspector does not examine buildings on the Government Housing Estates. He merely deals with applications which are made to the Authority by private citizens who wish to build or extend houses. If required I could arrange to get the information which could be submitted when we come to the appropriate Head in the Development Estimates.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** In the light of what the hon. Minister has said I beg to withdraw my Amendment.

#### SENIOR SURVEYOR

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I beg to move a reduction by \$1 of sub-head (6)—“Senior Surveyor”. From information I have received it appears that there is a considerable amount of land which Government has acquired at Ruimveld, East and West, which is still not built up. I would like to know what are Government’s immediate plans with respect to making those lands available to those persons who would like to build houses, and what credit facilities Government is willing to make available to such persons.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I think that is also a matter which should be dealt with under the Development Estimates.

**Mr. Tello:** There is a token vote here and there must be some urgent necessity for this officer. We thought we would have been given more detailed information rather than a mere reference. We hardly know what the Building Inspector is for.

**The Financial Secretary:** The Estimates indicate that the post of Senior Surveyor is to be abolished.

**Mr. Gajraj:** We understand that the

officer has left the Department, and it is intended to provide a post of Senior Surveyor elsewhere.

**The Financial Secretary:** The Estimates imply a transfer is pending, so I can only assume that he is to be absorbed in another Department which needs a surveyor.

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I beg to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**The Chairman:** The question is, That Head 6—Central Housing and Planning—be carried out at the figure of \$48,113. Those in favour please say “Aye”, those against “No”. I declare that the “Ayes” have it.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### CHIEF SECRETARY’S OFFICE

##### DEPUTY CHIEF SECRETARY

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (2)—“Deputy Chief Secretary” \$8,640—by \$1.

**The Chairman:** You cannot go back.

**Mr. Jackson:** The hon. Member for Georgetown South wishes to deal with the item before this.

##### CHIEF SECRETARY

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (1)—“Chief Secretary” \$11,520—by \$1. I understand that this post is now vacant. The last holder of the post is well-known to us, and we understand that he has been appointed to another post elsewhere. This is an important post, and British Guiana is certainly looking forward to the Guianization of the Public Service from the top downwards.

It gives me great pleasure at this juncture in our political development to see that an opportunity has arisen for a Guianese to direct our affairs. We would like that post filled by a Guianese. The Deputy Chief Secretary is a person for whom I have great regard and respect, but at the same time I know that Guianization is beating in the hearts of every Guianese. It is part of the life of the community, and we would not like this opportunity to pass by without expressing our sentiments as forcibly as we can in this matter.

**The Financial Secretary:** Why should we reduce the Chief Secretary's salary by \$1 if a Guianese is to be appointed?

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh:** The hon. the Financial Secretary does not seem to take the matter very seriously, but I would like to remind him that in Trinidad the Chief Secretary is a West Indian and we must go in that direction. The time will come when the highest posts in the land must be held by Guianese. I have made my point, and I beg to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### DEPUTY CHIEF SECRETARY

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (2) — "Deputy Chief Secretary" \$8,640—by \$1. The experiences of Trade Unions dealing with the Government through the Central Secretariat makes us feel that there is something wrong with his Department, and it is felt that there are not enough persons on the level there who can take responsibility. Those Trade Unions which represent Government workers find it difficult to get their problems attended to with the speed with which they ought to be handled, and it is felt that if more officers in the Secretariat were given responsibility to handle certain matters conditions would be improved considerably.

It is felt that there is too large a cir-

cuit through which representations must pass, and because of this method very much delay is experienced. I would have thought the Government would have realized that the treatment of representations by Trade Unions should be given priority and serious consideration, and that the only solution to the problem would be to appoint another Deputy Chief Secretary who could be given the responsibility of dealing with matters arising from Trade Unions representing employees of Government. These organizations represent thousands of workers, and the problems which arise are many — enough to keep an officer fully employed. I feel that the time has come to ask Government to give this matter serious consideration.

**Mr. Burnham:** May I inquire what has happened? I saw an announcement in the Press some time ago that a Deputy Chief Secretary had been appointed. However, the person whom we know to be the Deputy Chief Secretary is still with us. Can we find out whether there will be two holders of one post? May I point out that there is only provision for one post of Deputy Chief Secretary in the Estimates.

**The Chief Secretary:** There is only one post and I am here.

**Mr. Burnham:** Do we understand that the announcement in the Press is inaccurate? I think some announcement should be made, lest people go away with the idea that we want to change our present Deputy Chief Secretary.

**The Chief Secretary:** I do not see the reason for raising the matter now.

**Mr. Burnham:** We should have had the Estimates about four months ago, but as a result of the tardiness of the Government the Estimates did not reach us until 1959.

**The Chief Secretary:** The hon. Member could have asked a question.

**Mr. Burnham:** Such questions are not very well answered by the Chief Secretary.

**Mr. Jackson:** Will the Chief Secretary comment on the point I have raised?

**The Chief Secretary:** I have listened to your suggestion, and I will give it some examination. You do not just alter your establishment off-hand.

**Mr. Jackson:** Will the matter be considered?

**The Chief Secretary:** I always consider everything the hon. Member says.

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

CONTROLLER OF GOVERNMENT  
PRINTING AND STATIONERY

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (9) — "Controller of Government Printing and Stationery" \$6,540—by \$1. I cannot understand why there has been this increase of \$1,980 in one year. This seems to be a very big jump, and I do not know which scale merits so great an increment that an officer who gets \$4,560 in 1958 should be paid \$6,540 in 1959, an increase of \$1,980.

**The Chief Secretary:** I think the figure for 1958 was under-estimated.

**Mr. Burnham:** In 1958 there was a Controller of Government Printing and Stationery. This item appeared in last year's Estimates, and Government knew at the time what it proposed to pay the Controller of Government Printing and Stationery. I am not suggesting that the person concerned is not worthy of his hire, but it is certainly not efficiency on the part of the Government to under-estimate expenditure on emoluments — in this case the difference is \$1,980. I am prepared at the moment to accept the answer of the Chief Secretary who is not to be blamed. Of those who are gone, speak no ill.

I understand that there is a post of Controller of Government Printing and a post of Supervisor. Is that so? At least I know that there are two individuals connected with Government printing. I think one is Mr. Rawlins and the other is Mr. Faria.

**The Chief Secretary:** One of the officers the hon. Member is referring to is an Administrative Officer in the Chief Secretary's Office who handles ministerial matters.

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg leave to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

SUPERNUMERARY CONSTABLES

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (12)— "Supernumerary Constables" \$960—by \$1. For some time I have been trying to get an undertaking from the Government that Supernumerary Constables would be permitted to join an organization of their choice such as a Trade Union. Last year I was given an assurance that the matter would be gone into and action would be taken on it.

**The Chief Secretary:** To a point of order, Sir! This is not concerned with Establishment.

**The Chairman:** Does it relate to this Head? The right of a constable—

**Mr. Jackson:** I would have thought so, Sir.

**The Chairman:** I think, it would be in other realms. I am not saying that he should not join a trade union or anything like that, but I do not see how it touches upon this Head.

**Mr. Jackson:** I am referring to a post, and not to an officer as such. The fact is that the holder of the post has not got a channel through which he can voice his representations, as other people have.



**Mr. Tello:** Salaries are always associated with conditions of employment. It is no use appropriating the salary and the holder of the post has not got the freedom which is a universal right of free people.

**The Chairman:** I do not think you can bring it in under this Head.

**Mr. Jackson:** All right, I will bring it up under another Head, because I want to express myself on behalf of people who have not got the right to join some organisation. Therefore, I beg to withdraw my Motion.

#### TEMPORARY CLERICAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Burnham:** I move the reduction of item (14) — "Temporary Clerical Assistance" — by \$1. What is the sum of putting down in the Estimates the sum of \$10? It is no use telling us it is a token vote. Certainly the Chief Secretary must know if he will need temporary clerical assistance. This vote of \$10 will probably mean that he will come back here and ask for a supplementary vote.

**The Chief Secretary:** One cannot make realistic estimates on such items, and what is done now, is always done. I think I am right in saying that in respect of other types of personnel it is necessary to come back here for a supplementary vote.

**Mr. Burnham:** I ask leave to withdraw the Motion.

**The Chairman:** The question is, that the Head 7 — "Chief Secretary's Office" — be carried at the figure of \$69,668.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### ESTABLISHMENT

##### ADMINISTRATIVE CADETS

**Mr. Burnham:** I notice here that there is provision for Administrative Cadets. It is my opinion that there is not sufficient use made of persons coming back from the University College of the

West Indies, to have them appointed to these cadetships.

Just some time last year we had quite a few young Guianese, some of them scholars, some of them private students, who had qualified at the University College of the West Indies and who, when they came back here, could not obtain any Administrative Cadetships. It was advised by our last Chief Secretary that they must think of loyalty more than remuneration. Of course, if I were in their places, I would have asked him to consider the reduction of his salary, which was nearly \$12,000 a year. But that was the cynicism expressed by that officer, which was typical of Government's policy in this respect.

After these students have spent years qualifying; they have been sufficiently patriotic to come back to British Guiana to seek employment, which in all cases they could have got abroad. In places like Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad people who have gone to the University College of the West Indies and enhanced their qualifications have got employment. It seems to me that until I can be told something authoritatively by the Acting Chief Secretary, I will conclude that the Government has no policy with regard to Administrative Cadets.

One hears that Government wants these candidates to have an Honours Degree. Of course, an Honours Degree does not really mean anything more at this level than a General Degree. That is my feeling. So haphazard is Government's policy in this respect that it tends to give grounds to a rumour which I had not believed, a rumour which I would like to see scotched; and I would like to see every possible opportunity given to Guianese returning with degrees.

**The Chief Secretary:** I am sorry that the hon. Member finds it necessary to criticize the last holder of this office, particularly when he is not in a position to reply. I do not know what he said. As for qualifications for the post of Cadet in Finance Committee the view was expressed that the insistence on an Hon-

[THE CHIEF SECRETARY]

ours Degree was making it difficult to get suitable candidates. I am now able to tell the hon. Member that we now accept a General Degree as well. As to the accusation about favouritism, there is no twisting and turning. The policy is to bring in well-educated Guianese at the Cadet level of the Administrative service. I only wish we could bring in some more, but obviously one has to match the number of Cadet posts with the number of higher posts in the Administrative service to which they will graduate after completing their period as Cadets.

After a Cadet has served his or her term, he or she expects, quite rightly, to go on from there to a substantive post, but we can only have a certain number of higher administrative posts every year. The Cadetships are intended to give promising men and women inside and outside the Service and who possess the necessary qualifications an opportunity to enter the Administrative service through competitive examination, and the number of these Cadetships must be limited each year. The fact that more people are coming back than we can offer posts is something to be regretted.

**Mr. Burnham:** I appreciate in part what the hon. the Chief Secretary said, but perhaps my naiveté can be excused; I cannot see why other West Indian territories are able to absorb into their Service *pro rata* a higher number of graduates from the University College of the West Indies. Is it perhaps they are pursuing the West Indianization of their Service more actively than we are seeking the Guianization of ours?

The hon. the Chief Secretary said it is not possible to take in so many, and he said one has to have regard to the higher posts, but can he excuse the absence of policy on what criteria the number six is based?

**The Chief Secretary:** If the hon. Member can give me facts and figures relating to the West Indian Islands, I may be able to tell him whether they have done more than we have done.

As far as Guianization is concerned, with the exception of one officer who is a specialist officer in the Administrative field, all the others are Guianese.

**Mr. Burnham:** There are higher posts in certain respects, and I may say that District Administration has been Guianized long ago.

**The Chief Secretary:** You have to start at the bottom before you can reach to the top.

**Mr. Burnham:** I did not quite hear, but the only trouble about it is that we Guianese have been at the bottom so long, that our rate of progress to the top is slow. Too slow! When one looks at the Service in the West Indies one sees the West Indian from the top to the bottom. Why are we groping so long at the bottom? Why are we stuck at the morass so long? Perhaps the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry can tell us.

**Dr. Jagan:** As the Leader of the "Opposition", if the hon. Member had not taken the stand he has, we would have got further.

**Mr. Burnham:** I attribute that remark to the lateness of the evening. The leader of the Majority Party is in the Executive Council, and as a Guianese it is his duty to speak on behalf of Guianese in the Executive Council, and see that Guianese come first and that they move on much faster. I have no quarrel with the Officials; it is not their duty and not in their interest to represent Guianese. That is the duty of the Leader of the Majority Party.

**The Chief Secretary:** I do resent hearing that it is not in my interest to represent Guianese. It is the declared policy of the Government, and we are doing it all the time.

**Mr. Burnham:** When I said that it is not in their interest I meant that their interest in the matter cannot be as strong as that of the Majority Party. There is many a lapse between a declaration of policy and its implementation. These

declarations of policy were being made when I was in knee pants, but I have been wearing long pants for some years now, and they are still to be implemented.

**Dr. Jagan :** The hon. Member has taken opportunity to attack the Majority Party, but may I point out to him that what is done in the secret chamber of the Executive Council cannot be disclosed here. I would like to know that the Majority Party has no voice in the appointment of senior officials in the Government, neither does it have any say in the selection of personnel for the Civil Service. I want that to be clearly understood, so let him stop all this nonsense.

**Mr. Burnham :** I must object. I think the word "nonsense" in the context is unparliamentary. Now that we have been informed of the fact I am going to assume that I have been talking nonsense. We are told that the Majority Party has no voice in the Establishment, but what is the view of the Majority Party? It is all very well to say that you have no voice. We know that we have no say because we have no right under the Constitution, but we want to know what is your view, and let your view be stated in the presence of your colleagues.

**Dr. Jagan :** We have expressed strong views on this matter from time to time.

**Mr. Burnham :** Strong views in what direction, and when were they expressed? We would like to hear them expressed here. Is the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry afraid of embarrassment?

**The Chairman :** May I put your Amendment?

**Mr. Burnham :** I beg to withdraw it.

**The Chairman :** The question is, that Head 7A—Establishment—be carried at the figure of \$167,966.

Agreed to.

## INFORMATION SERVICES

### CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

**Mr. Tello :** I beg to move a reduction by \$1 of sub-head 1, item (1) — Chief Information Officer", \$7,200. I desire to draw the Council's attention to the recent development in the publications and broadcasts of the Government Information Services. I take for my pattern the information broadcast service of the B.B.C., and I listen regularly to their Home Service as well as their Overseas Service, to Government information and otherwise. The Bulletin and the radio broadcasts by the Government Information Services each evening and almost on every Government programme have deteriorated into publicity of certain Members of the Government. I can tell this Council what I will hear tomorrow morning—that the hon. Minister of so and so will travel to such and such a place, or the hon. Minister said so and so. If the B.B.C. were to put on the air what each Minister in the United Kingdom was doing or contemplated doing that would be all we would hear each day and each night for 24 hours.

I want to say quite frankly that it is public opinion that the G.I.S. has deteriorated into being used as an instrument of the Majority Party. Actually what is happening is that the taxpayers are now called upon to meet the cost of a very important branch of the propaganda machinery of the Majority Party. That is public opinion. Today people do not bother to listen to the G.I.S. broadcasts other than possibly what is under the control of the British Council. Folk already know what they are going to hear about the activities of the various Ministers. I have a great deal of respect for the Chief Information Officer and the other officers associated with the G.I.S., but it seems that they are under some sort of pressure; they do not seem to be sufficiently free. They are the officers who operated the service some time ago, and I know they released information as facts and not what they think ought to be facts. I think it was a natural information service, a reliable service, a service to educate the masses about the

principal activities of the Government in the interest of the Colony as a whole.

We are trying to test the sincerity of the Government in this Council. The hon. Member for New Amsterdam suggested that the Debates—especially these Debates on the Budget—should be broadcast. Quite suddenly we heard the hurried “No”.

**Mr. Benn :** Do you want this on the radio?

**Mr. Burnham :** It is much better than the voice I heard tonight talking to teachers.

**Mr. Tello :** I have listened to the Debates in Trinidad over the radio, and it does not seem to have done any harm to Trinidadians. I cannot see how it would harm the people in British Guiana.

**Mr. Benn :** This ?

**Mr. Tello :** I believe the Minister of Community Development and Education is so intoxicated with his importance that he feels that only the things which emanate from his Party are worthy of consideration. This would give the people an opportunity to get proper information, and they would be in a position to make suggestions for the improvement of the service they are paying for.

I feel very strongly about this matter. I know this officer is a genuine man who wants to serve his country, but the sudden change is so apparent that we must take it into consideration. I notice that hon. Members of the Government have been trying to shelve their responsibility by supporting the points of view that some people express. I hope that when his side of the Council have expressed themselves fully on this matter we will receive a reply. We are anxious to know what is responsible for this change—a change not in the interest of the Colony.

The hon. Members who are now saying that the G.I.S. Bulletin is doing a very good job are the same people who have expressed the opinion inside and outside of this Council

that the Government Information Services is a waste of taxpayers' money. I wonder what is responsible for the change of opinion that it is now a good service, and is worthy of the taxpayers' investment in it? I suggest that the reason why the Majority Party has changed its view of the Government Information Services is because what I have said is one hundred per cent. true.

**Mr. Ram Karran :** That is a lie.

**Mr. Tello :** Some people do not know the true definition of words, and in this case my hon. Friend suffers from that. What I have said is merely voicing the opinion of the general public. If you were to test public opinion by a vote on whether or not the Government Information Services should be continued, you would be surprised at the results.

**Mrs. Jagan :** Why didn't you say that two years ago?

**The Chairman :** Order, please. If the hon. Member wishes to address the Chair she can do so. I do not think she should answer across the Table.

**Mr. Tello :** I thought you would have protected me more than that, Sir. I think I have the floor.

**The Chairman :** It is all very well for Members to say that, but when Members permit themselves to be involved in answers across the Table both parties are blameworthy. I have heard an expression on two or three separate occasions during this debate—two Ministers shouted across the Table the words “That is a lie”. I wish to say that such language is undignified in this Council. I said nothing before, but I find that it is being repeated too often. I hope hon. Members will not derogate from the high standard that is required of them in the Legislative Council Chamber.

**Mr. Tello :** May I draw your attention to the time?

**The Chairman :** I am quite willing to stop if Members wish to do so.

**Dr. Jagan :** I suggest that we complete this Head.

**Mr. Jackson :** It was proposed that we work from 8.15 p.m. to 10.00 p.m.

**The Chairman :** I suggested that we begin at 8.15 p.m. and work for two hours. I am entirely in your hands.

**Mr. Gajraj :** We should adjourn now.

**Mr. Tello :** I am not likely to finish tonight.

**The Financial Secretary :** Let us go on until 10.15 p.m.

**The Chairman :** If hon. Members wish to continue you may move a motion if you so desire. I am at your service up to midnight or later.

**Mr. Beharry :** I beg to move that the Council adjourn until tomorrow.

**The Financial Secretary :** I beg to move that the Council resume.

Question put, and agreed to.

Council resumed.

#### ADJOURNMENT AND PENDING BUSINESS

**Mr. Speaker :** So far as I am con-

cerned, the question of subsequent sittings is purely a matter for hon. Members. If Members wish to sit on Wednesday night, Friday night and Saturday night, I am available, but I will not be available on Thursday night.

**The Chief Secretary :** The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, raised the point on the adjournment this afternoon that we should endeavour to fix a definite hour for the week. I think both sides of the Council agree that we should have two sittings each day with a break for tea for the rest of the week.

**Mr. Speaker :** I am not available on Thursday. I wish that some intimation will be given to the Speaker whenever there is an agreement among Members as to the time Council should sit, before the Speaker enters this Chamber.

**The Chief Secretary :** I beg to move the adjournment of Council until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

**The Speaker :** Council stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.