

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 19th DECEMBER, 1946.

The Council met at 2 p.m., His Excellency the Officer Administering the Government, Mr. W. L. Heape, C.M.G., President, in the Chair.

### PRESENT

The President, His Excellency the Officer Administering the Government, Mr. W. L. Heape, C.M.G.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. D. J. Parkinson (acting).

The Hon. the Attorney-General, Mr. E. M. Duke (acting).

The Hon. the Colonial Treasurer, Mr. W. O. Fraser (acting).

The Hon. E. G. Woolford, O.B.E., K.C. (New Amsterdam).

The Hon. C. V. Wight (Western Essequibo).

The Hon. J. I. de Aguiar (Central Demerara).

The Hon. H. N. Critchlow (Nominated).

The Hon. J. B. Singh, O.B.E. (Demerara-Essequibo).

The Hon. F. Dias, O.B.E. (Nominated).

The Hon. E. A. Luckhoo, O.B.E. (Eastern Berbice).

The Hon. J. Gonsalves, O.B.E. (Georgetown South).

The Hon. Peer Bacchus (Western Berbice).

The Hon. H. C. Humphrys, K.C. (Eastern Demerara).

The Hon. C. R. Jacob (North Western District).

The Hon. T. Lee (Essequibo River).

The Hon. V. Roth (Nominated).

The Hon. C. P. Ferreira (Berbice River).

The Hon. T. T. Thompson (Nominated).

The Hon. W. J. Raatgever (Nominated).

The Hon. G. A. C. Farnum (Nominated).  
The Hon. J. A. Veerasawmy (Nominated).

The Clerk read prayers.

### OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT administered the Oath of Allegiance to Mr. E. M. Duke, Acting Attorney-General, who then took his seat.

### MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, the 11th December, 1946, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

### PAPER LAID

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. Parkinson) laid on the table the following document :—

The Telephone (Amendment) Regulations No. 20 of 1946.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICE

#### WAREHOUSING REGULATIONS

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Mr. Duke) gave notice of the following motion :—

"That, this Council approves of the Warehousing Charges Regulations, 1946."

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Members will see that there is in the schedule to the Order Paper, Regulations made by the Comptroller of Customs and which are to have the approval of this Council. The Regulations deal with warehousing fees and they are the result of a Committee appointed by the Governor. I think I am right in saying that the Colonial Treasurer would like to have them dealt with this year. Am I not right, Mr. Treasurer?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I do not know if they are controversial. Perhaps hon. Members would agree to have them dealt

with as the first item on the Order of the Day, tomorrow.

Agreed to.

### ORDER OF THE DAY

#### PURCHASE OF U.S.O. CLUB BUILDINGS

Mr. JACOB, on behalf of Mr. LEE, asked and the COLONIAL SECRETARY laid over replies to the following questions :—

- Q. 1—Does Government contemplate buying, or has it arranged to buy the buildings of the U.S.O. Club, when they are vacated by the present holders ?
- A. —Yes, Sir : In November, 1945, in response to an enquiry from the United States authorities as to whether Government would be interested in the purchase of the buildings when vacated by the U.S.O., a provisional offer of \$38,000 was made. The United States Government has not yet indicated whether it would be prepared to accept this offer.
- Q. 2—In the event of buying, has Government any definite plan for using these buildings ?
- A. —It is considered that the best use for the premises would be to provide accommodation for Government departments at present housed temporarily in residential premises, and thus relieve to some extent the shortage of housing in Georgetown. A Committee consisting of the Acting Colonial Secretary, the Acting Colonial Treasurer and the Commissioner of Local Government is considering the question of which Departments should be allocated space in the buildings.
- Q. 3—If so, what is that plan ?
- Q. 4—Does Government actually contemplate using them to house Government Departments ?
- Q. 5—If so, what Departments and why ?
- Q. 6—Would Government consider handing them over to some suitable body to organize and run as a Hostel for Working Girls ?
- A. —See answer 2.

### ESTIMATES, 1947

The Council resumed the debate on the following motion :—

“That, this Council approves the Estimates of Expenditure to be defrayed from revenue during the year ending 31st December, 1947, which have been laid on the table.”

Mr. RAATGEVER : Sir, on behalf of the Unofficial Members, I desire to express appreciation to Your Excellency of the opportunity afforded us of discussing among ourselves the details of the Draft Estimates. I am happy to report, sir, that hon. Members attended the meetings regularly and co-operated with each other, showing their whole-hearted appreciation of this method. I think this opportunity of examining the Estimates is very desirable and should be continued in future. The decisions reached have been handed to Your Excellency, and it is proposed, for purposes of procedure and regularity, to take each Head in sequence and to move in the amendments recommended as we come to them. We have not yet considered two items under head XLV (Colonial Emergency Measures) — item 1 — Miscellaneous, and item 2 — Subsidization — but we propose to meet early to make recommendations under these Heads and to consider ways and means.

Dr. SINGH : I would like to say something in connection with the Budget speech. Those of us who have heard the Colonial Treasurer's fine Budget Statement must take this opportunity to congratulate him on his lucid review and his straightforward details. He did not lead us into a morass of intricate figures, but explained everything so clearly that even the ordinary layman could come to some conclusion of his own. There is no doubt about it that the Colony enjoyed a fair measure of financial prosperity during the last three years of World War No. 2, when Government expenditure rose from \$7,000,000 to over \$14,000,000. In spite of this increased expenditure, there was a correspondingly higher revenue which left the Colony with a considerable surplus. This period of prosperity has seemingly ended but, sir, we do hope that with careful consideration we

would be able to improve conditions next year.

We cannot but recall that during the early years of the War that has just ended we had to wonder how we were going to meet the extraordinary expenditure we had to bear but, fortunately—and I may call it a stroke of good luck—we were able not only to meet our obligations, but to leave ourselves with a surplus also. Similarly, sir, I feel that with capitalists in the U.S.A. and Canada focussing their adventurous minds on British Guiana in the hope of exploring the potentialities of the country—working our mineral and timber resources—along with the plan that has been envisaged for expanding our rice production in order to supply the Caribbean area with even more grain, and other plans for expanding the sugar and other industries—those are all factors which, when they materialize, will benefit this country to a very great extent.

The fact remains that the transactions during the year 1946 have resulted in a deficit of over \$2,000,000. Subsidization has been responsible to a great extent for this, but it was introduced in order to ease the high cost of living. We are hopeful, however, that with assistance from the United Kingdom this deficit will be reduced to a sum below \$2,000,000. Then again, we have to face a deficit for 1947—one that will be around \$1,500,000. It has been suggested that we should increase taxation on luxuries and other commodities, but I feel, sir, that this is not the moment to increase taxation.

With regard to the working of the Transport and Harbours Department, there seems to be some improvement and I hope that there will be a decrease in expenditure and, perhaps, a saving under this Head. There is a possibility of reduction under Colonial Emergency Measures, and there is also a possibility that expenditure on Subsidization will be reduced during the coming year. With these decreases, sir, and with the hoped-for increase in the production of bauxite, timber, gold, diamonds and other resources, I feel that we will be able to meet the deficit in 1947. I can assure you, sir, that the people of the Colony are not in a position or in the mood to take on extra taxation. We must

be optimistic, however, and we have to plan. We have to cut our coat according to our cloth. We must not take up a defeatist attitude. As I have said, we were in a most frightful position in the year 1945, but by good fortune we have been able to overcome it.

Mr. LUCKHOO: I should just like to say a few words in this matter. It is usual to criticise or support Government in any particular line of policy but, unfortunately, in this case we have a Budget Statement without any particular line of policy. I am aware, however, that we have at present several schemes engaging Government's attention. I am also aware of the activities of Government during the last few years, and I can assure Your Excellency of the whole-hearted co-operation of Members in any practical measure for the benefit of the people of this Colony. We must bear in mind that whatever we do we must place in the forefront the welfare and advancement of the people of the Colony. I think it is very fortunate that the suggestion has been made that Members of this Council should be given an opportunity of going through the items of expenditure in order to make recommendations, as to how the deficiency might be met. We have heard from the Colonial Treasurer, I think, a very clear statement relating to the finances of the Colony and I wish to join the hon. Member who has just taken his seat in congratulating the Treasurer in that respect.

It is very necessary that Members of this Council should carry out a continuous and rigorous scrutiny of all the expenditure in the Estimates, and I hope that all Heads of Departments would see to it that all expenditure incurred is properly controlled for the benefit of the people of the Colony. There is a note in the Treasurer's Statement requesting Heads of Departments to take their own initiative in bringing to Government's attention any possible way of effecting a saving in their Departments. That, I think, is a wise suggestion to make. Great care should be exercised in the revision of the Estimates, and wherever it is possible to effect any reduction without doing injustice to the Service as a whole I think we should support such a measure. We must, however, see that the Colony is

not involved in any further difficulties from which it would require greater sacrifice to rescue it. We must bear in mind that we are trustees of the people of the Colony and, as such, we promise Your Excellency our whole-hearted support and co-operation, and we shall see that no unnecessary expenditure is passed by this Council.

There are some very big projects before Government at the present time. Several memoranda have been sent to me about them and I think it is a good effort on the part of Government to put before the general public the plans for the development not only of the coastlands, but also the interior of the Colony. I am also aware of Government's activities in so far as the rice industry is concerned and I hope that when the schemes have been put into effect there will be an increase in the production of rice, particularly in the county of Berbice where the people have been provided with better drainage and irrigation so that they may be able to secure good results from their crops even in the face of adverse weather conditions. These facilities have greatly encouraged the people on the Corentyne coast, and I wish to say that they are extremely grateful for them because they would be able to get the fullest possible benefit from their labour.

There is no question, sir, that the rice industry is going to take a hold in this Colony. As I said years ago—and as I still maintain—it is primarily due to the initiative of the East Indians that the rice industry has reached such a pitch, and it is now being taken up by other people also in the Colony. The industry has been the means of helping peasant proprietors to put their lands in order, and it has also enabled them to muster sufficient money to build decent houses and carry out sanitary measures required by law. We will have to increase production in every possible way, however, if we are to meet the increased expenditure for which the Budget calls. I am glad to know that there has been a saving in the operations of the Transport and Harbours Department due, no doubt, to the initiative of the present Management. I hope steps would be taken by other Heads of Departments to see where savings could be effected so as to relieve to some extent at least, the

heavy burden of taxation which is being carried by the people of the Colony.

Mr. JACOB: It has been my privilege—nay, an honour—to address hon. Members of this Council on 12 Budgets since I have been a representative of the people here, and it is only on this occasion that I have found myself in substantial agreement with the Budget as presented. I wish I could have said that the Budget is the combined work of the Official and Unofficial Members of this Council, but I hope—and I hope sincerely—that the co-operation that has been started will be continued for the benefit of the Colony as a whole. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Raatgever, referred to what has been achieved and I would like to endorse all that he has said. There are, of course, certain details with which I am not in entire agreement and I shall endeavour to point them out; but, before I do so I wish to give credit to Lieut.-Colonel Spencer, Economic Adviser to this Government, and also to the Acting Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Fraser, for the very active work they have done and the ability they have shown in performing their duties. I know their job has been somewhat tedious and, therefore, all the more credit is due to them.

I should also like to give credit to the Unofficial Members of this Council who are Members of the Executive Council for the part they have played. We have been told that they have been responsible for reducing the Estimates as presented to this Council by about \$450,000 and I trust that the co-operation and interest recently shown between the Unofficial Members who discussed matters with Executive Council will continue. The idea which some of us had in the past that Members of the Executive Council had some secret for Government has been removed. I trust that the same co-operation would exist in future and I should also like to appeal to Government as a representative of the Unofficial section, that it is their duty to secure the approval of the majority of the Unofficial Members of this Council whenever Government takes a decision on any particular matter. As Your Excellency has seen, there will be very few controversial issues relating to the Budget, because the majority of the issues have been

ironed out and we have come to substantial agreement.

I have listened with some amusement to the hon. Member for Demerara-Essequibo, but I really could not understand what the hon. Member said. Is it the intention to levy more taxation to meet the deficit that has been presented to this Council? If that is so, let me say at the outset that I am entirely opposed to this method of budgeting. Let me give some figures: In 1945 the deficit was \$2,407,491 and in 1946 it was \$2,892,115. That is a total of \$5,299,606 in the last two years.

The PRESIDENT: Are you dealing with the Estimates?

Mr. JACOB: Yes; we are discussing the question of balancing the Budget. Nothing was done on those two occasions to balance the Budget and I say the Government blundered very, very badly. Is the hon. Member for Demerara-Essequibo now suggesting that we should continue to blunder? I cannot imagine that. I wish to say again that it is the duty of this Government to balance its Budget year by year, and that policy should have been started years ago. I am not here to place any blame, but the thing is so obvious to me. We have had a very energetic Administrator who was also a very energetic politician but a politician of a kind. I do not know what I am—perhaps I am a businessman—but I would not run my business with a Budget deficit year after year. I would balance my Budget and make provision for lean years, for it is well known that there are such things as lean years.

I do not know what is the view of Government, but I know that there are lean years ahead. I do advise very strongly that we take steps to balance the Budget this year. The Economic Adviser (Lt.-Col. Spencer) referred in the course of his address to Sir Gordon Lethem's policy and I should like to quote from the *Daily Chronicle* of December 6, where the Economic Adviser said

"I have not used any such words as "new financial deal" as that might suggest a fundamental change in policy and I would not like to sup-

port such a suggestion. As Your Excellency has already pointed out, it is a genuine continuation of the policy of Sir Gordon Lethem and one in respect of which I had the privilege of constant discussion with him and, I may say, met with his appreciation and general approval....."

Well, sir, I am not an economist, nor am I a Civil Servant. There is a tradition among Civil Servants and I do not mind that, but I cannot reconcile myself to the statement that this is a continuation of Sir Gordon Lethem's policy. I have criticised the Budget during the last few years, very, very seriously, and I am happy now because there has been a change of policy. Col. Spencer tells us, however, that there has been no change of policy. I will just leave that as it is. Even the *Daily Argosy*, that conservative paper—if I may just quote one sentence from it—stated in its editorial columns on December 8:

"The practice of spending in excess of revenue destroys credit and spoils one's good name in financial circles and British Guiana, now on the brink of industrial expansion, must be free from this stigma."

I endorse every word. I have stated in this Council, I think on not less than three occasions, that the method of budgeting in this Colony will damage the credit of this Colony. Whether it has damaged it or not I do not know, but I am not prepared to accept and I shall oppose in every possible way any suggestion of budgeting for a deficit in the future, from this year. I think I have made the point, but I want to make it quite clear that whatever surplus we have should not be touched, and that some arrangement should be made to put it in a reserve.

When it comes to Revenue, I am afraid I cannot quite agree with the Estimates that have been presented to this Council. I am in the unfortunate position of not being able to get at the comparative figures. But, sir, from the figures that have been presented I am fully satisfied there has been under-estimation in respect of Customs, Excise Duty and Licences, particularly *Ad Valorem* Duties, Specific Duties, Export Tax, Bill of Entry Tax and Rum Duty. I

ask Government to go into those Heads very carefully and, I am sure, it will be found that there is no reason, for instance, to put down \$75,000 only for Export Tax when large quantities of articles are being exported from this Colony.

The PRESIDENT: I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member, but I think it would help if I do. Actually, I consulted Col. Spencer on several of the Heads, and on reconsideration it is agreed that the Export Tax is put too low. We can indeed add to it \$5,000. Your point is well taken on the Export Tax.

Mr. JACOB: I think it should be \$100,000, but from my knowledge of these things I think that has been definitely under-estimated. I cannot understand why Rum Duty which was \$1,707,404 actual revenue in 1945 and \$1,700,000 revised estimate for 1946 should be put down now for a sum of \$1,600,000—\$100,000 less—when it has been stated quite clearly that the consumption of rum will be more than this year's. I am not referring to the increase that has been suggested. I am referring to Revenue based on the existing taxation. I think that Rum Duty should be possibly \$300,000 more. I feel that *Ad Valorem* Duties should be higher in Revenue because this Colony has been starved of various items, especially necessities, owing to war conditions and I cannot imagine this Government continuing its policy not to make increased applications for commodities of all kinds, essentials and non-essentials, from wherever we can get them. I think those Members who are engaged in the same business as I am can say, if they will take the trouble to think, that we must have increased imports into this Colony. Why those Heads of Revenue should be at the same figure, amazes me. However, I may agree on this occasion that it may be well to be on the conservative side by about a few thousand dollars in certain items, when in the last few years you were on the conservative side by millions. Then I must say that my criticisms in the past were well and truly founded.

Now, sir, I urge on this Government to make application very early for all articles that are required to come into

this Colony. I urge that for several reasons. The first is that we should have increased Customs *ad valorem* duties as regards revenue to give people an opportunity to live fuller and better lives and to have the country developed. There must be no debt so as to have this country developed for various reasons. I urge, and not too strongly, that every effort should be made that businessmen be not restricted and hampered when they can import goods into the Colony. That is unfortunately so at the present time, and men with initiative just do nothing but sit down and wait. That is not good for the Colony; it is not good for anyone; it is not good for the exporting countries. Let me repeat, every item of necessities and luxuries that can be had abroad should be allowed to come into the Colony. There may be financial difficulties—international financial difficulties—but I think our needs here should be paramount. We should get those goods. I think that Revenue has been under-estimated by at least half a million dollars, and so that will possibly reduce the deficit by a good sum. I am not suggesting, however, that my figures should be taken and that additional taxation should not be levied to meet the deficit that appears here.

Turning to Expenditure, we have had various criticisms in the Press. Letters have been sent to the Press but they have not been published. One or two have come to me without any names and they have suggested that certain things, particularly the Education vote should not be increased as the Colony is not getting value for it. I want to say that that is a theory which has been exploded a good time now—long ago. The man who wants the education system that we have to continue is not a friend and is not even true to himself much less to the country that gives him everything he wants. I am going to refer to Education a little later on, but I want to endorse what has been stated by Lt.-Col. Spencer and, if I am permitted. I would just refer briefly to one or two items he mentions in regard to Expenditure. Col. Spencer has made a very excellent point—that the expenditure on Health, Education and Poor Law cannot be reduced—but I want to make the point that expenditure under these Heads should

and must be increased. We cannot continue to allow the children to go uneducated, whatever that education is. Three out of every ten children are not in the schools, and Col. Spencer has given certain figures here. He says we have 45,000 pupils on roll with 1,500 teachers and that is 30 pupils per teacher. That is substantially correct, but those are the figures up to August, 1946. The number on roll now is 63,046 with an average attendance of 47,756. I am afraid Col. Spencer took the average attendance and called that the number on roll. The teachers number 1,528 and the average per teacher of pupils attending school is 32, whereas the average for the pupils on roll is 42.

Now, sir, I have taken a very lively interest in Elementary Education, and I invite all those hon. Members of this Council and those who are not in this Council who want to see the Education vote reduced to visit some of the schools in Georgetown and in the outlying districts and see conditions for themselves. Some schools have as many as 80 pupils to a teacher, the accommodation is not sufficient and it is impossible for the children to learn, and that is one of the reasons why the education given is so faulty in this Colony. In some outlying districts you have 10 pupils in a class. And so when an average is given, as 30 or 32, or even 42 for the pupils on the register, that may be doubled in some cases and halved in other cases. So I say this Colony must face the fact that the Education Vote must be increased, and it may be increased according to circumstances and according to the Revenue that the Colony gets, I am wholly in disagreement with any person—it does not matter who he is—in this Colony who thinks the vote must not be increased.

When it comes to Health Services take a walk to the Hospital and go around the country. Let the School Medical Officer and other Medical Officers tell you what is the state of the health of the people. We cannot economize on Health Services, and I lay stress on this point because it is necessary that we should maintain them and, as guardians in this Council

of the health of the people, it is our duty—a sacred duty—to see the people of this Colony have a fair measure of health conditions and amenities as regards admission to hospitals and other institutions.

When it comes to Poor Law Relief, I am ashamed at times to know that I have been a party to giving Old Age Pensions at the rate of ten shillings (\$2.40) per per month and \$3.50 per month. I say no more. If that is to be continued and it is still being argued that it is costing us so much, then how can one argue with people of that calibre? But you cannot just leave them to themselves. We must get these things—Education, Health Services and the other things—properly administered. There is no doubt about it, and I would admit there has been a great deal of laxity in those matters. May I suggest for the immediate consideration of Government that an Advisory Committee of Members of this Council be appointed to look after the Medical Vote and also that the Education Advisory Committee be a little more active and look after not only Primary Education but Secondary Education as well, and send all its papers, its decisions and its minutes to the Education Advisory Committee for ratification, so that the members of the Advisory Committee may know what is going on. Likewise, the minutes of the Governors of Queen's College and the Bishops' High School should be sent to that Committee. As a member of that Committee I am very unhappy at what is actually being done. Actually, the Committee is doing nothing. If we are to do anything at all, we must see that expenditure is properly made and that the Colony gets value for the money spent.

As guardians of the taxpayers' money we must see that these things are properly done. We have made certain advances in regard to representation and in regard to the administration of this Colony, but I am afraid that hon. Members of this Council, Elected and otherwise, are not taking their responsibility seriously and are not using it to the advantage of the Colony as a whole. I am sorry to have to make those remarks, but they are 100 per cent. correct and true. What is the Education Advisory Committee doing? I do not know

when last we met. It is time that when we have something we must use it and do so to advantage. I ask in spite of my criticism that a similar system be introduced in regard to health matters. I feel that if the men of these Committees would not work Government ought to invite other Members willing and anxious to work to serve and to give them an opportunity to work.

We are told that expenditure is rising; it is so heavy. I am sorry to say that Expenditure is not very correctly stated in Government accounts. Here we have items under the Head "Miscellaneous"—on page 49, item 15—"Refunds of Revenue, \$632,000"; on page 54—item 70—"Special Grant to the Drainage and Irrigation Board in lieu of rates for maintenance of incomplete schemes in drainage areas, \$72,530"; on page 87, "Loans from Public Funds, \$57,200". These three items total \$761,730 and should not be put as expenditure. They are not expenditure at all by any stretch of imagination, but for convenience in accounting they are put that way. I suggest there ought to be some other way of stating them, and they may be shown in the Budget. It may be possible to discuss this later on with the Officers concerned. As regards the item "Special Grant to the Drainage and Irrigation Board," what is that? Let me just say in a few words on what I think it is though, the hon. Member in charge of these things might say the same thing. You begin to do certain works, but in most cases they are not properly planned, supervised and executed. They are lingered over, and when no benefits are received you have to give the Drainage and Irrigation Board money to maintain those works. That is what has happened, what is happening and what will continue to happen for an indefinite period. I suggest—

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: To a point of order! I do not think the hon. Member is correct. That is a grant given to certain Local Authorities to help them out of the difficulty in meeting the rates levied on them.

Mr. JACOB: I know as a matter of fact that in some cases more than this

amount has been spent for work of that kind. I want to suggest very seriously that greater interest be taken, and any Member of this Council who wishes to look into these matters should be given the utmost facility to do so. There is where Expenditure cannot be checked. At our meetings here when we have been very successful in cutting down the Estimates—I want to be very frank—what knowledge was brought to bear on the Estimates to reduce the figures? I must confess further that I have had very little assistance from those responsible.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: May I just point out that if the ordinary method is adopted, of having the Head of the Department concerned present when the Estimates are being discussed, we would obtain all the information needed. It is very interesting to mention that when we were considering the question of increasing the assistance to villages to pay Maintenance Rates, Mr. Laing gave very full and interesting information.

Mr. JACOB: I cannot explain it any more. Perhaps it would take me a year to explain that, but I might say that the information I got was not understood in the way I wanted it understood. I have been to Bonasika and I am fully satisfied in my own mind that there is a great lot of waste going on there, but how can I point it out? I cannot. Nevertheless I will go on with my observations.

As regards Public Debt shown in the Estimates on page 71, we have an item there as "Loan Ordinance 5 of 1945 (local), \$175,000." I have expressed the view and I want to repeat it, that in placing that item under that Head you have increased the Vote from \$1,112,920 for 1946 to \$1,141,728. Let me repeat that that should never have appeared under this Head. With \$5,000,000 added to the surpluses made during 1945 and 1946, it was possible for large sums of money to lie in the hands of the Colonial Treasurer without any compensation for those amounts. No businessman is going to borrow money and pay interest on mere assumption. Let me quote the exact words of the Colonial Treasurer in his Budget Statement, as I want to be ex-



ceedingly fair. On page 5, at paragraph 19, he states:

"Hon. Members are aware that advantage was taken of the favourable domestic money market to raise by the issue of 3½% debentures a sum of \$5,000,000."

It is not well to be wise after the event. I think you can float a loan now at 3 per cent. and possibly less. (Voices: Question!) I can quite see why hon. Members disagree. Let us examine who benefits by this thing. Who is to pay this burden of \$175,000? That is what I am concerned about. That \$175,000 should have been very well spent on Health Services, Poor Law Services or Education Services. As I say, unless Unofficial Members discuss these things and take an interest in them and bring their points of view to bear on them, this Colony will continue to be in a very precarious position. Certain hon. Members think this is an electioneering speech, but it is not. I think that Expenditure can be reduced. We have made certain reductions, but that is not sufficient. I would suggest one or two means whereby Expenditure can be substantially reduced, but it can only be done by the position being constantly reviewed by Unofficial Members of this Council in co-operation with the Members of the Executive Council, who are included in my term "Unofficial Members," and the Government's Financial Advisers together with the Heads of Departments. That is the kind of thing we want, but if certain Members believe they have not the time, and if certain Government Officers believe it is not Members' business to know certain things, and certain Heads of Departments believe it is not Members' business to see anything no progress would be made. We are hoping that that is something of the past and that we will continue to work in a spirit of co-operation in the future.

Let us take the Transport and Harbours Department. Your Excellency must remember that every year I have criticised this Department very strongly and I have termed it a bankrupt concern. We have there now as General Manager a man who without raising freight rates—I think I am correct in that—but by just

carrying out proper supervision, and proper control, has been able to show a decrease in expenditure of roughly \$450,000. I do not want to say anything about the Transport and Harbours Board, but I would certainly much prefer to place the responsibility on a single individual with determination and ability and initiative to do work, and let him be advised. Certain hon. Members and the public are not very much appreciative of that statement of mine. They think Members should go and meddle and say this and that. If you want to meddle you have to take the responsibility, and so the thing goes on. But in most cases that does not happen. Here we have a Department that was not doing very much, but we have seen a substantial reduction of expenditure, wastage, etc. So I say that with skilful and competitive buying of all kinds of stores, equipment and machinery, I think, this Colony can save hundreds of thousands of dollars. You cannot reduce salaries. As a matter of fact salaries in some cases are miserably low. Perhaps we may say "Take off the War Bonus." In the Estimates, War Bonus amounts to \$1,000,000.

It is nice business to sit down and cut \$1,000,000 off the Estimates, but I have never been accustomed to do work like that. If you want to cut off \$1,000,000 you must see how it is made up from the first cent to the last. But that is not the attitude of my hon. Friends who just want to cut the amount off. This Government has been responsible for that. This Government has gone further and pampered hon. Members of this Council in that attitude. If this Colony is to make any progress, and if some of us are hoping to have the entire control of this Colony and have it properly administered with adequate safeguards, Government would be well advised to begin a system of that kind now so that we would have that opportunity at no distant future. That is what the West India Royal Commission recommended, but that is what this Government is not prepared to do at present. I trust, however, that in the very near future we will have this system which I have advocated.

There is one other matter which I must refer to, and it is a very delicate

matter, I think. It appears to me that something went wrong before the Budget speech was delivered in this Council, and I think hon. Members for our own protection and safety—for our own good name—should investigate the matter very thoroughly and see what could be done to prevent it from happening in future. This is not the only time it has happened; it has happened on several occasions. Today we have a fairly good case to investigate, and I suggest to Government that hon. Members be given an opportunity to investigate it so that a stop may be put to it in future. I think we have a good lot of work to do. I am prepared to work so long as it is conveniently possible for the majority of Members to work also, so that we could finish before the end of the year. I am not prepared, however, to rush through these things. We must go through them properly, and whatever decisions are arrived at they would be followed by me 100 per cent.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I think I can claim the privilege of having addressed this Council as regards the Budget Statement on more occasions than the hon. Member who has just taken his seat. I have risen today to add my quota to this debate, but before I do so I would like to pay tribute to Lieut.-Colonel Spencer (Economic Adviser) for the very excellent speech he delivered to this Council, and also to the Colonel Treasurer for the very able Budget Statement he has presented. As stated by one hon. Member who spoke before me, the Statement on this occasion was written in such simple language that it is very easy for the ordinary layman and persons not engaged in financial matters to understand it. I desire also to congratulate Government on what I would describe as its second post-war Budget and to say that, in my view, it has the merit of careful planning for the future. In saying that, sir, I do not wish to decry the Budgets presented during the recent years when conditions were so difficult—when we were subjected to a great deal of surprises and when it was almost impossible to estimate what expenditure was likely to be in the coming year.

I see from this Statement that some attempt is now being made to plan—and

plan carefully—and that is as it should be. Whether, as some hon. Members feel, Government has now awakened to its responsibility, it should always present a Budget which is clear and easy to understand, and in this case I think great credit is due to the brain that lies behind it. I know also, sir, that this Budget has been prepared along lines which would surely put this Colony on a better footing in so far as its financial position is concerned. I know, too, that Government is following as much as possible the advice of the man who was specially selected to come to this Colony to give advice on economic questions. I am not going to claim that I was one of the Members of this Council who were responsible—to any great extent at any rate—for the appointment of an Economic Adviser to this Government, but I would like to say that in my view, the decision to make the appointment one of a short duration should be changed, and I hope it will be reviewed.

I feel sure that this Colony would derive considerable benefit from the advice we are now receiving from this gentleman. My only regret, sir, is that even at this stage hon. Members of this Council including myself have not yet had an opportunity of examining in full the proposals—or whatever else one may call them—that have been submitted to Government so far. I sincerely hope that the time is not too far distant when Government would find itself in a position to lay before this Council, if not the full report, the portions which it has been found necessary to adopt. I regard a report of that kind as one which would certainly have received the most careful consideration of Members of this Council and, indeed, of every public-spirited citizen in the Colony. Whilst I agree that it is perhaps too early for Government either to publish the report or to indicate the portions which are likely to be accepted, I am going to ask that the matter be given careful consideration so that Members of this Council be made aware of the plans that are being prepared for the future.

I speak in this strain because it is my belief that Members may not be aware of the fact that the Budget that was presented to the Council a few days ago was

more or less framed along the lines I have indicated and, sir, if Government thinks it advisable to follow that course, it must be that Government is satisfied it is the wisest course to take after giving the advice the most careful consideration. Now, sir, as I have said before, I am not aware of the contents of the report, but I do know that this Budget and, possibly, all future Budgets would be framed along the lines of the advice received, and that is as it should be. This Council decided to appoint an Economic Adviser and if that gentleman is worth his salt then we should endeavour to agree with him, and if we agree with him we should take his advice. I think we should very soon be told, if not the whole, the substance of the advice that he has given to Government. I believe I am right in assuming that his advice did not only take into consideration the expenditure side of the Budget. I cannot conceive that it would be such half-baked proposals, and whilst I am on the question of principle now, perhaps a little later—on the expenditure side—I would make a few remarks on them.

I propose at this stage, in dealing with the report of the Economic Adviser, to say that this Council would also be interested, I think, in the financial side—the revenue side. When I deal with the financial side I shall also refer to the fact that hon. Members would undoubtedly be interested to know what are Col. Spencer's views in regard to the tax-paying capacity of this community. I do not know, for instance, whether proposals to increase duty on certain items under Customs, or proposals to increase income tax in the higher brackets form part of the advice given by Col. Spencer. If they form part of his advice I think this Council should be told the reasons why. If Government is unable to give Col. Spencer's reasons for the proposals, then Government ought to be in a position to indicate to this Council the reasons for their acceptance, and if it is at all possible to do so, I think we will have gone a very far way indeed.

I think I ought to say also that I agree in principle that the Budget of this Colony should and must be balanced. At

the same time, sir, there is another side of the question and I am going to refer to that other side for a moment in view of the remarks which fell from the lips of the hon. Member for North Western District, when in his criticism of Government's policy he repeated the charge—because he said he had made it before—that Government was wrong in recent years in not attempting to balance the Budget. The hon. Member went on to say that he disagreed with Government then and that he still disagrees now. In principle I agree with the hon. Member—I would not be a commercial man if I did not agree with him—that Budgets were made to be balanced, and there is no reason why the Budgets presented to this Council should not be balanced unless there is an adviser.

Perhaps there is good reason why the Budget was not balanced in recent years and I would suggest that if there was good reason then there might also be a good reason at this stage. The hon. Member (Mr. Jacob) is a very ardent student; he examines figures and quotes them all the time—sometimes wrongly it is true—perhaps more often than not he is wrong, but—

Mr. JACOB: Your Excellency, if the work of this Council is to proceed, I would suggest to the hon. Member not to follow along those lines.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I do not understand the hon. Member, sir. I have made a statement, but I qualified it by saying "perhaps". If my hon. friend objects, perhaps he should say that my "perhaps" is wrong. I will proceed to make the point, sir, and then, perhaps, he would be able to appreciate it.

Mr. JACOB: You may have 10 days now.

Mr. de AGUIAR: Perhaps the hon. Member has lost sight of the point. I was saying that perhaps there was good reason why the Budget was not balanced in the past, and I went on to say that perhaps the same reason exists at present. I am going to invite the attention of hon. Members now to the position shown on the

opposite page to Roman iii. in the Budget for 1947 and suggest that perhaps that is the reason—not necessarily in the same figures, but perhaps in the same form. Here, we have the Annual Recurrent expenditure shown as \$10,720,000 and we have Annual Revenue shown as \$12,700,000. If the annual expenditure of the Colony is fixed so as to fall within the amount shown as Annual Recurrent expenditure, it is very clear from that statement of revenue that we should not only balance our Budget, but we would have a surplus.

Mr. JACOB: May I rise to a point of correction and refer the hon. Member to page Roman viii. to let him see what Extraordinary expenditure amounts to and to ask him whether it should not be met?

Mr. de AGUIAR: I am not saying that. I want to repeat again that the Annual Recurrent Expenditure is \$10,720 000 and the Annual Revenue \$12,739,000 and with that margin the Budget should not only be balanced, but there should be a surplus. I was going on to point out the reason for the deficit. The hon. Member refers to Extraordinary Expenditure which amounts to \$1,196,000 but I would suggest to him that if he adds these figures to those I have just quoted he would find that there would still be a small surplus.

Mr. JACOB: I would ask the hon. Member to add in the War Bonus—\$1,000,000.

Mr. de AGUIAR: The hon. Member continues to interrupt. He is entitled to do so, however, so long as the Chairman permits him.

The PRESIDENT: I think I must say that you interrupt also. The hon. Member has interrupted because you addressed remarks to him.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I am sorry I made the statement, and if the hon. Member does not wish to hear me he can interrupt as often as he likes. It makes no difference to me. He refers to Temporary War Bonus, but I did not refer to it. The hon. Member must know—perhaps I had better leave him out altogether—perhaps

it would be the best thing to do. I would say, however, that until a decision is taken as to what would be the position of that particular item, it must be temporary. It is not a recurrent annual expenditure in the true sense of the word. If it is decided later to add it to the salaries of the persons concerned then it would be an annually recurrent charge, but so long as it remains separate in the estimates it is a temporary measure and further consideration must be given to it later. Then we have the Colonial Emergency Measures vote which stands at \$300,000. I would like to remind this Council of the time when this vote was far in excess of this figure. As a result of recent considerations Government has been able to reduce it, but would the hon. Member say it is going to remain on our Budget for all time?

Then we have an item of \$1,000,000 for Subsidization. Is it contemplated that this Government—or any other Government for that matter—would, as a matter of policy, continue subsidization *ad infinitum*? Therefore, that item also should be regarded as extraordinary expenditure. I have been at pains to point out these items because I wish to invite Government's attention to them when they are going to consider the taxable capacity of the people in this community. I have no objection—speaking as a Member of this Council and as a private individual—to the Budget today so long as this expenditure remains as it is, but I have no guarantee from Government that when these items of extraordinary expenditure disappear the measures of taxation which were introduced as a result of war conditions would be examined in the light of those conditions.

The PRESIDENT: You have made a suggestion and it is a very sensible suggestion, but there would not be this same Council in three years' time. Naturally, whatever Government there is at the time it would review taxation, but I am not giving a guarantee.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I wish I could express the same sentiments Your Excellency has expressed. I live in this Colony and I hope to die here, and I know just

what the trend is so far as taxing the people is concerned. There are some people who feel that the best means of equalizing revenue with expenditure is by piling up taxation.

The PRESIDENT: I must interrupt again. For the two years I have been in British Guiana we have actually taken off taxation with respect to Customs duty.

Mr. de AGUIAR: You are speaking of reduced taxation to the tune of \$300,000 but I am speaking of increased taxation to the tune of one and a half million dollars—five times as much. There is one criticism I have to make about the size of our Recurrent Expenditure; I have made it before and have to make it again. How is it that when the Imperial Treasury was handing out loans to this Colony there were certain Members of this Council—I warned them at the time—who opened both hands and accepted them? I warned them that some of those loans were going to become burdens and I regret to say my word has come true. As regards Recurrent Expenditure there are several items which have found themselves on these Annual Estimates through occasions on which we received money from the Imperial Treasury. I am yet to be convinced that the expenditure incurred at the time was of any benefit at all to this Colony but, like everything else, when we were receiving this money the Colonial Treasurer—not the Acting Colonial Treasurer—said it was more convenient to have it put in the Estimates as we would get a corresponding credit on the other side. We are still doing that today.

In the 1947 Estimates there is a sum of \$1,610,000 coming from the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund and in five years' time, perhaps, we are going to reap the reward. I am inclined to think that some of it is going to be in the expenditure that still appears in the Budget. It is now \$1,610,000 but in 1946 it was \$1,800,000. I have always maintained that if we are doing any development works and have not got the money, if the project is a good one it would be far better to borrow the money and pay interest and sinking fund on it rather than putting our hats out through the door. I cannot think

of it in any other form. When all these Imperial Arts expire I shudder to think what the Annually Recurrent Expenditure of this Colony is going to be. Members are alarmed at the figure of \$10,000,000 even including the extraordinary item to which I referred, but I would like to tell them that the item I referred to has come to stay and that \$14,000,000 or perhaps \$15,000,000 would more likely be a permanent feature of our Budget. I am not pessimistic. If this Colony should progress, as we hope it would, and it could stand a Budget of \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 by all means let us have it. I am concerned when we attempt to make a forward step that as the result of criticisms in this Council we are likely to go backwards.

I have heard, sir, of the Legislative Council Committee meetings when decisions were taken which, I believe, are hide-bound. I do not know how hide-bound they are, but in this Council you have heard of an Elected block to vote against certain items of expenditure. I wish them luck. I am only going to say this: In making these cuts there is such a thing as Supplementary Provisions which in this Council we are accustomed to receive, and possibly we may begin to have them in the first quarter of next year. This Colony, sir, is at the cross-roads and I believe that we may take the wrong direction by ruthlessly cutting expenditure which should ordinarily be met and which step would certainly throw us backwards. We have to find \$1,500,000. Let us consider ways and means of finding that money. There is one point I wish to make in concluding my remarks. Whilst I am supporting the expenditure as put down here because I believe that for the present at any rate the existing Government Services should be maintained, I wish to suggest to Government that in this period of post-war budgeting some directive should go from the Head of this Administration to the various Heads of Departments to make careful scrutiny of all items of expenditure commencing from the very beginning of the year. I think a similar directive should be handed down to the Treasury so that in this coming year—a year of doubt, and a year in which anything may happen—

expenditure as budgeted for here will receive the most careful scrutiny in order that some savings might be effected.

The final observation I wish to make is this—and I am going to say it is within my knowledge—that even with the most careful scrutiny the Heads of Departments should be charged with the responsibility not to indulge in heavy expenditure during the last quarter of next year, even although there may be substantial balances at the credit of the various Heads of Departments I know what I am talking about. I know it is the common practice of Heads of Departments in order to expend their votes to indulge in expenditure during the last quarter of the year so that they will not have to come back to the Council for a revote in the following year. I think that is wrong budgeting, and I sincerely hope that such a directive will go out from the Head of the Administration because I believe that, whilst it is not possible for an individual Member of this Council to suggest reductions here and there unless on any particular matter of policy it may be possible to effect a reduction which may result in a substantial saving at the end of 1947. My reason also for making that suggestion is this: We will then be able when the time comes to frame the 1948 Budget, which will be the third post-war Budget, to face it with facts and figures which are obtained through the coming year as the result of careful examination of Government expenditure. As I have said before, sir, I am prepared to support the expenditure as shown here, because I feel I am unable, after having examined the various Heads of Expenditure and obtained the reductions to which reference has been made by the Treasurer, to offer any useful suggestion for further reduction.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: I have not risen to say anything on the Budget. I thought that, perhaps, some hon. Member who had spoken would have given consideration to a matter which is of some importance to this community and to which I shall make reference at a later stage. I would like to join in the congratulatory remarks made with reference to the hon. the Colonial Treasurer and Colonel Spencer.

I would also like to add the Heads of the Departments for the assistance they gave us on the Committee. Then I would like to add a word of praise to the hon. Member for North Western District (Mr. Jacob) for his attitude. I do not think we can take any exception on this occasion to anything he has said and, I think, it augurs well for the progress of the consideration of the Estimates in a spirit in which it should be approached.

The point to which I would like to make reference is this: We have to consider not only the expenditure, but we have to see that it is necessary. We have to see that it is kept within bounds. We also have to consider the question of the sources of revenue. Looking through the Budget Statement as laid before us by the hon. the Colonial Treasurer, I see that he makes reference to the sources of revenue. It is proposed to give consideration by way of relief of taxation to new undertakings which have as their object the development of industrial, agricultural and mineral or natural resources of the Colony. Taking a cursory glance at it, I do not think he has considered that in relation to a recent pronouncement by the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the policy which he advocates in regard to mining and other industries. I do not remember having seen that communication or having heard any reference by Government in relation to that memorandum, and unless Government takes the initiative some time or other when it is appropriate, I propose to table a motion to have that aspect of the Colony's wealth as affecting the Colony's revenue discussed by Members around this table. It may or it may not have any effect at all on the possible revenue which we derive in the Colony, but I do think that some reference should be made to that matter and that it should be debated by Members in this Council Chamber.

I am not going to pose as a financial wizard and say how many Budget speeches I have made—how many times I have spoken and where I have spoken, and that I know what I am speaking—because whenever I get up to speak I always try to ascertain something and to understand what I am going to say before I

say it. We have had a lot of discussion here about balancing the Budget because it must be done. Surely there is the necessity to balance the Budget if we can, because if we cannot we would have to face taxation going up to a high level in order to do so. Don't we know that in the United Kingdom, the Mother of Parliaments has not regularly balanced its Budget? Don't we know that over and over again there has been a deficit? Don't they know more about it than we do in this Colony? That is what I would like to draw to the attention of hon. Members. It is all very well and good to say that Water Street knows something about budgeting and about statements of revenue and expenditure, but I take it that every man in Water Street is not there for the benefit of his health. He is there to make profits; he can dismiss at will and can reduce his staff at will. Government cannot do that. Government cannot by a stroke of the pen tell A or B to get out, especially if he is on the Fixed Establishment

As regards such services as Health, Education and Poor Relief, referred to by the hon. Member, he asks for an increase. I am in agreement with him that those services should be expanded and that the time will come, and very shortly too, when expenditure on those three items will have to be increased. Some hon. Members may not be in agreement with that, but I think the majority will agree that those three services, in some manner or other, will automatically have to be increased.

I would also like to add that the re-result of the deliberations of hon. Members in Committee, the net result in figures, happens to be \$38,116, because the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Raatgever, has told me that they are prepared to accept a reduction of \$19,000 in one instance instead of \$20,000 which sends up the amount by \$1,000. We have to face a deficit of \$1,500,000 and of that we have only got \$38,116 so far. So we still have a long way to go, but if we go along the road we are travelling we would not succeed. We have two items in the Estimates that we have not yet considered.

One is "Miscellaneous, (b) Subventions, etc., other than Municipal" showing an increase of \$95,000 odd. Let us wipe the whole lot out. The other is "Subsidization" showing an increase of \$250,000. Let us wipe that out also. I know nothing about figures, but if you add all those figures up you will not get your deficit of \$1,500,000 wiped out. You will still have to impose some sort of increased taxation. Let us go to the other side. Neither of the two items I have referred to can be reduced. I have gone through the amounts and I cannot see that very much can be taken off "Subventions other than Municipal" and "Subsidization". One hon. Member has said that he will support it *in toto* but whether he does so or not, it can only be possibly reduced by \$38,116, and we will have to find the difference between \$1,515,203 and \$38,116 to balance our Budget. It seems to me that if we are going to balance our Budget and make it come out a nice and perfect balance, we would have to impose increased taxation. It may not, however, take the same form which Government proposes. That is how the situation appears to me at the moment. It looks to me that the subject matter of our deliberation is still how to try and wipe out a little more. I do not see how it can be done, as the Committee's report represents after very careful pruning all that hon. Members around this table have been able to deduct from the original Budget put before us.

Mr. LEE; I move that this Council go into Committee and get on with this work.

The PRESIDENT; Does any other Member wish to speak? I would like the Colonial Treasurer to be given an opportunity to reply to the speeches made.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I desire, sir, to thank hon. Members for the congratulatory remarks directed towards me. There are just a few points that Members have touched upon that I would like to speak on. One is the point made by the hon. Member for North Western District in connection with the Estimates of Revenue for 1947. I am surprised the hon. Member should think that Revenue has been underestimated by about \$500,000. I am going to concede to him that the

estimate under "Customs"—Export Tax—is underestimated by a sum of \$50,000. The reason is that when that estimate was prepared by the Comptroller of Customs he was not in the fortunate position as the hon. Member is today. At that time the Comptroller of Customs was by no means certain that bauxite exports would continue, but they did in the succeeding months and that accounts for a short-fall of \$50,000 under that particular Head.

I am unable to agree with the hon. Member that other items are generally underestimated. In any case, if there is underestimation to the extent of \$500,000 in an estimate of \$14,000,000, that only represents an error of a little more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. I think even the specialist who makes estimates for much smaller amounts is allowed as much as  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. With regard to his criticism of the presentation of items of expenditure in the Estimates — Grants, Advances, Refunds and Income Tax—I would like to say that the Estimates are prepared in that form as the result of a directive received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1939. The instructions to all territories in the Colonial Empire were that all expenditure which diminishes other than temporarily revenue available for permanent expenditure, should be provided for on the Estimates and should be charged as expenditure at the time payment is made. Those items appear in the Estimates under Expenditure in accordance with that directive.

With regard to taxation to which, I think, the hon. Member for Central Demerara (Mr. de Aguiar) made reference, I would call attention to my Budget Statement in which I said that Colonel Spencer's report on the economic and financial position of the Colony would shortly come before the Council. In that report Colonel Spencer touches on every phase of expenditure and taxation and, I think, hon. Members will then have an opportunity to consider amendments and a redistribution of any item of taxation. As regards the other item, "Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes" to which he also referred, I would like to say that no item on which money is now expended under

Colonial Development and Welfare is at present on the Estimates of the Colony, and that such items can only come on the Estimates of the Colony as the result of a vote of this Council. There is no undertaking, as far as I am aware, given by Government that in respect of the schemes for which money has been voted any additional expenditure required will be undertaken by the Colony, I think that the majority of those works would be economical and productive and should tend to expand our Revenue rather than to add to the ordinary expenditure of the Colony. Sir, I do not think there is any other point on which I wish to make any further comment

The PRESIDENT: I would just like to say that I have listened with very great interest and care and have made notes on the points made by the various Members who have spoken. Colonel Spencer's report has just been handed to me, although I see it is dated 1st December. It is very lengthy and Members will receive it before the end of the year. The interesting fact really is that the report has an introduction as well as conclusions and recommendations, and as this Budget is definitely drawn up on the lines of planning for the future those lines are carefully explained by Colonel Spencer. If Members would just bear with me for one moment, I would like to read paragraph 6 of his introductory letter to me :

"The principal conclusions and recommendations which are brought together in some of the most important features may be summarized as follows:—

"To assist trade—the Customs Tariffs to be revised, simplified and opportunity taken in a variety of ways which are recommended;

"To shift the burden of taxation away from productive and development enterprise and from the family man with responsibility and attach it on to speculative activity, luxuries, semi-luxuries and those who are in the higher income group or the larger property-owning group."



I think I should mention that because one hon. Member in speaking said he did not see nor did not know of any real plan Government had in mind. Well, Members of Council, here is a financial plan. You will have it to study, and it will be very well worth your giving it careful thought.

As regards the suggestion that a directive should be issued to Heads of Departments, Colonel Spencer and I have already discussed that and we have that in mind, but the question of re-votes is rather complicated. If you tell the Heads of Departments at the end of a year to shut down spending, they would definitely show a saving in that year, but it is not really a true saving because you would be asked to spend that money in the following year. The only thing we should tell Heads of Departments is to try and effect true savings—money they will not have to spend again—but if they start a scheme or anything they should try to finish it off in the year for which you voted the money. I think that is reasonable. It gives one a true picture of the Budget for the following year. However, a directive will be issued by me in consultation with the Treasurer and Colonel Spencer to try and get the Heads of Departments to save.

I have in mind also—I have not discussed it with my colleagues but I am going to do so—the appointment of a Standing Economic Committee rather along the lines of the Economic Committee in the House of Commons. It may not be practical, but I am going into it. It may be very useful, if it can be done, to ensure that there is a continual eye on the expenditure of Heads of Departments all through the year. I will go into that. It may be interesting to Members to know that I have that in mind. With your approval I suggest that we take the non-controversial Heads in the Estimates. There may be some recommendations; I have them marked and I could not have sent them to you before we met. In that case, I will leave them until we get to the Heads concerned and, if necessary, discuss them

### COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Council resolved itself into Committee to consider the Estimates of Expenditure for 1947.

#### GOVERNOR

The CHAIRMAN : There has been a recommendation that this head should be reduced by \$2,400 under items 2 and 3. I am not opposing that and I agree that the Head should be carried out at \$12,863.

*Item 2—Furniture, Plate, Linen, and Uniform for Servants, \$1,200 :*  
Reduced from \$1,200 to \$800.

*Item 3—Transport on Official Visits — \$4,000.*  
Reduced from \$4,000 to \$2,000

The CHAIRMAN : I move that the Head be carried out at \$12,863.

Motion put and agreed to.

#### LEGISLATURE

Mr. LEE : I would like to make some remarks under this Head. I am glad to hear from you, sir, that it is your intention to appoint an Economic Committee, but may I state that I hope you will follow the procedure already being carried out, that two Members of this Council be appointed with the Heads of certain Departments.

The CHAIRMAN : I have an idea that the Economic Committee should be comprised entirely of Members of this Council, with the Colonial Treasurer.

Mr. LEE : Thank you, sir. We would then be able to scrutinize the various problems as we would be responsible to the people.

The CHAIRMAN : I will go into the matter.

Mr. WOOLFORD : I desire to direct your attention, sir, to sub-head 2 which reads "Travelling Expenses of Members of the Councils whilst engaged on the business of the Councils—\$1,000." I think it would be better for the purpose of the representation I am about to make, that the words "whilst engaged on the business

of the Councils" be deleted. I did promise certain Members to try and frame some amendment to give effect to what I have in mind, and that is to say that Members should be entitled to free travel on the transport system throughout the Colony and not only while doing so to attend meetings in this Council or somewhere else for the State. I do not think Members should incur any personal expense in travelling, and my suggestion really makes no difference to Government at all. In other words, it would not cost Government one penny whether Members travel by train or by steamer.

The days are gone, I think, when a small expenditure of that kind should be grudged even if Government had to meet it. In almost every place that I know of in British Colonies there is a growing tendency to recognize the public services of legislators by payment. In some places that payment is confined to attending meetings of the Executive Council, but in places like Trinidad and Jamaica payment is given to Members who travel from the capital to a country district. The general practice being recognised is that Members should be paid.

In my view, I do not think the services rendered by Members in the past have been so onerous as to merit remuneration, but any assistance rendered by Members in giving service that would be of assistance to Government should not entail any encroachment on the personal funds of those Members. It does not matter what their conviction might be, it is a matter of substantial loss of money in the performance of a public duty in which they have a certain amount of direct responsibility to this Council. I think the time has come when this question of remuneration would have to come up for consideration. In the interval I do ask, sir, that you give instructions to the Transport Authorities that each Member of this Council—whether Elected or Nominated—be permitted to travel free on the services.

The CHAIRMAN: What about an Official Member?

Mr. WOOLFORD: There is a vote provided for that.

The CHAIRMAN: I always pay \$1 every time I have to cross the Ferry.

Mr. WOOLFORD: Members of this Council should not be made to do that. If a Member of this Council has to go to Bartica to visit Prisons or anything else in the vicinity he should not be made to pay for travelling. Members of this Council should not be made to become out of pocket in such cases; some of them cannot afford it. I do ask that our Transport system be open to all Members and that they be provided with passes which they would have to hand in from time to time, and let us see what would happen at the end of 1947. It would only be a book entry.

The CHAIRMAN: You are really suggesting an alteration of the wording of the item?

Mr. WOOLFORD: Yes; and whatever is received by the Transport Department as a result of these visits would only go to the Department as a matter of business. The Department is entitled to the benefit of those fees in order to carry out its accounting properly, but it does not make any difference in Government's expenditure. I hope I have made myself clear. The deletion of the words "whilst engaged on the business of the Councils" would put an end to the practice which limits the benefit of free travel to attendance at meetings.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the Colonial Treasurer for a little information about this money—\$1,000—in item 2? I am not quite sure what the position is. Do Members travel and then claim the cost of doing so afterwards?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: This vote is to pay for travelling, sir. If a Member of the Council travels he has to pay the same as any other member of the public. Members of the Council pay and afterwards claim their expenses on a subsistence allowance form. What Mr. Woolford wants is that if a Member travels a voucher would go to the Colonial Secretariat and they would debit the amount and give the Transport Department credit. It would still mean expenditure and if this \$1,000 is exhausted we would

have to come back to the Council and ask for a supplementary vote.

Mr. WOOLFORD: In any case the item is not properly worded. It includes subsistence allowance—does it not?

The CHAIRMAN: Is that so, Mr. Treasurer?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I am a little puzzled because I think there was a Committee of this Council which suggested that Members should not get travelling expenses when travelling on the business of the Council.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: The report was laid on the table but, subsequently, it was changed and a Sessional Paper was put before the Council.

Mr. FERREIRA: If I am right, the Transport Department issued passes and Members of the Council could travel throughout the Colony with those passes. When the Rooke report was submitted the question of those passes came up, I know, and they were withdrawn at the end of March, 1946. Mr. Woolford's suggestion simply means re-introducing the passes.

The CHAIRMAN: That seems to be a better way, rather than having to fill up vouchers and things of the kind. It would really mean no expenditure on the part of Government.

Mr. FERREIRA: That is so, sir.

Mr. JACOB: If the Transport Department wants to continue to collect that money this Head would have to be debited with the amount.

The CHAIRMAN: What about this as a compromise? In order to save a lot of accounting work by the Transport Department, let us pass this vote of \$1,000 and call it "Travelling Expenses" for the year.

Mr. WOOLFORD: But then there would be no provision for subsistence allowance.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I suggest that the description of the item be amended and that it be made to read "Travelling Expenses and subsistence allowances to Members of the Councils," \$1,000.

Amendment put and agreed to.

#### AGRICULTURE

*Item 2 — Transport and Travelling, \$19,000.*

The CHAIRMAN: There is a recommendation to reduce this item by \$3,000 but I think it is going to embarrass the Department of Agriculture very much and I would like to hear something more about it.

Mr. JACOB: It is proposed to reduce the item "Transport and Travelling" by \$3,000 and it is also proposed that the item "School Gardens"—\$1,000—should be deleted. I would like to take this opportunity to say for myself that I am not at all happy about the policy of this Department. This Department has come in for severe criticism from year to year and I am not satisfied that it is giving value for the money being expended on it. There is a 10-year development plan as regards agriculture and I have the honour to be a member of the Committee concerned with it, but I find it very very hard to follow the planning being done and I am sorry I cannot agree that this Department is really planning for the improvement of production of all kinds of things including sugar. The sugar industry is being very successfully managed by those who have their money invested in it, but any assistance that Government can give is being given—and given generously.

As regards the other products I do not understand the present policy, and the whole set-up to my mind is bad. I was told that we should increase the production of rice by about 100,000 tons per annum; I was told that four years ago when the Rice Marketing Board took over. I have not seen the fulfilment of that promise, however. You have not increased production by one ton and by merely putting down wrong figures would not do a thing. There is something fundamentally

wrong in this Department and I hope that the new Director of Agriculture is going to map out an entirely new course. I hope he would not follow in the footsteps of his predecessor. I hope we are going to have increased production in rice, coconut and livestock very shortly. This Department is top-heavy and the Officers are very well paid. If I had my way I would reduce this item by more than \$3,000 so that these officers should realize that this Colony is paying them. They are not doing anything in a practical way, and some people tell me that they are a definite menace if not a hindrance to this country. They are too unique in some ways and I would ask this Government to change its policy and do something in a practical manner.

Mr. THOMPSON: The question of travelling by Government officers has been causing us a great deal of concern, and I think Government should endeavour, as early as possible, to supply certain Departments with cars and also to have the travelling expenses reduced. As regards school gardens I am not in favour of taking off the vote, but since we have agreed upon a policy I have to follow the majority. I am in favour of district gardens being introduced as was done many years ago. There are not many gardens at present and there could be a gradual elimination until they all go out of existence. In the country districts there is some difficulty as regards these things because pigs destroy the cultivation, but if we have the gardens properly set up and properly controlled I think that would meet the case very satisfactorily. Then, as regards the Agricultural Instructors, I would very much prefer to find them in the fields with the people than to see them getting out statistics all the time. They are always making up papers and reports so that they are unknown as Instructors. They should be always available for giving advice and practical assistance to the people in their respective districts.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the hon. Member this? If they are to get about more why do you want to cut \$3,000 off the vote for travelling?

Mr. THOMPSON: Because they would have to go down to the farms and would not have to use cars for that purpose. The cost of the contract cars is definitely too high.

The CHAIRMAN: You are suggesting here that the whole vote for school gardens should be cut out; isn't that so?

Mr. THOMPSON: That is the suggestion of the majority, but I suggest that there should be gradual elimination.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I have risen because of what I have heard—the suggestion to cut this vote—and if after my explanation hon. Members still desire to cut the vote they could do so. The reason for the increase of \$3,000 in the vote is due to the operation of the Co-operative Credit Banks in the Colony. I see that some hon. Members are amused over that statement, but I think they would be interested in some of the figures. In 1946 the vote for Travelling in connection with the Co-operative Credit Banks was \$1,700 and the proposal is that the item should be carried out at \$3,700 for 1947. This vote has to provide for the travelling expenses of the Supervisor and a Chairman in some cases, then there is an Assistant Supervisor who is Chairman of nine banks and is responsible for their operation. Then there are two other Assistant Supervisors and all of these men have to travel. If it is the desire of Members that they should not travel I would take this opportunity to sound a note of warning—that the supervision of these banks would be lost.

This Council has a responsibility because a considerable sum of money has been advanced to these banks and if there is going to be this change of policy Government would have to say whether it would continue to make advances to the banks. I think hon. Members would be ill advised if in these circumstances they reduce this vote by \$3,000. It would only mean that the Supervisors of the banks would be unable to carry out their duties, and that would involve some risk. As member of the Board of the Co-operative Credit Banks I shall not be discharging my responsibility if I am not satisfied that the banks throughout the Colony are

being properly supervised. You cannot have them operating without having them properly supervised. Some of the Supervisors are actually the Chairmen of several of the banks and it is only fit and proper that they should be given the necessary facilities to supervise them properly.

As regards the question of school gardens, I agree with the remarks made by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Thompson. There are 53 registered school gardens and 31 of them receive grants from the Education Department and the remaining 21 from the Agriculture Department. I do not wish to appear to be dissenting from the majority, but I would suggest that the school gardens connected with this vote should make representations to the Education Department for grants so that we could abandon the whole lot under this Head.

Mr. LEE: I would like to enquire from the hon. Member for Central Demerara (Mr. de Aguiar) what was the cost of travelling for the Supervisors of the banks last year. What we are saying is that the cost of travelling for the officers other than the Supervisors is too high.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: Some years ago when the question of travelling by Government officers was being considered, I suggested that the whole question should be dealt with either by the Transport Department or some other Department. We have a new General Manager of the Transport Department, who is a capable officer and whatever the opinion of persons outside this Council may be, there is no man who can say that during the six months he has been here he has not done a good job of work. The whole question of travelling by Government officers should be handled by one Department. We would have lorries kept at the Public Works Department while haulage vans and other vehicles could also be kept under one Head and charges could be made in the form of book entries. My suggestion was marked "P.P.A." and put in a file which is somewhere around. I think that is the system adopted when Government wants a file put away.

The CHAIRMAN: I think you have put in too many "P.s."

Mr. JACOB: We are a Party in this Council now. What is the hon. Member's position now, I do not know. His speech here has disclosed something very obvious to me. He is not fully conversant with these facts: In 1944 the item for travelling expenses of the Department was \$13,548; in 1945 it was \$14,314 and for 1946 the approved estimate was \$16,000. In 1947 there is to be an increase of \$3,000, but we have cut the amount down leaving the Department with the amount of \$16,000—a similar amount as in 1946. When I turn to page 87 of these Estimates what do I find? Under the Head "Loans from Public Funds" there is an item "Loans to Co-operative Credit Banks" in respect of which the 1946 Estimates show \$50,000 and the 1947 Estimates \$50,000. What is this increased activity of the Banks? I don't follow it: Perhaps the hon. Member knows more about it, but it is not stated in this document. I do not pretend to know, but the hon. Member is very anxious about these Estimates going through and he is Chairman of the Committee of the Department which is connected with the Co-operative Credit Banks. This Government lent the Co-operative Credit Banks \$73,950 in 1945 and \$50,000 in 1946, and proposes to lend them \$50,000 in 1947. What is the hon. Member doing about it? His firm is lending money to people in connection with rice. Would his firm lend something like a quarter of a million dollars? What is this messing around, deceiving people? This will not deceive me. I advocate that these Banks should lend millions of dollars if you want to have anything done. Increase the vote by \$3,000 to supervise the addition to what they have been doing before? That is how Government runs its business, and that is how the hon. Member advocates that it be run. If he has not done so, then he should resign from the Committee. He will not accept responsibility. What is it for, but to go messing around and fooling people?

Mr. de AGUIAR: The hon. Member is fully aware that I can always accept his challenge. That he has displayed so much ignorance of the subject which he is discussing, I am not surprised. He made

reference to the fact that the vote for last year having been \$50,000 that is the amount the Banks operate with. That is not the money we are trying to protect or to supervise. The hon. Member is surely aware, if he has not got the reports of the Banks, that the Banks are not operating with that \$50,000 but with four or five times that amount. The amount of \$50,000 on the Estimates, I may point out, incidentally is only a token vote. The amount may be higher but certainly not less, and the amount that is owing to the Government today, I would like to inform the hon. Member, is far above \$50,000.

Mr. JACOB: Kindly state the amount? I have not the figures with me, but you want me to accept that?

Mr. de AGUIAR: I would be surprised if the hon. Member accepts anything. The Banks are not operating in this Colony with a loan of \$50,000 but with four or five times as much money as that. What is more, it is not only the money that is advanced by Government to these Banks with which they operate. There is also the money of individual members of the Banks who are interested, and in my view Government has an obligation because if the Banks fail—and some of them have failed in the past through non-payment by borrowers—it is the hard-earned money not only of the taxpayers but of the people who are members of the Banks that will be lost. I repeat that if Members wish to delete the item they must accept the responsibility for anything that goes wrong with the Banks as the result of lack of supervision.

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: I may remind this Council that about a year ago we repealed the Co-operative Credit Banks Ordinance and reorganized these Banks. In the reorganization the Co-operative Credit Banks are being run, so far, independently. Before that Ordinance was repealed the Agricultural Superintendents managed the Banks as Chairmen of the Committees of the District Banks and their travelling expenses were one and the same for the Agricultural Department and the Co-operative Credit Banks. Under the reorganization there is a separate Department of the Co-operative Credit Banks

with a Registrar, a Superintendent of Banks and Assistant Supervisors comprising the staff to run the Banks. That carries with it separate expenditure for travelling and it is not the same as when the Agricultural Superintendents used to function. The activity of the Banks has extended in the reorganization in so far as its facilities to farmers throughout the country districts are concerned, and it is expanding daily.

I agree that the \$50,000 appearing in the Estimates is just a token vote. I am sure, sir, that the amount involved is nearer \$150,000 than the \$50,000 which appears here. It is not only for supervision of the securities offered by borrowers to the Banks. The Chairman has to attend these Banks to consider applications from borrowers and that necessitates his travelling from one Bank to the other. If Members of this Council want to restrict the facility which they so strongly advocated a year ago, I say it is at their discretion to do so. The position has been fully explained and if after that they are still determined to reduce the vote by \$3,000 they can anticipate that the facilities of the Banks instead of being extended will be restricted.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: I cannot see the difficulty in this after hearing all the remarks made by Members. It just means this: If there is a reduction of \$3,000 the Officer in charge of the Department who watches the travelling vote can, every month or every two or three months, or whatever period he desires, place before the Chairman of the Advisory Committee or the Director of Agriculture the state of the vote. That is all he will have to do, and when they see that the vote is greatly reduced come back to this Council and point it out. Let Government circulate the Departments about not applying for supplementary votes and so allow efficiency to go. I have repeatedly said it here and also elsewhere that I have seen Officers travelling in cars when they need not have done so. I have seen Officers going not too far away from their offices to the Colonial Secretariat with no books and in cars. Surely those Officers can get a bicycle to go there, especially when they are young men. If the sun is too hot they

can use an umbrella. I have repeatedly stressed, up to the last session, that this travelling expenditure is going up too high. The hon. Member for Central Demerara (Mr. de Aguiar) also called attention to the fact that the travelling expenditure is steadily mounting up. In the Georgetown Municipality the Heads of Departments have to submit to me every quarter the position of their votes, and attention is called where the expenditure is heavy for a quarter. I do not think hon. Members are really wedded to a set purpose. I cannot see that any hon. Member around this table can say "I am not going to give any money for travelling whether you want it or not." I can see that hon. Members may say "I am not satisfied with the way in which you are travelling: I do not think it is necessary."

Mr. LEE: What we are concerned about is this: The Director and Chairmen of the Co-operative Loan Banks should make such conservation as to meet the amount voted on the Estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to put it to the vote. It is rather interesting.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I think the hon. Member for North Western District (Mr. Jacob) was correct when he quoted the figures of the 1945 expenditure and the estimate for 1946, but he has failed to tell the Council that I reported in Committee that the cost of travelling and allowances paid to Public Officers is very high, particularly this year, and that it has increased by 50 per cent.

There is another matter I would like to mention and it is in connection with the Banks. The actual amount paid by Government is \$268,000. I ask, therefore, that the item be passed as printed.

Mr. RAATGEVER: It is a pity the hon. Member for Central Demerara did not avail himself of the opportunity of attending the meetings of the Unofficial Members of the Council. He happens to be an Elected Member representing the people, but he did not take the trouble to attend the meetings. If he did I do not think he would have risen to upset this vote. I think it is a waste of time getting

together to do something and have some individuals deliberately staying away and taking no part in it. If those who have attended the meetings have come to a unanimous decision, I think that decision should be respected. I am not averse to a vote being taken now, but there are three Members absent who supported the item.

Mr. JACOB: If Government wants a division, let us have it.

Question "That the item stand as printed" put, and the Committee divided and voted as follows:—

For : Messrs. Roth, de Aguiar, the Colonial Treasurer, the Attorney-General and the Colonial Secretary—5.

Against : Messrs. Veerasawmy, Farnum, Raatgever, Thompson, Ferreira, Lee Jacob, Gonsalves, Dr. Singh, C. V. Wight and Woolford—11.

Did not vote: Mr. Peer Bacchus—1.

Motion lost.

The item was therefore amended to read "\$16,000" and passed.

Item 16—*School Gardens, \$1,000.*

Item deleted.

#### ANALYST

Mr. LEE, I had reserved the right to speak on the question of allowances to Officers.

Item 1 (f)—*Allowances to Officers for analysis of milk on Sundays and Holidays, \$500.*

Mr. LEE: I am of the opinion that milk need not be analysed on Sundays and holidays, and will ask Government to enquire carefully into the matter to see if this \$500 cannot be saved. There is some method employed when milk is sent from a far-distant place like Essequibo to the Analyst to be tested. If that can be done and a valid certificate issued, I feel that this \$500 is being wasted.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: I had opposed the hon. Member's views in Committee and I

still do so. As I had indicated in Committee and I still do so. As I had indicated in that when a sample of milk is taken on Saturday it is sealed and should remain sealed until presentation in Court when the case is to be heard. If you allow someone, whether he is the Analyst, a policeman, or some specialist to interfere with it, it would cause no end of trouble in Court. The other Members are unanimous in allowing the item to remain.

Head passed as printed.

#### COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE

Item 1 (g)— *Clerk of the Legislative Council (Senior Clerk)*, \$1,920.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT I think it is the unanimous request and unanimous decision of Members — we had a very good turn out and I think there were about fourteen of us present — that this item should be increased by \$240. It was felt that since the allowance has been taken away from the Officer, the fact remains that he actually receives less money by his promotion. I am not concerned with whether he would get future benefits or increased payment in the future, the fact is that on his promotion today he actually receives a cheque for an amount which is less than what he would have got before his promotion.

The CHAIRMAN: I will give that my careful consideration. I give an undertaking to go into it. Is that satisfactory? It is difficult to single out an officer for a special increment. Many times in this Council we are told you do not favour allowances to individual officers. I am perfectly prepared to go into it very carefully. One difficulty is that I am not prepared to interfere with the actual figures and I do not think the Council can increase the vote.

Mr. RAATGEVER: I have knowledge of the Principal Clerk in that Department who was appointed this year starting at the maximum of his salary scale.

The CHAIRMAN: It wants going into. I ask you to let us take the Estimates, and at the same time I give an under-

taking that I will go into it and come back and report. I think there should be give and take on both sides.

Mr. RAATGEVER: If you give an undertaking, that is all right.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: I think that is all we can ask for.

Item passed.

#### PUBLICITY BUREAU

The CHAIRMAN: There is considerable difficulty about the reduction recommended.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: This is not really my funeral, but I may explain to Government that there are certain Members including myself who think the whole Department should go, and there are certain other Members who are against the deletion. I wonder whether my suggestion to transfer the Department to the Colonial Secretariat finds favour. I hope it will be gone into so as to find out whether this Department can be housed in the Secretariat. The Publicity Officer thinks that that is not practical for certain reasons. As a compromise the Committee arrived at the decision submitted here. If I sense the feeling aright, the majority of those Members present were rather against the retention of the Department but, as I say, as a compromise we decided to go into the question with the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. LEE: I would certainly ask Members of Council to defer consideration of this item. I think, as Your Excellency knows, before Sir Gordon left he appointed a Committee of which the hon. the Deputy President, Mr. Woolford, is Chairman, to deal with this matter. He is not in his seat now, and I would like him to be present when this Head is being considered.

The CHAIRMAN: There is difficulty about this. If you take off \$4,000 it should be understood that you are reducing the staff. One member of the staff that you will reduce happens to be a permanent pensionable officer. His name is Mr. Seymour. He is an Officer of the Treasury and has gone into this Department. If there



is no money to pay him under Publicity Bureau he would come back to Government to pay him from somewhere else. It is not that you are lopping off a temporary appointment and saving money thereby. There is no way you can lop off the rent, but we hope to be able to do so. The position is this: If you allow the staff to remain and they are not paid under this vote they would be paid under another Head. Should you take off \$4,000 you would merely have the position of Officers being placed in a Department with nothing for them to do.

Mr. FERREIRA: Can they not be transferred to another Department rather than to employ new men?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Seymour was transferred from the Income Tax Office to the Publicity Office. The post he held in that Department is now filled. It is a matter which calls for some thought.

Mr. JACOB: The position is this: The amount for those on the Fixed Establishment is \$8,000. That may remain. If Government takes over the Staff salaries other than those on the Fixed Establishment and all other charges—

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The clerical staff goes also with the Fixed Establishment.

Mr. JACOB: Take off the Temporary War Bonus from the few on the Fixed Establishment. I appreciate the difficulty in it. What the Unofficial Party wants is that Government must appreciate these things. This is not the only Department; the Labour Department is practically in the same position. We are not saying that those Officers who are on the Fixed Establishment should go. One can be ab-

sorbed in the Income Tax Office which needs strengthening and you can absorb the others in other Departments. One is in New York and when he comes back he should go somewhere else. If you can take off \$10,000, we would approve of it.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it is nearly 5 o'clock. I suggest that the Committee adjourns and reconsiders this matter, and let the Publicity Officer state his difficulties to you before your final consideration.

The Council resumed.

The PRESIDENT: When are we going to meet again? Do you want to meet at nights? I am quite agreeable. I presume you do not want to meet on Christmas-Eve day. A notice to meet tonight may be rather too short, but if you agree we may meet tomorrow afternoon and at night. I am quite prepared to assist in the despatch of Government business.

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: It looks to me that if things go on as they are going, we would get through very quickly except for one or two speeches which we should try and curtail. I think we may change the hours of sitting from tomorrow to 1 to 5. I think that will meet the wishes of Members.

The PRESIDENT: I do not mind. I will meet you on that.

VOICES: From 1.30

Mr. VEERASAWMY: I do not think it is necessary for the Publicity Officer to be heard. He was heard and has explained everything.

The PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until 1.30 o'clock tomorrow.