

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 27th December, 1944.

The Council met at 2 p.m., His Excellency the Governor, Sir Gordon Lethem, K.C.M.G., President, in the Chair.

PRESENT:

The President, His Excellency the Governor, Sir Gordon James Lethem, K.C.M.G.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. W. L. Heape, C.M.G.

The Hon. the Attorney-General, Mr. E. O. Pretheroe, M.C., K.C.

The Hon. the Colonial Treasurer, Mr. E. F. McDavid, C.B.E.

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

The Hon. F. J. Seaford, C.B.E. (Georgetown North).

The Hon. J. A. Luckhoo, K.C. (Nominated).

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

The Hon. J. I. deAguiar (Central Demerara).

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

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

The Hon. M. B. G. Austin, O.B.E. (Nominated).

The Hon. Peer Bacchus (Western Berbice).

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

The Hon. A. G. King (Demerara River).

The Hon. J. W. Jackson, O.B.E. (Nominated).

The Hon. A. M. Edun (Nominated.)

The Hon. V. Roth (Nominated).

The Clerk read prayers.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 21st December, 1944, were taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY laid on the table the following:—

Comprehensive Despatch to the Secretary of State reviewing Drainage and Irrigation conditions in the Colony. (Leg. Co. No. 27 of 1944).

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

The PRESIDENT: With regard to today's business we have this small Bill which I propose to take first if Members are agreeable, and get that out of the way. We will then proceed to the discussion of the motion on the Estimates. The Treasurer may have some comments on points that have arisen during the discussion in Committee which affect his original Budget Statement. My proposal is that we sit this evening and tomorrow afternoon, and waive sitting tomorrow evening. If necessary, we can conclude the debate on the Estimates on

Friday. I therefore ask the Attorney-General to move the second reading of the Bill.

SUGAR EXPERIMENT STATIONS
(CONTINUANCE) BILL, 1944. -

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move that Standing Rules Nos. 9 and 36 be suspended—No. 9 because the Bill does not come first on the Order Paper, and No. 36 because, although it was published on December 20, owing to the intervention of several public holidays, seven working days have not expired since its first publication.

Mr. WOOLFORD seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to continue in operation for a further period of one year the Sugar Experiment Stations Ordinance, 1942."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In moving the second reading of this Bill there is no need for me to explain it to the Council because it has been on the Statute Book in substantially, or in every material respect in its present form since 1932. The first two periods of its life were for five years, and since then it has been renewed from year to year. Two years ago, owing to the position of the sugar world, the sugar producers asked that it be made an annual Bill, and they have agreed this year that it should be enforced for another year. As far as this Council is concerned there is no expenditure involved, because the sugar producers and cane farmers provide the money for the working of the Experiment Stations. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. WOOLFORD seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and considered the Bill clause by clause without discussion.

The Council resumed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move that the Bill be read a third time and passed.

Mr. WOOLFORD seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ESTIMATES, 1945.

The PRESIDENT: There are two minor items under Education—Queen's College and the Bishops' High School—which were left over in the Committee stage, and we can deal with them now. I will therefore ask the Treasurer to move that the Council go into Committee to deal with pages 18 and 19 of the Estimates.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I move that the Council resolve itself into Committee to resume consideration of the Estimates for 1945.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Council in Committee.

EDUCATION—QUEEN'S COLLEGE.

The CHAIRMAN: I will call upon the Fourth Nominated Member (Mr. J. A. Luckhoo), as Chairman of the Advisory Committee, to address the Council.

Mr. J. A. LUCKHOO: The Council will remember that during the consideration of the Estimates in Commit-

tee two items dealing with Education under Queen's College and the Bishops' High School were held over for further consideration. Since then we have come to the decision that sub-head 1 *m* — Allowance to Librarian, \$180 — in the estimates for Queen's College should no longer form part of the estimate. I therefore formally move the deletion of the item.

Item deleted.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I would like to mention that, as appears on the printed memorandum, I proposed to move in a certain item for an allowance for a part-time Librarian, but in view of the amendment just accepted by the Council that amendment will not be moved.

EDUCATION—BISHOPS' HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no amendment proposed in respect of the estimates for the Bishops' High School.

Mr. JACOB: I wish to say something on this head. Frankly, I do not understand this Government's policy on secondary education, nor do I understand the Imperial Government's policy on education generally, and particularly secondary and higher education. I think the whole country, and indeed all the Colonies have been very pleased with the very kindly gesture by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in awarding scholarships of various kinds, and we have with us here now a representative of the British Council. We had Mr Stanard, a previous representative of the Council, who came here and made a report. Those of us who have an abiding interest in this Colony and the people in it are wondering what is the position in regard to secondary education. We have in this Colony several up-to-date schools for boys. We have now an up-to-date schoe' for girls (I hope it is up-to-date), but I see that Government has not put this school on the same footing as the school for boys.

I notice that the number of boys at Queen's College rose from 159 in 1931 to 387 in 1944. I understand that the number of girls now at the Bishops' High School for Girls is 210. Owing to lack of accommodation those of us who have daughters are unable to send them to this school. While that is bad enough I think the question of the fees is worse still. I am not certain whether the Board of Governors or the Governor in Council is responsible for the fixing of the fees for B.H.S. at such a high rate. I think I raised the point last year and I gathered that something would have been done. As a matter of fact it seems so obvious that if we want this community to progress, and if we want our girls to keep pace with the boys we must give them equal opportunities. As a matter of fact we should be a little more considerate for our girls. But what do we find? The fees for girls at B.H.S. are nearly double those at Queen's College. One wonders what is the policy of the British Government and this Government towards secondary and higher education.

It may be of interest to give a comparison of the fees that are charged at these two schools. At Queen's College the fees are: Preparatory Form \$10 plus \$1.50 Extras; Forms I to III, \$12 plus \$1.50 Extras; Forms IVB to VI, \$14 plus \$1.50 Extras. The fees at B.H.S. are: Preparatory Form \$16, other Forms \$20. Again, if you have one son going to Queen's College and you have a second son you pay for the second boy half of the fee for the first. At B.H.S. it is not so. I think there is a reduction of a dollar or two. Practically speaking the fees at B.H.S. are double those at Queen's College. I am very disappointed to think that the Board of Governors and the Governor in Council should allow this state of affairs to continue. Their attention was drawn to this matter last year and. I think, the year before, yet the position remains as I have stated. I have not got the fees for St. Stanislaus but

I think that at the Ursuline Convent the fee for the higher Forms is \$18.50, ever lower than that at B.H.S.

I do urge on Government to put the girls at B.H.S. on the same footing as the boys at Queen's College, and do not let us feel—particularly a certain race—that girls are not to be given the same opportunities as boys in the only Government institution that provides for secondary education for girls. I think that Government proposes to take over another secondary school in Berbice where both boys and girls attend. I have not bothered to find out what the fees are, but I do hope that this unsatisfactory system that prevails at B.H.S. will not prevail in Berbice when that school is taken over.

Mr. J. A. LUCKHOO: In view of the remarks of the last speaker and my own views on the matter, I think the fees at Queen's College are too low. Personally I think the fees at Queen's College should be brought into line with those at B. H. S. I think that is the levelling up the hon. Member seems to aim at, and not a reduction of the fees charged at B. H. S.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not prepared to make any pronouncement, but if the practice in England were followed the proportion of revenue from fees generally regarded as correct is about a third of the total expenditure on the school, and that calculation was reached after making allowance for a considerable number of scholarships or places held in the school paying either nothing or reduced fees. If there are a number of free scholarships and a number of cheap places in school it means, of course, that the fees to be paid by paying pupils will have to be correspondingly higher. Judged by that standard, both of our schools fall below. The fees at Queen's College bring in about one-sixth of the total expenditure, and those at B. H. S.

something less than the third which is regarded as ideal. It was put up to both Governing Bodies last year that the fees at Queen's College should be brought up to the same level as those at B.H.S., but that has not been proceeded with.

Mr. JACOB: I cannot accept the suggestion made by the hon. Nominated Member that I wish to see the fees at Queen's College increased. It certainly would not affect me, and I do not think it would affect the hon. Member, but in the interest of the community as a whole I think the fees at Queen's College are not low.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a matter of opinion. That completes our consideration of the Estimates in Committee.

The Council resumed.

The PRESIDENT: I will now call upon the Treasurer in case he has any comments or information to put before Members before we continue the debate on the motion for the approval of the Estimates.

TREASURER'S COMMENTS.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I would just like to say that as a result of our consideration of the Estimates in Committee we have added to the items which this Council was asked to vote sums totalling \$25,006, and we have deleted certain items totalling \$18, 830, with a net increase of \$6,176. In addition to that the Estimates have had to be amended by inserting the correct items which are provided for by law. Under the recently enacted Civil List (Amendment) Ordinance, and the Audit Department (Amendment) Ordinance, those amendments, which were not actually voted but have to be inserted in the Estimates, total \$20,570. The final net result is an addition to the total of \$26,746. The grand total, therefore, of the expenditure estimates to be

borne from the funds of the Colony becomes \$12,169,078 instead of \$12,142,332 as printed in the draft

I would like to remind the Council that there is one large item of emergency expenditure which we have not touched at all. I refer to subsidization and, as I stated in the Budget Statement, the procedure which we have followed for the last two years will be adopted again. That is to say Government will come forward with a formal motion at the next meeting, which will probably not take place before February, inviting the Council to approve of the continuation of subsidization measures. Various matters, or at least one matter affecting this is still under consideration, and will no doubt be completely decided by that time. In the meantime His Excellency proposes to authorize, and I think the Council will agree, the continuation of expenditure during January on subsidization as at present carried on.

On the other side of the account—Revenue—we have varied one important item in the Budget Statement. Instead of deleting the Sugar Duty we have continued its operation by an amending Bill—the Expiring Laws Continuance Ordinance, which has been enacted by this Council. As it happens, the item of \$140,000, representing the yield of that tax, is in the Draft Estimate which was prepared on the basis of existing taxation. Therefore as far as that is concerned the Draft Estimate remains as it should be.

One other item of revenue which was proposed in the Budget Statement has not yet been proceeded with. I refer to the proposal to increase the licence duty on cinemas, and also to increase the tax on admission tickets. Consideration of those matters has not yet been completed, and a Bill to give effect to that proposal will also come before the Council at its next meeting in February.

I should also like to refer to the head "Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes" which, as Members know, is almost a separate budget in itself. The items as shown in the estimate for the current year total only \$695,603. In fact the expenditure under that head will be very much larger in 1945. One item alone, which will be included in supplementary estimate as required, is provision for the construction of the Mackenzie airport. That will be a very large sum.

As regards Revenue, the revised estimate for the current year, as it looks to me, may not be reached. I was disappointed this morning to learn that we have not yet reached on the 27th, December the amount of \$4,061,000 shown under Customs. I understand it is about \$90,000 short. I do not know what will happen in the next few days, but it is just possible that we may reach it by the end of the year.

The motion before the Council is the approval of the Estimates based on the Budget Statement. I should have a little more to say after hon. Members have spoken, but for the present the Estimates themselves, the Budget Statement and the amendments made are sufficient bases for any remarks which hon. Members wish to make on the position generally.

The PRESIDENT: The debate is open to Members.

Mr. EDUN: I am not quite conversant with the figures just quoted by the hon. the Colonial Treasurer. I was prepared to examine the Budget Statement as presented to this Council previously, but having now reached the end of the Estimates there is a revision which alters the situation considerably and gives a better prospect. It was my intention to examine the proposals as submitted to this Council from 1943 up

to the last Budget Statement of the 7th December, 1944. I consider budgeting as a precise science and if I were placed in the position of the hon. the Colonial Treasurer who has graced that position for so many years, I might have been able to present a better picture of the financial situation of the Colony rather than going through the mass of figures, as presented to us, not intolerably in themselves but confusing and exasperating. Let me examine really what the hon. the Colonial Treasurer has said. If I am to examine the policy by Government's financial experts, I would consider it one of rigid reaction as against the other as envisaged by yourself in the various despatches that were submitted to His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies and those we were privileged to read. I see a complete somersault in the policy of this Government just within a period of eight months, and I am beginning to be very fearful because if I follow the hon. the Colonial Treasurer in his remarks of the 1st December, 1943—and with your permission I shall read the portion I am referring to:

"As regards Revenue, receipts have been exceptionally well maintained throughout the year and the total collections will exceed all expectations. Receipts from direct taxation—Income and Excess Profit taxes—now estimated at \$3,450,000—will exceed the original estimate by nearly \$700,000 while receipts from Customs Duties, originally estimated at \$3,000,000, are now anticipated to yield over \$4,800,000. The revenue from Rum Duty is expected to total \$1,550,000, an increase of \$550,000 over the original estimate. Altogether, the revised estimate of revenue for the year 1943 has been placed at \$12,587,461—an increase of \$3,621,622 over the total originally estimated."

That gave me a roseate picture of what the finances of the Colony were in the year 1943. That made me feel so comfortable that I agreed to raise the salaries of Civil Servants appreciably because of the situation. But the hon.

the Colonial Treasurer continued to give roseate pictures. Let us take his, "Note on the Present and Prospective Financial Position (1944)," dated 26th July, 1944. Paragraph 10 reads:

"As regards Revenue the position is now less indefinite and it appears that the forebodings referred to in the second paragraph of the extract quoted above were exaggerated. Actual collections for the first half of the current year have totalled approximately \$4,470,000 compared with \$4,744,500 for the same period of the previous year. (Customs departmental receipts have amounted to \$3,033,000 compared with \$3,308,000 in 1943—a reduction of only \$275,000). The major receipts from income and excess profits taxes accrue during the later months of the year and the revenue for the second half is consequently greater than that of the first half. In 1943, over \$7,800,000 was collected between July and December and it is possible to anticipate collections of not less than \$7,500,000 in the second half of 1944 with a total revenue of about \$12,000,000 for the year."

The 1943 Budget Statement followed by that note on the prospective position of the finances of the Colony moved me to create expenses which ought not to have been created at all. If I were to attempt that in private business I would be committing an act of bankruptcy. Therefore this Colony would be in a state of bankruptcy as a result. Explaining the final position in the 1944 Budget Statement the hon. the Colonial Treasurer said:

"I stated that the deficit on the draft estimates as presented is \$960,393 and that the variations in taxation proposed would, if adopted, decrease the revenue estimates by \$100,600 thus increasing the deficit to \$1,060,993. If it is assumed that subsidization measures will be continued at a cost to the Colony limited to \$1,000,000 as in the current year, the final outcome of the Budget for 1945 on the basis presented would be a deficit of the order of \$2,000,000 which would fall to be borne by an appropriation from the surplus balance."

Just within a period of two years, 1943 and 1944, the situation has so

changed materially as to alter the whole prospects so far as our finances are concerned. Then I consider this to be misleading to me, because if I am to accept the figures of an expert then I am to be given these figures on a rational basis, something I cannot understand. Do not expect me to believe that the 1945 position was roseate and then in 1944 there is a collapse of the whole thing and the whole finances are in a state of bankruptcy. I am beginning to feel that was done purposely to mislead hon. Members of this Council in order to enhance the Civil List so that Civil Servants should get a lot of money. I consider that as not playing the game at all. That is the situation as I see it. In my own mind reading through these budgets—I am dull perhaps and I may be blamed for being dull at figures but certainly I claim the right to have the figures placed at my disposal in order that I should present a comprehensive situation as clearly as it should be placed on paper—we have here a state of indefiniteness. The hon. the Colonial Treasurer himself says so emphatically in his Note, and I consider it very misleading. I do want to make it very clear that I have been following budgeting in the United Kingdom and, I am sure, in that country budgeting has reached such a state that every intelligent Member of Parliament is able to understand it. Here we have not so many items to go through as in Parliament. It is just one routine thing. Even with all that has happened I can present a better picture. Is it not for me to come to the conclusion then that these figures are presented here like this in order to mislead?

Am I to understand that the creating of an apparent deficit is due to the desire to make the world believe we are a bankrupt country? Is it not better to vote a surplus instead of a deficit? I remember the days when there was in this country a political party known as the Popular Party.

The people of this country were organised and certain of them got into the Legislature with one determination. But what happened in the course of a few years? Because certain political concessions were mooted and grant-loans began to be showered on us, this country's financial control was handed to the British Treasury. I feel that this idea of creating an apparent deficit in the finances of the Colony is a deliberate attempt to mislead. If it is a question of budgeting, it should not be left to one Member alone. The Finance Committee should have met and presented the Budget instead. I feel much disappointed over the whole situation because I do not see how I can go back on my own commitment. How can I justify my position here as a Member of the Legislature, when I had begun to feel that we had a lot of money and that this Colony was solvent and to be presented now with a very doleful statement which causes very grave alarm. The hon. the Colonial Treasurer himself has spoken. With your permission, sir, I shall read it from the Budget Statement:

“His Excellency the Governor has in his recent announcement in Council emphasized the urgent need for production, and still more production, both for domestic consumption and for export, and this must be the guiding principle in the coming year.”

I agree that there should be more production, but on looking at this Note here as presented by the hon. the Colonial Treasurer I find in paragraph 17 the item “Economic Development” showing an expenditure of 2.7 per cent. in 1937 and 4.47 in 1943. I see on the whole Social Services the expenditure has risen by 5 per cent. and more, but the whole thing that affects my perspective is this: I see the Administration is heavy at the top while at the bottom there is no development, no production and the people are struggling for existence, if I am to conclude the amount of money

we waste on administration under this particular Head—Economic Development—is more than just 4.47 per cent. as given here.

The PRESIDENT: What do you conclude from?

Mr. EDUN: The Note on the Present and Prospective Financial Position by the hon. the Colonial Treasurer dated 26th July, 1944. I am thinking that this is a continental country, the administration is top-heavy and there ought to be much development economically, agriculturally and otherwise in order to pay for the administrative services. I agree that in the course of a few years there will be total bankruptcy—

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I never said that!

Mr. EDUN: If I read the hon. the Colonial Treasurer's statement correctly, he has actually said so but in other words, because if we have a deficit of \$2,000,000 that in itself gives the impression that we are not progressing on rational lines. I do not know how this Government can accelerate production by not helping industries with money. I do not see how we can progress if we continue to do as we are doing and not endeavour to explore the avenue of economic development. I want to give an idea of what I mean by more production.

Just recently we have received a communication from the Ministry of Food stating that an increase of subsidy will be given to Sugar. Whatever the Minister of Food may say that the United Kingdom Government will give, the expense had already occurred. That will mean on a basis of 140,000 tons more than \$1,000,000 or maybe \$1,344,000. On the one hand we are told Sugar is being given money, and on the other hand we are told by the Minister of Food not to give

Labour any money at all, and the British Government expects us to accelerate production. That is not good philosophy at all. What kind of suggestion is that? Frankly I cannot understand it. I am taking the view that unless there is economic development and more money spent that way we cannot hope to progress. We have made a little headway in the production of rice, but we do not get anything much from rice exports. I can say this, however, that it is attracting those people who ought to be producing sugar. If we had no control, no restrictions imposed by the Rice Marketing Board, no interference by Government we might have seen a different picture. We might have seen rice production increased by leaps and bounds right into the year 1916 or 1919.

I am not against control, a single-seller and so on. In the interest of the economy of the State those things are necessary in war time, but can any person who happens to be controlling the Ministry of Food tell me that if the sugar companies are given money in order to stabilize the industry, and the producers are not given anything there will be more production? Anybody who would suggest that to me does not understand human nature. Government is satisfied because the sugar companies say "We will forego \$240,000 and we will not give the sugar workers anything." Is it a bribe? I wish to be clear on this point—that the British Guiana Government has, so far, nothing to do with the matter. That is clear. It acts only as a go-between the two parties. If the sugar workers say that they are not prepared to work in the interest of the State in order to carry on a top-heavy Civil Service, what will become of the economy of British Guiana? Is it not our duty to tell the Ministry of Food that something should be ear-marked for the sugar workers? What is the use of saying in the Budget Statement that there should be more production? I have made

representations to the sugar companies. I see that they are more concerned about the stabilizing of their own properties, and I think the time has come when something definite ought to be done.

I want to say emphatically to anyone who suggests to me that if sugar workers were given more money they would not work, that that is all blarney. Today sugar workers are producing rice and are making money by it. If there was no control of rice they would have made more money. If the average worker can make more money by planting rice can he be expected to help to produce more sugar in order that we should get more rum? I think the sugar companies ought to have told the Ministry of Food, the Colonial Office, and this Government, that they are making a lot of money out of rum, so much so that the Budget Statement discloses that it is anticipated that the rum duty will yield \$1,730,000 in 1944. We are producing rum, poisoning certain people, and getting a lot of revenue. Is that Christian? What I am concerned about is how are we to balance our budget? How are we to have more production? Where are we to get revenue to meet our deficit? I thought the Treasurer might have told us that it was proposed to increase the licence duty on retail spirit shops by at least 10 per cent. He would have got \$5,000, and an increase of hotel and tavern licences by 50 per cent. would have given \$2,000.

Has it escaped the notice of the Treasurer how many properties are changing hands, and how the middle class people are making money out of tenement rooms? He might have suggested a 40 or 50 per cent. increase in the tax on transports and mortgages, but that would have affected a certain class, the *petite bourgeois*. Why is it that landlords are making so much money and we are not getting some

revenue out of it? Some of the big firms, the wealthiest firms of this country, have asked for drawbacks. Perhaps we Members of this Council might suggest that Government should ask for drawbacks too. After all we are giving public service and wasting time in this Council; we are getting nothing out of it. I do not think we have reached the stage to ask for drawbacks, but the firms do it simply because there is provision for it in the law. The firms take the opportunity to get some money out of the State.

Even the Banks do it; they ask for a rebate of \$1,800. I have tabled a motion—and it takes a man with some courage to do that—that the Banks should pay a licence duty of \$5,000 each, which would give Government \$10,000. There are branches of the Banks in New Amsterdam, and the licence duty on five Banks would give us \$25,000. We may get revenue to the extent of \$50,000. The poor man has to pay a cent more postage on his letters, and the trade unions post no less than 50 letters per week. That is the kind of Government we have in this country. It taxes the poor man instead of making the Banks pay higher licence duty. Perhaps some people will tell me that the Banks give loans and help to develop the country. Examine our exports and see whether the Banks have justified their existence in British Guiana at all. No small man can get a loan from the Banks unless he has collateral security—guilt-edge security for that matter. Instead of that the Banks are making money at our expense.

I think we should get some more money out of the Public Works Department. I have come to the conclusion that the time has come when the question of land settlement should go by the board. We have a land settlement scheme at Vergenoegen, but wouldn't it have been better if those lands were sold to the people? It is not the policy of the Government to sell lands. I was

in favour of that policy myself but I have changed my mind. If Windsor Forest was put up for sale tomorrow in 5-acre plots Government would get all the money it needs. Anna Regina should also be sold in lots, but there is the rigid reactionary policy of the State of which there is no explanation. It is easy to ration a scarcity, such as the Control Board is doing. The criterion of genius is expansion, the kind of expansion Your Excellency has made us comprehend—something that caught the imagination of the people of this country—and we are prepared to back you to the core. It is a painful episode in the history of the country that at a time when we feel that there will be a jumping-off ground to greater things some evil genius is pulling at the strings and has changed the whole situation within eight months. We have a deficit of two million dollars staring us in the face. I do not see any sum on the estimates for subsidization.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I thought I had carefully explained that that particular item had not been dealt with. I went on to say that, as is customary, Government proposed to come forward in February with a formal motion with regard to subsidization. I also said that Your Excellency, and I had no doubt the Council, would approve of our continuing subsidization in January until that motion was moved. I specifically stated that no provision had been made for that in the Draft Estimates.

Mr. EDUN: Perhaps the matter will be clarified then. There is also the question of the sale of Colony lands and Crown lands. Of course the hon. Member is an expert on that subject and I do not wish to anticipate him. I want Government to believe that in this matter I am prompted by one motive, and that is to see that my country progresses. After all this is my land; I was born here, my children

and I live here, and I am not prepared to accept anything less than service from those whom we pay. During the Budget session, when the glare of the light manifested itself in the crevices of this Chamber, I was inspired by something. I saw at the head of this Administration four intellectual geniuses. Perhaps I should name them in the interest of this Council—His Excellency the Governor, No. 1, the hon. the Deputy President (Mr. Woolford), the hon. the Colonial Treasurer, and the hon. the Attorney-General—a combination of intellect. What struck me rather forcibly was this: that as I saw them that evening, the electric lights shining on their bald heads, I saw intellectualism just rushing out, (laughter) and I began to feel that at last this country would progress, because I believe in the political truism that bald heads suggest growth. I wish to place implicit confidence in the highest members of the Administration, but I do not think I can entrust them with the destiny of British Guiana yet. In my humble opinion I think there is something wrong. I may be told that we cannot achieve more production by magic, but I say that we can do so by spending, and we may do more harm by irrational spending and giving the sugar companies more money and not giving the sugar workers any money at all.

I am asking Government to consider my suggestion that we raise the licence duties on the various items I have mentioned. I am also asking whether the Official Receiver ought not to return to his post? I am sure that if that office is examined Government could get another \$1,000 of revenue. My friend on my right says that we should tax the lawyers. I do not know how we could do that. I want to make it very plain that the people of this country are not content with the solace of social and welfare development; we do not want charity any longer; we want a big loan from somewhere. In everyday life when

a man's business has reached saturation point it has to be capitalized. In the case of our country Your Excellency has, with your great imagination, suggested that we should borrow 20 million dollars and spend 10 millions on irrigation and development—a long-range policy—and 8 millions on roads. If the British Government proposes to give us money from the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund to be repaid when we have a surplus I consider that to be just tinkering with the problems of British Guiana. We want more progressive ideas of development, and the only way we can maintain the Administration is to plan for economic development, more production on the coast lands, and so on. I have been speaking with the representatives of the sugar companies and I said to them: "Can't the sugar companies and the workers not plan together so as to urge the workers to work more days per week?"

I am pleading with every Member of this Council to ask himself this question: Doesn't the economy of this country depend upon the illiterate and barefooted sugar workers of British Guiana? Is it justice to deny them the right to have a say in the Administration—the right to vote? Ask yourself whether that is justice, economic or otherwise? You make them work for you—make them hewers of wood and fetchers of water, and when the time comes for them to exercise their right to vote you deny them. They are to have no right to citizenship because they happen to be barefooted and illiterate. I want to tell this Council that an injustice has been done these people and nothing can write it off. Someone will suffer retribution for it. Sugar workers will not work in the interest of anybody. They may suffer, but I am sure the Indian sugar workers of British Guiana will never suffer. There may be a transition stage. I want a change of heart on the part of Government also, because it is no use talking of more production by barefooted and illiterate

sugar workers if you are not prepared to give them the right to live under better conditions, to achieve a higher standard of living, and the right to vote.

Mr. JACOB: It appears very clear to me that the majority of the Members of this Council were not very keen about debating the Budget that has been presented, and through my insistence we have had a changed method of debating the Budget. It does not matter how it is debated so long as we debate it. It does matter how we go about it. I believe we must get to the right place some day. That day, to my mind, is very far distant, I am sorry to say. With those few words I will proceed to review the estimates of expenditure and revenue, and to add to what I have already said under some of the heads we have discussed in the Committee stage. I notice that Your Excellency has caused a departure to be made by not giving at this time of the year some forecast as to the future. I take it that the Treasurer's forecast is Government's forecast. Your Excellency's last speech delivered in May, 1944, was somewhat lengthy, and I am going to refer to a few figures in it. On page 2, under the heading "Finance" it is stated:—

"It will be recalled that the latest figures, as announced by the Treasurer, indicated that there had been a surplus of \$1,300,000 on the working of the year 1943, with a total accumulated surplus balance of \$5,760,000 at the close of the year. The final figures on the closing of the accounts are: surplus for year \$1,468,000, accumulated surplus balance \$5,929,000."

I had made up my mind not to deal with the Note by the hon. the Colonial Treasurer, nor to say very much on his Budget Statements presented to us year by year. I have the Budget Statement dated 7th December, 1944, and have read it with interest. I have the Budget Statement dated 1st December, 1943, and that also I have read with interest. I have the Budget Statement dated 18th November, 1942, and the

Budget Statement dated December, 1941 by the Colonial Secretary. Those four Budget Statements intimated a deficit with the exception of the one for 1943 which showed a surplus of \$86,000, and in spite of that forecast we have, as Your Excellency stated in your review, an accumulated surplus balance of \$5,929,000. This year's revenue figures are based on existing taxation for 1945 and amount to \$11,181,939 and the expenditure from Colony funds is \$12,142,332. The result is a deficit of \$960,393. In other words, the deficit of \$960,393 generally speaking wipes out the \$929,000 that we have, leaving an accumulated surplus of roughly \$5,000,000 at the end of 1944. The year that is coming to a close will not result in a surplus over expenditure. That is to say, revenue will not exceed expenditure by at least \$5,000,000. The hon. the Colonial Treasurer has given his forecast, and he wishes us to believe that the financial position in 1944 will be a deficit of \$844,541. As I said, I am not prepared to accept those figures, not even to comment on them very much.

I am going to comment on one aspect of his Budget Statement of 1944, dated the 7th December. Under the head "Budget for 1945" he states—it is a long paragraph and I am going to read the second portion of it:

".....Notwithstanding the recently announced favourable developments as regards the Colony's major mining industry, the revenue derivable in 1945 from direct taxation (income and excess profits taxes) will still be not much below the exceptionally high level it has attained in the last two years because the full effect on revenue of these developments will not be felt until a year later when a severe drop may be expected. Some immediate deterioration is however certain to ensue in the receipts from other sources."

Let me repeat "Some immediate deterioration is certain to ensue in the receipts from other sources." The hon. gentleman has been predicting and

prophesying for the last four years, and yet we have roughly \$5,000,000 accumulated surplus. I am sure he has grown so accustomed following the uneven track that he still pursues that course. I cannot understand why and, as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat stated, there is something wrong. Some other genius is at work. This idea of presenting an unfavourable budget to the Colonial Office year after year is something I must protest against. I do not know how the Colonial Office sees the records of this Council, whether it is informed that everybody agrees with Government's indications, whether it sees these things and says the Legislature has approved and everything is O.K. Well everything is not O.K. so far as I am concerned, and the sooner this Government takes steps to put forward both points of view and not only its own the better it will be for all concerned. So long as Government insists on its point of view so long will we continue to wrangle in this Council.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: If the hon. Member wishes he can see the despatch to the Colonial Office forwarding the Estimates in which reference has been made to his own criticisms. That reference said that one particular Member criticised the Estimates unfairly and even said it was particularly designed to mislead. Those remarks were communicated to the Secretary of State. The hon. Member may rest assured that every side of the picture is put up to the Colonial Office. His very words were used.

Mr. JACOB: I am not referring to the garbled statements made from time to time. I prefer the debates to go forward. I am wondering why the Colonial Office is not asking for the debates, why it suited Government to print the debates on the Franchise question. I think it is essential that the debates are printed so that the trend of thought of Members can be seen. I repeat it is most unfortunate

that unfavourable balances are put up year after year to the Colonial Office and this Legislature approves of them. It is not possible to get a vote against it. The set-up is of such that we have to take things just as they are. What else can some of us do? As a matter of fact we may be told that we have the remedy, but I do not see it. The deficits as indicated are very disappointing to those of us who have the Colony at heart. I am hoping there will be some immediate change, maybe constitutional or otherwise. So far as constitutional changes are concerned I hope they will come about soon and that we will get some inspiration from Jamaica, a Colony that has shown the Colonial Office that the people can combine. Maybe efforts will be made to do something to counteract any such combination of co-operation here by the elements that do matter, but we will wait and see. It has been stated that Revenue is based on existing taxation, and the Revenue Estimates are \$11,877,542. I do not know if those two words "Existing taxation" have different meanings to what I take them to mean. The Revised Revenue Estimates for 1944 amount to \$13,504,598.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I would like to help the hon. Member to quote the figures. The amount quoted includes the Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes, which he will see mentioned as \$1,500,000.

Mr. JACOB: I think it will be much better to leave out the Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes. The total Colony Revenue was \$12,004,598 exclusive of the Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes, and the estimate for this year is \$11,181,939, roughly \$1,000,000 less, based on existing taxation. Everything is to be collected now except a few minor items, and yet there is a proposal to have Cinema Licences and Cinema Taxes increased. I cannot imagine why there should be this low estimating

of Revenue, but I am told that the best thing is to be on the conservative side and let us have a surplus rather than a deficit. Frankly I do not believe in that, and I made a note here about that. "Customs" as I stated during the course of the debate in Committee, is estimated far too low, "Fees of Court or Office, etc." is estimated too low, "Rents" is estimated too low, and "Post Office, Telegraphs and Telephones" is estimated too low. So I am not going to go into much details about them. I maintain that the estimated Revenue should have been higher for 1945 than as put down here, and the estimated Expenditure should not have been put down so high.

The hon. Member for Western Essequibo stated that there is a saving, and I tried to look up the Press reports to see what the figure was. The hon. Member on my right (Mr. Peer Bacchus) reminds me that it is \$600,000 on "Public Works." Then I think we have some saving under "Transport and Harbours Department." So I have no doubt that with these savings it is very unwise to estimate so high again this year for "Public Works." What was the amount estimated for this year?

Mr. C. V. WIGHT: Speaking subject to correction, I think the amount is \$1,714,000 odd. The hon. Member quoted, and I agree with him, \$1,900,000 odd, but, as has been pointed out, if he takes from those figures the Colonial Development and Welfare Schemes, the General Staff Establishment amounting to \$200,000 odd and another amount of \$80,000 for Drainage, Irrigation and Sea Defences, he would find that the figure quoted by the hon. the Colonial Treasurer is what will be for works to be put into execution.

Mr. JACOB: I am referring to the whole Public Works vote of \$1,996,848 I think it is unwise on the part of Government to put up estimates amounting to roughly \$2,000,000, when it ought to be known on Government's own showing

that deterioration is going to take place, several things are going to happen and these works are not going to be executed. Why burden these estimates with such a huge sum when it ought to be known from experience gained during the last three or four years that every year you estimate to do certain public works but you don't do some for reasons, I think, very plain to certain people and others beyond our control? In every case they are not done because of certain methods which this Government must practise. I refer to the Hague Road as one. If it is going to be said that you cannot find mud to burn to make up that road and so make 500 people comfortable, then something is radically wrong somewhere. Government has admitted there is something wrong. When Government is cornered it just remains silent. It says nothing. I speak strongly on the Budget position because I realize what the outside world thinks. Your Excellency was at pains to tell us what the outside world thinks. Let me read what the outside world thought of us as intimated by Your Excellency last year. In the hon. the Colonial Treasurer's Budget Statement of 1st December, 1943, he repeated Your Excellency's words said in this Council on the 19th November:

"To sum up, the present position gives no cause for anxiety and we can meet present obligations and even carry some extraordinary expenditure. I wish I could say the same about the more distant future. Outside opinion is exceedingly concerned as to the precariousness of our economic position at the end of the war and I think most of those within the Colony who can judge best share this concern....."

I am one who cannot judge at all. I certainly do not share that concern that this Colony must remain in its present stagnant position and not go forward, but Government's policy has been not to plan at all, except through some of Government's Advisers to plan for the sugar industry alone. Has our Government planned for the future as

regards rice, coconuts, coffee, livestock and minor industries? Absolutely nothing has been done. We have heard Your Excellency make announcements in this Council Chamber during the last three years and I have paid particular attention to those announcements, but I am sorry to say they were so vague, so wide off the mark, that one wonders when we will get something practical, some plan made to let the outside world feel that this Colony has men to look after its future and is not going to depend on outsiders to come here and boss us. To tell the outside world that we have no future, then we should shut up shop and leave the Colony to the Aboriginal Indians, the original inhabitants 100 years ago. Over a century this Government has had no plan but to exploit the people from the East and from Africa. This Government brought nearly 300,000 people down here and after they have laboured some have gone back to their homeland decrepit and worn out and some have died. Government has brought all those people here and what has it done for them? Is it not better for those who remain here that those who want to go away should be allowed to do so? That is the only proper thing for this Government to do. Let all the people who want to leave the country go. Do not prevent them. Don't do the things you have done during the last 50 years—not bringing ships and not allowing those people to exercise their right to leave the Colony, a right they have by law, though this Government is saying they have no legal right. Let the people clear out of the Colony as Government is unable to plan. Government finds itself hopelessly incapable to plan for the future. That is how I see it. Budget for real progress where the war does not affect very badly. But you are unable to plan. Look at our South American neighbours. Everywhere progress has been made, but we are unable to produce even for our own domestic requirements. I thought at one time this Colony was hoping to

supply the whole of the West Indies with rice. What have we done really? We have reduced our exports by 50 per cent. That is not going to be admitted but it is a plain fact. We have reduced it, but the jugglers of figures are going to put up another proposition. My hon. friend, the Sixth Nominated Member, said that the people are making more money on rice than on sugar. That may be true to some extent. What are they making on sugar? The women are not working for \$2.00 a week and the men are not working for \$3.00 a week. Of course comparing that with what they earn working on rice it certainly seems they are making more money on rice.

Mr. SEAFORD: Will the hon. Member say how many days a week?

Mr. JACOB: I am not going to bandy words with my hon. friend. Let me say that I know they have to leave their homes early in the mornings and walk miles to work returning late in the evenings. My hon. friend knows that better than I do. He is the principal party who prevented them working 5½ days or 44 hours a week.

Mr. SEAFORD: That is absolutely untrue and the hon. Member knows it is untrue. It is the usual wild statement that he makes in the hope of getting away with it. The people of the Colony have begun to know him very well, and he does not get away with it as much as he hopes.

Mr. JACOB: Does my hon. friend say that the people are not working 14 to 16 hours a day?

Mr. SEAFORD: His hon. friend does nothing of the kind.

Mr. JACOB: I know workmen who work more than 44 hours a week in the sugar industry. They will not prepare statistics as to the working days and how many working hours. However,

that is not going to take me away from my point. The hon. the Sixth Nominated Member stated that the people were making more money working on rice than on sugar, but he did not give figures. The figures I have quoted are on the high side, but they have been given by the Labour Department. They are not my figures. Maybe it is well the Labour Commissioner has had to go. We have not heard why. He has gone on leave and will be going back to his original job. I think that is the best place for him. Fancy a Labour Commissioner coming with European ideals and ideas that must be fitted in with native ideals and ideas! The whole thing is a howling farce. I wonder if the people in England are working 10 and 14 hours a day for a day's pay! I know that immediately they finish an 8-hours shift they get something more, and my hon. friend knows that as well as I do. He has children in England.

Mr. SEAFORD: My children are not in England. They happen to be in Holland at the present moment.

Mr. JACOB: He knows better than I do the conditions in England. This is a country of natives who must be exploited. They are here to work 10, 12, 14 hours a day. There is no alternative but to work and for whom—a set of people who take away all the money from the country. I would not worry if the money remains in the Colony. Some method ought to be adopted to prevent the money going out of the Colony as is done in England that money must not leave the United Kingdom. These Colonies are to be exploited and the natives here, the people brought here, must be exploited for the benefit of a few.

I was saying that the people who are producing rice now are doing better than those who are working for the sugar proprietors. That is definitely so. But that has been the position all along. Owing to world conditions and

because the people were not getting that preference in subsidy and artificial aid they had to suffer, but the British people are unable now to stabilize anything—and I say that with some concern. They are definitely unable to stabilize anything, and world conditions must have effect. What this Colony ought to do and will not do is to produce as much rice, as much live-stock and other things as we can produce and have produced in commercial and exportable quantities and sell them to our neighbours who want them and will pay any price for them. This Government does not want this Colony to produce 100,000 tons of rice. This Colony produced over 50,000 tons of rice some time ago. You don't want to double it, why? It is because the Indians are going to benefit by it. It is their industry. But you do want to increase the production of sugar from 100,000 tons to 200,000 tons and to carry it in another year or two to 250,000 tons. What are you doing about rice?—Absolutely nothing. Is it not time those concerned with the rice industry, fortunately or unfortunately they are not now concerned with it because of self-interest, be concerned with it for the benefit of production? I have dropped at least £4,000 or £5,000 in the industry and that is enough for me. But what is Government doing about it? You are not prepared to do anything about it, and yet there is all this unnecessary talk about doing this and that. It is time to call halt. Stop this talking and let us do some planning.

I ask this Government to plan and produce 100 tons of rice. You have the land, the people, and the market for it. What are you going to do about it? I am sure you are not going to do anything. I ask you to plan and produce three times the quantity of coconuts we are producing. What are you going to do about it—nothing? What are you going to do about coffee?

We used to export coffee. We have heard so much about minor industries. What is the Government doing about it? I see nothing practical. I see committees upon committees being appointed. I have seen good reports. What is the net results of all these reports? Maybe it is too early to talk about the Minor Industries Committee, and so I will give it a chance for another year. I do want to see results so that we can tell those people who are concerned about our economic precariousness that we can manage our own affairs, and given a reasonable chance we can certainly do better than what has been done for us in the last century. I do not know whether it is Your Excellency's intention to go on with the debate as it is now the adjournment hour and I have some more to say.

The PRESIDENT: Can you finish your remarks?

Mr. JACOB: No.

The Council adjourned until 8.30 p.m.

NIGHT SESSION.

8.30 p.m.—

The Council resumed.

Messrs. Lee and Critchlow were present.

Mr. JACOB (resuming): I think it is my duty to refer to the announcement which Your Excellency made a few days ago regarding the increase in the price of sugar, and to couple that with the Sugar Duty. Your Excellency stated that the Ministry of Food had agreed to increase the price of sugar by £2 per ton, and I noticed in Sunday's newspapers a copy of a letter to the B.G. Sugar Producers' Association and the Man-Power Citizens' Association from

the Colonial Secretary's Office. I have in my hand a copy of the *Guiana Graphic* in which that increase is reported, and it is stated clearly that the increase in the export price of sugar is intended to cover the increased operating costs, and that there is no obligation on the part of the sugar producers to increase the rates of wages. I wonder if the workers contribute to the operating costs; maybe they do not. It is simply the machines that produce the sugar. Those who till the land, plant the canes, reap and transport them to the factories, are probably not connected with the manufacture of the sugar, and so they are not to be included in the operating costs.

I wonder, too, whether that letter has any real merit, and I wonder whether this Government had the authority of the U.K. Government to send forward such a letter. I really question the propriety of that letter, and I think Government has been most unwise to send a letter like that and ask that it be given the widest possible publicity. Government seems to be asking for trouble. I do not know whether Your Excellency has read the letter, but the concluding sentence of the first paragraph reads as follows:—

"It is further stated that producers may be given to understand that this increase does not carry with it the obligation on their part further to increase wage rates."

This Government knows how to conduct its business. It has its advisers, and all I can say is that I think it was a most unwise letter to forward to a trade union and to the Sugar Producers' Association, and to have it published. I think that when it granted this increase the Ministry of Food must have had the approval of the Government of the United Kingdom. I wonder what the Labour Party is going to say about it. When an additional preference was given to certificated sugar, as

it was called, I think it was with the distinct understanding that it was a contribution by the working people of the United Kingdom to the working people of this Colony, and when the Royal Commission visited this Colony in 1938-39 they went into the question very carefully. With Your Excellency's permission I would like to read par. 17 of the recommendations of the Commission which states:—

"17. These proposals have been framed in the light of pre-war conditions, and on the basis of the pre-war purchasing-power of sterling. We leave open the question how far they can be applied under war-time conditions, and how far they may need modification when the war is over. It seems probable that our various proposals with regard to sugar would cost the British Exchequer upwards of £1,500,000 a year; though less than two-thirds of this sum would be attributable to the West Indies."

The British Exchequer is contributing £1½ million yearly to colonial sugar, and two-thirds of that amount comes to the West Indies.

Mr. SEAFORD: May I ask where the hon. Member gets those figures from?

Mr. JACOB: If my hon. friend would walk with some books of reference he would certainly know.

The PRESIDENT: I think you should tell us where your information comes from.

Mr. JACOB: I was reading from the recommendations of the West India Royal Commission. I had the book in my hand. I read paragraph 17 on pages 19 and 20.

The PRESIDENT: Does the paragraph state that?

Mr. JACOB: That is word for word—one and a half million pounds a year.

Mr. SEAFORD: I know that that was stated in the recommendations made by the West India Royal Commission, but conditions have changed so considerably since then that what they recommended is in no way carried out. The price of sugar today is below world price. The Royal Commission do not say that we are receiving that price today.

The PRESIDENT: I think you can comment in due course. The Member is entitled to quote from the document.

Mr. JACOB: I go further and say that it is the intention next year to increase the production of sugar, particularly in this Colony, and since that is so the preference will have to be increased. The amount to be paid to certificated sugar will have to be increased, and the amount to be contributed by the British Exchequer will be increased. My hon. friend must learn to reason. If he has not started he must begin. As a matter of fact, I commend to him the reading of paragraph 16 of the report of the Royal Commission. Paragraph 17, which I read, is merely a summary of what the Royal Commission stated. When you increase the production of sugar in this Colony you are going to increase the contribution by the British Exchequer; you are going to take away from the working man in the United Kingdom and put it into the pockets of the few capitalists who own the sugar estates in this Colony. That in effect is what you are doing, and what this Government seems to appreciate, and indeed the National Government in England at the present time. I am wondering what the Labour Party is going to say, and what they are going to do about it sooner or later.

I give that information so that those who are interested in this preference and want it to continue indefin-

itely by the working people in the United Kingdom may set about to get the Ministry of Food and the war-time experts to do what they can to get Parliament to continue it later on.

I propose to refer to the wages that are being paid, and the query of my friend this afternoon as to the days the workers work for the small wages they receive. I did not intend to burden the Council with it but it seems necessary that I should do so and let it be put on record. I have in my hand the report of the Commissioner of Labour for 1943, and on page 9 I find the following figures: Non-resident piece workers' average weekly earnings during the period January to December, 1943, were, males \$3.87, females \$2.39; resident piece workers, males \$3.63, females \$1.99. In the case of "young persons," as they are described, (I take it that they are resident on the estates) for the period March to December males earned an average weekly wage of \$1.50 and females \$1.23. I thought the time was given in respect of resident and non-resident time workers, but the Commissioner seems to have omitted that information.

Mr. SEAFORD: Are those the figures that suit the hon. Member?

Mr. JACOB: It was not given in the 1942 Report, and I am surprised. On page 10 of the report are given the wages of the workers per hour, and they range from 4½ cents to 15 cents, and if these people are allowed to work only 8 hours per day it will be seen that they would only work for 36 cents per day. The combined wages of the workers are: males \$2.58 and females \$1.44 per week. If they work for \$2 per week and the combined average is \$1.44, it shows that the employers are unable to offer those time workers six days' work per week.

The statement is made continuously that the workers do not want to work every day of the week, and I want to put the onus definitely on the employers. Here are people living on their estates and in their houses, and when those people ask for work, particularly in non-grinding periods, they do not give them six days' work per week. When it suits the employers they give them six days' work per week, but when it does not suit them they only offer the people three or four days' work per week. One wonders how those people exist on these wages. I have given those figures for the benefit of my hon. friend who was very keen on knowing the number of days worked and the exact figures as regards earnings.

When the question of the Sugar Duty was being debated a few days ago I think I got Your Excellency's permission to refer to an interview with the hon. Member for Georgetown (Mr. Seaford) which appeared in the *Guiana Graphic* of March 19, 1944. I have the figures here and I think they will make very interesting reading. The *Guiana Graphic* sent its cartoonist to interview the hon. Member who happens to be, I think, (I am not too sure) the controller of that newspaper.

Mr. SEAFORD: Once again may I say that the hon. Member knows that that statement is incorrect. I have absolutely nothing to do with that newspaper, and he knows it.

The PRESIDENT: I rather think you have made that statement before.

Mr. SEAFORD: Yes, sir, I said that before.

The PRESIDENT: That statement has been made to this Council before and should be accepted. It is unnecessary to make the suggestion.

Mr. JACOB: I am going to say something more. I still think the hon. Member has something to do with this paper,

Mr. SEAFORD: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. Member allowed to make a statement which he knows is incorrect?

The PRESIDENT: You must accept the statement of the hon. Member.

Mr. JACOB: This Council has it that the hon. Member, as President of the Sugar Producers' Association, has nothing to do with the *Guiana Graphic*. I notice that it is printed by John Emanuel Forde, residing at lot 78, Brickdam, Georgetown, for the proprietors, F. A. Persick, Ltd. It may be interesting to know who F. A. Persick is.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think this is relevant to what you are quoting from the article. You must accept the statement by the hon. Member that he has nothing to do with that paper. It is quite unnecessary to carry the matter any further.

Mr. JACOB: I was saying that the hon. Member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford) is the Chairman of the Daily Chronicle, Ltd. I do not think that will be disputed.

Mr. SEAFORD: That is correct.

Mr. JACOB: I think Mr. F. A. Persick, in whose name this company is operating as a limited liability company, is an ex-Foreman Printer of the *Daily Chronicle*, and it is general knowledge that Mr. Persick has disposed of this limited liability company.

The PRESIDENT: This is all quite irrelevant. We have had a statement from the hon. Member that he has nothing to do with the paper. Continue your extracts from the newspaper if you like, but leave the hon. Member for Georgetown North out of it.

Mr. JACOB: I am amused but I have to accept your ruling, sir. I see the hon. Member's photograph in this paper.

Mr. SEAFORD: That is not my photograph. I have been insulted.

Mr. JACOB: I do not know if it is a caricature. I think the artist has done a very decent job, and the hon. Member is credited with saying many things here, and I am going to refer to one or two of them. He concludes by saying "I will place all my bets in British Guiana sugar." My hon. friend has been at pains to tell this Council—

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I may be allowed to say that I myself have been quoted by the artist who writes those articles, as making $2\frac{1}{2}=4\frac{1}{2}$. Is that to be quoted against me too? It is undoubtedly popular and jocular.

Mr. JACOB: I quite appreciate the hon. the Colonial Treasurer's anxiety to help his friend out.

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. Member needs no help whatever, sir.

Mr. JACOB: I must make my point. The point I am making is that this Sugar Duty which the Government has decided at last to continue to levy is at the rate of \$1 per ton on sugar manufactured, that is \$145,000 per annum, and that I made the point a few days ago that the consumers were probably paying the whole of that amount. I made it perfectly clear that I was not very conversant with the figures because they were a guarded secret by the sugar producers, and it appears to me that Government was not even aware of the price of sugar.

Mr. SEAFORD: I rise to a point of correction. Government knows the exact price of sugar, Government has

every figure dealing with local and export prices. The price of local sugar was fixed by Government.

Mr. JACOB: The hon. Member is not going to put me off my point; I am going to make it. He knows everything, but when he stated quite clearly on two occasions that the price of local sugar is \$14 per ton below the export price his hon. friend, our financial expert, was quick to jump to his feet to say "Oh no." He said that the Sugar Duty was paid partly by the consumers and partly by the sugar producers.

Mr. SEAFORD: Is that statement correct, sir.

Mr. JACOB: Definitely correct.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: What I explained was that the Excise Duty was no longer in force. It was imposed and taken off in 1942, and was paid partly by the consumer and partly by the producers. I am sure the hon. Member knows that too. The present manufacturing tax is paid wholly by the sugar producers. That is the point I made.

Mr. JACOB: And my point was this: that since the local price of sugar is fixed at a rate above the export price it is the consumer who was paying it, and my friend, the Treasurer, agreed that although the sugar producers were paying \$145,000, or whatever the amount was for last year and this year, and whatever it will be for next year, they were getting back a portion of it, if not all, from the local selling price of sugar, which was above the export price in 1943 and probably in 1944.

Mr. SEAFORD: That statement is absolutely incorrect. He was told that in respect of dark crystal sugar the export price was \$15 per ton higher than the local price. I am satisfied, and I think every Member will vouch for it, that the Treasurer did not admit such a thing as the hon. Member now says he did.

The PRESIDENT: Wasn't the local price kept down as a result?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The point I made was that the consumer did pay a part of the old Excise Duty, but Government took off that duty and reduced the price to the consumer. That is the present position. At the time when the old Excise Duty was imposed the local price of sugar was undoubtedly higher than the export price. Today the reverse is the case. In 1944 the export price is higher, and in 1945 it will be very much higher. The figure quoted by the hon. Member on my right (Mr. Seaford) is \$15 per ton higher, and that figure refers mainly to dark crystals. If you took all the grades of sugar sold and arrived at the correct quantities sold you would get a figure smaller than \$15 per ton. It is a fact that the present local price is below the export price of sugar, and it will be more so in 1945.

The PRESIDENT: Speaking for Government I should like to point out that this was part of the general arrangements made in January, 1942, whereby several things were done. One was a 5% bonus to lower paid Government employees, another was a 5% bonus to labourers on sugar estates, another was the lowering of the fixed local price of sugar, and lastly the determination to bring in subsidization in order to keep down the cost of living. It must be accepted that the action taken then was with the object of lowering the cost of living to the working man. I refer particularly to the adoption of subsidization and the step taken to keep down the local price of sugar. Am I not right, Treasurer?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: That is so, sir.

The PRESIDENT: All those four things hang together.

Mr. JACOB: That does not affect my point. The wholesale price of sugar

in 1942, 1943 and 1944 is: dark crystals \$2.55 per 100 lbs., yellow crystals \$3.25, and white crystals \$4. The equivalent to \$2.55 is \$57.12 per ton, and the export value of sugar in 1944 is \$54 per ton. In 1943 the price went up by 10/- per ton. This year I do not know what it is, and no increase was announced, but the increase of \$9.60 now made will carry the price up from \$54.60 to \$66 per ton.

Mr. SEAFORD: Once again the hon. Member is very far out in his calculations.

Mr. JACOB: After all we must get to the bottom of these things. If the export price in 1943 was \$56.40 per ton and no increase was announced—after all it is all controlled.

The PRESIDENT: We are dealing with a motion on the Estimates. What point are you trying to make relevant to the Budget?

Mr. JACOB: I am speaking on the Sugar Duty.

The PRESIDENT: Well, make your point and pass on. It is quite unnecessary to go into this lengthy rambling.

Mr. JACOB: If I am not interrupted I will make my points. I think I am going to make them unless you rule me out of order. My point is that if you take the three grades of sugar and multiply them by the three prices, and then divide those three prices by the tonnage sold you would get the value per ton. The value per ton of export sugar in 1943—

The PRESIDENT: What is the point you are trying to make that affects the Budget?

Mr. JACOB: That it was the consumer who was paying this duty although, for the sake of convenience, the producers were paying it.

The PRESIDENT: You have already supported the imposition of this production tax. Are you trying to suggest that we should remove it again? You must keep your remarks in some relevance to the Budget proposals.

Mr. JACOB: I think I am relevant, and I think you gave me permission to refer to these figures because, when the matter came up the other day, I did not have the complete set of figures here. I have them now and I wish to give them so that they might have some sense when one reads the debate. That is my main point. I am proving that the price of sugar, although controlled, is controlled at such a figure as to give the sugar producers a profit when selling the sugar locally.

Mr. SEAFORD: I rise to a point of order! The hon. Member stated three times that he does not know what the export price was in 1943. Therefore what conclusion can he possibly draw from the statement he is trying to make.

The PRESIDENT: Make your point that is relevant to the Budget as quickly as you can and pass on.

Mr. JACOB: I think I have made my point that the price of sugar sold for local consumption by the sugar producers was higher in 1943 and probably in 1944 than the export value of Dark Crystal. I passed on and referred to the interview of the hon. Member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford) published in the "Guiana Graphic" regarding the net value, as he termed it, in which he is reported as saying:

"Still I would not yet encourage an extremely high acreage of rice. Rice pre-war \$20.00 per acre and sugar around \$150.00 per acre."

Basing what I have to say on that, I would give figures extracted from the report of the Director of Agriculture to show that my hon. friend has underquoted the rice figure

and has overquoted the sugar figure so as to convince this Government that rice as an economic proposition to keep this Colony on its feet is worthless and sugar is the only stabilized product that can keep this Colony on its feet. I want to explode that theory. It is common knowledge among certain people that the economic value of rice is greater than the economic value of sugar in these parts, and in this Colony particularly one consumes two and a half times more rice than sugar. I think the quantity of sugar consumed in this Colony is roughly 10,000 tons and the quantity of rice is roughly 25,000 tons and, taking both, rice has a greater stabilized value than sugar. I maintain that this method of putting the value of rice so low and the value of sugar so high is with a certain object in view and that is, not to expand the rice industry but to expand the sugar industry. These factors are used by those in authority to assist in a greater extent the sugar industry than the rice industry.

My hon. friend stated that in pre-war years, that is between 1928 and 1938, the basic price fell by one-half. I have gone into those figures and have found that in 1930 there were reaped 54,264 acres of canes producing 127,764 tons of sugar and of that 114,542 tons were exported, the value being \$47.30 per ton. The value per acre was therefore \$111.35. That means you produced 2.35 tons of sugar per acre at \$47.30 per ton. The preference that was granted to Colonial sugar in 1930 amounted to \$22.80 per ton. If this amount is deducted from \$47.30, then the net value of Colonial sugar in the world market would be \$24.50 in 1930, which at 2.35 tons per acre is equal to \$60.57 as the value of an acre of sugar cane.

The PRESIDENT: What are those figures quoted from?

Mr. JACOB: The figures quoted are from the Report of the Department of Agriculture as regards the acreage reaped. The tonnage per acre and the quantity produced, calculated by the world price of sugar, give the world basic price of Colonial sugar without preference as \$60.57 per acre in British Guiana as against the figure of \$150 per acre quoted by my hon. friend. Cuban, or Hawaiian, or Puerto Rican sugar entering the world market goes on the world market price, but Colonial sugar enjoys various preferences which amounted to \$22.80 in 1930. I am saying, sir, that since no other article produced in this Colony gets that kind of assistance, when you want to compare that major industry with the second highest—rice—you should remove the preferences or artificial aids granted to the sugar industry. I ask this Government if it would go to the trouble of getting its Economic Adviser—we have got an Agricultural Economist—to go into this matter and get at the economic value of sugar, the economic value of rice and the economic value of coffee, so that we can know exactly where we are. I maintain that rice as an economic crop is of far greater value than sugar and this Colony will be far better off in producing two or three times the quantity of rice rather than a lesser quantity. That is my point. I go on now to say what is the value of an acre of rice. I have given sugar's. The value of an acre of rice based on the same Report is.—

Mr. SEAFORD: What year the hon. Member is quoting?

Mr. JACOB: 1930, based on my hon. friend's interview with the Representative of the "Guiana Graphic." Both figures being based on the same year, they are comparable. I gave the figures for 1930 regarding sugar and I am giving those regarding rice.

Mr. SEAFORD: Those figures are quite incorrect.

Mr. JACOB: I know they are not. 63,482 acres of rice were reaped producing 38,511 tons of rice and of that 22,480 tons were exported. The export value was \$48.50 per ton and the export value of sugar was \$47.30 per ton with preferences included and \$24.50 without preferences. That is a plain fact. The yield was .061 ton per acre with no preference, no market, but with proper methods and with drainage and irrigation assured—and in this my hon. friend can help—there should be not less than one ton per acre produced. In the Mahaicony-Abary Scheme they are producing not less than one ton of rice per acre.

Mr. SEAFORD: May I ask where my hon. friend is getting his figures from—one ton of rice per acre in the Mahaicony-Abary Scheme?

Mr. JACOB: 25 bags of padi per acre is certainly one ton of rice.

Mr. SEAFORD: Can the hon. Member state where he got 25 bags of padi per acre from?

Mr. JACOB: I know my hon. friend will contradict my figures when I give them.

The PRESIDENT: Is the hon. Member not prepared to tell us?

Mr. JACOB: From the Report of the Director of Agriculture. He gives .061 ton per acre as the yield. I am stating as a fact that with proper methods you can reap 25 bags of padi per acre—proper methods of flood fallowing; that is, leaving portion of the area uncultivated for a number of years in the same way as the sugar producers do. You have a large area that can be taken in for rice cultivation; plant a certain area yearly. Two crops per annum will certainly yield 2 tons per acre in the same way as 4 tons per acre for sugar.

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. Member has completely changed since questioned. He stated that Mahaicony produced one ton of rice per acre. I challenged where he got that figure from and he has been unable to state. It is in his imagination.

The PRESIDENT: That is quite true. The hon. Member stated they are producing not less than one ton per acre in the Mahaicony Scheme and when questioned he stated in his opinion that can be done. He must say one or the other. If it is his opinion very good. If it is a fact let us hear.

Mr. JACOB: I am not stating it is my opinion. I am stating it has been reported in the Press that the Mahaicony-Abary Scheme produces 25 bags of padi per acre, and it is within my knowledge that in certain parts of the Colony you get an average of 25 bags of padi per acre provided you do the planting in a proper manner.

Mr. SEAFORD: Twenty-five bags of padi is very different from 25 bags of rice.

Mr. JACOB: That is what my hon. friend will not understand. He gets up every half-minute to interrupt and will not listen. I never stated 25 bags of rice. I said padi all the time. Twenty-five bags of padi is equal to one ton of rice.

Mr. SEAFORD: I am sorry to get up again, but the hon. Member said they got two tons of rice to the acre in the Mahaicony Scheme. Those are the words he used. That is 25 bags of rice.

Mr. JACOB: I have stated 25 bags of padi per acre is equal to one ton of rice and two crops per annum will give two tons per acre. My hon. friend must learn to appreciate the other man's point of view. I am merely giving my point of view based on a close study of the figures of the Department of Agriculture as given in the Department's Reports from year to year, and I go on to say that the value of rice per acre is

therefore \$90.00 as compared with \$60.00, the value of sugar.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: To a point of order! It is an interesting point too. The hon. Member now says it is his point of view but before he said they were all facts. If it is his point of view it is O.K., but if it is a fact then it must be disputed.

Mr. JACOB: I am afraid I cannot make my hon. friends understand. I can only say what I have to say. That is the politest way I can put it. I say that based on the figures the economic value.—

Mr. de AGUIAR: To a point of correction! I am sorry to interrupt. The hon. Member is basing his argument on an assumption which does not exist. He has said twice this evening that the figures are based on the assumption that you get two crops of rice per annum. The hon. Member knows that that argument is not sound. We do not get two crops throughout the entire Colony. The best argument is based on facts.

Mr. JACOB: We will certainly never get two crops of rice per annum, if the rice industry is controlled, as it is, by the hon. Member for Georgetown North who makes it perfectly clear that so far as he is concerned rice must hold second place and sugar must be on top every time. It is most unfortunate that in a Colony like this where we have small industries—and I reckon the sugar industry is a small industry in the sense that it is expanding and has doubled itself within the last 20 years—that we should have the rice industry dying practically. It is impossible to get anything done, when persons who are interested financially in one industry are asked to control and give expert advice in respect of another industry. It is most unfortunate that this Government continues to take no kind of advice. This Government must plan as to what it will do with the various industries that we have in order to let the outside world

realize that we have potentialities, that we have possibilities and that we have men too to put this country on a sound footing.

I am going to refer to Land Settlement in this debate and to make just two or three points. I happen to be, sir, a member of the Land Settlement Committee. When I accepted the appointment to serve on that Committee, I think, I made it perfectly clear to Your Excellency and to the Chairman of the Committee that it is time we make land settlement a practical proposition. For a long time we have been trying—I have been trying—to see how far we can make this wonderful business a practical proposition, and I am sure that this Government does not know how many people want land and how many families desire to settle on land of their own either by long-term lease or by outright purchase. Is Government really concerned with the settling of people on lands? I leave it there. If the Government is concerned, what is the plan? I understand that a comprehensive despatch has been sent on to the United Kingdom saying that Vergenoegen should be taken over. I would be surprised to hear that Vergenoegen can accommodate 1,000 families. It is within the knowledge of this Government, never mind it does not want to say it, that not less than 10,000 families require lands, and if after all this time you are just going to begin with Vergenoegen it is time that this Government tells the community very clearly that Vergenoegen will settle so many and the others must look for something else to do rather than look for land to settle on or plant whatever crops they like. Land Settlement is one of the things that will put this Colony on a sound footing, and if this Government is not prepared to accept that advice and is not prepared to do that as promptly as possible then I can quite see and agree with outside opinion that everything here is very precarious.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. Member is a member of the Land Settlement Committee and had he taken the trouble to attend the meeting which I convened he would have known all about it. The hon. Member did not attend and I do not know why.

Mr. JACOB: As Your Excellency knows, I am a frequent attendant at meetings. It is humanly impossible for me to attend every meeting. That is the explanation. I come here every day at great personal inconvenience.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. Member might have told us that he could not attend, and we would then have taken the trouble to inform him of what was done. The decision was of first class importance, as would be seen from the despatch.

Mr. JACOB: I think the onus is on Government, and I am entitled to the courtesy of being supplied with a copy of the minutes.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. Member will see the despatch.

Mr. JACOB: I go on to make my point. I was saying that this Colony was heading towards bankruptcy having regard to the Budget figures, but I have so much confidence in the stability of this Colony that despite the figures as presented I feel we will be able sooner or later to get rid of these figures and have a sound balance at the end of 1945. I think, Government had made some kind of promise that the wages paid to the ordinary workers would have been increased. This bombshell that was given to us a few days ago regarding the increased price of sugar is another set back to the hope of labour co-operating with the Public Works Department and with the Irrigation and Drainage Department to get things done in a proper manner. I do not know if Government is satisfied with the wages offered the workers on

those schemes especially the Drainage and Irrigation Schemes.—I refer to the day-workers not the jobbers—because it ought to be known to Government that there is a huge waste of money when jobs are given out. The day-workers are not at all satisfied that the lesser works are not carried out on schedule time. I am going to plead with this Government that the money voted for public works—\$1,996,000—be explained as it would be a great help to some of us at least if a statement can be produced as early as possible showing what amount of the vote provided in 1944 was not expended particularly on public works, and it may be well too in order to minimize criticism that the same thing be done as regards the Transport and Harbours Department. I have a suspicion that if the exact figures are known we would feel more at ease and we would not be so alarmed at having the outside world believe in this time of Colonial prosperity that British Guiana is budgeting for \$1,000,000 deficit.

I hope this will be the last occasion that I will have the painful privilege of speaking so harshly on the Budget proposals that we get here year after year, particularly during the last three years. I am sure, sir, that if greater care is taken we would find that we can present a brighter Budget and, I think, the Colonial Office would be more concerned about giving us far greater assistance to carry on the affairs of this Colony. I think I have said sufficient to let this Government understand that the Budget is not prepared to create confidence in the minds of the ordinary people and if a different attitude is adopted there ought to be greater co-operation between Government and the people.

Mr. SEAFORD: I did not intend to make a speech, but figures have been quoted and statements made by the last hon. Member which are so inaccurate, so

far from the truth, that I am bound to get on my feet to refute them because, as the hon. Member oft-times says in this Council, they have got on the records. In this case although it is very much against my grain I must apologize for delaying the Council in this way, because I feel it really has nothing to do with the finances of the Colony. I cannot allow those things to go on record without refuting them. One of his pernicious statements—he makes so many that I am afraid I am quite incapable of putting them down—is that the British Exchequer is granting £1,500,000 to Colonial sugar of which three-fourths went to West Indian Sugar.

Mr. JACOB: On a point of correction! It is not a statement of mine. It is a quotation from the Report of the West India Royal Commission, and I want my hon. friend to appreciate that fact. He is not familiar with the Report.

Mr. SEAFORD: I am well aware of that, but the hon. Member tried to get it across that it was a fact today. He did not point out that was in 1939 before the war had started and that the Commissioners pointed out what would have been the result of certain recommendations if given effect to. He is trying to put it across because he stated that those recommendations have been carried out and, therefore, they are to-day giving us £1,500,000. It has been stated in this Council before, and the hon. Member knows it, that our sugar has been purchased for some years since the war by the Imperial Government, and we have been given a fixed price for it. It is known also to the hon. Member that the price we are getting for our sugar is below the world price of sugar to-day.

Mr. JACOB: To a point of order! Will the hon. Member state what the price is to-day?

Mr. SEAFORD: I am not prepared to state that figure because it fluctuates above the price the Colonies are given for their sugar. That being the case—and I think it is known by everyone—I fail to see how the hon. Member or anybody can say that the British workingman or the British Exchequer is paying £1,500,000 to the Capitalist of this Colony and the West Indies. The price, I stated, is below the world market price of sugar and, therefore, instead of giving us we are giving them. The hon. Member dealt fully, or thought he dealt fully, with the wages question in this Colony and he quoted the Labour Commissioner's Report where it is stated that the male workers earn \$3.00 a day and the female workers \$2.00 a day, and he mentioned some others. He did not state how many days per week. The hon. Member was in regular attendance when the inquiry was held into facts of this kind and the number of days worked per week, and he knows as well as I do. He has read the report fully and has quoted it here that workers were found to work 2.39 days per week.

Mr. JACOB: Is the hon. Member quoting the exact figure or telling us what he thinks?

Mr. SEAFORD: I am quoting the exact figure, and the hon. Member knows it.

Mr. JACOB: Will the hon. Member give the reference, please?

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. Member knows as well as I do that this is the report of the inquiry, and that was the figure which was given. He also said that there was no more work available than the people were getting. I would ask any sensible man in the world whether sugar estate proprietors are going to withhold work so that their production would decrease from 200,000 tons to 140,000 tons or less per year?

I do not think I need say anything more. The whole position is too obvious. I would, however, like to refer the hon. Member to a statement made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the House of Commons. The report states:—

“Colonel Stanley replied that wage rates paid to labour in the British Guiana sugar industry compared favourably with those of other sugar-producing colonies, but the chief difficulty facing the industry was shortage of labour owing to the fact that it was needed for food production for local consumption, and other important purposes. Wages had already increased on more than one occasion during the war. The average turn-out of labour was now approximately 2½ days per week for men and 1½ days for women, and a further increase would not necessarily tend to improve the labour supply.”

We in this Colony find ourselves in rather the same position as other Colonies in the Caribbean. I think people will remember that not many years ago the Jamaica Government introduced a Bill to help the sugar industry of that Colony. In the neighbouring Colony of Trinidad the sugar producers also found themselves in a difficult position and the Government put up \$800,000 to help the industry. I have quoted those figures so that the hon. Member for North-Western District (Mr. Jacob) might realise what is happening in the West Indian Islands.

The hon. Member went on to quote figures, and talked about 4½ cents per hour which worked out at 36 cents per day. The hon. Member quotes the Commissioner of Labour when it suits him, but he closes both eyes when it comes to figures that do not suit him.

Mr. JACOB: I rise to a point of order. I object strongly to that statement. I will pass on the report of the Commissioner of Labour to show that the figures I quoted were absolutely authentic.

Mr. SEAFORD: I am not saying that they are not, but if the hon. Member would read a little further he would find that the average wages are very considerably higher, and the average rates per hour are higher than the figures he referred to.

Mr. JACOB: It is stated in the report very clearly—men 8 cents per hour, women $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour. Throughout the report those figures are quoted.

Mr. SEAFORD: That is for time workers and not task workers. Furthermore, the hon. Member multiplied $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour by 8 hours and made it 36 cents per day. I made a careful note of it. He cannot get away with it. No male labourer is paid $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour, and the hon. Member knows that.

Mr. JACOB: I know that watchmen are paid less than $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour at Vryheid's Lust and La Bonne Intention.

Mr. SEAFORD: I do not intend to prolong that point. The hon. Member then went on to refer to certain remarks made by me, and referred to the *Guiana Graphic*. He referred to the export price of sugar once again, and the amusing thing about that is that he made a definite statement as regards 1943 and 1944, while in the same breath he said he did not know what the export price of sugar was in 1944.

Mr. JACOB: That is incorrect. I gave the prices for 1942 and 1943 and said I did not know what the price was for 1944.

Mr. SEAFORD: That is my point. The hon. Member says that the local price of sugar is higher than the export price, yet he admits that he does not know what the export price is for 1944. On the face of that does he expect any reasonable individual to put any faith in any figures he quotes, when he makes a statement like that? I told him the

other day that I thought the export price of dark crystals was \$14 per ton higher than the local price. As a matter of fact I was wrong; it is \$15.

Mr. JACOB: May I remind the hon. Member that the Treasurer said that that is not so.

Mr. SEAFORD: The Treasurer did say what I said—that the local price of dark crystal sugar was \$14 less than the export price. I now say it is \$15 less than the export price, and I am quite satisfied that the Treasurer cannot contradict that statement, nor has he done so.

The hon. Member went into long figures showing the value of rice as compared with sugar. It was not very difficult for him. I sat on a Committee some time ago when we were told that the average production of padi was 20 bags to the acre. Padi was then fetching from 80 cents to \$1 per bag, which gave a return of \$20 to the acre. At that time the average return of sugar per acre was slightly over 3 tons.

Mr. JACOB: My hon. friend is probably referring to certain parts of the Colony. Has he forgotten that in Essequibo the price of padi was \$1.50 per bag at the worst?

Mr. de AGUIAR: The hon. Member's statement is not correct and I am in a position to challenge it.

Mr. SEAFORD: I take it that the average price of padi was \$1 per bag, which gave a return of \$20 to the acre. The return of sugar was over 3 tons to the acre. Sugar was then selling at \$50 per ton, which gave a return of \$150 to the acre or more.

Mr. JACOB: May I ask the Chair to let the hon. Member state now where he got those figures from—3 tons per acre, \$50 per ton for sugar, and \$1 per bag of padi and 20 bags to the acre?

Mr. SEAFORD: Those are well known figures in the Colony. The production of sugar in 1942 and 1943 was in the neighbourhood of $3\frac{1}{2}$ tons per acre. This year it has dropped, and I do not think it will be $2\frac{1}{2}$ tons per acre. I do not think those figures can be contradicted, and they bear out the point which I tried to make at the time. The hon. Member compares the consumption of rice in the Colony with the consumption of sugar in the Colony, and declares that the economic value of rice is greater than that of sugar. The Secretary of State for the Colonies made a statement in Parliament, which I think was accepted by everyone in Parliament, that for the Colonies to keep their heads above water, to improve their living conditions and economic conditions, it was essential that they should find markets for their products. In other words, that they cannot take in their own washing. They must find export markets for everything, and I think that is a simple fact that is appreciated by every right-thinking and sensible person. We cannot produce stuff to be sold only in the Colony. No Colony can ever advance in that way. It is for that reason that I have stated that it is for us to produce as much sugar as we can, and as much rice as we can. I think Government and the vast majority of the people of the Colony know that I have been and I am still doing my utmost to improve the production of rice, to increase its production and to produce it as economically as one possibly can. I feel that sugar and rice have to go hand in hand. We cannot base our economics on a single industry. We have to secure markets, and I think that at some time to come we may have to compete with the East in the production of rice. That being so I hope we will never reduce the standard of living which exists in this Colony. It would be disastrous for this Colony from every point of view.

The hon. Member spoke about Cuban sugar being at a certain price, but I would like to point out what depressed the price of sugar in those days. What

was it? The cause was the high protective duties given to every country in the world by its Home Government. In the case of the Dominions Australia got £22 per ton for its sugar, which allowed that country to export its surplus and dump it into the world's market at a ridiculous price. It did not matter whether they got anything. The same thing applies to South Africa and the beet sugar of the United Kingdom. If we were getting for our sugar what they were getting for their preferences alone we could have lived comfortably on it. Cuba also got a preference in the world's market, but the hon. Member did not tell us what preference she got in the protective markets. He took good care to avoid that.

Mr. JACOB: I know that Cuban sugar in the world's market was given a preference of more than 4/- per cwt.

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. Member did not say what preference Cuba got in the protective markets. I was rather flattered by the statement of the hon. Member that the rice industry is controlled by the hon. Member for Georgetown North. I am not even a member of the Rice Marketing Board. I have nothing whatever to do with the control of rice in this Colony, or anything else. The hon. Member also said that I was called in to advise. I do not think I have ever been called in to advise on rice. I know nothing whatever about rice. I was called in and I did my best to help in laying out and empoldering land for drainage and irrigation, and to get machinery, for which I went North. I was successful in getting that machinery for the purpose of increasing the production of rice, but I have never attended a meeting of the Rice Marketing Board.

Mr. JACOB: The hon. Member is the Chairman of the Rice Expansion Committee. Instead of expanding, the cultivation of rice has gone down.

Mr. SEAFORD: I would ask the hon. Member one question—what is the acreage under rice today compared with

the acreage a year or two ago? I think he will find that 30,000 acres have been taken in for rice growing.

Mr. JACOB: That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. SEAFORD: The figures are there to prove it. I do not ask the hon. Member to accept any figures of mine.

The PRESIDENT: The figures are stated in a printed despatch.

Mr. SEAFORD: I do not propose to delay the Council.

Mr. JACOB: May I ask what figures were stated in the printed despatch?

The PRESIDENT: The acreage under the various schemes. I think it was 12,000 acres under the Mahaicony-Abary scheme alone. I think those figures were stated in the various applications for funds.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: What the hon. Member is concerned with is providing additional lands for rice cultivation, and the works which have been executed by that Committee or in progress cover 30,000 additional acres. The hon. Member is not saying that 30,000 acres were completed last year or the year before.

Mr. JACOB: May I enquire whether it was new or virgin land?

Mr. SEAFORD: The hon. Member knows the figures very well, but I will say this much, that practically the whole thing is new land which has not been under rice cultivation previously. It is no good my delaying the Council further. I fail to see that this has anything to do with the Budget Statement. I rose to refute statements made by the hon. Member and I hope I have made myself clear, and that hon. Members will realize what value they can put on statements and figures put forward by the hon. Member for North-Western District,

Mr. de AGUIAR: The Council is considering at the moment the Budget proposals, and I should like to have it recorded that since I have been a Member of this Council I have never listened to a debate which was so far off the subject under discussion as the debate I have listened to this afternoon and again this evening. As a matter of fact I would not like to be impolite to my hon. colleagues who preceded me. If I were I would say that I have listened to their remarks with a good deal of annoyance and disgust, more particularly because they did not deal with an important subject to which I have always looked forward when the occasion arises in this Council. Such criticisms as they had to offer were destructive, and they offered no solutions which would assist Government and the people of the Colony. In dealing with the Budget it is not enough for Members to make reference only to the deficit, and to accuse Government of motives for showing that deficit. It is a fact that the Budget proposals as submitted to this Council show a deficit of nearly \$700,000 on the printed statement, but in addition to that the Colonial Treasurer in his Budget speech made reference to the fact that those figures did not include certain other measures which will certainly come up for consideration later on, and it seems to me that instead of a deficit of \$700,000 we may have to face a deficit of something in the vicinity of \$2,000,000.

Mr. JACOB: May I ask where is this \$700,000? I notice that it is \$960,000.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I am referring to recurrent items. I have not taken into consideration extraordinary expenditure. The fact remains that what I have in mind, and what the Treasurer has referred to as the deficit (whatever the figures may be) I say that it is more likely to be two million dollars. It seems to me that is the figure hon. Members should pay more careful attention to and offer some suggestions to Government which might assist us to relieve the position,

The first thing I would like to say is this: Speaking for myself I have accepted these proposals in view of our present position, but I am very pessimistic. Your Excellency has more than once referred to the fact that when it comes to items of extraordinary expenditure we may allow those to proceed, but we should be careful with items of recurrent expenditure. I would like to say that I am entirely in agreement with that view, and I had hope that hon. Members would have expressed themselves in the same way. Maybe they are not concerned as to what portion of Colony expenditure keeps on rising, or they are not concerned about giving advice or warning to Government, so that some curb might be put on the rate of expenditure. What is also disturbing to me is that our recurrent expenditure continues to rise at an extraordinary rate, and whilst there is some buoyancy at the moment in our current revenue I am somewhat alarmed that our recurrent revenue will not be able to keep up with our present rate of recurrent expenditure. In these days the tendency is to look for revenue to switch over from indirect taxation to direct taxation, and I think we have already begun to take a step in that direction. In so far as the results are concerned, it is true that, for the present at any rate, and perhaps for another year, the amount of revenue that will be earned from direct taxation will probably assist us to keep pace with the rise in our recurrent expenditure, but I want to say this: that I am alarmed that our direct taxation will not, for the next year or so, be able to keep pace with it, and it seems to me that we have to be very careful in removing the levies we have at present on indirect taxation.

I had hoped that by this time it would have been possible to produce certain figures which would give some indication of the annual income of the people of the Colony, I think an

attempt was made in one of the Islands of the West Indies, and I am not so sure that the result of that investigation has proved satisfactory, or has produced the information that the particular Government concerned expected. I venture to predict that so far as this Colony is concerned it will be a shock when the time comes, if it does come at all, to ascertain the quantum (I use that word in its widest sense) that would be subject to direct taxation in this Colony. We should not take the present figures as any guide because, if we do, the day will come when we will all be very sad to find that we are unable to carry on some of the works we are doing now, however valuable those works may be to the people of this Colony. I do not think I am too early in sounding that note of warning.

Constant reference is made here to the surplus balance we have at present. Whether it is five or six million dollars that money is there, it is true, but if we have a landslide in any particular year—if our revenue under Head III (Internal Revenue) falls short of the figure at which it now stands, we would find ourselves in a very bad way, and we would have to do what we did not very many years ago. As a matter of fact it was done during my time in this Council when it was an extremely difficult matter to look around for increased revenue to the extent of \$20,000 or \$30,000. We must not do like the newly rich; we must be careful. Whilst extraordinary expenditure is something we can carry when we have a surplus balance available, we must be extremely careful that our recurrent expenditure does not rise to such an extent that it outpaces our recurrent revenue. I think the time has come when we should even take some notice of our extraordinary expenditure. My own view is that extraordinary expenditure, unless perhaps it is of a social or welfare nature, should never be under-

taken if there is no chance of recouping some of it in years to come by some revenue return. In other words we should try to avoid spending any money from which we know it will not be possible to earn any dividends, because I can see the time is coming when we may not be able to maintain these things far less to expect any dividends from them.

Government's proposals up to the present time include subsidization to the tune of a sum over \$2,000,000, for example. I know it will be said that I have always been opposed to that measure. I opposed it from the beginning, I opposed it from the centre and I oppose it tonight. I think the time has come when Government ought to review its ideas on this subsidization question. It is a good thing in a way. There is no doubt about that, but it is costing us too much money, and I question whether the man in the street will be against Government when the time comes for these measures to be substantially cut, if not taken off altogether, because to each man. I am sure, it represents so little but on the whole it represents a very handsome item in our expenditure. It is true, sir, that we get back a substantial portion of it from the Imperial Government. I think the figure we get back is about \$1,000,000, but the balance of \$1,300,000 we cannot afford out of current revenue and as matters now stand—let us assume the Estimates here as printed will be fully realized on both sides of the picture—it seems that item alone will have to come out of our surplus balance. I do not think that is a good investment for this Government to make. I cannot see in what way expenditure of that kind will give us dividend in the future. I cannot see in what way we can hope to collect revenue from it, because it is money spent day after day without any investment of a capital

nature, and so I must conclude it is an expenditure that we should not embark upon.

I have already referred to the \$1,000,000 from the Imperial Government. I do not want to speak much on this question, but I do urge if it is a matter in which the Imperial Government is particularly interested, if the Imperial Government wants us to carry on this measure, we should express to the Imperial Government our appreciation of the grant of \$1,000,000 but if they want us to continue the measure our expenditure under that head should be the amount of the contribution received from the Imperial Government.

The PRESIDENT: The position is, we are prepared to spend up to \$1,000,000 and anything above that up to \$3,000,000 the Imperial Government will meet. We are limited to \$1,000,000.

Mr. de AGUIAR: We are limited to \$1,000,000 and the Imperial Government will meet the surplus! Before I leave this particular subject I am going to ask—I take a very keen interest in this matter and I must confess that we were all rushed at the time the several amendments were made when these proposals were before us, and I am not too sure that we have a very clear picture of it—that after the whole thing is revised the Estimates be reprinted.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, that will be done.

Mr. de AGUIAR: Then you think I should not proceed further with that. There is one other item in which I want to suggest that some reduction be made. It is under the Colonial Emergency vote. In making that suggestion I want to say that nothing should be done which would in any way endanger the war effort of this Colony. If

certain services are absolutely necessary then by all means let us offer our contribution, but I think that some of the items were considered not long ago. I think it is possible for some reduction to be made, and I am going to urge that particular Head be carefully scrutinized because hon. Members never want to criticize them because they deal chiefly with items concerning the war. But I do think certain reductions can be made and, I hope, in some cases at any rate some of the expenditure can be done away with altogether. That matter may well engage the attention of Government during the course of the coming year, so that if it is thought possible to reduce expenditure under that Head we might be able to achieve something.

I see the hon. the Sixth Nominated Member is not in his seat, and I do not like to make reference to anything a Member has said when that Member is absent. The hon. Member made certain statements in which I am particularly interested. In one statement he said—I shall quote his words—"We do not get anything from rice as an export crop." I do not understand how the hon. Member arrived at that conclusion. I do not know whether he was referring to the export of rice in the old days when, perhaps, the export market controlled the selling price. If he does, then probably he did not follow the change of events. That position no longer obtains. We no longer have to compete with India at least for the present, and when the hon. Member says that as an export crop rice has no value, I do not quite understand his logic. I do not know whether he means to suggest that the quantity of rice produced in this Colony can be consumed in this Colony. He seems to be arguing in a different direction, sir, and will awake one day to find his argument is not sound, when I hope he will be man

enough to withdraw it. When he spoke on this rice export crop he wanted to refer to the fact that Government is doing nothing for the people.

I am wondering whether we are drifting. Certain Members of this Council keep on referring to certain things day after day. I want to ask them, what do they mean? Why don't they come out with what they want to say. The hon. Member for North-Western District spoke about people coming from the East. I do not know what he means. I do not know whether he wants to sectionalize this community. We hear a lot of clap-trap about Guianese getting together, and we have hon. Members holding positions in this Council continuing to talk about people from the East. One hon. Member, I think it was the hon. Member for North-Western District, suggested that Government has committed a breach of faith in not sending them back. Why don't they go? I was born in this country, and I strongly protest against the introduction of this sectional argument. When those two hon. Members are speaking on any subject in this Council, whether on rice, Government expenditure or sugar, they always endeavour to turn the argument around to a racial issue, but they are the people who get up here and keep on talking about there is no such thing as a racial issue. I am a British Guianese. I am a British subject. I am a Portuguese by race. There are a number of Portuguese people in this country. I want to warn them. They want to introduce in this Colony nothing short of minority interests. I have referred to that before. I am sure if the hon. Members continue to speak in the way they do they would be doing nothing other than encouraging minority issues in this Colony, and the cry of British Guianese would be lost.

Mr. JACOB: We have minority interests dominating in this Colony now.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I do not accept the hon. Member's statement. I think the hon. Member wants to refer to the sugar industry as a minority interest dominating this Colony.

Mr. JACOB: Commercial interest too!

Mr. de AGUIAR: Equally I do not accept that statement, and the hon. Member will excuse me when I tell him that he ought to be ashamed of himself, particularly when he referred to commercial interest. The hon. Member is himself a commercial man. Let him go through Water Street and see the number of East Indians who are today engaged in commerce. He is as old as I am or probably older. I want him to say that the number of East Indian merchants in Water Street is less than it was 25 years ago. As a matter of fact I challenge him to deny the fact that today they are far greater in number in commercial interest than the hon. Member himself wants to admit. They do not only carry on business in Water Street. Let the hon. Member ascertain from the District Commissioners' Offices throughout the Colony, and let him argue that they do not carry on at their best throughout the Colony to a greater extent than some of the minority interests to which he refers. I happen to be a commercial man and I know what he is talking about probably better than he does. I know how to give them a square deal and, therefore, the hon. Member does not know. They will not tell him for reasons best known to themselves. Do not let us deny things that are hard and cold facts. It is the case that there is a welcomed development too in the particular race to which he refers in the commercial line, and when he talks about minority interest dominating commerce the hon. Member, like in

many statements he has made this evening, it is not true and he knows it.

Then it is said that nothing is being done about rice, and further that the rice industry is being strangled. I do not understand the position at all. Either the hon. Member takes no interest in what goes on in this Colony, or he wants to present the case in the way that suits his argument. Of course, if the hon. Member tells me that owing to the change in events he is not in a position now to know very much about the rice industry, then I must agree with him. The hon. Member no longer trades in rice unless he produces it himself. But I do not know him as a producer. He can only know what goes on in the industry, if he is a producer or he learns about the subject. He must learn. The times are changed. Opportunities that were afforded him and others like himself in the rice industry have changed.

Mr. JACOB: Now to minority interest.

Mr. de AGUIAR: If that is what the hon. Member is quarrelling about, I entirely agree with him. In the same way I hear him talking against the sugar industry because he no longer gets anything from the sugar industry. He is talking about the rice industry because he no longer gets anything from it.

Mr. JACOB: To a point of correction! I get my whole subsistence from both interests.

Mr. de AGUIAR: The hon. Member makes the frank submission that both industries are of value to the country. If he had said so before it would have been all right, but I understood him to say that sugar was no good and rice was no good. I wonder he did not

go on to say why. I am very pleased he now admits—it is the only frank admission he has made for the evening—that he obtains a living from both the sugar industry and the rice industry. Let us hope he will continue to give those two industries his support instead of trying to destroy them both, because at one time I was under the impression that he was trying to destroy both. Now he admits he has a soft spot for both of them. I hope he will continue in that strain.

When we talk about the expansion of the rice industry, I have not been able to follow the arguments that have been put up by those hon. Members at all. Sometimes for the purpose of their argument they use the term “tonnage” and on other occasions they use the term “dollars and cents,” but they have studiously refrained from making a comparison between the number of acres under rice cultivation in this Colony and the number of acres under sugar cultivation. That is the line of argument I would like to see them take, because if they do I am sure they would not pursue the point they tried to thrust down the throats of Members of this Council who know more about the subject than they think. In one breath we have heard here tonight that possible expansion from the recent works that Government has undertaken would mean an increase of some 30,000 acres under rice. That is one item, and yet those Members have the effrontery to stand up in this Council and elsewhere—I wish the public would know that not only in this Council they do it but elsewhere as well—and say that nothing is being done to expand the rice industry.

They would refer to 50,000 tons of rice and 50,000 tons of sugar. That is not the way to make comparison at all. You only refer to values when you are speaking in terms of cost of labour, but

if you want to know what is being done in a country in respect of a particular article of food produced, you must deal with acreage, and that is the only way, I respectfully submit, those hon. Members will find out whether there has been an increase or decline in the rice industry. They never put it that way, but I want to say this: I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that certainly within recent years there has been an increase in not only the acreage under cultivation but in the quantity of rice produced and, what is more important, the amount of money that is obtained from the rice produced in this Colony. When it comes to the question of money, it can be said quite briefly that the increase is due to the circumstances of war. That may be so, but at the same time it must be admitted that the increase is not only in the value but in the acreage under cultivation and in the tonnage as well.

Constant reference is being made to export figures, and the hon. Member for North-Western District is very fond of that. We have been told time and again that figures quoted are not quite correct. He always refers to juggling of figures. I give him credit for being very good at juggling with figures, very good at prophesying, but I do not remember hearing him say how much rice is going to be exported this year. Perhaps he is guarded about that. I want to give him a slight shock. He will find the quantity of rice exported from the Colony this year is much higher than he thinks, because his pessimistic view of the situation will not turn out at all. I want to tell him again—I hope it will not disappoint him—that he will find the export figures for next year will also probably be an increase on the figures quoted here time and again. He must be careful when quoting figures because he does not know what they are.

Mr. JACOB: Let us have the figures!

Mr. de AGUIAR: The year is not finished, but if the hon. Member wants to know I would tell him that the exports of rice this year will be 25,000 tons.

Mr. JACOB: What it was last year, 17,000 tons?

Mr. de AGUIAR: That is an increase. I wish the hon. Member will not advance argument against his own point. According to his logic we have not increased our exports. He made the statement himself.

Mr. JACOB: The previous year it was 22,000 tons and, therefore it was due to shipping perhaps.

Mr. de AGUIAR: The hon. Member introduces another subject. I am going to leave him alone. He will not accept the view that the increase in the exports of rice is going to be 50 per cent. higher than that of last year.

Mr. JACOB: To a point of correction! 50 per cent. higher? Last year it was 17,000 tons. How is 25,000 tons 50 per cent. higher than that?

Mr. de AGUIAR: If last year it was 17,000 tons and this year it is 25,000 tons, I am afraid the hon. Member does not know his calculations. I am sure he sees the point now. That represents an increase of 50 per cent. on last year's figure. I am going to advise him to study the figures a little more carefully. I can excuse him. He has quoted so many figures that even a little arithmetic confuses him.

Mr. JACOB: I am maintaining that owing to shipping difficulties you have to take an average of several years. In 1942 it was 22,480 tons, in 1943—17,180 tons and, assuming that in 1944 it is 25,000 tons, that is not a 50 per cent. increase on the three years.

Mr. de AGUIAR: I am afraid I cannot continue to argue with the hon. Member. He will take me back to Genesis. But the hon. Member made a statement that there is no increase on the average likely export for this year, and the hon. Member himself quoted the figure for last year which showed an increase of 50 per cent. I do not propose to pursue the subject at all. Let us proceed a little further. The hon. Member may probably rise from his seat and interrupt when I say there is a distinct improvement in the quality of rice produced in this Colony. If he does, I would like to tell him from my position on the Rice Marketing Board that I am one of the persons charged with the duty of preparing the purchasing grades of rice from the producers of this Colony, and I would like to tell the hon. Member further that it is being found extremely difficult to produce a sample of the lower grades. The hon. Member may laugh, but he does not know that is a fact. I mention that just to prove that we must not only look for improvement in one direction. There is improvement in several directions. If we want to keep and develop our markets abroad, one of the important weapons we must have is improvement in our quality. That was a little difficult in pre-war years. Speaking for myself I was very pleased to observe the distinct improvement in the quality of our rice this past year or so. I sincerely hope it will continue. I personally think it will be a good thing, a very important weapon to have, because no longer will we be faced with the position in the East as we knew it before the war when our rice fell down very badly indeed. There can be no question about that.

Mr. JACOB: To a point of order! Is the hon. Member suggesting that Burma is not going back to the British and we will not be faced with any competition?

Mr. de AGUIAR: I do not understand the hon. Member. I have not said anything of the kind. I do not think any other Member did. What I said was that the improvement in the quality of our rice is an important weapon in our export markets to fight our competitors. That is the point I made. The hon. Member does not seem to understand. I did not say anything about Burma not going back to the British. What is our constant fear is that when the war is over in the East the West Indies, which is our natural market, will be again invaded with rice from the East, and I said that one of our important weapons to meet that invasion is a distinct improvement in the quality of our rice as we see it today. I sincerely hope that that improvement will continue, and I feel sure that now that those people who have been obtaining benefit from it would like to see that improvement continue they can no longer be urged by speculators to produce rice that will not obtain a good price. They want to produce rice that will give them the highest possible price, and the only way is for them to continue to improve the quality of the rice produced.

Hon. Members referred to the expansion of the sugar industry, and I do not know whether I should interpret their remarks to mean that they are opposed to it. On the one hand they said they would like to see the sugar industry improve, and on the other hand they wanted to see an increase in rice production. There can be nothing against that. Anybody who would not like to see considerable expansion of both of those industries would certainly wish to ruin this country. I know the amount of money distributed at the pay table on a sugar estate. The same commercial men referred to early this evening knew it too, because that money finds its way into their businesses. I refer to the sugar industry because I wish to make this point.

I think that at the same time some effort should be made to bring about a corresponding expansion of the cane-

farming industry. I am very sorry to think that within the last year or two that industry should have declined to the state it is now in. I do not know who is to be blamed for it—whether it is the farmers themselves, or whether it is due to circumstances with which they had to contend. It may well be that their troubles are far greater than they can tackle themselves. I was one of those who were inclined to the view that maybe their difficulties are irrigation and drainage problems. There are some people who hold the view that their main difficulty was the lack of fertilizers. I am sorry to say that I do not accept the latter view. I have had an opportunity to examine a portion of the matter not very long ago, and I have come to the conclusion that their main difficulties have been lack of drainage and irrigation. I know that certain proposals are being put up, and I want to make a statement so that Government might give the proposals the consideration which I am sure they deserve.

In the villages, where the cane-farming industry is being carried on at the present time, it means nearly everything to the villagers. If I may say so, it means to them what the sugar industry as a whole means to this Colony, and I say that if there is going to be any considerable expansion, as I hope there will be, in the sugar industry some attention might be paid to the cane-farming industry so that it might also share in the development we would all like to see. Government has appointed a Cane-Farming Officer, and I think that is a step in the right direction. The officer, I know, is doing some very good work, but he alone cannot bring about a transformation in that particular industry because he alone cannot solve its problems. He can give the farmers the advice they need, but at the same time the assistance they need in the way of drainage and irrigation should also be provided, otherwise I am afraid we would see no improvement in that direction. I think that hon. Members might be bold enough

to say that if we continue as we are at the present moment we will only be marking time.

For years I have heard the cry here that if we want this country to be developed we must have money and people. I think that both are very essential. We want money and we want people. It is no good looking upon any unemployment we may have at the moment. If we have any at all it is because we cannot expand the industries we have, and we cannot do that without money. We must have money. Let us see in what way we can encourage people to come here, not only to settle but to bring their money with them. Without money I am afraid we will have to be satisfied with just marking time. Let us try to do that instead of trying to pick quarrels and throw stones at each other in this Colony or outside. The only way we can do that is to think in terms of British Guiana instead of in terms of people who came here from the East. They came here and I am sure they have very little to complain about. Even those who went back were very glad to return to this country.

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that we make an effort to finish this debate this evening. There are some Members here who may not be able to attend tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. LEE: I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I regret very much that I could not attend all the meetings of the Finance Committee, and on that account I am not conversant with all the expenditure that has been voted, and all the resolutions that have been passed by this Council. I have read them all but I am not in agreement with all of them. We have raised the status of the Colony to that of a first-class Colony, and in so doing we have increased the expenditure of the Colony. We have not considered whether, after the war, the Colony will

be in a position to meet that expenditure. The schemes proposed by Government will take a long time to produce revenue in order to balance our budget. Are we to go to the Imperial Government with our hats in our hands and ask for help to balance our budget at the end of each year? That would be a retrograde step, because it would mean going back to Treasury control and not an advance towards the goal this Colony is aiming at—self-government or Dominion status along with the West Indies. That is my fear—that we are moving in the wrong direction.

Is Government planning for the future, for at least ten years, in order to balance its budget? I fear that is not the policy of Government as initiated by the Colonial Treasurer. It is all very well to say that we have a surplus balance of six million dollars, but I desire to draw Government's attention to the fact that replacements for the public utility services will require at least two million dollars. I am a member of the Transport and Harbours Board and I am warning Government that the public is not satisfied about the net deficiency in respect of the transport services. An expert will be here soon to enquire into and advise Government as regards these services. If Government is not prepared to increase freight rates on agricultural products it will have to meet the deficiency out of the surplus balance.

Therefore I say that the policy adopted by Government in raising the status of the Colony to that of a first-class Colony is not a correct one at the present moment. I am not saying that Government officers are not worthy of the salaries that are voted by this Council, but I do say that in raising the status of the Colony Government has not considered where the revenue is to be got from in order to meet the increased expenditure for a period of at least 10 years.

The PRESIDENT: I am not conscious myself of ever having made such a proposal to raise the status of the Colony. If you look through the debates you will not see that Government has ever suggested such a thing. You will find a great deal of it said in Council and outside, and one of the most prominent people in pushing that has been yourself. Please do not say that Government has been doing anything in order to raise the status of the Colony. I have to defend myself.

Mr. LEE: I absolutely agree with Your Excellency's statement.

Mr. JACOB: To a point of correction. Government has initiated the principle and has carried it through.

The PRESIDENT: I have to make a correction for myself—that I have never made any such statement about raising the status of the Colony to that of a first-class Colony.

Mr. LEE: I absolutely agree with that. My friend, the hon. Member for Georgetown North (Mr. Seaford), laughs, but I am saying it publicly as a warning to Government, that as a Member of this Council I accept responsibility because I feel that under Your Excellency's direction this Colony will progress and be raised to that status, and I agree that it should be raised to that status, but Government is proceeding towards that goal by raising the salaries of officials. I am not saying that we did not agree to it, but that the policy which has been directed to us by the Executive Council, viewing it now in its true light, is a wrong one. I therefore would like Government to note that I have given the warning that unless schemes are undertaken in order to meet the expenditure on increased salaries we will find ourselves in the position of having to go to the Colonial Office with our hats

in our hands begging for assistance. That is what I would like to prevent. I would like Government to take note that, having now seen that we have taken a wrong step, I am suggesting that Government should rectify it by making it clear to the Imperial Government that unless money is put into this Colony whereby we can get development and increased revenue to meet our increased expenditure, I consider that as a Member of this Council I have done a wrong thing in raising the salaries of Government officials.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: What salaries does the hon. Member refer to? Is he referring to the increases given to teachers, the Transport workers, the Medical Service, and the revised salaries scale for the Clerical Service, for which he has himself pressed Government? I think the majority of the increases were really for the lowest paid employees of Government. I am not quite certain as to what salaries he is referring.

Mr. LEE: I am referring to all the increases of salaries given to Government employees in order to make this Colony a first-class Colony. If we have to provide replacements for the Transport services, and to reduce the deficiency in respect of those services, we will have to expend at least two million dollars of the six millions we have in reserve.

The next point I have to make is that subsidization will have to be continued after the war if we are to keep down the cost of living. Our agricultural products will have to meet competition in the world's markets. Will we get protection for our rice in the West Indies? Sugar will get protection, but will it get such protection in order to provide the people with a better standard of living? Sugar is all right now and I am glad, but will the sugar producers raise the standard of living of the workers on

the sugar estates? Sugar and rice are well off at the moment. I have advised the rice farmers to save some of the profits they are making now in order to make provision against the depression which will come after the war. There was depression five or six years after the last war. Will those who are benefiting now be able to stand the strain when it comes? Will Government secure revenue to meet its expenditure? I am pleading with you, sir, and your advisers to save this Colony from having to go back under Treasury control, if we can help it. If we are able to weather the storm ourselves we will be able to prove to the Imperial Government that we have governed ourselves in a profitable manner, and to ask for a little more self-government.

To that end I am pleading with Your Excellency to appoint Advisory Committees to the Lands and Mines and Medical Departments so as to give Elected Members greater responsibility in the Government of the Colony.

I agree with the hon. Member for Central Demerara (Mr. de Aguiar) that the extension of cane farming by peasants should be encouraged by Government. I am not suggesting that it is not being encouraged at present, but it is not being encouraged sufficiently, and I am appealing to the sugar producers to do their utmost to assist the cane-farmers to increase their production. If the sugar producers get a subsidy the peasants would also get a subsidy and be able to improve their standard of living.

I also desire to plead with Your Excellency on behalf of the rice producers, many of whom have a feeling of insecurity about their tenancy after the war. If a land settlement scheme as envisaged by this Government and the Comptroller for Development and Welfare is pushed at once I am confident

that within five years there would be a development of minor industries in this Colony. Delay in this matter is causing distrust in the minds of the people. I have come into contact with several of them who are quite willing to occupy lands either on leasehold or freehold and to work under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. Revenue can be derived from a land settlement scheme as envisaged by Government. It must be done at once. The longer you delay, the longer it will be before it reaches that height where you can say that Land Settlement is and has been a success in this Colony. My hon. friend, the Member for Central Demerara, talks about indirect taxation but, Your Excellency, I can assure you that I feel that the public at the present moment cannot stand any indirect taxation through the Customs, and no deficit should be met by indirect taxation. But unless there is trade, unless there is profit, you cannot obtain revenue to meet your expenditure, and that is where I ask Government to carefully consider the way the money will be obtained to meet expenditure. I sincerely hope that the policy adopted by you and your advisers is the proper one.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Sir, I am a little embarrassed at having to rise an hour before midnight to endeavour to reply to a debate that has already lasted four and a half hours and which covers such a wide field. This is the time when hon. Members of Council have their opportunity to put to Government their own conception of efforts that should be made financially and economically for the advancement of the Colony. I have listened very carefully to what has been said, and I must confess that I am no wiser. I have listened to a great deal of somewhat petulant criticism of the Revenue Estimates and figures which really mean very little. The first speaker was the hon. the Sixth Nominated Mem-

ber, and he began by making a very definite charge. He said that it has now come to his mind that the Colonial Treasurer, and through him the Government, presented in 1944 a favourable picture with the deliberate intention of misleading him and the Council as to the financial situation in order to induce him to pass increased salaries for the Civil List. He said the picture presented by me in the Budget Statement for 1944, which I delivered in 1943, and also the memorandum which I caused to be published in July this year made him so happy that he welcomed the opportunity to approve of those increases, but this proposed Budget for 1945 has cast him into gloom and the truth has now come out. I will return to the hon. Member just now.

Immediately after, the hon. Member for North-Western District took up the other line of argument. He charged the Treasurer with continuously, since 1941, presenting the most pessimistic picture to the Council (and here again deliberately) with the motive of creating an unfavourable situation and preventing desirable expenditure from being incurred, and also with the object of painting a black outlook of the Colony to people in the outside world. These two hon. Members have presented completely contradictory pictures, but neither picture is true.

As regards the hon. the Sixth Nominated Member, he made certain quotations from the Budget Statement for 1944 which was delivered in December, 1943, but he omitted to quote from the most important paragraph in the opening portion of that address. I remember taking the trouble to be very pessimistic. Members of Council will forgive me quoting very briefly what I said then. I said:

"We are rapidly expanding the scale and scope of our public services and aiming at progressive improvement in the living standards of our people; but it would be well if there were a clearer appreciation by all that any hope of attain-

ing, by our own efforts, the standards to which we aspire depends upon the maintenance and advancement of production and export. For us, production for domestic consumption alone is not enough; and if our basic exporting industries should decline or be subject to violent disturbance our economic and financial situation would speedily deteriorate and might indeed become desperate. Nevertheless, undue pessimism is as bad as premature optimism and I sound this note of warning mainly lest the satisfactory report of the Government's financial position for the year 1943, which I shall now make, should induce any over-confidence as to its stability."

Those words which I have quoted were spoken on the 1st December, 1943. Later one newspaper publicly took the Treasurer to task for being unduly pessimistic. This is the Statement which the hon. the Sixth Nominated Member said was so favourable as to induce him to feel we were completely out of the wood and to persuade him to accept without any care proposals for increases. Then he also referred to the Note which was published in July, 1944. In that memorandum which was completely factual for the greater part of its length, I came to the conclusion that we could not avoid in the future a recurring bill of less than \$10,000,000. I went on to say that as regards our meeting such a bill from recurrent revenue I could not prophesy as so much depends on external factors not within our control. I further continued.—

"Can we know that the bauxite industry will be maintained at a reasonable level of production? Can we know that the sugar industry will be maintained and expanded? Can we know that our rice industry will succeed in capturing and maintaining the markets in the British West Indies? Then we will be able to say something about what our revenue will be. We cannot tell and, therefore, we can do nothing but try and make sure that we do something to keep our financial equilibrium in the best way."

I suggested in the memorandum the importance of doing something to enable the Colony to meet the inevitable financial

deficits over the immediate post-war period, and I suggested that we raise a loan to cover War expenditure in part and replace in revenue an equivalent amount, and so build a stabilization fund to keep ourselves going to meet these inevitable deficits over the immediate post-war period. The last Budget forecast a deficit of \$1,500,000. The memorandum talked about borrowing money in order to build ourselves a fund to meet inevitable deficits. The hon. the Sixth Nominated Member therefore has no ground for charging me or Government with putting forward a favourable statement in order to induce the passing of the Civil List or increases of salaries to Officials.

I also object to the statement by the hon. Member for North-Western District. There is no motive whatever in presenting a Budget with a deficit. The reason for these Budgets showing a deficit is that the people who prepare them have taken the facts as they see them. Year by year as the war goes on we get information as to difficulties which may arise. Sometimes these things do not occur and then we are better off. So far as next year is concerned, we know the war is going on and shipping is by no means easier. We have been told that the current situation is difficult and we can expect that our volume of importations will suffer. On those grounds I see no reason for putting our revenue higher than they are.

Mr. JACOB: If I may say a word, why that was based on existing taxation?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: As regards direct taxation, the estimates under this Head are exceptionally high, and hon. Members know from what source that high revenue is obtained. It is quite possible that the peak will have been passed in 1945, but I want to say now that we have

potentially more revenue under that Head than is shown on the Estimates. The Estimates show a figure which we can reasonably foresee will come in. Certain returns of profits, which are very complex requiring investigation along legal lines and accounting lines, may result in more revenue yield than is put down, but it is correct and proper that we should not take into account just the possibility of deriving a very much larger sum than is put on these Estimates. I maintain that the correct manner of budgeting is to budget conservatively and not to overstate income or understate expenditure. It is the common practice in these Colonies to do that. I notice that Trinidad last year budgeted for a revenue of \$20,000,000, whereas their actual receipts were \$27,000,000. So I presume they took the same line as we here. So much for the figures and the Budget.

The hon. the Sixth Nominated Member referred to the analysis which appears in this Note of mine in regard to expenditure, and he emphasized that we were only spending about 4 per cent. on economic development. In truth and in fact our expenditure on economic development does not really appear in these Estimates at all. It appears under our Development and Welfare Budget where last year we spent over \$1,500,000. That is the direction he must look for expenditure along those lines.

I come to the remarks of the hon. Member for North-Western District in regard to Government's policy and plans. I was amazed to hear him say that we had no plans for anything, no plans for agriculture, no plans for sugar, nothing for rice, nothing for live stock. I have been unable to assimilate the enormous amount of printed matter which has gone forward in this Council setting out Government's plans, and I cannot understand how any hon. Member can have the temerity to come to this Council and

say we have no plans; no plans for rice when we have just succeeded in obtaining from the Imperial Government one and three-quarter million dollars (\$1,750,000) for rice expansion by providing new lands, by mechanizing the industry, by providing for new and modern mills. Yet we have no plans for it. As regards cattle, surely the hon. Member has heard something about the experiments at Ebini Downs, experiments in regard to the proper feeding of animals on our interior savannahs. Surely he has heard about the soiling units. Surely the hon. Member must have heard about the plans for livestock, the new livestock farm, the district livestock centres which are being set up. As regards the interior, has he not heard of the plans for interior air fields? Has he not heard of a grant having been applied for towards that?

As I have said, the plans put forward are numerous, so numerous that it is difficult to follow all. I cannot understand how it can be said that Government has put forward no plans at all. I am not going to refer in detail to rice. The hon. Member for Central Demerara has already dealt with that very fully, but I was relieved to find that both the hon. the Sixth Nominated Member and the hon. Member for North-Western District now believe that more money is being circulated since Control of the Industry. The hon. Member for North-West District himself said that he has lost \$3,000 to \$4,000 since the rice industry has been controlled by the Rice Marketing Board. I am not aware that he is or ever was a producer. So in regard to that, I can only say that something done, because we are trying to circulate the money in the hands of the producers and not in the hands of other people.

Mr. JACOB: May I remind the hon. Member that the Income Tax

Commissioners knew perfectly well that I owned and controlled a rice mill and financed rice growers?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: As an Income Tax Commissioner I can say a lot of things the hon. Member would not like. The hon. Member for Essequibo River (Mr. Lee) referred to this question of this Colony becoming a first class colony and to his disappointment now at having imposed the burden of a first class colony on us. By that I presume he means the increases in the Civil List. The actual increases in the Civil List—

The PRESIDENT: He said all the increases on personnel!

The COLONIAL TREASURER: That is strange. That does not make this Colony a first class colony. I have listened to hon. Members of this Council, and their idea of raising the status is merely to raise the salaries on the Civil List. We have increased the cost of the Civil List to \$14,000 next year, whereas the salaries of the personnel will be something like \$1,000,000. Therefore the idea of a first class colony is costing us very little. I hope it will be of value, but we are paying not much for it.

Mr. LEE: I do not know whether the hon. the Colonial Treasurer understands what I mean by first class colony. In a first class colony the pay from the bottom to the top is greater than that of any other Colony in revenue and expenditure.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I ask the hon. Member to say straight out, is he against the increase to employees?

Mr. LEE: Unless the policy of Government is carried out wherein revenue can meet expenditure. At the present moment I am against it.

The PRESIDENT: What the hon. Member suggests is, if we go on increasing and not bringing in constructive schemes which in time will bring in revenue we will be making a mistake. That is what you mean?

Mr. LEE: That is what I mean.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: With that I entirely agree. That is the note on which the memorandum ends. I said:

"It would at least serve to allay fears and doubts existing in many quarters which may act as a brake on the initiation of measures designed for future development and the amelioration of social conditions."

The whole idea was to try and carry the Colony along for the next five years. Measures are taking place now as to projects under contemplation, some of which are actually going on. We all hope these measures will lead to increased revenue.

Mr. LEE: To a point of order! When the Medical vote was on and I was complaining about the inadequacy of Medical Officers to attend to the Poor and I asked Government to do something in the matter, the remark was made that expenditure has increased and we may have to go back to Treasury Control. That is my fear.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I do not want to prolong the debate, but I would like to end on one point. I have listened with a great deal of distress and bitterness to some of the violent criticisms made on Public Officers who have very infrequent opportunities to defend themselves. Some of the criticisms are unfair and many of them are unjust. I am one myself and I would hesitate to illustrate with reference to my own experience. Let us illustrate with the case of the Public Works Department. I have listened to criticisms of the Depart-

ment and its Officers. Hon. Members should try and think about the immense increase which the war and all these new works and services have cast on the Officers of that Department. I had taken the opportunity to visit Mackenzie to see the airport under construction there. I was amazed to think the Director of Public Works had taken on work of that description on his shoulder and only with the assistance of one of his executive officers. That work is supervised on the spot by one man who is not an engineer but is Superintendent of Roads and who is nevertheless a very capable man. That airport is, I understand, equal in size to the one at Atkinson Field. I think hon. Members would accept it that had that construction been undertaken by our American friends they would have had a dozen Engineers, several Superintendents and an army of Clerks. Up there I saw the Superintendent and the Clerk living on the spot under the most primitive conditions and working from dawn to dusk. I only mention this to illustrate the point that the lot of Public Works Officers is not a roseate one, and it seems a great pity that all these slurs should be made on them.

In my own case I have myself taken on the job of controlling Exchange, a most complex work. I have taken on the Rice Marketing Board and the Excess Profits Tax. I do not want to blow my own trumpet, but it means work for something like 10 to 12 hours per day, and a number of other Officers are placed in the same position. It is a great pity that so little confidence is placed in them by Members and that so much by way of personal attack is made on them. It makes me feel that the task of a Public Officer is a very thankless one. We get a salary and still have a sense of security, but something more is required to keep up the morale of the Civil Service. We have a body of men

who are doing their best, and it is hoped Members will have a sense of fairplay in speaking in this Council on the work of Public Officers.

Mr. LEE: May I say something on a point of correction? I have not seen the airfield at Mackenzie. Is Government contemplating to make a road from Mackenzie so as to bring the airfield at Mackenzie in easy reach of Georgetown.

The PRESIDENT: Certainly not.

Mr. LEE: It is lack of policy, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I am in a position now to put the motion, but before I do so I think I should have to say at least a word about the Budget, which should not be allowed to pass without at least some word from the President. What I propose to do is to comment on the more salient features of the debates which have taken place during these Budget sittings.

In the first place I wish to say that the policy of the Colonial Treasurer, as I have seen it not only in the three years I have been here, but since 1939, and recorded by my predecessor, has my absolute and complete support. It is absolutely impossible to estimate accurately the comings and goings of revenue and expenditure in years of war. That is a job which nobody can do, and an attempt to do it would only mean failure. In war time expenditure is very often unforeseen and uncontrollable. Every three or four months we have some fresh crisis which means further expenditure of an emergency nature. Revenue is entirely uncertain. There have been certain commitments in these last three years which our ordinary revenue could not meet, and but for war conditions we should not have had anything like the windfall in revenue we have had in these last four

years. These are the uncertainties of war conditions, and the only thing to do is to carry on and do exactly as the Treasurer has done, with a conservative estimate of revenue.

We have been very fortunate in this Colony. We have had windfalls of revenue from several sources, while a good deal of war emergency expenditure is being carried by the Imperial Government. It would have been utterly impossible, going back these last four or five years, to have foreseen in any useful way what was coming from year to year. Had we attempted to have some rigid plan in figures and stick rigidly to it we should have had trouble and failed to carry through our obligations.

Now, added to the difficulties of war time and the difficulties and burdens of war expenditure, we have to add all this projecting of development and welfare, and at the worst possible time. That must be considered as an extra burden thrown on Government, which it is often unable to carry out fully. That aspect of things has already been mentioned by the Treasurer, and I agree absolutely with all he has said.

As to the features of the Budget as I have seen them in the volume in front of us, I am going to make three points. One is the tremendous need of the Colony for capital expenditure. The second is the recent Bill we have had to face in respect of personnel, and the third is the dangerous rise in recurrent "Other Charges." That capital expenditure is the first plank in our platform of development, in the planning of which we have been told Government has done nothing at all. I will revert to that in a moment.

As to the expenditure on personnel, a question which has been raised by the hon. Member for Essequibo River (Mr. Lee): that has been quite

inevitable. There was, when I came here, in existence Treasury control, which was with us until fifteen months ago, and the policy was laid down in 1939 that we should not increase salaries at all during the war; that we should meet the necessities of the moment by subsidization, and perhaps by temporary bonuses. Nobody in this Colony, except the Treasurer and myself, knows the tremendous trouble we had to get through the very necessary war bonuses in 1943.

What has emerged is this. In two particular aspects of the question it has been absolutely necessary to move. One was that a great number of very subordinate employees of this Government, and in particular school teachers, were grossly underpaid, and it astounds me to hear the Member for the Essequibo Islands tell us that although he agreed a little while ago he finds it is now a mistake, and he calls upon Government to go back upon its decision. The other aspect of the matter concerns our technical and professional services and officers at the top, and that is that if we did not look to it we would not be able to get or retain the quality of personnel such as other Colonies get. These two particular items were absolutely inevitable and absolutely proper. If the hon. Member wishes to go back to some degree on that, it is quite easy. Next year's Budget will show our temporary war bonuses as an extraordinary expenditure, and he can move either its reduction or abolition. In the meantime increased salaries, apart from bonus, have been given.

As regards recurrent expenditure on "Other Charges," I expressed considerable concern during the discussions on particular items of the Budget, and that has been repeated by the hon. Member for Central Demerara (Mr. de Aguiar). I have been concerned about that and, as I told Members, I had issued a very special warning about it in July. It is too late for me to take action on this Budget, and I have

explained what I propose to do, and that is to endeavour to place some limit and check on this kind of expenditure during the year, and to refuse to issue a warrant covering all items, some of which I think have somewhat lightly gone through.

The upshot of it all is clear. We all know that we are going to face an inevitable drop in revenue and, quite possibly, a little sooner than we expected. We should realize that we are trying to carry on a number of services, in particular the social and welfare ones, at a standard which the economics of this country cannot carry. That was stated very clearly by my predecessor about four or five years ago, and it is as true as ever now. Yet I listened in Committee to Member after Member asking for something here and something there; that Government should take over schools or estate hospital, increase the number of officials here and there, or this and that service quite light-heartedly, without any conception of what the reality of the position is. I will repeat a phrase I used before. We are aiming at a champagne standard for which we cannot pay.

What is the action we can take? One is to reduce the services and attempt less. The Treasurer has made reference to attacks on certain officers who are trying to do far more than their Departments can really carry, and I should incline to say to them "You must not take on any more than you can efficiently carry." That is the kind of thing I should be very much inclined to do with a Department like the Public Works, which has been trying to carry out too much with inadequate machinery. There is another alternative, however, which does not necessarily imply Treasury control at a future date. I have written a minute on that subject which is going around the Executive Council.

I will return to the other item of capital expenditure which is the main and principal plank in our platform of

planning our future economy. When I came here I had heard a great deal about the need of drainage and irrigation. We have not heard so much about those things in the course of this debate. But it was the very important feature of the comments of the Royal Commission on this Colony. When I passed through London on my way here and met the Under-Secretary of State, Mr. George Hall, he told me of what, in the fortnight he spent here, he heard, and it is recorded of his meeting with Legislative Council Members that he ended up by saying that he had been hearing nothing else since he came here. When I came I found the memorandum by Sir Frank Stockdale saying the same thing, and I have made my own observations. That remains the principal plank in Government's plans. No criticism can ignore the fact that that is the case. And as regards many particular plans for reconstruction as a whole—whether it is sugar, rice, land settlement, rural housing, or even village administration—they all depend on that. Irrigation and drainage is the first plank in our platform and in any criticism of Government policy that must at least be considered. Accomplishment may be a different thing. I know it is going to be slow, and all members here know perfectly well the reason why it cannot be accomplished quickly. You all know the reason why we cannot get off at anything like the pace we might have done in peace years. In spite of that a good deal has been done. The Treasurer has already told you of the parti-

cular aspect of the matter touching rice expansion, and I hope to be able to put in a summarized form what works have been approved and carried out, and those that remain to be recommended. If I had a magic wand which I could wave and beat the head of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in London and get exactly what I wish, perhaps we would have the money tomorrow. But even if we had the money we could not begin on the full scale. That is the position.

I do not want to be taken as having made any considered statement on finance. I have simply dealt with certain aspects arising from our debate, which I thought I should at least put on record. I think I can now proceed to put the motion.

Motion put, and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: There being no other business the Council is in a position to adjourn rather unexpectedly, with some of our colleagues no doubt somewhat disappointed that there will be no afternoon session tomorrow. In saying that I would just like to thank very warmly those Members who have attended this evening. It must have been burdensome to some of them who have occupied chairs until midnight, and helped us so very greatly by their silence. (Laughter).

The Council was adjourned *sine die*.