

# SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

*Thursday, 2nd June, 1960*

*The Council met at 2 p.m.*

## PRESENT :

**Speaker**, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

**Chief Secretary**, Hon. D. M. Hedges

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

**Financial Secretary**, Hon. W. P. D'Andrade (acting)

} *ex officio*

The Honourable **Dr. C. B. Jagan**

—*Member for Eastern Berbice*  
(Minister of Trade and Industry)

„ **B. H. Benn**

—*Member for Essequibo River*  
(Minister of Natural Resources)

„ „ **Janet Jagan**

—*Member for Western Essequibo*  
(Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)

**Ram Karran**

—*Member for Demerara-Essequibo*  
(Minister of Communications and Works)

„ **B. S. Rai**

—*Member for Central Demerara*  
(Minister of Community Development and Education).

**Mr. W. O. R. Kendall**

—*Member for New Amsterdam*

„ **R. C. Tello**

—*Nominated Member*

**F. Bowman**

—*Member for Demerara River*

„ **L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.**

—*Member for Georgetown Central*

„ **S. Campbell**

—*Member for North Western District*

„ **A. L. Jackson**

—*Member for Georgetown North*

„ **S. M. Saffee**

—*Member for Western Berbice*

„ **Ajodha Singh**

—*Member for Berbice River*

„ **R. E. Davis**

—*Nominated Member*

„ **H. J. M. Hubbard**

—*Nominated Member*

„ **A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.**

—*Nominated Member.*

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

## ABSENT :

Mr. R. B. Gajraj—Nominated Member

Mr. E. B. Beharry—Member for Eastern Demerara

Mr. Jai Narine Singh—Member for Georgetown South—indisposed.

Mr. A. M. Fredericks—Nominated Member—excused.

The Assistant Clerk read prayers.

## MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 1st June, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

## LEAVE TO MEMBERS

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to announce that the hon. Member for Georgetown South (Mr. Jai Narinc Singh) is indisposed and is unable to attend today. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks has asked to be excused today because he is out of Georgetown.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**The Chief Secretary** (Mr. Hedges): I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Pensions (Special Provisions) Bill, 1960

**The Financial Secretary** (Mr. D'Andrade, acting): I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Tax (Amendment No. 2) Bill, 1960.

## ORDER OF THE DAY

## BILLS — FIRST READING

The following Bills were read the First time:

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

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Tax Ordinance."

## RICE MARKETING (AMENDMENT) BILL

**Mr. Speaker:** Council will resume the debate on the Motion of the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry, Dr. Jagan, for the Second Reading of the Bill intituled:

"An Ordinance further to amend the Rice Marketing Ordinance and to make a minor consequential amendment to the British Guiana Rice Producers Association Ordinance"

On the last occasion when this Bill was taken and when the adjournment was reached, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, was speaking. He has 21 minutes to go on his half-hour.

**Mr. Tello:** I have no desire to continue for the full 21 minutes allocated to me, but merely to carry on from where I left off on the last occasion. There is still no urgent reason for the introduction and passing of this Bill. The hon. Mover said that the Bill was a sincere attempt to democratize the administration of the Rice Marketing Board, but there is on the Order of the Day a Motion in the name of the hon. Member for Georgetown South seeking to achieve the same purpose. It is my opinion that a voluntarily formed Co-operative would be regarded as conforming much more to the true principles of democracy than legislation initiated by the Government.

If it is really true that the prime motive behind this piece of legislation is to give those who operate in the industry the democratic right to market their own product, then I feel that the hon. Mover would consent to having this Motion debated now and left in Committee. I have had the opportunity of speaking to a few rice millers and rice producers since the adjournment and they impressed upon me again that their preference would have been the turning of the Rice Marketing Board into a Co-operative rather than accepting rigid legislation.

It is quite true that the hon. Mover said that at one time his Party was considering the question of the Board being turned into a Co-operative, but they were out of power, and now that they are in power they are backbenchers.

**The Minister of Trade and Industry** (Dr. Jagan): To a point of order, Sir:

I did not put it that way. I said the reason why it was felt we should not proceed with the Co-operative idea was because at that time there was no opportunity to amend the Ordinance, but now we have the power to amend the Ordinance there is no interest in a Co-operative.

**Mr. Tello.** I am very grateful that I am corrected. But it does not alter what I am saying. What I am saying is, the objective of this piece of legislation before this Council is the same which he had before coming into office; and I am simply asking him to agree to the deferment of further debate on this Bill by leaving it in Committee and the bringing forward of the Motion by the Member for Georgetown South, so that we can hear what the latter has to say. Let us hear both arguments so we can make up our minds. I am simply offering the hon. Minister an opportunity to be as democratic as he wants this marketing organization to be. I hope that my suggestion will be supported by Members on the other side of the Table, so that the hon. Member for Georgetown South will have an opportunity to give his views on the matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** Any other speakers? Does the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry wish to reply?

**Dr. Jagan:** Having listened to hon. Members speaking on this Motion, I note that certain points of criticism have been raised. The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, was particularly concerned about the millers' representation on the Rice Marketing Board and the danger that their interests will not be adequately provided for. The same type of criticism was levelled by him not so long ago when this Council was debating the Rice Producers (Amendment) Bill.

What is the position as things stand at the moment? What is contemplated in this Ordinance? First of all, we find that although provision was made in

the Rice Producers Ordinance that a certain number of millers be elected to the Rice Producers Council — I cannot remember what the number is — nevertheless there was no provision in the Rice Marketing Board Ordinance that any of these millers in the Council shall, *ipso facto*, become members of the Board. We find that in the past although the number was five or six — I do not recall the exact number — yet there was only one miller on the Rice Marketing Board. At the present time I think there is only one member on the Board who is a miller.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Mahabir.

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Mahabir was subsequently appointed when a vacancy occurred on the Board. When the original panel of names was put up as a result of the Rice Producers Elections three years ago, only one miller was elected to represent the millers on the Rice Marketing Board. Subsequently, as a result of a vacancy, this Government appointed another miller to fill the vacancy. This alone shows that the millers have no reason to fear that their interests will not be protected. We now find that the fear expressed cannot materialize. The Rice Producers Elections have brought forth four persons who are either directly millers, or are associated with milling in the Rice Producers Council. In addition to this, provision will be made for two millers to be appointed to the Board, so that in fact we will have possibly six millers speaking on behalf of the rice industry being represented either on the Council or on the Board. Although provision is made for at least two, it does not preclude the Council from nominating others—one of these four or more than one of these four—to the Board. It is left to the producers to do what they want. Therefore I need not spend more time on this matter, because I think the fears of hon. Members are not really justified in the light of the course of events.

Since it is true that only one miller was on the last Board and the rights of

[DR. JAGAN]

the millers were not jeopardized, then there is no reason to fear that with two or more millers on the Board the rights of millers will be jeopardized. There is also other protection, because whatever is done by the Rice Marketing Board with respect to the fixing of price must finally be approved by the Governor.

The hon. Member is concerned about the miller's margin. There is what is regarded as a miller's margin in determining the price of rice which the Board has purchased from the farmers. The ultimate price is based on what it costs for a bag of padi, how many bags or how many pounds of padi are required to make one bag of rice; the cost of converting the padi into rice, milling fees, and what remains is allowed as a miller's margin. In ultimately deciding what the price will be to the rice industry, the Board has to take into consideration the miller's margin. Before the price of rice is made law, it has to be approved by the Governor. If the millers are dissatisfied with the margin allocated to them, they can make representation to the Governor who will look into the matter. There is no justifiable fear that the miller's rights will not be protected.

If we followed the advice of the hon. Member and increased the number of millers on the Board from two to three or four, there is no guarantee that the miller's right or fear will be resolved because there will still be a small minority in the Rice Marketing Board where there will be a total of sixteen members. Taking all of these facts into consideration, I hope that the hon. Member will now concede that he has nothing to fear with respect to the new composition which is proposed for the membership of the Rice Marketing Board.

The hon. Member for Georgetown North has expressed another fear, consumer interest. He would like representatives of the consumers to sit on the Rice Marketing Board. If we go on like that, we will eventually go back to

the days of Grecian democracy where we will have everybody sitting in all assemblies.

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems as though both of you are *ad idem*. I notice both of you are drinking water at the same time.

**Dr. Jagan:** While it may be regarded that the rice producers, millers or landlords have a vested interest and are likely to fix a price for rice which will penalize the consumer, it must be remembered that the Governor has the last word in deciding what price consumers must pay for rice. There, again, we do not see any reason for fear. In fact if you were to examine the history of the Board you will find that, generally speaking, the consumer's price of rice in this country is more or less similar to, or in some cases lower than, the price in the West Indian Islands. I repeat that the final authority is in the hands of the Governor, and, if by some chance, the Board were to recommend an increase in the price to the consumer, the final decision will have to be made by him. The interests of the consumer are therefore protected.

On the other hand, if it were decided to have consumers on the Board, who would say how many should be elected? Who will choose the consumers? Even if three, four or five were put on the Board they would still be in the minority and would not be able to make a final decision or recommendation to the Board. One need not sit on a Board to see what is being done and to object to certain things, because we know that several bodies outside of the Board are capable of making a tremendous noise when the need arises for so doing. I am sure that if the interests of consumers were jeopardized, it would not be long before certain people outside of the Board made strong representations to His Excellency the Governor with a view to putting things right.

**Mr. Kendali:** They cannot change a decision.

**Dr. Jagan:** Mr. Tello again raised the question of converting the Board into a consumer organization. From the way he was speaking, he wants to give the impression that the Party is turning its head and has completely reversed what it said and believed before.

I notice that my hon Friend, the Member for Demerara River is smiling. He is also an exponent of this line of thinking.

**Mr. Bowman:** I agree with you on this.

**Dr. Jagan:** Some people do not understand the science of dialectics. It may be necessary to change because conditions have changed.

As I said before, when we were advocating the setting up of a co-operative we were outside of the Government. There was no reason to believe that the Board would ever be changed; that the Amendments which we are now proposing would ever be made to the Rice Marketing Ordinance, therefore we conducted our agitation outside to convert the Board into a co-operative. That was very justifiable agitation. Therefore, I need not worry too much about the argument for a co-operative. I should like my friends who advocate a co-operative, to tell us the mechanics of it; how it is to be organised. If they can put up a proposal which is sound I can assure them that we will give it very serious consideration, and if it is worthwhile we would be prepared to amend the Ordinance or, indeed, to repeal it. I give them that assurance. If the organization of the Rice Marketing Board into a co-operative will be in the greater interest of the farmers I can assure them that this Government will seek either an amendment of the Ordinance or its repeal to make provision for that.

Some criticism was also raised to the proposal that members of the Board shall hold office for one year instead of

two. I think the hon. Member who raised the objection was slightly confused. It is true that so far as the Rice Producers' Association is concerned provision has been made for elections every two years. Annual elections have been abolished in the case of the Rice Producers' Association, because we found that although the Council of the Association was elected for two years, elections were held annually, so that on some occasions we found that people who were still sitting on the Council of the Rice Producers' Association were defeated in the second year. We are seeking to correct that by having elections once every two years.

In the case of the Board we say that Members shall hold office for one year only, because there may be reasons for changing certain members of the Board. If the Council of the Association wants the same people who have been nominated to represent them on the Rice Marketing Board they will continue to make the same nominations, and the Minister would appoint them. But for some reason we find sometimes that people say they represent one thing and when they get in they say something else. We have had experience of that kind of thing, and provision is being made so that if at any time after the end of one year the council of the Rice Producers' Association are not satisfied with the representation given by any one or more of their colleagues on the Rice Marketing Board, they could at the end of the first year elect other representatives to take their places.

Another criticism was raised by the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, with regard to the provision relating to foreign matter or impurities in rice. I think the suggestion he made was that the Board should blow out the foreign matter. However it is done, whether by blowing out or separating the foreign matter by the use of a vibrator, such foreign matter must be regarded as impurities, for which a deduction will be made by the Board from the price to be

[DR. JAGAN]

paid for the rice. That is all that is provided in this simple Amendment, therefore I do not see any reason for fear.

The hon. Member also referred to the case of persons being found in possession of rice which they are not legally authorized to have. He said that in time to come there will be more rice produced in this country, so that there will be a surplus and no likelihood of a shortage, with the result that the practice of black-marketing is not likely to continue. Aside from the question of black-marketing, one finds that because of the price structure, the price at which the Rice Marketing Board buys rice and the price at which it sells it, some people may take advantage of the differential by causing an internal circulation of rice. To prevent that, this Amendment has been introduced so that anyone found in possession of rice who has not been legally authorized to have it, can be charged and brought before the Board, and the onus will be on that person to prove how he came into possession of the rice.

Those were the main criticisms raised against the Bill, but I do not think they are fundamental to the principle of the Bill. I formally move that the Bill be read a Second time.

Question put.

The Council divided and voted as follows:

<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>
Mr. Hubbard	Mr. Bowman
Mr. Ajodha Singh	Mr. Davis
Mr. Saffee	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Rai	Mr. Campbell
Mr. Ram Karran	Mr. Kendall.—5.
Mrs. Jagan	
Mr. Benn	
Dr. Jagan	
The Financial Secretary	
The Attorney-General.	
— 10.	

Motion affirmed.

Bill read a Second time.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 and 2 passed as printed.

Clause 3. — *Amendment of Section 4 of Chapter 249.*

**Dr. Jagan:** I beg to move the Amendments to Clause 3 as set out in the list which has been circulated. They are:

(i) Substitution of the word “persons” for the words “rice producers” between the words “twelve” and “appointed” in the new subsection (2) (b).

(ii) Substitution of the word “person” for the words “rice producer” between the words “one” and “nominated” in the new subsection (2) (b) (iii).

(iii) Substitution of the words “experienced in marketing” for the words “nominated as being persons experienced in marketing by the rice producers appointed under the preceding paragraph” in the new subsection (2) (c).

**Mr. Davis:** I beg to move the following Amendments to the Clause:

(i) Substitution of the word “seven” for the word “nine” in the new subsection 2 (b) (i).

(ii) Substitution of the word “four” for the word “two” in the new subsection (2) (b) (ii).

My reason for moving this Amendment lies partly in the fact that I do not believe that the millers desire representation on the Board in terms of voting power — the mere counting of noses. My contention is that the millers should have fair representation on the Board; even if they are outweighed by others they would have the satisfaction of knowing that their arguments have been adduced and their cases heard, even if some do not understand them. The miller must feel that justice is being done to him and to his contribution to the industry. The arguments of the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry, in fact, strengthen my contention.

**Mr. Bowman:** I rise to speak on the original Amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry. When this Amendment was first moved I mentioned that I felt it was a very clumsy

manoeuvre on his part for the purpose of intimidating the rice producers and influencing the results of the rice producers' elections. The Objects and Reasons of this Bill state :

"The members of the British Guiana Rice Marketing Board who include representatives from the British Guiana Rice Producers' Association have hitherto been appointed by the Governor. It is now contemplated by the British Guiana Rice Producers Association Ordinance that the representatives of that Association on the Rice Marketing Board would be appointed by the Minister of Trade and Industry from the persons nominated by and from the Council of the Rice Producers' Association."

The hon. Minister has said that he wanted to give the rice producers more power on the Board; but now he wants to change the word "producers" to "persons", so that he would have room to manoeuvre, because the results of the elections to the R.P.A. Council have not turned out as he had expected. He had thought that those whom he nominated would have won, but the contrary happened.

I heard it said just now that the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, should allay his fears and suspicions, because rice millers and landlords were already adequately represented as a result of the rice producers elections. That is not true .

The Minister finds that he will not easily get "yes men" to nominate to the Board and so he is introducing this change in the vital words for obvious reasons. Therefore I am opposing the Amendment.

**Mr. Davis:** Speaking on the Amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry, I would like to say that I do not place on it the same interpretation as that of the last speaker. My interpretation is that these "persons" need not be rice producers but they may be millers and landlords. Perhaps the hon. Minister can tell us something about it

**Mr. Bowman:** Let me clarify this thing a little further. I would like to make this clear. As a result of the militant stand taken by the people opposed to the P.P.P. at the Rice Producers Association elections some landlords and millers won seats. A change in the wording does not arise because the men are already there. I cannot see the need for such a change. The only reason, as I said, on the part of the Minister is that the elections did not meet his taste.

**Dr. Jagan:** I am afraid the hon. Member does not understand what is being done. The wording is being changed for good reason. Why? Because we are dealing with the Rice Development Company, which is a corporate body and therefore we cannot say "rice producer". That is why we are saying "persons" instead of "rice producers" and having these consequential amendments.

**Mr. Burnham:** We are right for once.

[Noises]

**The Chairman:** Order, Order!

**Dr. Jagan:** I can see the anxiety of the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, but I cannot see his fears. At the present time, in fact only until recently, two members who are millers found themselves on the rice producers side of the Board. [Noises]

**The Chairman:** If the Members of Council wish to hear whoever is speaking, then I hope they would not speak so audibly around the Table. It also makes it difficult for me to hear.

**Dr. Jagan:** Only recently two persons found themselves on the Board who can be regarded as millers. One is not now a miller, but a landlord. All along the millers' interest had not been jeopardized. However, to meet his point and to be charitable, I would accept his Amendment if he agrees to amend it as

[DR. JAGAN]

follows: In subsection (2) (b) (i), instead of substituting the word, "seven", substitute "eight"; and in (2) (b) (ii), instead of substituting a new word, "four", substitute "three". The rice producers would still have a majority. The argument has always been levelled that the rice producers did not have a real say because the farmers and others ganged up against them.

**Mr. Bowman:** Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has been trying, very clumsily, to bamboozle this Council. Some people feel that we should study anything he says. Provision has already been made in the Bill for dealing with a corporate body, and I am objecting to his Amendment.

**Mr. Benn:** I wonder whether I can be helpful? The hon. Minister is asking that the phrase "twelve rice producers" be changed to "twelve persons". The words "rice producers" will still remain at (b) (i), and (b) (ii). I hope I have made it clear.

**Mr. Davis:** The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry has been good enough to remind us that at one stage the Board was constituted of landlords, and that the millers section ganged up with the consumer section to the detriment of the rice farmers. Using that as a basis, one can see that the suggestion today is just the reverse. However, today he is in a very generous and magnanimous mood, so I think half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. I accept the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry's Amendment.

**Mr. Bowman:** These are the last few words I desire to say on this Bill. I know that the Bill will be passed. Let the Government try to fool whom they can fool. Some people are gullible and will swallow anything because they cannot think for themselves. I am sure that this question will soon be decided by the people themselves.

**The Chairman:** I will put the Amendment which has been accepted first. The question is, that in Clause 3 (2) (b) (i) the word "eight" be substituted for the word "nine".

Amendment agreed to.

*Mr. Bowman indicated dissent.*

**The Chairman:** The question is, that in Clause 3 (2) (b) (ii) the word "three" be substituted for the word "two".

Amendment agreed to.

**The Chairman:** The question is, that in Clause 3 (2) (b) (iii) the word "person" be substituted for the words "rice producer".

Amendment agreed to.

*Mr. Bowman indicated dissent.*

**The Chairman:** I shall state my understanding of it. If I am wrong, then hon. Members must explain the Amendment to me. The Amendment is to replace the word "rice producer" by the word "person". This Amendment, I understand, does not interfere with the Amendments to (b) (i), (b) (ii) and (b) (iii) because they add up to the same eleven. Clause 3 (2) (b) (i) refers to eight producers. A rice producer is a person, but a person may not necessarily be a rice producer.

There is an Amendment which affects Clause 3 (c). The question is, that the words "two other persons experienced in marketing" be substituted for the words "two other persons nominated as being persons experienced in marketing by the rice producers appointed under the preceding paragraph".

Amendment agreed to.

**Dr. Jagan:** I am advised by the hon. the Attorney-General that Clause 3 (3), line 1, should be amended by substituting



the word “paragraph” for “paragraphs”, and deleting the words “and (c)”.

**The Chairman:** The question is, that in Clause 3 (3), line 1, the word “paragraph” should be substituted for the word “paragraphs”, and the words “and (c)” be deleted.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. Davis:** Before you put the Clause to the Committee, I should like to point out that Clause 3 (3) (b) states “by the substitution for the words “two years” in subsection (4) of the words “one year”. I beg to move the deletion of those words.

**The Chairman:** I was putting the Clause as amended here and not in people’s mind.

**Mr. Davis:** That is why one will have to get his mind clear.

**The Chairman:** You may have an Amendment in your mind, but I have not yet reached the stage where I can divine what is in people’s mind. You must express your mind to this Council.

**Mr. Davis:** The hon Minister of Trade and Industry had turned over the page to deal with something else before I could make my point.

**The Chairman:** If you desire to move an Amendment you may do so.

**Mr. Davis:** I beg to move that Clause 3 (3) (b) be deleted. I have heard what the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry said about two years being too long a period for persons to be appointed to the Board, but I want to differ from him. My opinion is just the reverse. The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry spoke about experience in this matter, and I would like to remind him that the experience was of his own making. It is my view that when a person is appointed to the Board, it takes him three or four months to settle down and understand

the working of the Board. The ramifications of the Rice Marketing Board are very diversified and important, and it will take one a little time to become *au fait* with its intricacies. If one pushes too hard in one direction one might cause a bulge in another. That was my experience, and I take it that it is the experience of others who have taken some time to get the atmosphere and the correct slant or approach to things on the Board. I feel that one year is too short, if the Board is to get the best from a person’s approach, ability and capacity.

I know that in other organizations things are handled differently. They stagger the directorate, so that only three or four people go off at a period and others remain for re-election. Rice producers and hon. Members of this Council will agree with me that the situation is slightly different so far as this matter is concerned. It is my considered opinion that a person would be able to serve better if he were allowed to remain on the Board for two years. The Board would then be able to get maximum results from that person.

**Dr. Jagan:** The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, need not fear this Amendment, because members of the Rice Producers’ Council will be elected for two years. It is from the Council that members will be appointed to the Board. We have already seen how the Board will be constituted — two Government officers, one member nominated by the B.G. Rice Development Company, eight rice producers who may be millers or non-millers, and three other persons experienced in marketing. If the Council of the Rice Producers’ Association wishes to re-nominate a member for a second time there is nothing to prevent it from so doing, and his appointment will be more or less automatic. If, however, a member does something wrong the Council will have the remedy in its own hand to decide that he should not go back for a second year.

I agree with what the hon. Member says—that it takes a person two years to

[DR. JAGAN]

become knowledgeable, but there is nothing to preclude a member who is appointed for the first year being nominated for a second year, if his colleagues have confidence in him. On the other hand, what will be preserved if this Amendment is passed, is that if someone has the confidence of the producer members who elect him, and he subsequently loses their confidence, they will have the right to put someone else in his place.

**The Chairman:** The question is that subsection (3) (d) be deleted.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 3, as amended, put and agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 12 put, and passed as printed.

Council resumed.

**Dr. Jagan:** I beg to report that the Rice Marketing (Amendment) Bill has been considered in Committee and approved with certain Amendments. I move that the Bill be now read the Third time and passed.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

#### **GEORGETOWN SEWERAGE AND WATER (AMENDMENT) BILL**

**The Minister of Community Development and Education** (Mr. Rai): I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill intituled

“An Ordinance to amend the Georgetown Sewerage and Water Ordinance.”

It was the practice in the past for the Audit Department to examine the accounts of the Georgetown Sewerage and Water Commissioners, but this practice was discontinued in 1952 by the then Director of Audit, for the reason that

there was no provision for auditing those accounts in Chapter 153. In 1958 the Director of Audit recommended that since the expenditure of the Georgetown Sewerage and Water Commissioners was met from the funds of the Georgetown Town Council, the Georgetown Sewerage and Water Commissioners agree with this recommendation, and this amending Bill seeks to provide for the accounts of the Commissioners to be audited. I formally move that the Bill be read a Second time.

**The Minister of Natural Resources** (Mr. Benn): I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

Council resolved itself into Committee and approved the Bill as printed.

Council resumed.

**Mr. Rai:** I beg to report that the Georgetown Sewerage and Water (Amendment) Bill was considered in Committee and passed without amendment. I now move that the Bill be read the Third time and passed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

#### **INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL**

**The Attorney-General:** (Mr. Austin): I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill intituled :

“An Ordinance to amend the Interpretation Ordinance.”

The Interpretation Ordinance, which is Chapter 5 of our laws, was passed in 1891. It has been amended on a number of occasions to incorporate various provisions which were found to be useful, and I feel that the time has

come when the Ordinance should be repealed and re-enacted in an up-to-date form.

It is an important law because, in a way, it acts as a gearbox to the interpretation of phrases in all the other laws, I hope the time will be not too far distant when the Law Officers can give attention to preparing a new Bill for introduction in this Council. But in the meantime I think it is necessary to amend the Ordinance in a number of ways which day-to-day experience has shown to be desirable from the legal point of view.

Now, Sir, the Bill before the Council provides for four amendments to be incorporated into the existing law. The first one deals with the question as to when an act may properly be done if on the last day on which it can be done is a Sunday or a Public Holiday, when the Courts and other institutions are closed.

The usual interpretation is that it is sufficient if the act is done or performed on the next day, that is to say, the following day if it is not a Sunday or a Public Holiday. But it has been represented that it would be helpful if what is accepted in practice is provided for in the law.

At a later stage I proposed to move an amendment to Clause 3 as it is set out in the Bill. The object of this amendment would be to extend the provision by the inclusion of the words

“Where by or under any Ordinance, any period of time dating from a given day, act, or event, is prescribed or allowed for any purpose, and the last day of any such period falls on a Sunday or public holiday, unless the contrary intention appears, the period shall include the next following day which is not a Sunday or public holiday.”

The next matter which has engaged our attention is the question of dealing with subsidiary legislation. Hon. Members know that with the growth of Government business a good deal of legislation has, for the sake of practicability, to be left to subsidiary legislation —

where there is no question of policy involved, and where it is necessary to legislate for details and particulars and so on. In the old days the main form of subsidiary legislation were proclamations, by-laws, rules and regulations. Now, however, I imagine that the most common form of subsidiary legislation is an order in council and certain other forms such as directions and notifications.

Section 21 of the Interpretation Ordinance provides that rules, regulations or by-laws when they are made, may be amended, varied, rescinded, or revoked by the same authority and in the same manner in which it was made. We have found in practice that there have been occasions on which it has been desirable to amend, vary or revoke an order in council, but we do not have the power to do so under the Interpretation Ordinance. So Clause 4 of the Bill seeks to extend the definition of “subsidiary legislation” covered by this Section 21 to include proclamations, orders, notifications, directions, notices and forms.

The opportunity is also taken to clarify the Section to provide that these forms of subsidiary legislation shall come into force on the day they are published in the Gazette. Hitherto there was merely a requirement that they should be published in the Gazette and it is assumed that they come into force on the day they are so published unless some other day is specified.

Directions, notifications and forms can sometimes be described as subsidiary legislation and they should therefore be taken into account in this Amendment. It is not really necessary; if the case merits it, then they shall be published, and provision is made accordingly in legislation — proclamations, regulations, by-laws and orders must of course be published in any event. There is a provision in one or two enactments to the effect that if a form is prescribed it may be varied to meet a particular case, and if it is so varied without any alteration in substance, then the form as varied shall

**[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]**

be good in law. That situation applies in the Criminal Law (Procedure) Ordinance and the Summary Jurisdiction (Procedure) Ordinance. This Bill seeks to extend this common provision with regard to forms prescribed under all laws by making provision under the Interpretation Ordinance.

Lastly, there have been one or two cases recently, where an appointment for office or membership of a Board has been made and no provision exists as to how long the appointment may be held and how a person who should no longer hold it, for one reason or another, can be relieved of it.

Of course, it is perfectly right and proper that the power to appoint must include the corollary which is the power to suspend or remove. This Bill makes that provision.

These amendments to the Interpretation Ordinance are in common form. I have mentioned that we wanted to produce a new and up-to-date Interpretation Ordinance. I had in mind the Interpretation Act of The West Indies, which is probably the latest and most up-to-date legislation of its kind in overseas territories. These amendments in the Bill are more or less based on what is found in that Statute.

I do not think there will be any controversy about this Bill. I commend it to this Council with the comment that it will serve a most useful purpose in everyday practice in the Courts. I beg to move that the Bill be read a Second time.

**The Financial Secretary:** I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 and 2 passed as printed.

Clause 3. — *Insertion of new section 9A in Chapter 5.*

**The Attorney-General:** I beg to move an Amendment in the form as circulated to hon. Members. It is a non-controversial Amendment. There is also a slight variation in the marginal note. I shall read it.

“Time for performance of act in relation to Sunday or public holiday.

9A (1) Where by or under any Ordinance anything is required or authorised to be done on a certain day, then if that day is a Sunday or public holiday, unless the contrary intention appears, the thing shall be deemed to have been done in due time if it is done on the next following day which is not a Sunday or public holiday.

(2) Where by or under any Ordinance, any period of time dating from a given day, act, or event is prescribed or allowed for any purpose, and the last day of any such period falls on a Sunday or public holiday, unless the contrary intention appears, the period shall include the next following day which is not a Sunday or public holiday.”

**The Chairman:** This means that this subsection 9A will be substituted for that printed in the Bill at Clause 3.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment carried.

Clause 3 passed as amended.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed as printed.

**The Attorney-General:** I beg to move that the Council resume.

Question put, and agreed to.

Council resumed.

**The Attorney-General:** I beg to report that the Bill has been considered in Committee and one Amendment has been approved. I now beg to move that the Bill, as amended, be read the Third time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

#### LAND BONDS ORDINANCE 1959 : REPEAL PROPOSED

Council resumed the debate on the following Motion:

“Whereas enactment of the Land Bonds Ordinance, 1959 (No. 21) has caused dissatisfaction and grave concern among the landed proprietors of the Colony,

Be it resolved: That this Council recommends the repeal of the Land Bonds Ordinance, 1959 (No. 21).”

**Mr. Speaker:** On the Adjournment yesterday the hon. Member for Demerara River, the Mover of the Motion, was replying, and he may resume now if he so desires.

**Mr. Bowman (replying):** This Motion, which seeks to repeal the Land Bonds Ordinance, was brought before this Council as a result of the fear or doubts which it has created in the minds of landed proprietors, small and large, throughout British Guiana.

Yesterday the hon. Minister of Natural Resources reminded me that I became an hon. Member of this Council as a result of the support given to me by the sugar workers in general. I would like to tell the Minister that I have recognized that fact. I would also like to tell the Minister that I am an hon. Member of this Council. I am also

considered an honourable person outside of this Council, because truth and honesty have always been on my side. I am a poor and humble man, but I dare any man to point a finger in my face — even the P.P.P. — accusing me. I can stand honourably before the Colony as a whole, but it is not so with the hon. Minister of Natural Resources. Unlike me, he cannot claim that position.

They claim that I am now representing the big landlords, and the Minister of Natural Resources had the audacity to go so far as to call names. He referred to Mr. Rahaman of Tiger Island, and Bookers. Bookers' representative is right here, and they can question him and find out whether they have appointed me at any time to represent them. The Party once gave me a good name. I made a release when I left the P.P.P., and the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing also made a release. I have a good recommendation. I intend to hold them up to the public. I am here representing everybody in this country, and I am here to see that the scales are held evenly.

Unlike this Party—a Party whose very foundation was built on lies and slander, which has striven on lies, slander and the distortion of facts throughout its existence — I want to do the right thing. I am here to hold the scales evenly and to represent not only the landlords but the small farmers as well as the small people. Let them go back to the arguments which were adduced by me in the Motion which we discussed earlier — the Motion which sought to give freehold titles to small farmers on the Government Land Settlement Schemes. Who were the people I was representing at the time? The big landlords? They are trying to twist things, but I am trying to hold the scales evenly.

This Party has built itself on class hatred by stirring up one class against another class. That is the foundation of the P.P.P. I am guilty of that, too, because I have been following them with-

[MR. BOWMAN]

out thinking. But the time came when I had to think for myself, unlike some of those on the other side of the Table who are now skinning their teeth. They are expressing the thoughts of other people, but I am expressing my own thoughts today.

I am here representing every section of this community. I have brought this Motion because I feel that the Land Bonds Bill is iniquitous. In introducing this Ordinance in this country one section of the community would be discriminated against another, and that, to my mind, would foster class hatred. It would put the landlords against the landless people in this country and *vice versa*. That is why they are clamouring for independence now. When we get independence and real power they are going to confiscate people's land.

**A Member:** What will happen to you?

**Mr. Bowman:** I will fight my way out.

**Mr. Speaker:** You will have to speak to the Chair, or I will have to stop you.

**Mr. Bowman:** A little heckling is good at times, Sir. I am prepared to fight my way out. These hon. Friends of mine — we are friends, but politically we are enemies—would like to foster class war, and I feel that is wrong. That is why I have taken up the cudgel of the landlords. I fought for the rights of the small man the other day, and today I am fighting the cause of the landlords. I am now fighting the cause of the large landlords and the small landlords.

Later on I will refer to the hon. the Attorney-General's speech. He made it quite clear that it is not only the large landowners who will be in jeopardy, but the small landed proprietors as well. We are now faced with a paradox, and the

P.P.P. have always been a paradox. In one breath they will tell you something, and two hours later they will say something else. They are arch liars. The Members of that Party will tell you something to your face and then deny it to your face. They have done that to me several times, but I do not want to call names now.

**The Speaker:** I am experiencing a little difficulty, and the difficulty is this: you are replying to a Motion; I was not present when the Motion was being debated, so I do not know how much you are saying is in reply to what has happened before, or whether it is new matter. I do not know whether you are replying to the Motion, or whether you are introducing something fresh.

**Mr. Bowman:** I am replying because we are faced with a paradox. The Minister of Trade and Industry made the point yesterday, and the P.P.P. claim that they are in favour of giving people land and allowing them to own land. However, when I made representation to give titles to small landowners they fought against it. There is the paradox: in one breath they say that the people should own land, and in the same breath they say that the people should not own land. That has been the Party's practice from its inception. They accuse me of representing the big man today. Who would believe that? That is intended for the gullible — the people who are incapable of thinking for themselves.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry said that things are subject to change. I would like to remind the P.P.P. that the people's way of thinking is changing radically—let them make no mistake about that. The people are beginning to understand what the Minister of Trade and Industry is doing. The people are now realizing that what he has been telling them years ago is not true. The members of the P.P.P. are trying to give the impression that they are comfortable, but I know that they are rather uncomfortable. I know that some of them are shaking in their seats right now.

**Mr. Speaker:** Has that got anything to do with the Land Bonds Bill or the Motion?

**Mr. Bowman:** That is my way of replying to the Motion. I am replying as I choose.

**Mr. Speaker:** You cannot reply in this Council as you choose. You will reply in this Council as the Rules will allow. You may reply elsewhere as you choose, but not in here.

**Mr. Burnham:** At Bourda Green.

**Mr. Bowman:** Earlier in this debate the Minister of Communications and Works made this point. It was he who first raised the question of my representing the big landlords. He has tried to create that false impression, and I want to dispel that falsehood, because I said earlier that I am here to balance the scale. I am here to represent every section of the community in British Guiana. I feel it is wrong for the People's Progressive Party to attempt to set one section against another, and that is why I have taken up the cudgel of the landed proprietors. We have discussed this question in the Party conclave several times, and the view was that we should try to isolate the small section. I refer particularly to the landlords. The view of the Party was: "Their votes do not count for much, so we can do them anything. Let us look after the interests of the masses who can always give us the votes".

I feel that that is wrong. Those are things which the P.P.P. have been preaching inside and outside. I am not only saying that, now that I have left them. We have had repeated disagreements. There were times in the Party's Executive when I voted alone on questions with which I did not agree. This is one of those questions.

I do not believe in class warfare and class hatred. We are trying to build a nation, welding the various sections into one integrated whole, but if we

follow the P.P.P. the people will remain in segments and we will have no unity. They feel that their Party can only thrive by putting one section of the community against another. That is why they have passed a Bill which will operate against one section of the community for the benefit of another section.

There is one other point to which I wish to draw attention. It is the use of the term "vendor" in the Land Bonds Ordinance. In the Ordinance provision is made for the appointment of Commissioners to investigate lands which are believed to be lying idle, and if the Commissioners decide that lands are not being beneficially occupied they will report to the Governor in Council, and action will be taken by Government to acquire such lands

In cases where lands are compulsorily acquired an arbitrary price will be fixed by Government, and a person whose land is taken away in such circumstances is being described as a vendor. I gather from the dictionary that a vendor is a person who sells anything voluntarily. If a person has by compulsion to give up his property can he be called a vendor? I feel that a legal advantage is being taken of such persons.

Instead of enacting legislation for the compulsory acquisition of people's land I think Government should have introduced a land tax. That was one of the questions I took up with the Ministers when I was a member of the P.P.P. I suggested to them that rather than take away people's lands which were lying idle, they should impose a land tax, because I do not think anyone would want to pay a tax on land which was not producing anything. The imposition of a land tax would force those who have lands lying idle to sell them to persons who could develop those lands. But the Acquisition of Land (Land Settlement) Ordinance which was introduced by Sir Frank McDavid was to their liking, as it was their intention, when they got into the Legislature, to introduce legislation for the compulsory acquisition of land.

[MR. BOWMAN]

But realizing that Government has no money to pay cash for land compulsorily acquired, this Government introduced the Land Bonds Bill which is now law. Personally I am not so much opposed to the Acquisition of Land (Land Settlement) Ordinance but I am opposed to payment by bonds for land compulsorily acquired under that Ordinance. It is most iniquitous to take away land from a man who perhaps had invested his life savings to acquire it, and then give him bonds in payment.

All these are legal advantages being taken of the people, but they conform to one pattern which we are seeing gradually unfolding in this country. It is the intention of the P.P.P. whenever independence is won and they are the Government, to nationalize all lands. Those who disbelieve what I say should read the Communist Party's history. That is the ultimate intention of the P.P.P. That is why they are saying "We want independence now." They are going to confiscate, abrogate and expropriate when independence is won, if they happen to be the Government, and that is why I say that the people must begin to think about what is taking place here. I am thinking of the dangers because I know that the people are going to rise up in arms against any iniquitous move. That is what I am afraid of. I see the danger that is in the offing, and that is why I am raising my voice now in warning. If people continue to follow the P.P.P. and independence is won, the day will come when there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth in British Guiana. Blood will flow.

**Mr. Speaker:** You are doing very well on the Land Bonds Ordinance. Why not continue to deal with it?

**Mr. Bowman:** All of us cannot express our thoughts in the same way. It is my way of expressing what I have in mind, and I think I am speaking quite relevantly to that Ordinance. I am not challenging your competence, Sir. I am

only saying what I feel. I know I am speaking against the Majority Party which introduced this legislation to take advantage of the people, but even if this Motion does not succeed, what I am saying today will be remembered. I want to say further that I know the Motion is not going to be passed, but I have confidence that I am coming back here in 1961, and I am coming back here with sufficient force to repeal that Ordinance. (**Members:** *Hear, hear.*) I am saying that with confidence. Let them say "Hear, hear"; I am saying what I know. Men are trembling in their seats already. It may sound stupid, but time will tell.

I will now support my contention by quoting a few words which were spoken by the hon. the Attorney-General yesterday. In supporting the righteousness of the Majority Party in introducing this legislation in this country he referred to England where he said that similar legislation had been in force, but later in his speech he said that the law had been repealed in England. At any rate the situation in this country is vastly different from that in England with a population of over 50 millions. There was need for such legislation in England because land must necessarily be scarce in that island as compared with British Guiana with its 83,000 square miles and a population of just over half a million. The Attorney-General also referred to Jamaica, a small island which can be put into this country 15 times, but which has a population of 1½ millions. One can appreciate that legislation for compulsory land acquisition is justifiable in those countries. Where is the need for taking away people's lands in British Guiana?

The Attorney-General went on to say that if a small land owner had a piece of land adjoining a land settlement scheme which was well developed, and that person's land was not developed in such a way as to suit the wishes of the Government, it could be compulsorily acquired. He said further that if Government compulsorily acquired land which was developed to the ex-



extent of nine-tenths the Government would fix the price of the land and pay nine-tenths of the price in bonds. Can we call such a Government a good Government?

I was a member of the Majority Party. Before the P.P.P. was I was with them! I know how they think. This is going to be their doom, believe it or not! They will arbitrarily fix prices for people's lands. This is the Party that claims to be representing the small man, the masses.

When Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935 or 1936 Churchill said that Mussolini was trying to out-Herod Herod. Similarly the Majority Party today is trying to out-commune the Communist. They are only waiting for a chance. Note their associations. Cuba is one of them; in Cuba Castro has taken away the property of one person valued over \$68 million. These people claim to be representing the small man. It was for this reason that I asked the other day—and which you objected to, Mr. Speaker — whether the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing could say whom she was representing in Cuba.

**Mr. Speaker:** Your question was not in order; it was not Supplementary, and I said you may table an independent Question or a motion, which you have not done yet.

**Mr. Bowman:** I will table a Motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Very well.

**Mr. Bowman:** I will soon go to the country and tell the people what I know and what I think. I know that in process of time we will see vast changes in this place. Some people believe they are invincible, but their invincibility lies in one false conception.

I do not think I have more to say other than to commend this Motion to this Council, and I ask the Members of the "Opposition" in particular to support

it. The Majority Party will vote against it, but, as Churchill once said, "Time and history will tell." Before I close, I will refer to the remarks of another well-known Englishman, Neville Chamberlain. The Second World War was brewing, and in the face of opposition within his Party against his policy at the Munich talks he maintained that he was right. He told them, "If time does not prove that my approach is right and that my critics are wrong, I will eat my hat." Although time has proved him wrong, I am prepared to say that if time does not prove me right in bringing forward this Motion for the repeal of the Land Bonds Ordinance, I will eat my hat.

Question put, the Council divided and voted as follows:

<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>
Mr. Bowman	Mr. Tasker
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Ajodha Singh
Mr. Burnham	Mr. Saffee
Mr. Kendall.—5.	Mr. Rai
	Mr. Ram Karran
	Mrs. Jagan
	Mr. Benn
	Dr. Jagan
	The Financial Secretary
	The Attorney-General
<i>Did not vote.</i>	The Chief Secretary.—12.
Mr. Davis.—1.	

Motion negatived.

### TRAINING OF GUIANESE FOR ALL HIGHER PUBLIC SERVICE POSTS

**Mr. Speaker:** The next item is the Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central and which reads as follows:

"Be it resolved: That this Council recommends to Government the immediate preparation and implementation of an extensive and thorough scheme for the training of Guianese with a view to the latter's filling all the higher posts in the administrative and technical branches of the country's Public Service".

**Mr. Burnham:** Mr. Speaker, this Motion which was tabled some time ago did not enjoy the good fortune of coming up for debate, and it had to be re-tabled this year. I imagine it should not be a controversial one. Consequently I do not propose to speak at any great length on it today as I do not anticipate any opposition. Because I take it the object it seeks to achieve is one which is shared by all Members of this Government. It seeks to have a native Guianese Administration when British Guiana achieves self-government and/or independence.

It is not that with the coming of independence we would not have persons from other countries and other places, but it is my feeling that we with the achievement of independence must have personnel—our own personnel available. Next year will see constitutional advance as a result of which a great deal more power will be put into the hands of the Elected Representatives of the peoples of British Guiana and I further see a time-table for independence within a period of no more than two years after 1961.

I have always thought that the achievement of political independence is an ideal devoutly to be wished for, but it is my further contention that it would be an empty mockery unless we have our own people to man our machine of State.

There may be some from abroad with the greatest amount of sympathy for Guiana and things Guianese, but I do not think the sympathy of the foreigner can possibly replace the enthusiasm and vision of the native.

From time to time we have instances which surround the appointment of persons such as, for instance, the Postmaster-General (now renamed Director of Posts and Telecommunications). From time to time we have palpably unfair solutions like that found by the Governor of the day. And I feel now we have in

office an elected nationalist Government something should be done to prepare an elaborate and comprehensive scheme to train Guianese to hold every type of post, whether it be administrative or technical. I am fully aware of the fact that in some Branches of the Establishment, the Technical Branches, the courses which Guianese will have to do or undertake may be long and may not be completed before we have independence. But, to my mind, we should start immediately, and even if we do not get our full complement by the time we achieve independence, we can see in front of us our being able to secure Guianese to fill top posts.

I do not know what the hon. the Chief Secretary will say as to what is being done so far, or what has been done so far, but it does appear to me that even if something is being done there seems to be no overall plan or picture. Sometimes you hear of a few police officers going to Scotland Yard; a few school teachers going to do a course for the Diploma of Education at some American University; and a few going on I.C.A. courses. But one gets the impression that these things are not part of a proper scheme — a scheme aimed at complete Guianization of the Public Service of British Guiana.

I do not necessarily feel that all of the persons trained will be absorbed into the Public Service. To my mind there will be nothing wrong with the expenditure of Government funds for the acceleration of educational training in branches which are not necessarily part of any Government Department. We shall need chemists, engineers in the various industries which we are seeking to attract to British Guiana, and I do not see that the training of personnel for such purposes is necessarily outside the scope of what I have suggested originally in the Motion. In this 20th century, Government cannot take a sort of neutral attitude so far as industries are concerned. Government must take an active part in encouraging and, if neces-

sary, set up industries in this country. Therefore I think that the Government of the day should take an active part in having trained the necessary people to do certain jobs.

When I speak of having Guianese trained to fill all posts in the administrative and technical branches, I include the training of such experts as economists. I know that there are some people who think that economics is not a science, but I do not think that they would publicly put forward that point of view.

Finally, there is a particular branch of the Service which did not occur to me when I originally penned the Motion, which occurred to me very shortly after I had done so. It is the question of having personnel trained for the Foreign Services. I should not like to see British Guiana in a position where it does not have a Foreign Service of its own. I should not like to see British Guiana represented, as somebody said, by the U.K. or the United Nations when we achieve independence. I feel that British Guiana must be represented by her sons and daughters, and I feel, therefore, that this Government, in adumbrating a scheme for training Guianese for top posts, should bear in mind the training of people for entry in the Diplomatic Service. If we are going to have such a scheme, then I feel sure that political independence will be a reality and not an empty mockery.

I have heard the view expressed by an eminent West Indian that a particular African State which will be achieving its independence in 1960 will have great difficulty in finding native persons to fill high posts. This commentator feels that it is something to be bemoaned, and that independence may not work as smoothly or as well as a lot of people think. He may be right; he may be wrong, but I feel that we will be right if we set about making preparations immediately for the proper training of our people. As I have said, this, to my

mind, is not a Motion for a long speech because I cannot imagine opposition in this Council on such a Motion.

**Mr. Kendall:** I beg to second the Motion.

**Mr. Tasker:** I accept the view of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central that there is hardly likely to be any argument on this matter. I am, however, disappointed that the hon. Member did not take his reasoning a stage further. None of us can possibly argue with the principle or the active prosecution of the policy of Guianization, but it seems to me that Guianization of itself is not enough. What the hon. Member said is quite true, and we support him; but saying that Guianese men and women should be holding jobs which they are at present not holding is not, to my mind, tackling the other half of the question.

My sole reason for being on my feet on this subject is through my membership of the Public Accounts Committee of this Chamber where, for the past three years, my colleagues and I have been endeavouring to get from Government a clear-cut policy of training in the Public Service. Time after time Departmental Heads will admit that standards are inadequate, that morale is low, that they are short of staff or short of funds; but there is no doubt whatever that the basic problem in the Service at present is a lack of standards and morale which can be attributed directly or indirectly to a lack of in-service training.

There is not at the present moment any form of Induction Training, and yet people complain about the extent to which able young Guianese men and women join the Service, get frustrated and leave it again. We are losing people, young men and women, from the Service who should, as the hon. Member for Georgetown Central says, be provided with new opportunities for looking ahead to the future.

[MR. TASKER]

As regards the in-service training side of the matter, I feel very strongly — and I know that this view is held by certain of my colleagues — that there is a completely inadequate approach at present towards a sound training in financial responsibility. Far too often senior Government Officers have answered questions by our Committee by simply saying: "It is in the Financial Regulations". Certainly, the Financial Regulations are given to Government Officers for the guidance and conduct of the officers in the Service. But when questioned as to what steps are taken by Senior Officers to train Junior Officers in the responsibilities of the Regulations, the answer is: "None at all; everybody is too busy".

The Public Accounts Committee, two years ago, specifically recommended that Government Officers in Departments with particular financial responsibilities should be brought together from time to time if necessary for a week-end course or seminar—in order that the Financial Secretary or someone deputed by him, maybe the Accountant General, should bring home to these people and clarify for them precisely what their responsibilities are. The answer we receive is: "That cannot be done," or "the people cannot be spared."

I am not levelling this criticism at any individual member of the Government. What I am saying is that, with all the other preoccupations, the Administration has failed so far to provide the essential framework of training within the Service without which our standards and morale cannot be improved. Far too many Senior Officers in the Government have very little idea or interest in what is going on down the line. Far too often, when errors and faults are discovered, the buck is passed down the line as far as it will go, until it cannot be passed any further. There is too little recognition in the upper ranks of the Service that faults lower down the scale are ultimately the faults of management

itself. If we are going to Guianize the Service as the hon. Member for Georgetown Central has recommended, with any measure of success, we cannot afford any longer to ignore the desperate need for a comprehensive and efficient system of training in this Service, which we all want to see improved considerably.

**The Chief Secretary:** It is a pleasure to reassure the hon. Member for Georgetown Central that I entirely agree that this is not a controversial subject, and that it is one which we all wish to see going right ahead. This afternoon I shall review the progress that has already been made in the direction of Guianization. As Hon. Members are aware, Guianization is a continuing process, and in recent years a training programme designed to ensure that qualified Guianese are available for appointment or promotion to senior post in the Public Service has been stepped up.

In January, 1958, the Chief Secretary laid on the Table a prepared statement on "Scholarships and Training for and in the Public Service," and again, as recently as last July, a Progress Report with a supporting statement was prepared and distributed to the staff associations to show the special efforts that have been made, and are still being made, to train local officers for appointment to posts which were mostly filled formerly by recruitment from overseas. This document shows that public officers in all Departments are being provided on a large scale with opportunities, both by way of assisted study courses and by the grant of extended leave, to equip themselves for the higher appointments in all fields of the Public Service.

The Government's policy on training for and in the Public Service has so far been objective and, taking into account the country's general financial resources, is almost fully extended within the amount of funds which can be provided for training purposes. But, as with all things, there may be room for

improvement, and as hon. Members will recall, on the 14th of July, 1959, the acting Chief Secretary announced in this Council that Government had decided to review the present policy for the Guianization of the Civil Service, and after consultation with the various representative organizations of the Civil Service and, if necessary, the Secretary of State, would produce a White Paper in which would be set out the policy for Guianization which it was considered should be followed in the future. I am sorry that the hon. Member for Georgetown South is absent, as I was hoping that this would partly answer his Motion which I see is the next on the Order Paper. In July, 1959, those staff associations were invited to state their views as to what the future policy for Guianization of the Service should be, but to date replies from two of the three staff associations have still not been received.

I should like to pass now to what we are doing in trying to train Guianese to fill important posts in the Public Service. There are two main groups. One group is the Conditional Scholarships that are awarded, and the second is the Overseas Training Courses. With few exceptions Government Officers in this territory, who undergo overseas training courses arranged by Government, are sent to suit specialized departmental requirements, and they go under United Kingdom or International Co-operation Administration sponsorship. This second group can be subdivided into three particular categories: First, there are the special courses which are undertaken by officers specially selected; secondly, there are the ordinary courses which are included as part of the annual approved training programme, and these are generally undertaken by officers during their normal vacation leave. Thirdly, there are *ad hoc* courses which do not form part of the annual training programme, but for which permission is given to officers to undertake, sometimes at their own expense, if funds are not available, while on vacation leave.

With regard to the Overseas Training Courses these are the facts: In 1951 twelve attended these courses; in 1952 (2), 1953 (17), 1954 (17). The programme was stepped up in 1955 when there were 48 taking courses; in 1956 (63), 1957 (67), 1958 (46), and in 1959 (57). Altogether the courses covered 37 different subjects, including Accounting, but I do regret, and I agree with the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, that perhaps more officers should have gone on study courses dealing with Public Accounts. None the less, the record shows that this subject has not been completely neglected.

Returning now to the Conditional Scholarships, there are at the moment 50 current Conditional Scholarship awards and the candidates are due to qualify—two in 1960, four in 1961, and even more in 1962. So that it will not be for another two or three years that we shall see the full fruits of those awards. Besides the Conditional Scholarship awards we have other students to whom loans have been granted from public funds, and on the 1st January this year the number stood at 54. In addition, we have 15 officers who have been selected for training courses since the beginning of this year, and if we add to this the carry-over from 1959, the number is increased to 32.

The Government has also taken advantage of a further field of training which is paid for from Technical Assistance funds provided largely by I.C.A., the Caribbean Vocational Training Scheme in Puerto Rico, and other schemes under the U.N. World Health Organization. If I may briefly give some details: Under the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization we have one person attending a training course; under the U.N. World Health Organization we have eight. Under U.N. Technical Assistance Fellowship we have one, under I.C.A. we have 17; under the Caribbean Vocational Training Scheme in Puerto Rico we have 13; the International Road Education Foundation has provided us with two places, and under the International

## [THE CHIEF SECRETARY]

Association for the Prevention and Treatment of Tuberculosis we have one. I think this is quite a formidable list, and it does show that this Government has made an honest attempt to get as many Guianese as possible fully trained, so that when they come back they can assist in raising the standards in the Public Service and other fields in this country.

This, then, is the Government's Training Programme. As regards in-service training there will always be a continuous need for this. In-service training covers all grades and, as hon. Members are aware, one of the functions of the Public Service Commission is to advise on training; but inevitably it is more closely concerned with pre-service training than with in-service training. Mr. Gorsuch recognized that the Public Service Commission lost touch with those who were in the Public Service and who received training after appointment, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to read an extract from the Gorsuch Report at Chapter 10, paragraph 155. I quote:

"155. One of the functions of the Public Service Commission is to advise on training; but it is more closely concerned with pre-service training than with in-service training. Where the former is aided from public funds the candidates are presumably selected through the agency of the Commission, and when the time comes to appoint to a post in the Service it is again the Commission that advises. But the candidate who is trained after appointment disappears from the Commission's view after a relatively short probationary period, and does not reappear until he is a candidate for promotion to a higher grade (or unless he has the misfortune to incur disciplinary proceedings). For that reason it does not seem that in-service training should be left entirely to the Public Service Commission, though that body should be kept in touch with it."

Later on Mr. Gorsuch says:

"156. In order to ensure that local resources are used and developed to the utmost this Commission feels that the Government would be well advised to arrange for local in-service training to be comprehensively examined throughout all departments. This could be done by a Committee consisting of the Chief Estab-

lishment Officer, the Director of Education, one member of the Public Service Commission and, when technical training is being examined, the Principal of the Technical Institute. The head or heads of departments concerned would be co-opted when training within a department, or joint training for departments, is under discussion. In this way the whole field of local training within the Service would be examined and co-ordinated."

Government has decided to accept Chapter 10 of the Gorsuch Report, and a Committee will in due course be set up to examine comprehensively and co-ordinate local in-service training throughout all Departments. This Committee will have as one of its tasks the question of examining the whole host of training courses that are brought almost by every mail to Government's attention. Careful selection will have to be made of courses that suit our needs, and equal care will have to be taken in selecting the most suitable candidates to attend those courses. It should perhaps be made clear that in-service training is not intended to compete with direct entry, rather, it is complementary, and from these two sources it is hoped that standards in the Public Service will be raised.

At this stage I think I may be permitted just to reflect on some of the achievements in Guianization within recent months. This Motion calls for equipping Guianese to fill all the higher posts in the administrative and technical branches of the country's Public Service. In the last year we have seen Mr. Glasford appointed Comptroller of Customs and Excise, Mr. Dow appointed Deputy Conservator of Forests, and we have seen Mr. Weber promoted as Commissioner of Police. All these appointments were made purely on merit. They were made because the officers were considered to be competent to fill these posts, and I think we can feel justifiably proud that they have measured up to the standard expected for these high posts in the Public Service.

A top post is not necessarily filled by sending someone away to obtain a degree. Other indefinable qualities such

as powers of leadership are needed which no training programme can necessarily provide.

When I was in Sierra Leone a Commission of Inquiry was appointed with Sir Herbert Cox, formerly Chief Justice of Tanganyika, as its Chairman. I did not know much about Sir Herbert Cox then, and it was not until I came to this country that I learned that he is a Guianese. So that this country has produced outstanding sons who not only serve within this territory but have made worthy contributions elsewhere. And I do not think that we should shut ourselves in our own world by insisting on having Guianese only for higher posts in this country. This can prove to be a double-edged sword. If this country decided to have only Guianese people, other parts of the world might also say,

“we are only going to have our own men.” I think exchange is a good thing.

I have briefly tried to show some of the results that have already been achieved, and some of the things that are now being done. I think that in the next few years the efforts of this Government will be shown, and we shall get returns from the moneys that have been expended on this costly training programme; I also think that perhaps by August, 1961, or shortly after that date there will be Guianese equipped to fill nearly all the higher posts in the Service.

**The Chief Secretary:** I beg to move that this Council do now adjourn and resume at two o'clock tomorrow afternoon, at which time we can continue to deal with Private Members' Motions.

*Council adjourned accordingly, at 5.04 p.m.*