

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 2]

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE FIRST PARLIAMENT
OF GUYANA UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF GUYANA' ~~1966~~ ¹⁹⁶⁷ _{29.12.}

2nd Sitting

Thursday, 10th August, 1967.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

PRESENT

His Honour the Deputy Speaker, Mr. R C. Tello.

*Members of the Government
Ministers*

The Honourable L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.,
Prime Minister

Dr. the Honourable P. A. Reid,
Minister of Trade.

The Honourable N. J. Bissember,
Minister for Parliamentary Affairs (Leader of the House).

The Honourable R. E. Checks,
Minister of Local Government.

The Honourable E. F. Correia,
Minister of Communications.

The Honourable Mrs. W. Gaskin,
Minister of Education.

The Honourable C. M. L. John,
Minister of Home Affairs.

The Honourable R. J. Jordan,
Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

The Honourable W.O.R. Kendall, C.B.E., J.P.,
Minister of Health and Housing.

The Honourable C. A. Merriman, J.P.,
Minister of Labour and Social Security.

The Honourable M. F. Singh,
Minister of Works and Hydraulics.

The Honourable M. W. Carter,
Minister of Information.

Parliamentary Secretaries:

Mr. D. B. DeGroot,
Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office.

Mr. G. Bowman,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Mr. O. E. Clarke,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education.

Mr. P. Duncan,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Local Government.

Mr. J. G. Joaquin, O.B.E., J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Works and Hydraulics.

Mr. C. V. Too-Chung,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

Other Members

Mr. W. A. Blair

Mr. J. Budhoo

Mr. M. Kasin

Mr. R. G. B. Field-Ridley

Mr. D. Mahraj

Mr. H. Prashad

Mr. J. H. Thomas

Rev. A. B. Trotman

Mr. H. M. S. Wharton, J.P.

Members of the Opposition

Dr. C. B. Jagan,
Leader of the Opposition

Mr. A. Chase

Mr. B. H. Benn

Mr. Ram Karran

Mr. R. Chandisingh

Mr. H. J. Hubbard

Dr. Charles Jacob, Jr.,

Mr. C. V. Nunes
Dr. F. H. W. Ramsahoye
Mr. E. M. G. Wilson
Mr. M. Hamid, J.P.
Mr. J. R. S. Luck
Mr. D. C. Jagan
Mr. H. Lall
Mr. Mooneer Khan, J.P.
Mr. L. Linde
Mr. R. D. Persaud, J.P.
Dr. S. A. Ramjohn
Mr. W. Bhagwan

Absent

The Honourable P. S. D'Aguiar,
Minister of Finance

—

on leave

The Honourable S. S. Ramphal, C.M.G., Q.C.,
Attorney-General and Minister of State

—

on leave

Mr. W. G. Carrington

—

on leave

Mr. T. A. Sancho

Mr. Y. Ally

Mr. M. N. Poonai

Mr. E. M. Stoby

Mr. S. M. Saffee.

Clerk of the National Assembly — Mr. F. A. Narain.

Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly — Mr. M. B. Henry.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE
SPEAKER****Messages of Condolence**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have to announce that further messages of sympathy – both local and foreign – on the death of the Speaker were received from:

- (i) The Speaker of the Trinidad and Tobago House of Representatives; and
- (ii) The President of the Eastern Berbice Union of Local Authority.

LEAVE TO MEMBERS

I also have to announce that leave has been granted to the hon. Attorney-General and Minister of State (Mr. Ramphal) from today's sitting, and the hon. Minister of Works and Hydraulics (Mr. Singh) for the period 11th August to 16th August, 1967.

PUBLIC BUSINESS**MOTION****DEBATE ON THE GOVERNOR
GENERAL'S ADDRESS**

"Be it resolved that this National Assembly direct that an expression of its sincere appreciation and thanks be conveyed to His Excellency the Governor-General for the Gracious Speech addressed to the Assembly on the occasion of the Opening of the Second Session of the First Parliament of Guyana under the Constitution of Guyana, on Tuesday, 8th August, 1967."

Rev. Trotman: Mr. Speaker, I was invited by the hon. Leader of the House (Mr. Bissember) to move the vote of thanks to His Excellency the Governor-General for the Gracious Speech delivered to this honourable House, on the morning of the 8th August, 1967, and I am deeply conscious of the honour conferred on me.
2.10 p.m.

This National Assembly must observe, with due decorum, certain conventions of the democracies of the world. As a demo-

cratic institution also, this Honourable House delights to follow in the pattern of those conventions that savour of good form and are both necessary and convenient, and this is in fact responsible for this Resolution.

On that memorable and historic day, I sat in my seat and watched him, the centre of gravity, political and constitutional, around whom pivots every laudable principle of the spiral polarity of Home-rule. Like the Britons, we Guyanese can now sing in some lilting, rhythmic cadence: "Guyanese never, never, nevermore shall be slaves." This is an historic occasion.

I watched His Excellency the Governor-General of Guyana, noble son of the land, gallant Knight, fully knightly arrayed, standing on that dais, where once only aliens stood on such occasions and for such purposes, – chief celebrant of that colourful ceremonial and ominous occasion, addressing this Honourable House presenting the Speech from the Throne, in full right of office, the first Guyanese, Titular Head of the State of Guyana. As I watched him emotions welled up in my bosom, and my spirit rejoiced. Then I breathed a silent prayer of praise and thanksgiving to God Almighty the invisible Deliverer of this once down-trodden nation.

It is my duty to move the vote of thanks to His Excellency the Governor-General, and this I now do. I should like also, at this time, to wish His Excellency fullness of days, and a Heaven-guided, Heaven-protected term of titular. I should be unforgivably in default if I did not express the high esteem and gratitude of this Honourable House to Her Excellency Lady Rose, whose silent graces and feminine charms lent added lustre to the occasion.

Now, sir, to His Excellency's children – they are Guyanese; may they grow up to be torchbearers of the magnificent character content of their noble forebears in this good land. As Titular Head of Guyana, long live the Governor-General. God Bless Guyana. God Save the Queen.

[REV. TROTMAN]

Now, sir, the Speech from the Throne, apart from its formal, silent, symbolic or titular authority, unveils matters of grave importance to this Honourable House. It discloses the all-embracing programme of the Government for the second Session of the First Parliament of Guyana under the Constitution of Guyana. It is not addressed to this Honourable House for an answer, servile, formal or indifferent. It is being presented to intelligent, reasonable and responsible human beings, affording them an opportunity for thoughtful, analytical review of the Government's policy and proposed legislation, primarily brought to this Honourable House.

2.20 p.m.

Since Parliament reserves the right of debate on the address, this postulates no imperial infallibility implied in the Speech from the Throne, but makes a way for the wisdom there is in counsel. It is expected that the standard of debate here will reflect the character of realism and responsibility of those who contribute thereto. The main purpose of having a debate on the address is not criticism — though this element cannot be entirely ruled out — but it is for adjustments in case there happens to be regretted omissions, and these may be inserted by way of Amendments.

The whole exercise is, germanely, one of construction. The address challenges the responsibility of this National Assembly, and it is before this Honourable House with the intent for ultimate ratification and democratic committal of each member, be he or she a member of the Opposition or of the Government's Benches. With these aged and accepted landmarks before us, to stray from the correct course cannot but be a deliberate violation of the established principles of parliamentary procedures.

Sir, the Throne Speech is a penetrating disclosure of a programme which points to advancement in this country, which advancement cannot be denied.

[Mr. Luck: "Repeat that sentence for me."]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please!

Rev. Trotman: Now, Sir, effective State action is a teamwise affair and it requires organisation and co-operation. Organisation must be based on membership, commitment, decision, discipline and co-operation. Wherein lies the commitment of those who sit and anatomise and criticise this Government that has undertaken a task that they had never undertaken, and will never be able to undertake? The task is one of grave importance, tedious and exacting — the building of the foundations of this newly emergent nation. What is membership of Parliament without commitment? To some it is enough to say: "I am a Member of the House."

Guyana has long suffered and someone must come to the fore like Moses — [Laughter] — perhaps I had better say like "the Moses of old" and do something rather than merely sit in a corner and criticise. The Government is moving forward. Guyana is one year old in her independence, and she has already extended her horizons into the far regions of peace and progress.

Now, it is not necessary to re-read the Throne Speech for my hon. Colleagues. But it is important to emphasise a few points here, and I shall read from the Throne Speech under Health and Housing — page 4.

"The provision of adequate housing is a matter of active concern to my Government. There will be an extension of the self-help schemes started some time ago in the rural and urban areas. Further, as a result of negotiations, it is expected that a sum of approximately \$20 million will be invested in housing, making homes available for purchase."

This is an undertaking which is very vast but the Government sees it possible. Who can deny that this country of ours is badly off for housing? Who can deny that great

exploitation is brought to bear on the poor and suffering masses by those who have been able to erect houses for rental. To think of \$20 million being sunk in a matter of this long outstanding necessity, is complimentary to our Government.

Now, a little further down in the Throne Speech it is stated that:

"Steps will be taken, legislative and otherwise, aimed at wiping out the abuses, especially with respect to exorbitant rentals and resumption of possession"

2.30 p.m.

This is a burning need in this country and some who loud-mouthedly criticise this Government, when they had everything under their charge and in their hands, neglected to do anything for the suffering masses. Today they ask, what is this Government doing?

I now pass on to page 5 and I quote:

"My Government will introduce during this Session legislation to establish a national insurance scheme to provide benefits for all workers between the ages of 18 and 65."

This is evidence of the fact that Guyana is on the frontiers of human welfare interests in this matter. Not only are we thinking of today; we are thinking of tomorrow. We have to lay the foundation for future generations. There was a crying need for a national insurance scheme years and years ago. It will be tackled for the first time by this Government. [Applause.]

We now turn to External Affairs on page 7. I quote:

"During our country's one year of Independence, my Government's foreign policy has earned the respect of the international community — a policy of non-alignment in which, situations, as they arise, are examined on their merits, and actions and decisions are taken with the basic aim of securing and advancing the vital interest of the nation."

"In the Caribbean of which we are an integral part, my Govern-

ment's aim has been to encourage and sustain the movement towards regional unity. In furtherance of this objective, whenever a proper opportunity has offered, the Government has not hesitated to take an initiative in Caribbean affairs."

This was the fear of many persons at one time. We were much afraid that we had gone away from unity with our Caribbean brothers, but since this Government came into office, it has been steadily moving towards re-uniting the Caribbean people with Guyana. Not only have we sought to introduce regionalism, but we are offering co-operation in every sense possible. We prefer regionalism and co-operation to isolation and opposition.

I do not wish to delay this honourable House, but I desire to say that if the Throne Speech is read and fully reviewed it would be seen that, comparatively small though this land is, we are stepping forth into great things. We aim, as is shown in this Speech, to build roads right into the Rupununi area. We aim, some good day, to make Guyana the central entrepot for Brazil and Venezuela. We are aiming to make this country a place worthy to live in. Not only do we think of roads to split up our country and to help persons to move into our hinterland where the loveliest of the Guyanese possessions lie, but we are thinking in terms of hydro-electricity to make cheap electricity become the true servant of the housewife, and not only the motive power of the factories. Someday the turbines will roar power will be shed forth into Guyana.

It is an interesting point and, whether or not it is conceded, this Government is on the frontiers of social services. These are plans that no other Government dared touch; these are plans which call for more than ideology. Some people think of politics merely in terms of ideology. These are plans which call for brains and still more brains. [Laughter.] We are alive today; we may not be here tomorrow, but the policy of this

[REV. TROTMAN]

Government is to act well its part realising that therein all the honour lies.

Mr. Prashad: I am indeed very grateful for this opportunity and the honour to second the Motion so ably moved by my colleague and hon. Friend. I do not think he has left me anything to say. I therefore beg to second the Motion.

2.40 p.m.

The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan): As I listened a few days ago to His Excellency the Governor-General delivering his Throne Speech and expressing the fact that he was very proud, as a Guyanese, to do so in an independent Guyana, I could not help closing my eyes and thinking that I was again hearing Sir Charles Woolley as President of the Legislative Council reading the Budget Statement prepared by Sir Frank McDavid. If one looks at this Speech outlining the Government's programme, the Government's plans, one gets the impression that there is very little that the Government can really claim credit for and that the Government's failures are being covered up with a great deal of verbiage.

In the part dealing with the Development Programme, we are told that the achievements of the past year are well known. **[Mr. Luck:** "What are those?"] If one looks at the figures and statistics perhaps one can say there is progress. But figures and statistics, as is well known, can be made to tell all kinds of stories. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Ask the man in the street and you will see the clear indictment that these achievements are largely illusory.

Unemployment is increasing. The Government has refused to give us the figures. Can the Government tell us how many permanent jobs have been created within the last 2½ years, as a result of the Development Programme? The Government airily tells us about 10,000 jobs being provided, but we cannot get a breakdown of the statistics. How many jobs are permanent, how many

are for one day, how many are for two days, how many are for one week? I will make a categorical statement that less than 2,000 permanent jobs have been offered to the Guyanese people within the last 2½ years, as a result of the new Development Programme. Let the Government deny this! Let it bring the figures to show that this is not true.

In the face of this, one has to look at the increasing labour force. The population is increasing: births are in excess of deaths by 20,000 odd per year. Let us take a figure of merely 8,000 per year coming into the labour force. In 2½ years the figure would be 20,000. What is the Government doing? What is being done to solve this major headache which is leading to frustration, to crime, to delinquency, and all the ills which are associated with colonial and neo-colonial societies? Besides, the Government has embarked on a policy of retrenchment.

In two departments alone Sea Defence and Transport and Harbours Department, nearly 1,000 workers have been retrenched. **[Mr. Jordan:** "Where did you get those figures from?"] To be exact, 416 workers have been retrenched in the Transport and Harbours Department. Where did I get the figures from? These are your own figures! Ask Egbert Bolton, one of your erstwhile colleagues who charged the Minister of Labour and Social Security (Mr. Merriman) with arrogance a few days ago! He said that nearly 600 workers have been retrenched. Those are your figures; dispute them if you can.

Retrenchment is taking place all over the country, in the Public Works Department, in the agricultural station at Mon Repos and in the Botanic Gardens. This Government which claims it has the interest of the working class, has not been able to do anything to alleviate this major problem in Guyana. Added to this, the cost of living keeps increasing. Not only is a man unemployed, being retrenched, but his cost of living is constantly increasing.

On the question of inflation, we warned the Government when the first Budget was debated that if it proceeded on that line of fiscal and economic policy, there was bound to be inflation in this country. Well we have seen it come to pass. Balance of payments difficulties have arisen. The Governor of the Bank of Guyana, in a speech made to some local authorities a few days ago, said:

“A potentially dangerous development in 1966 was corrected towards the end of the year.”

“Potentially dangerous.” How? The International Monetary Fund had to give standby credit to bolster up our foreign reserves which were being drained. But this is only the beginning because, according to their own figures, the deficit of the balance of payments figures which I will come to a little later is increasing.

A major sector of this country, which can help not only to keep down the cost of living and increase our exports but which can also help in our balance of payments is today in the doldrums. I speak of agriculture. Agricultural production is virtually going down. Meanwhile, food imports are increasing year by year in a predominantly agricultural country. The Government keeps building castles in the air. Every day we read of some new projects, some new scheme. But where are they now? We heard about an oil refinery. When the Prime Minister was Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, this is what he said on 20th January, 1960:

“Where is the plan even for towns, and where is the plan for even the villages? . . . No industry for the villages; no plan to get an industrial area and see whether it is possible for Government to erect factories.”

2.50 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: From what are you quoting?

Dr. Jagan: These things are taken from the Hansard of February 20, 1960. We

have heard about the oil refinery which has fizzled into thin air.

THE BANANA PROJECT

We were going to employ thousands of people to work on the land, but banana has disappeared.

OIL

We were going to get oil gushing out of the bowels of the earth in Guyana. Now we hear that the international sharks are about to leave. I remember that they came here during the regime of the first Interim Government. Esso Standard Oil Company looked at this country, and they came to some prognosis that there was no oil here.

INDUSTRIALISATION

We have not heard very much more about industrialisation. What has the Government done in this field? The Prime Minister talks about establishing factories. Not a factory has been established by the Government. Indeed, the Government has said that it is not the duty of the Government virtually to do so. Although certain members of the Government talk about a mixed economy, the impression is given that it is not the responsibility of the Government to set up industries. That has not been said in so many words, but in June 2, 1966, in an Order published in the Gazette it was clearly stated that the Government would not undertake the establishment of industries. We sit and wait, hoping for capitalists to come along. We notice that very few are coming here. We see more and more statements every day in the Press that the situation is improving and that somebody is coming tomorrow, but tomorrow never comes.

CO-OPERATIVES

Of course, the Government is talking a great deal about co-operatives. A co-operative is a sound field. [Interruption.] Speaking about prostitution, we did not have co-ops, such as Accara Trucking Company, which

[DR. JAGAN]

are running rackets and operating through the Government for tenders and so on. I want to make this observation, and let it sink into the heads of members on the other side of the House. While a good deal can be achieved through the co-operative movement and community development there will not be much success in an atmosphere of colonialism, neo-colonialism and capitalism. Those who are putting so much emphasis on co-operatives should note the failures of countries like India.

A lot of effort was put in this field in India, but today India is in a position where she cannot meet her debt obligations, where millions of people face starvation and death. Therefore I warn my colleagues, if they are interested in Guyanese people, not to build castles in the air. The co-operative movement and community development will work, but it must work on something which is totally lacking in Guyana today. It must work on a frame work which is completely free of capitalism, neo-colonialism and colonialism.

We wish the Government well in trying to establish and put on a sound footing the co-operative movement, but I warn the Government that unless it is done properly a lot of taxpayers' money will be wasted as it was wasted during the time of the first Interim Government. It will be recalled that many of these bodies had mushroomed on the ground that they were going to stimulate things and have co-operatives.

The statement has been made that the Guyana Government has, in its foreign policy, earned the respect of the international community, and that it is pursuing a policy of non-alignment. We on this side of the House have not seen where there is non-alignment. If the Government has earned the respect of the international community, will the Government tell us whether the friends it has mustered at the United Nations will come out and condemn Venezuela for occupying our territory, Ankoko? This Government has an Ambassador at the

United Nations, but its friends will not come out and openly condemn Venezuela for what it is doing in Ankoko.

The Government has not mustered many friends because, from what we have observed during the debate at the United Nations on the Israeli-Arab crisis, it voted not with the non-aligned Afro-Asian bloc; it voted with the U.S.A. who, of course, got one of its stooges in Latin America to put forward a resolution. That is where our Government is aligned, and it talks about non-alignment! Let the Government tell us whether the friends it is seeking in Latin America have ever uttered one word for Guyana on the question of Ankoko. When the chips fall, the puppets will join America who will back Venezuela and remain silent so far as Ankoko is concerned. We have not earned any respect.

I remember during the days of the P.P.P. Government that it was current opinion in the United Nations that Jamaica and Trinidad were playing the role of the imperialists, and that when crucial issues came up inevitably they would join the imperialists.
3 p.m.

Now that Guyana has become independent and we have our own Governor-General to read our Throne Speech, we utter statements on non-alignment, socialism and consultative democracy to fool the masses, but at the same time people are being sold out in the forum of the United Nations and elsewhere.

In the very first part of this programme the Government talks about getting the co-operation of the people to ensure economic advance and establish true equality and opportunity for all. True equality and opportunity for all! This is really a joke! I do not want to use the unparliamentary word "lie," but lest it be said that we are over-critical, I should like to quote the words of some of those who support the Government, who can be found among its strongest backers. The Deputy Lord Mayor of the City of Georgetown, a stalwart of the

P.N.C. had this to say — this is to be found in an editorial in the *Evening Post* of 30th May, 1967:

“The rank and file cannot,’ said the Deputy Mayor, ‘look at what appears the high level of prosperity in certain exalted sections of the community, without feeling that they have been neglected and left out.’”

He goes on:

“That is a real danger that a new, larger area of snobbery is being created in this country, or alternatively, that old areas are being activated or fertilised, or merely perpetuated or revived in a country where the professed aim by politicians and other leaders is the building of a classless or equalitarian society.”

Commenting on bribery in the *Evening Post* of the 31st May, 1967, this is what he said:

“It is all over the place and is fast becoming a national industry. Every citizen’s position is in peril where he may not justly achieve what he bargained for, where he pays far more than he ought, and where even his rights may be delayed or even denied altogether.

“The harm done in any situation in which bribery, corruption, nepotism and favouritism assume national proportions and is a way of life from top down, can never be calculated.”

The Civil Service Association which, not too long ago, helped to instal these coalition parties in office is today, like many thousands of Guyanese, totally disillusioned and frustrated. In the *Weekend Post* and *Argosy* of 6th August, 1967, we read an article stating that:

“In a letter to the Trade Union Council the Civil Service Association has accused the Government of causing a breach of industrial principle and a display of gross irresponsibility and arrogance, and has

called upon the TUC to intercede before it’s too late.”

In the *Sunday Graphic* of the same date, we read about the Civil Service Association and the Public Service Commission. I quote:

“The CSA secretary said that his Association was most dissatisfied with several recent appointments made by the PSC. Some of these appointments CSA considers ‘most questionable, and have seriously disrupted the association’s confidence in the integrity of the PSC.’”

We have already charged that the Public Service Commission is merely a rubber stamp of the Prime Minister’s Office. The Civil Service Association came forward and made the same charge. Yet the Government tells us that it cannot fulfil the Development Programme because of shortage of skilled personnel. How in the name of God are you going to get skilled personnel or any kind of personnel in this country when bribery, nepotism and corruption are rife, when the Prime Minister or any Minister can call up the Public Service Commission and say: “We want ‘this’ regardless!” This is a common occurrence today.

The people are fed up. They are disgusted. Listen to what their dear friend Lucian said. I am quoting from the *Sunday Graphic*, 16th July, 1967:

“Many people — Guyanese and non-Guyanese are disgusted with the present state of affairs in this country. Some are packing up to leave out of sheer frustration, while others are dejected from unbearable disgust.”

Bribery! Corruption! Frustration! But these are not all the ills of Guyana’s society. We have crime, delinquency, and even that great American institution the call-girl system! Crime, delinquency and prostitution. These are the avenues into which decent people are being forced, as a result of the frustrations and what not. These are the ways by which Guyanese citizens have now, perforce, to try to eke out an existence.

[DR. JAGAN]

3.10 p.m.

What is the Government doing about it? Propaganda! Now our dear friend is in the propaganda department. Let us hope he will succeed where others have failed. I have a clipping here from the *Guyana Graphic* June 7, 1967 which quotes the *Daily Telegraph* of London. I must say that Sir Lionel Luckhoo is earning his keep. I quote:

“ . . . the *Daily Telegraph*, in an editorial comment last week, observed that ‘African leaders could learn something from Guyana.’

“The editorial stated: ‘This Caribbean country in the first financial year of independence has increased its gross domestic product by eight per cent – and doubled private investments from abroad. Its Prime Minister, Mr. Forbes Burnham, has called for ‘trade not aid’.’

“The TELEGRAPH added: ‘The moral is that investments increase in measure as emergent states treat them sensibly and fairly.’”

This is very good propaganda, but the question is how real is it? What about the 8 per cent rate of growth in the Gross Domestic Product to which the TELEGRAPH referred? And Guyana is now being made a model for Africa. Now, for a little bit of debunking. The Annual Report of the Bank of Guyana states at page 10:

“The increase in Gross Domestic Product in 1966 was to a very small extent nominal; price increases contributed probably less than two per cent to the rate mentioned, and real growth was about double the percentage increase in population. Real G.D.P. per capita can therefore be estimated to have risen in 1966 by about 3 per cent.”

When we deduct price increases of nearly 2 per cent, when we deduct population increase

of nearly three per cent, we have a net figure of three per cent.

That is the first bit of debunking that has to be done. But lest it be said that even 3 per cent is a good figure when compared to what is happening in other countries, where perhaps the growth rate is around 1 or 2 per cent, – [Interruptions.] This kind of rosy picture is also painted for other countries by propagandists. I have an article here from the *Express* in Trinidad. It is written by Robert P. Lee, who sounds like an American agent. It says in bold headlines “JAMAICA GIVES A LESSON ON HOW TO STRIDE AHEAD.” Jamaica is striding ahead; Guyana is striding ahead, but I recommend to my colleagues a little book called *New World* which is published quarterly by academics associated with the University in Jamaica. This is the latest issue and the first article is called “Some Aspects of Economic Development in Jamaica in the postwar Period.” It is written by Owen Jefferson who lectures in Economics at the U.W.I. According to propagandists, Jamaica also boasts a high rate of growth. It says here:

“Between 1950 and 1965, Jamaica’s gross domestic product (the total value of goods and services produced within the economy) increased at an annual rate of about 7.2 per cent.”

7.2 is very near to our 8 per cent, so one can say we are all very prosperous, but on the next page Mr. Jefferson has a “but” and this is where the “but” comes in. He divides the period 1950 to 1965 into three five-year periods and shows the decline. This is how he puts it:

“ . . . if the period 1950 to 1965 is broken down into five year periods, we discover that rate of growth of per capita national income for the period 1950-55 was of the order of 7 per cent, for 1955-60 it was 3.7 per cent, and for 1960-65 it was 3.0 per cent. In other words starting from a low base in 1950 and with the introduction of new sectors such as bauxite alumina and the rejuvenation of others such as

tourism, the rate of growth of output was pronounced in the early stages." But then came the decline. So that when our propagandists talk about our figure being 8 per cent and that Guyana should be a model for Africa we must first of all make the deductions which the Bank of Guyana made, deducting 5 per cent straight away, and then take the experience of Jamaica as regards the probability of future economic growth.

Jamaica had many favourable conditions, perhaps even more favourable conditions than we have today. At one time there was no bauxite alumina industry at all. Suddenly it blossomed and even surpassed Guyana's... Secondly, Jamaica is near to North America and thus has been able to attract a large number of tourists. Thirdly, during the time when England had its doors open to immigrants, thousands upon thousands of Jamaicans emigrated. That door is now closed to Guyana, indeed, it is now closed to all West Indians.

We have been talking about tourism here for a good many years but we have seen that very little has come out of it. What about industrialisation? Jamaica, following the policy of Puerto Rico's "Operation Boot-strap," went into an economic programme of incentives to foreign investors and thus manufacturing industries sprouted.

3.20 p.m.

I understand from this book that about 9,000 to 10,000 persons obtained employment under that industrialisation programme. Our Government has also patterned its policy on the same "Operation Boot-strap" Puerto Rican/Jamaican model, but so far we have seen no industry in Guyana. Apart from bauxite production which has increased, Jamaica has favourable factors which we do not have — I repeat them again — a totally new bauxite alumina industry, blossoming of tourist industry, a gateway into the U.K. for immigrants and industrialisation.

In its *Economic Survey* the Government has stated that the growth in Guyana has

been mainly in two sectors: (1) in the bauxite industry; and (2) in Government expenditure. If we look at the chart on page 89 of the *Economic Survey of Guyana* for the year 1966, we will see that expenditure under the vital sectors has gone down, but Government's spending has increased from 10.5% in 1961 to 12.6% in 1966. Bauxite has also increased. The present increase over the last year was about 20%. Mining and Quarrying has increased from 12.9% of the Gross Domestic Product in 1961 to 18% last year.

Look at the other key and vital sectors! Why do I say "key and vital?" I say this because the bauxite industry is geared to the technology of the metropolitan countries where there is a shortage of labour, where automaton and other factors are operating, and thus increased expenditure which has taken place over the last year in bauxite, is not really accruing much to the Guyanese people because, relatively, only a few more Guyanese are getting employment.

As regards the Government's sector, there is a sudden increase in expenditure on the part of the Government. Okay, you are getting money from abroad now, but the time will soon come when the debt repayments will become an increasing burden on the Budget, when you cannot balance your Budget and, therefore, you will have to tax more and more. This will increase the cost of living and affect the small man. Concomitant with this whole question of Government's spending there is also the factor of inflation.

Let us now look at the key sectors: Agriculture, including Sugar-cane, Paddy, Other — that is ground provision, fruit trees and so forth. When you add up the figures relating to these three items you will get a total of 20.1% of the Gross Domestic Product in 1961, 19% in 1962 and 21.5% in 1963. Now comes the decline; the total is 18.6% in 1964, 17.9% in 1965 and 16.4% in 1966. While the population is increasing and the Government is talking about the increased importance of agriculture in the economy of Guyana, its share of total production is going down.

[DR. JAGAN]

We heard about equality in the Throne Speech. What kind of equality? In the agricultural sector, let us leave out sugar, rice and paddy, Other Agriculture — plantains, cassava, eddoes, fruits, citrus fruits and so on — dwindled from 3.2% in 1961 to 2.6% in 1966. How are you going to get equality for all the Guyanese people when what the thousands of persons who are living all over this country are getting in the end is dropping all the time? Imagine thousands and thousands of Guyanese who are engaged in the field of agriculture, other than sugar and rice, earning only 2.6% of the Gross Domestic Product!

Surely, if the statistics were available in Guyana, we would come to the inescapable conclusion that there is grave inequality of income in Guyana, that the rich is getting richer and the poor is getting miserably poorer. This will be borne out when all the statistics come out. We are grateful to the Government for providing us with such useful ammunition.

The bureaucracy is increasing; more Ministers, more this, more that. I was told the other day that 53 persons out of those who are retrenched now can be employed for a whole year on what the Attorney-General alone gets in Guyana. Fifty-three!

3.30 p.m.

Multiply this and you will get the true picture. In this Jamaican article written by this gentleman, he speaks of the growing disparity in standards of living between the rich and the poor and the urban and rural population. He states here:

"In 1960 approximately 40% of the labour force was employed in agriculture, but that sector generated only 13% of the country's gross domestic product."

It means that in 1960, 60% of the Jamaicans earned only 13% of the gross domestic product.

In our country the larger proportion of the population is involved in agriculture. This is more than in Jamaica because we do

not have such a big bauxite industry, industrialisation programme and tourism, but the position is the same in this country. I want to say that, as long as the Government continues with the policy which causes inflation and an increase in the cost of living, this disparity will widen.

Mr. Jefferson made a very important observation in Jamaica about the trek from the country to the city. He said that certain industries like the bauxite industry and the tourist industry can pay high wages, and these wages become the minimum. The merchants inevitably put up the price of their goods to meet the minimum wage, as we see in this country.

Since the wage of \$4 a day was established in this country, the cost of living went up. But the poor farmer, who has to sell ground provisions and catch crops, cannot afford to pay the minimum wages. In the circumstances, those who are in need of employment prefer to walk around rather than accept anything below the minimum wage. Therefore you have a vicious circle of people in need of work refusing to work for less than the minimum wage and trekking to the city. I warn the members of the Government that they are leading Guyana into a similar position.

Mr. Benn will deal with agriculture in more detail and will point out how the Government has jettisoned the long-established guaranteed prices to farmers. The Government, in a White Paper, said it was losing \$16 million in subsidising the marketing division and in Transport Services. It was also losing money in drainage and irrigation and, therefore, it could not afford to carry these things unless they could pay their way. If the Government is going to adumbrate that kind of policy, please do it with your eyes open and realise where it is going to lead us.

A far better policy, in my opinion, would have been to continue to stimulate agricultural production in the country and have Georgetown and the urban areas glutted with things in order to keep the cost

of living down. The worker is not mainly interested in how many dollars go into his pay packet; he is interested also in how many of these dollars will fill a basket at the weekend. That is what he wants to know.

I referred to this article because we hear a great deal today about Caribbean unity, and those who are talking about Caribbean unity are running helter-skelter without knowing where they are going. While they are talking about Caribbean unity, Trinidad joins OAS; Barbados is a member of Carifta and is planning to join OAS; and Jamaica is thinking of some other association! If Caribbean unity is going to have any reality or meaning - [Mr. Jordan: "Should we join Cuba?"] We do not want unity just for the sake of colonialism or neo-colonialism. What we want is unity on a proper basis.

Look at the way in which the Angolans are accepted in America today. The "Uncle Toms" do not know what is called policy. They had a big conference in the U.S.A. the other day, which was attended by Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, President of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People and Mr. Allen, a white mayor of the largest city in the south-eastern United States. They did not say which city. The three men appeared at the convention of the International Platform Association -

Mr. Deputy Speaker: From what are you reading?

Dr. Jagan: I am reading from a clipping from the Guyana Graphic, Monday, August 7, 1967. Dr. King said that riots "are self-defeating and socially destructive. Over and over again I've said we must struggle for first-class citizenship. But never use second-class methods to attain it." Those who condemn the riots, he said, must condemn the causes. "The challenge is to attack poverty directly." "Social justice and progress is the absolute cure of the riot causes," Dr. King said.

People like Wilkins only see things in black and white in racial terms, and like the good "Uncle Tom" he has to apologize for

the U.S. capitalist system in failing to solve the problem of the Negro. He gives the excuse that there were Negro urban problems in the U.S.A., and similar problems were prevalent in African countries where the Governments were mostly under the control of black people.

What needs to be said is that in the U.S.A. a Negro is not only a person of dark colour, but a Negro is a member of the proletariat or working class. He is a member of the most depressed section of the working class; he is fired first and hired last; he is discriminated against; he has to live in rat-infested surroundings, and his children have to be sent to inferior schools. That is the sort of class struggle which is taking a racial form. If there is a problem of urbanisation so far as the Negro in the U.S.A. is concerned, then it is part and parcel of the capitalist-imperialist system. Jim Crowism and Negro ghettos are part and parcel of the capitalist-imperialist American system.

3.40 p.m.

I go on to say that the slums and the shanty towns of Trinidad and Jamaica, and the illiteracy, the backwardness, the misery of Latin America will be the fate of Guyana tomorrow. They will be the end result of extension of the relationship which the U.S.A. has established with that area and our country, which requires our country to follow the Puerto Rican model - [Interruption.]

In this book - the New World - Jefferson states that Puerto Rico has all kinds of advantages which other countries do not have. Its people can migrate to the United States. The goods produced can enter the United States free of duty. Puerto Ricans do not pay federal tax but they get certain concessions from the Federal Government. Yet Puerto Rico has not been able to solve its unemployment problem. There is misery. Not only Negroes are rebelling in Harlem. Puerto Ricans are also rebelling. I used to live in Harlem, in the Latin section adjoining Harlem and the white section.

[DR. JAGAN]

Jefferson points out in his book that Jamaica following operation Bootstrap, has not got out of the rut. He says that the labour force in Jamaica is increasing by 20,000 a year. These are the figures. From the time of its inception the whole industrialisation programme employed only 9,000. The labour force is increasing by 20,000 a year and the sugar producers have retrenched 10,000.

We, in Guyana, are going ahead with a similar policy. The Government would do well to invite people like Jefferson and others - it has access to them, they are all U.W.I. men - to come to Guyana, for it is now time to have an open mind about these questions.

The latest statistics given by Dean Rusk for the poor countries show that their percentage for the gross world domestic product is going down, compared to what it was, say, in 1949. Dean Rusk gave some figures a few days ago which were reproduced in our local newspapers. It is important for the Government to have an open mind about this question. Today, all kinds of pet theories are being put out as excuses. We can always have excuses! Either we have not technicians, or we have not got "this" or we have not got "that!" The other day I heard Professor Arthur Lewis saying that the reason the poor countries are poor is that they have not got enough technical skill. Others are bemoaning the fact that poor countries have too high a population increase, and so on. Some of them are saying that geographically and population-wise we are too small. But while these factors may influence, to a certain degree, development and progress, they are merely secondary. The core of the problem has to be tackled. Let all the Lloyd Bests and the Jeffersons and the other West Indians come and advise the Government. Do not bring Yankees to draw up economic plans for Guyana - Davenport and others! If you do, there will be no equality in Guyana. There will be

more frustration and we will probably end up with a situation similar to that which faces that unfortunate country, India, where hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, face death by starvation.

The latest statement issued by the Bank of Baroda in its *Weekly Review* of July 21, 1967 reads:

"Indian economy has now been passing through a very critical period. While the agricultural sector is in a perilous state thanks to two successive droughts, industrial economy is afflicted with recession on a scale unknown hitherto.

The declaration of the growth of industrial production in the last two years may be termed as stagnation. Recession, on the other hand, is a recent phenomenon which represents a climax of chronic stagnation in the past few years and has proved to be more far-reaching in terms of its undesirable economic consequences."

China and India are both large countries. Both have hundreds of millions of people. Both started out at virtually the same technical level. But one is becoming a super power to be feared by the sharks, while the other one is going down. This is not the result of an act of God as some of our parsons will tell us, or some of those who would like to delude us. In an editorial in the *Washington Post* on July 3, 1967 on the Congressional Joint Economic Committee's special study of the Chinese economy, this is what is stated:

"Far from being the land of total chaos and conflict, China is . . . a country which has made considerable progress in the past and which continues to tackle major economic concerns.

The Committee's study is the most comprehensive and timely one available. Its central conclusions summarized in Chairman Proxmire's report, are that China is in a 'reasonably satisfactory food situation with no indication of food stringency,' that 'remarkable gains' in education and welfare have been scored, and that Chinese nuclear development is limited not by its economic resources but by its technical knowhow (itself 'not

inconsiderable and expanding').
China's recent explosion of its
thermonuclear bomb underscores this
assessment of its nuclear progress."

That is official! United States assessment!

Here is another short quotation. This is by Kurt Mendelssohn, F.R.S., a reader in Physics, Oxford University, from a talk given on the BBC Third Programme - Challenge.

3.50

This is what he says:

"I am fully conscious of having used the word 'prosperous' because it is the only way in which I can describe the truly miraculous economic advance which China has made in only seventeen years. The progress in agriculture and, above all, in industry which I have seen since my first visit to China early in 1960 is hardly believable. Then, people were struggling with the beginning of industrialisation; now, there is practically nothing which the West can produce and China cannot; from merchant ships to motor-cars, from computers to electron microscopes, and from high-grade metal alloys to synthetic insulin. And here, incidentally, is a case where they have outpaced us."

I heard a little remark to the effect that I am plugging the Communist line. I am not concerned with how China got power. China got power through a revolution, yes. India got power through peaceful means but on the brink of a revolution, of course. I am concerned about the overall policies, trade, fiscal, economic. Our Government has a closed mind. The former Minister of Economic Development had a nice pastime of criticising the Government, - I suppose he had his head bounced for that - but when he went abroad where did he go? He went to visit not People's China but decadent Chang-Kai-Shek's China which is propped up with American dollars and bayonets.

We are living now in a highly scientific age. Economic planning and development and progress are now sciences and have nothing to do with 'abracadabra'. My

friend the new Minister of Information in a speech the other day said that practically every problem in Guyana has international relations and inter-connections. True. There will be a scientific outlook. If there is to be progress for Guyanese and the Guyanese nation, well then let us have not only plumes and feathers, let us have not only the conferring of a decadent orders, let us not make trips only to Chang-Kai-Shek, when we go to the United States, let us not only ride horses and travel in aeroplanes and say that we have seen the light on questions like intervention in the Dominican Republic, and let us not keep silent about events such as happened in Watts last year and which are reverberating throughout the United States today.

I close now, but I do so with a heavy heart, for Guyana is in grave peril. While Guyana is in grave peril the chief architect of our finances goes off mountain climbing. I am glad that he was not carried away by the currents. The time for serious reappraisal has come, an agonising reappraisal. The Prime Minister a few days ago said that he was now reassessing the Development Plan, reassessing priorities. I was hoping to find something about this new plan, but there is not a single thing there; not one word is said. There are the old cliches and the continuation of the old things which were started and if he goes back and looks through the files he would see that many of these were started by the P.P.P. Name one thing that is new that the Government has done! Name one single thing which is a departure, which is going to make this country move ahead! Nothing!

While the Minister of Finance goes mountain climbing and perhaps cooking up deals with Venezuela, such as the joint development of our territory, we see the other half of the Government lashing out. Let me quote from *New Nation*, July 16, 1967:

"But there are, in our opinion, a number of much more serious acts committed by public servants and

[DR. JAGAN]

government employees on the job, to which the Commission should direct its attention and take the same stern or sterner action than is implied in its circular.

Chief among them are bribery and corruption which from all reports are rampant in certain Ministries, but more particularly in the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics."

They rolled one Minister's head already and it seems that they want to roll another one. They cannot grapple with problems of this country and one of them runs away and is no doubt plotting to sell this country to Venezuelans and Yankees, while the others are merely passing the buck and pushing the blame.

The time is long past for blaming. We have said it over and over and I repeat it: My party, the Opposition here, and more than half of the people of Guyana are prepared to back the Government if the P.N.C. first of all goes back and reads its manifesto *New Road* and begins to implement some of the things which it outlined there. It is not too late for the P.N.C. to make an agonising reappraisal, for this hybrid Coalition not produce the results that the Guyanese people need.

My party is interested, whether we are in or out of the Government, to see that the country make progress, to see that the Guyanese people are not only proud in name, that they not only have a flag, a coat-of-arms and a Governor-General, but that they are so proud that they will want to stay here and not run away as many of them in increasing numbers are doing. They must feel proud deep down in their bellies, not only in their heads, so that they will stay here and help to build it in such a way as to make our country known as an example all over the world, and when the Prime Minister travels abroad he will be respected and will not be treated as he was, when he went to a function in his honour in Toronto in Canada recently. The Mayor of Toronto on three occasions said, "We welcome you, Mr. Prime

Minister of Ghana". Let us make Guyana not only a prosperous place for a few as it is today, but for all, and let us have Guyana so well known that when our Prime Minister goes abroad he is not insulted openly and in public. *[Applause]*

Sitting suspended at 4 p.m.

4.38 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.38 p.m.

[Pause]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Must I put the Question now?

Mr. Nunes rose -

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I see an hon. Member has taken the Floor.

Mr. Nunes: First, I should like to deal briefly with the subject of co-operatives - briefly, because my colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan) has already dealt with this subject. Subsequent to that, I shall deal less briefly with education.

On the subject of co-operatives, it is the view of this side of the House that, in an independent Guyana, we must not only strive for concentration on skills but we must have a sense of values.

4.40 p.m.

If the Government agrees with this view, then such an attitude of co-operation can certainly fall into its ambit of goals. If this is so, then the spirit of co-operation can certainly receive emphasis and this emphasis should be largely significantly emphasised within the area of youth and youth training.

The Government White Paper makes no reference at all to emphasis on school co-operatives. We on this side of the House feel that significant emphasis should be laid on school co-operatives. We feel that a significant part of Government expenditure should be devoted to training a child in the spirit of co-operation.

Our education system in the past has emphasized the question of right and wrong,

for example, where marking of arithmetic is concerned. This has led children to believe that those children who got so many sums right as against those who got none or very few right, fell into the group of a superior being. This is an unfortunate view, since it must be admitted that there are various reasons why children or some children do not get all the sums right, and this kind of concept or attitude persists even at Speech Day when many students are rewarded much more significantly for their performance in academic work than those who are concerned with the attitudes of co-operation and self-help.

This side of the House feels that in an independent country such an attitude as co-operation should be strongly emphasized and significantly developed in our schools. We are aware of the fact that, at both the pre-service and in-service teacher training, co-operatives are being taught. We ourselves took a decision when running the Government of this country in 1964 to initiate this scheme. We are aware that this continues.

Further we feel that, although 136 school societies or school co-operative societies exist, there is need for this kind of training to be included in the curriculum of every school in this country. The schools of this country number well over 400. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is the view of this side of the House that more money must and urgently be provided for expenditure on school co-operatives throughout this country.

We also feel that provision should be made for these co-operative officers who are not enjoying good housing facilities in such areas as Mackenzie, New Amsterdam and Leonora, and that they should have these facilities provided for them.

Then there is also the question of the Chapman Report on Co-operatives - a Report which was submitted to the Government as far back as the 1st April this year. We on this side of the House demand early publication of this Report so that we

may know exactly what Chapman has recommended for the development of co-operatives in this country. We on this side of the House feel that one thing that can be done in order to improve the situation in schools is that the teachers be given some stipend to serve as an incentive to them to devote more time in this field of co-operation when training children, and requested to work a few extra hours outside of the normal day's work. We feel that teachers should be provided with some kind of stipend so as to make this work a real success in their schools.

I shall now turn to the subject of education. The Government has announced in its White Paper that it shall soon present a comprehensive White Paper on education. I am shocked to find that, after 31 months in office, the Government has now thought it wise to present a White Paper on education. It has only 17 more months to live, and at this late hour it comes to us with the statement that it will shortly present a White Paper on education. [Hon. Members: "What have you done in 7 years?"] I hear comments about 7 years, but we should like to remind those who make such comments that the PPP Government presented its White Paper on education to this House or to a former House, but it was not after 31 months in office. It was done in February, 1963, and the PPP Government assumed office in September, 1961. [Mrs. Gaskin: "You were in office in 1955."] I am now told that we were in office in 1955. I should like to remind the hon. Minister of Education that the PPP came into office in 1957 and not in 1955; she is a bit off with her figures.

What is worse about the Government's announcement is that, despite its much vaunted policy consultative democracy, the White Paper seems to be coming here without consultation which the various groups in an independent Guyana with whom consultation ought to have been held before the preparation or the final preparation of such an important document.

[MR. NUNES]

In these days it is important for workers, peasants and other groups in this country - politicians, local authorities and everyone - to be involved in the question of consultation where the important and burning question of education is concerned.

4.50 p.m.

This must be emphasised in the context of our Independence, particularly in this year of 1967.

Much talk has been heard of the curriculum. Much has been said of its introduction in our schools in September. But we must remember that a curriculum is only an instrument for achieving certain goals, goals of skills, of attitudes, and of values. Guyanese should have been consulted about the goals which they would like to see in an independent Guyana. My stress is on an independent Guyana. It is in this context that I speak, and I should like those who are listening to remember the context in which I am speaking. We therefore feel that before this instrument should have been presented for use to the schools, as it is intended that it should be used in September, 1967, less than a month off, Guyanese should first have had an opportunity of expressing their views on the goals. What kind of citizens do we want to see in our Guyana of today? What values, what attitudes should such citizens have? When these questions have been fully discussed and there has been a consensus as to these goals, then the instrument for arriving at these goals, such as the curriculum, could be safely hammered out. This, to the knowledge of Members on this side of the House, has not yet been done. We, therefore, challenge the Minister of Education to say whether this process has been followed.

When we were in office we decided to have a National Education Committee which we were hoping to set in motion in 1965. But this, which is a part of the amendment of the Education Ordinance was not put into

effect. I was very pleased to hear the announcement that a "Teachers" Pensions Bill would be presented to this House during the present Session. I was also pleased to discover that the system on which the P.P.P. Government decided in 1962 - of teachers being paid pensions at the same rate as civil servants - has been accepted by this Government. I should like to recall for the benefit of Members of this House that discussions were proceeding between the Ministry of Finance and the then British Guiana Teachers Association, as to the various points which should have been included in a draft Pensions Bill. Then we were out of office. What surprises me, however, is the length of time that has passed, since the end of 1964, for this announcement in August, 1967, during which time discussions were still being held on this proposed Teachers Pensions Bill. However, as I said earlier, we on this side of the House are happy to associate ourselves with a measure such as this, and the decisions of the Cabinet can bear me out that we were firm in our decision that teachers should be paid the same pension rates as civil servants.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no mention in the Throne Speech of such burning questions as dual control and of the Independent Teachers Service Commission. On this question of dual control the Government must reassure the churches that it has no intention of suppressing religion. It must convince the churches that in this day and age the State must have a significant control of education, and that communities must be involved in this very important subject. I should like to remind Members that we have said time and again that we, as a political party, can never be against the people who are practising religion. We feel that there ought to be freedom for those who believe, and freedom for those who wish not to believe.

On the question of an Independent Teachers Service Commission, we feel that much more speed ought to be put into such

a question. We, ourselves, had discussions with every religious body in this country before we went out of office. We had drafted proposals, a copy of which was sent to the then Leader of the Opposition who, I am sure, will be honest enough to admit that we had sent him what we proposed in the Bill for the Independent Teachers Service Commission. We, therefore, urge that speed be put into this important question of the establishment of an Independent Teachers Service Commission.

In January of this year the Minister made a solemn statement that salaries of certain teachers in aided secondary schools will be approved. I should like to ask, through you, that the Minister tell this House what has happened to the solemn undertaking she gave to this House. As may be remembered by my colleagues on this side of the House, it was the intention of this Minister that these revisions will shortly be given assent, and shortly be implemented; "shortly" in terms of what she herself said.

5. p.m.

On the question of teacher training, particularly with regard to in-service training, the Minister in her reply said the reason for the discontinuance of six teacher-training institutions dealing with in-service training was that very few applicants applied in the areas in which these in-service training centres were established at the time of the People's Progressive Party Government.

I was in no position to reply as I shall not again be on this occasion, because after the Minister makes her statement I shall not have an opportunity to reply and to deny the accuracy of the Minister's statement. What we on this side of the House would like to point out is that had the Minister persisted with the criteria as set up by the People's Progressive Party Government in the light of the aims which that Government had in view, which aims were to improve the quality of teachers in those areas by training,

well then, if those criteria were followed we would have had as many applicants, or nearly as many applicants, as we had in our regime.

A significant percentage of teachers who are now untrained, who are yearning for training and who ought to be trained, may have to spend the next ten to fifteen years still dealing with the children under their charge and they would have had the advantage of the training which is their right in a developing society such as this.

We therefore ask the Minister of Education to reconsider the criteria which she set herself in 1966 in order that they may be reduced and so give those teachers the chance for which they are crying and so eventually benefit the children over whom they have charge.

I now turn to the burning issue of standardisation of text-books: In a recent statement from the Ministry of Education it was categorically said that standardisation of some text-books cannot be done for the next two years. We on this side of the House ask, Why is this delay; a delay of two years or more during which time parents will have to buy a vast number of text-books which may be used in one school, but which cannot be used in another school if the children of such parents are subject to transfers, which are not rare occurrences in our country.

I think that this Government should be less callous in dealing with the pockets of parents, and take immediate steps to have books standardised by the end of December, 1967, so that booksellers and teachers, particularly booksellers, would be acquainted with the list of books to be standardised so that they could be imported and made available for purchase by parents when July comes.

I should like to know what is the reason for this long delay. Can we, therefore, be supplied with an answer for what we term an unnecessary and long delay on the part of the Ministry of Education.

I refer next to the Caribbean Examinations Council. We would wish to

[MR. NUNES]

5.10 p.m.

know what is happening to the Caribbean Examinations Council. We would wish to see what the Government has in mind, what the Government has in mind as Guyana stands with reference to the Caribbean Examinations Council. We are anxious to know Government's thinking on this matter, and we are anxious to know what is being done about the Caribbean Examinations Council. We know that it is the Government's view that the examinations should quickly pass out of the control of either Guyana or the Caribbean or both, but there are many aspects to this question and we hope that, included in the White Paper on Education, will be the Government's policy on the question of the examinations, and on the question of the relationship of Guyana to the Caribbean on this very important question of this the Caribbean Examinations Council.

Dealing with the subject of technical education I should like to ask why it is that the post of Assistant Chief Education Officer for Technical Education which was created by this Government has not yet been filled. Will we be given an answer to this?

On the question of technical training, we on this side of the House would like to throw out for the consideration of the Government the idea of a technical training tax which would be applied to the owners of industry who are the people to benefit significantly by the skills acquired, since this Government has decided, as my colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan) mentioned earlier, not to undertake the establishment of industry, which we feel in the context of the present position is an unfortunate decision. There should be serious consideration given to this suggestion — the institution of technical training tax — and the tax should be used for the stepping up of the operations of the Technical Training Institute which the Government has in mind for technical training.

Let us now turn to the question of University training which includes technical training, or technological training, to be more precise, first with special reference to the University of Guyana. I should like to ask which Minister is responsible for the University of Guyana. I ask this question since not only in the *Official Gazette* dated 24th June, 1967, in which assignment of responsibility to Ministers was a special item, was there no mention of which Minister holds responsibility for the University of Guyana, but on repetition of this item, to wit, assignment of responsibility to Ministers, there is again an omission of this particular department from the responsibility of any of the Ministers.

Of course, we on this side of the House hold a strong view that this ought to be the responsibility of the Minister of Education, but we ask why is this department consistently omitted from the assignment of responsibility to Ministers? If it is an oversight, then I ask the Government to speedily correct it.

There is also the question that the University of Guyana was, and still is, providing Faculties of Arts, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences — three Faculties. Quite recently, the Faculty of Education which could properly be put in one of the Faculties I mentioned, as is done in some universities, has been added, but, nevertheless, we find that the Government, under a special arrangement, is now sending students to the University of the West Indies to study in Faculties which are the same Faculties which Guyana has in the University of Guyana.

The reply may be that we are sending these students in order that they may have honours courses in the special subjects, but we on this side of the House strongly feel that this country must be able to take a very strong line on this question. We provide Faculties here which are costing the taxpayers quite a lot of money. There is provision for these people to work in these

Faculties and receive the training which they ought to get there. After the acquisition of a general degree in any one of these Faculties a student can, after working the territory, subsequently get an honours degree. We feel that the taxpayers who, I believe, now have to spend \$1,000 to subsidise the fees of each of these students who are sent to similar Faculties in the University of the West Indies, ought not to be charged with this amount and that this money which has to be spent by the people of this country ought to be ploughed into the development of the Faculties of Arts, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences in our University of Guyana.

We would like to know, in the context of the Government's present policy of sending students to the Faculties of Arts, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences in the University of the West Indies, whether the order of merit which is referred to the Ministry of Education for its approval and final selection of the candidates, is strictly followed. If the order of merit list referred by the U.W.I. to the Ministry of Education is not followed, then would the Minister of Education be gracious enough to tell this House what are the criteria used in varying the order of merit list provided by the U.W.I.? It can happen, if indeed the order of merit list is varied, that a student may find himself or herself not acquiring a place in the limited number of places provided by the U.W.I. in a particular year. We therefore ask that these questions be publicly answered in this House.

We on this side of the House would like to repeat our stand: we believe that the University of Guyana must be an institution in Guyana, since every society has its own cultural drives and aspirations, and is therefore entitled to have its schools of higher education on its own soil. But since Guyana, like Barbados, Trinidad and Jamaica, cannot afford all the Faculties which any institution of higher education ought to have, then we feel that those Faculties which none of us can afford - for

example, Agriculture, Medicine and Engineering - should be shared by countries in the Caribbean. We wish, therefore, to emphasise that we feel that the Faculties of Agriculture, Medicine and Engineering should be the ones to which we should send students to the U.W.I., and if, in our present context, the contribution of Guyana is needed to provide such students with the opportunities they so richly deserve in a developing society as ours, then it is the duty of the taxpayers to respond to this by making the provision.

I should now like to speak on the subject of training. One of the major purposes in educational planning - and I say one - is to produce in quality and quantity an adequate number of trained manpower. We should like to ask the Government this question: Has there been any attempt to estimate manpower needs in an independent Guyana? We on this side of the House are aware that, in 1965, the Minister of Labour and Social Security (Mr. Merriman) carried out what was known as a Manpower Survey. We would like to repeat that this Survey is very limited and cannot satisfy the criterion we have in mind for the estimation of the manpower needs in Guyana.

5.20 p.m.

Every survey, as every person will admit, was confined to a particular time, but because of its limitation and, further, because of the criteria used in obtaining the information of that survey, such a survey is, without question, unsatisfactory and inadequate. There is the question of the future needs of this country. The future needs of trained man-power is an important question - a question which, to our knowledge, has not yet been adequate.

We would like to ensure that not only the needs for 1965, 1966 and 1967 are being met, but the needs for the future as well. We would like to know that the needs for the future in all aspects of manpower are estimated so that educational planning can be put on a sound footing, and as a result

[MR. NUNES]

the plans for educational institutions well and truly conceived to supply the various fields of trained manpower which this country not only now needs, but which it will sorely need in the future.

I, therefore, ask the Government through its Minister of Education to supply us with the answers to the questions which we have asked, and to assure us that the Government will start thinking not only broadly but deeply about a philosophy that will be satisfactory to the workers and peasants of this country as well as their supporters; in their aspirations.

The Minister of Education (Mrs. Gaskin): In reply to the questions - I should say rather exhaustive questions - asked by my hon. Friend Mr. Nunes, I would like to say, and I hope I am taking the points in order, first, that the hon. Mr. Nunes has started off by dealing with the subject of co-operatives which no longer falls under the Ministry of Education. I would have thought that he would have been aware of that change, but I forgive him because I believe he has just returned from a long sojourn in Moscow.

I would like to say, however, that in the field of co-operatives he has made some strange remarks. He has, for instance, said that the previous Government initiated the teaching of co-operatives at the pre-service and in-service centres. Did I get the hon. Member right? Did you say that your Government started the teaching of co-operatives? *[Mr. Nunes: "We took a decision."]* But you did nothing else. So far as teaching co-operatives in schools was concerned, the initiative was taken by this Government through the hon. Mr. Henry Thomas, who was the Minister of Economics at the time, and for the first time in the history of this country the teachers were trained in co-operatives to go into the schools and teach.

I would like to say also that it is most peculiar that the hon. Mr. Nunes who, during his regime, assisted in the breaking up

of the specialist co-operatives teachers system where teachers trained in co-ops were assigned, through the Co-operative Department, to go into schools and teach co-ops - he made them into Social Welfare Officers and removed their specialisation - peculiar, that he should make these remarks today.

It is significant also that my hon. Friend across the Table, when he was the headmaster of Anna Regina school, did not summon sufficient interest in co-operatives to start a co-operative society in his school. *[Mr. Nunes: "I had one."]* You never had a co-operative society in your school.

I merely make these points in order to expose that plapable hypocrisy that we have to deal with from the other side of the House. I would like to say also that it is quite obvious that the hon. Member on the other side of the House was not really thinking of the interests of the country, but is merely exercising what, I believe, is his right to seek to gain the public eye and possibly public acclamation, when he said that teachers must be paid a stipend for teaching co-operatives and that co-operatives must be put on the curriculum of the school. He knows fully well that if a subject is on the regular school curriculum, then we do not pay extra money to teachers. *[Interruption by Mr. Nunes.]* You said that it must go on the curriculum, and then you said we should pay a stipend to teachers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot pay stipends to teachers for teaching a subject that is on the regular school curriculum. Let us make this matter quite clear so that this hon. Gentleman will not go around claiming sympathy; I hope this is clearly understood.

I would like to pass from that statement and deal with his remarks about the White Paper. The hon. Member had the audacity to stand in this House and say that his Government took office in 1957 and, on his own confession and admission, presented a White Paper in 1963! *[Mr. Nunes: "I said that --"]* I refuse to listen to him. He even

went on to say that we were in office for 31 months and are now presenting a White Paper. I think, judging by the standards of the previous Government, we have been more than efficient in the job.

I would also like to find out whether the hon. Member is clairvoyant, because he mentioned the fact that this White Paper is going to be presented without any consultation with anyone whatsoever. It is very strange that he seems to be able to read into the minds of everyone. Is he transferring his own authoritative habits to this side of the House? I have no knowledge that there was any consultation entered upon by the previous Government when it launched its White Paper in this House. In fact, the *Hansard* will bear me out that there was a considerable amount of criticism because no one had been consulted about the matter.

5.30 p.m.

Then we pass on to the question of the new curriculum which, I must confess and admit, is an instrument that was really neglected by my friend Mr. Nunes. I entered into the Ministry and found that he had indeed put his hands to the plough but had grown weary of the task. There had been in the Ministry a curriculum guide that I had to get undusted because the dust was thick upon it, and which he had made no attempt to introduce in the schools.

The hon. Member keeps hammering at the point that we must think of an independent Guyana. He seems to be trying to say that in an independent Guyana there must be greater consultation than there was in an "unindependent" Guyana; that the curriculum for an independent Guyana must be brought to the people whereas the curriculum in an "unindependent" Guyana, such as he had proposed, could go through without any consultation. I should like to say that we are of the opinion that independent or otherwise, a curriculum should be subjected to consultation, and it is the intention of my Ministry - we have

already embarked upon it, we are now holding seminars and discussions with the teachers - to have discussions not only with teachers but we are also going to invite the Parent Teachers Associations, and eventually the local authorities and groups of citizens. This is the plan. The curriculum is being put into schools in September on pilot or experimental basis. In the meantime we are gathering as much knowledge and information of problems as we can get, and we are having consultations at all levels.

We next pass on to the point of the Education Advisory Committee, and this is one instance where I think we should indulge in what is known as a horse laugh because it is well known that the P.P.P. in office disbanded the Education Advisory Committee and decided to go ahead without it. I should like the hon. Member to give me the names of the members who were serving on the Education Advisory Committee at the time when the P.P.P. went out of office. -- *[Interruption.]* This Committee was disbanded under Mr. Rai and was never revived by Mr. Nunes. I should like, therefore, to say that on the other hand our Government is at present considering the introduction, not only of a National Advisory Committee for education, but we want to place stress on technical education and have an advisory board for it. These are things which will appear in the White Paper and on which I do not wish to give a forecast now.

Now, the Teachers' Pensions Bill. I should like to draw to the attention of Members of this House the fact that the teachers themselves had put up, since 1962 I believe it was, amendments to their Pensions Ordinance. But my hon. Friend dallied and dallied with this until 1964 when he, fortunately for Guyana, went out of office. Therefore the decision was not his, nor need he lay any special claim on anything that is being done.

May I pass on to the other question of the Independent Teachers' Service Commission.

MRS GASKIN
—

This is one area in which, I must confess, the hon. Member and also his predecessors in office have struggled manfully and in vain for many years. I think that one reason that their struggles have been so fruitless was due to the bullying tactics which they employed. May I say that with the coming of this Government, and with a change in attitudes, it is more than likely that we will see very shortly an Independent Teachers' Service Commission.

Coming to the point of upgrading salaries in aided secondary schools, we have, in the Cabinet, already taken a decision to implement the regrading of the salary structure for one section of the teachers. This is from January, 1967. We are now in consultation with the second section of the aided secondary schools and we have almost reached agreement. In fact, it is possible that very soon we will be able to make an announcement on both.

As regards teacher training, I must say that I agree with Mr. Nunes that the criteria at present used for selecting people for the Teachers In Service are rather high. We have been looking at these criteria and we are thinking of reorganising and revamping them to meet lower standards. At the present stage of the proceedings, with the present criteria, it must be recognised that we have trained almost all the people who qualify, and it is for this reason that there has been a closing down of the In Service Training centres. *[Interruption.]*

Now, there are other points but I do not want to be too rough on them. We come to standardisation and this is a most, shall I say, entertaining one. If I may go back, it is significant that at a meeting at which I spoke on a Friday some time last year, I made mention of the fact that I thought there should be some attempt to keep down the cost of books to pupils in the schools because I was alarmed at the number of books which the children were asked to buy

and at the cost to the parents. At that particular meeting I also made mention of the fact that I thought the Government should do something about this. This statement that I made was carried in the newspapers of the Sunday morning, and the strange coincidence was that in the next day's paper which I believe was received by the Leader of the Opposition before his Saturday Press Conference at nine or ten o'clock he made his first statement on standardisation of text books.

5.40 p.m.

As a result of that, from then until now, the People's Progressive Party has made a standardisation policy its main plank. I would like to refresh the memories of those to whom I have spoken on several occasions, in and out of this House, on this question of standardisation.

First of all, I should like to draw the attention of hon. Members to what I may call - and I hope this is euphemistically - a gross mis-statement that was made by the Leader of the Opposition when he said that I had given a definite promise that standardisation would be introduced in the schools by September, 1967. I sent for the Hansard in order to find out whether in some period of aberration I could have been guilty of such a statement. Nowhere is it recorded, and I should like it to be on record that in putting this statement down to me the Leader of the Opposition has been distorting the facts and misrepresenting the proceedings of this House.

I should like to pass on to the old issue of standardisation, which I have explained for the benefit of those poor gentlemen over there over and over again. In 1961 the hon. Member, Mr. Nunes, awakened to the realisation that there was a need to do something about standardisation. In that year. In that year he set up a Standardisation Committee. The Committee sat and recommended to him that there was very little that could be done about

standardisation with the text-books then current. Mr. Nunes cogitated on this for nearly a year and then in 1962 unilaterally decided that he would introduce standardisation. The sum total of this standardisation was that he imposed on the children of this country an abominable book called *The Caribbean Reader*. *The Caribbean Reader* is a book which is not only irrelevant in the context and aspirations of Guyanese, but it also is totally unsuited as a book for teaching language to children. This book has remained, and he did nothing more on the subject of standardisation from then until he entered into the Opposition ranks.

[Interruptions] When my hon. Friend (Mr. Nunes) went out of office, standardisation had achieved only one thing and that was the introduction of *The Caribbean Reader*.

What we have said time and again is that it is not easy to standardise the present text-books. Most of them are inadequate; some of them are unsuitable. There are text-books which are being used - *[Interruption by Mr. Luck.]* Why don't you shut up ! There are now in use, racially obnoxious text books which make reference to people. There are text-books now in use which have portions that are inaccurate, particularly those portions dealing with this country, geography books and that sort of thing.

In addition to this, the Ministry is now introducing a new curriculum. We were faced with a decision: Should we go into the process of attempting to standardise now the unrealistic books that are in existence or should we go ahead and restrict the number of books that are now in use, so that the expense to the parent is cut down, and then standardise when the requirements of our curriculum are known?

We have decided on the latter course because if we had gone ahead and standardised the present text-books, we would have been faced with the standardisation and entrenchment of the same colonial type of attitude that we are

trying to weed out of our children. The text-books are replete with that type of attitude. They are text-books for colonials not for independent people.

Our decision, therefore, was that standardisation, such as it is, would come after we had introduced our new curriculum and after we had been able to get text-books that were geared to the curriculum and that were also geared to the minds of Guyanese. This process is beginning. It means, however, that for the next two years two things will happen: one, there must be a constant watch by the Ministry on the number of text-books that are required of the children by the teachers; two. There must also be, along with that, a certain vigilance over the type of text-book that is allowed into the hands of children in schools. This we are prepared to do.

There is a third point which comes up: In view of the fact that there is a new curriculum, that new curriculum will demand of the teachers less reliance on text-books and greater reliance on teachers' work, and this, I think you will agree is most desirable in the context of our country.

I hope that I have said enough on this subject to bring understanding and light to those people on the other side of the House who keep banging away on the old drum of 'standardisation' in the hope thereby to gain some sympathy for themselves.

I pass from this point to the point of the Caribbean Examinations Council which is another question raised by my hon. Friend (Mr. Nunes). I think that it is well known by the hon. Member that it does not lie within the power of Guyana alone to initiate something for the Caribbean Examinations Council. We have entered into association - *[Interruption by Mr. Ram Karran.]* You keep quiet. On the question of education you are nowhere. *[Laughter.] [Interruption by Mr. Luck.]* You, Mr. Luck, don't say a word. You drop your h's and put the is's in the wrong place.

As I was saying, on the question of the Caribbean Examinations Council, we have to

[MRS. GASKIN]
[MR. NUNES]

enter into co-operation with the West Indies on this. It is well known that at the Regional Heads of Government Conference which was held here in 1965 a decision was taken to go ahead with the subject of the Caribbean Examinations Council.

5.50 p.m.

We have been waiting on Barbados to go ahead with the implementation of the secretariat for this Council. Barbados undertook to do this and has at last sprung into action. There was a working party which met last month and the project is now going again. We have done even more than what the hon. Gentlemen did in that he went to Jamaica and did not press that the University of Guyana should be represented on the Council. [Mr. Nunes: "We did."] Well you did not get it, and I got it! [Laughter.]

The hon. Member asked many questions which I do not think we can answer now. Some of the answers are contained in the White Paper and, as I have said, we do not wish to bring the White Paper before the House until it is formally presented, but I must mention the employer's tax. This is something which the Prime Minister himself mentioned long ago, which we have investigated in the countries in which it operates and which we are considering.

I should like to pass on to the question of the University of Guyana. I do not believe that the hon. Member is unaware of how the University was set up because he wanted to know which Ministry is responsible for it. Therefore he must be aware that it was never placed under his Ministry. When he was Minister of Education the University of Guyana was not under his Ministry because the previous Government set up the University of Guyana under a charter which makes it a completely autonomous body, independent of any governmental control. I think the hon. Member should have been aware of what was being done. It is for this reason that, under

the past Government, under my good friend the hon. Member Mr. Nunes, the University of Guyana did not appear in his portfolio as Minister of Education. It is also for this reason that the University of Guyana does not appear in my portfolio as Minister of Education. The only task that the P.P.P. left to the Government, as far as the University of Guyana is concerned was footing the bills. [Mr. Luck: "The Canadian Government is doing that for you."]

I will now come to the question of the University of the West Indies and the honours courses. It is quite true that we do award to Guyanese, places at the U.W.I. for honours courses in subjects that are offered in the University of Guyana at the general degree level only. I would add that this is done to speed up the process of having qualified people with the highest qualifications. If we were to take the route that the hon. Member suggests, of training everyone to the general degree and then having that person go back again to take the honours, we would really be holding back some of the progress which is needed.

The other point which I should like to make is that even though it is well known that the University of Guyana has these facilities, I should like to remind the hon. Member who queries our sending students to the U.W.I. for honours degrees only, of the number of students whom he sent abroad to English Universities to study for disciplines that were being given at the University of Guyana. [Mr. Nunes: "The public did not pay for that."] Because you gave them loans that you knew they were not going to pay back!

The hon. Member has queried the discretion of the Ministry to decide who will be sponsored by the Government for courses at the U.W.I. and he has asked for criteria. I will not give criteria but I will let him know, since he is so anxious to find out on behalf of the particular person who, I believe, approached him, that it may well be that one of the criteria that we use for

rejection is that those persons can benefit from that similar training at the University of Guyana. I think that, in the interest of his own principles, the hon. Member should point out to the person who complained to him that he has been possibly bypassed in selection for the U.W.I., that he should be loyal and patriotic and accept a place at the University of Guyana; it is much cheaper.

The next point I should like to make is about the Manpower Survey. I should like to say that this Government undertook the first Manpower Survey that this country ever had. [Mr. Luck: "Who has read it?"] The previous Minister of Education (Mr. Nunes) has told us that educational planning cannot proceed unless it is based on a proper survey of our manpower needs. May I find out exactly what he said? [Interruption.] I gathered that the hon. Member said - and I have the notes here - that the manpower survey is a basis for a development programme in education. [Interruption.] The hon. Member says that he said that manpower should be one of the bases of educational planning. I should like to say that I agree with this, and it is for this reason that we attempted a survey. We realise that it is a continuing process which we are carrying out, but may I also say that I am now enlightened as to the reason why education under my hon. Friend was in such a chaotic state. He did not do what he now realises is essential.

I have attempted, I hope, and succeeded, I would also hope, to answer questions that were put forward by the hon. Member. I should also like to say that the Ministry of Education, like the Government, is very much aware of the aspirations and ideals that Guyana needs to have inculcated in this state of its development. Not only are we conscious of this, but we are working earnestly and steadily towards the goal. We will not fall into the error, which was unfortunately the error of my friend across the table, of rushing in before we have thought out our problems and formed a workable plan.

6.00 p.m.

Mr. Benn: The reference to agriculture on the Speech from the Throne holds little hope for the farmers of this country that they will receive real assistance, and to consumers that they will see a reduction of the high cost of living. I have come to the conclusion that, although the Speech includes such statements as increased production, diversification, distribution of land, new credit facilities, extensive and concentrated training, marketing services, etc., very little funds have been allocated to achieve these desirable goals.

It strikes me that the real problem of the Ministry of Agriculture is that the heavy hand of the Ministry of Finance has fallen upon it, and therefore very little will be done in the future for the benefit of the farmers and the consumers. That this is so will not be surprising to anyone who recognises that the junior partner in the Coalition Government is interested not in the development of small scale agriculture, not in the development of the small man but in the development and expansion of large farmers and large operators in agriculture.

Every now and again we read that large sums of money are allocated for this road and that road; when it is not the road to Mackenzie, it is the road to the Corentyne or Black Bush and so on. We also hear of the construction of a hotel and the like for large sums of money - money which is being borrowed by this Government. But the curious fact is that very little, if any of this money is being allocated to agricultural production, and this must militate against the development of agriculture and against the expressed desire of the Government to provide more employment for the people.

It is clear that from what is happening in agriculture today, even what is being done by way of infrastructure development, especially in relation to the development of the road to Mackenzie, that very little benefit will accrue to the country because

[MR. BENN]

sufficient is not being done to provide the necessary funds and credit for the development of agriculture along this highway. So far, increased production has been in the traditional fields or in the field where the large operators carry on. I refer to the sugar industry, the rice industry and the shrimp industry.

Now, if anyone examines the 1966 Report of the Ministry of Agriculture one would notice that the increases fall mainly in these sectors which are traditionally sugar, rice, copra, milk, cattle, broilers, and shrimp. Of course, there have been some reductions possibly due to weather conditions, but I will not go into that matter at this stage. What I want to point out is that the tremendous amount of money spent in the broiler industry and the shrimp industry does not particularly benefit the small man.

There has not been an increase in sugar, but this is probably due to weather conditions. There has not been an increase in rice, which is due to other causes. The hon. Minister knows this, and the hon. Mr Mooner Khan, when he speaks later, will deal with the problems in the rice industry. Why is it that there have been no comparable increases in the new areas of agricultural development? I say this is due to the fact that the policy of restricting funds for agriculture is affecting agriculture. When we examine the Reports for 1965 and 1966 we see no marked increases in certain areas. In certain areas of agriculture production has been small, and arguments have been brought forward to blame nature for the failure to produce more. On page 16 of the Annual Report of the Ministry of Agriculture for the year 1965, we read under the head of coconuts:

“... The decline in production of nuts has been attributed to the marked increase in praedial larceny, as well as to the damage caused by attacks of the caterpillars; and to diversion of

an appreciable quantity of nuts from copra production for use as a drink.”

The Government is making the excuse that the people are drinking too many water coconuts, they are stealing the coconuts, and that caterpillars are destroying the coconut trees.

6.10 p.m.

The fact is that over the past year sufficient funds have not been allocated for the expansion of coconut production in the central agricultural station at Mon Repos. The Minister may sit and shake his head but he would not give away his colleague who refuses to give him the money.

Let us look at cocoa on page 17:

“Very little interest was shown in this crop. In spite of the incentive bonus being offered for its establishment, only 3,262 plants were distributed to farmers, the equivalent of 10 acres.”

Then he spoke about production demand. A little lower on the same page we come to what is referred to as food crops. I quote:

“The cultivation of these crops continued to make a substantial contribution to local food consumption. Despite the crop incentive bonuses offered for cabbages, peanuts, black eye and other peas, etc., substantial importations of these items were necessary as increases in acreage under cultivation were negligible.”

Then he went on to describe the value of exports of ground provisions.

On one page it is stated that sugar, rice, molasses and some of our traditional crops which are in the hands of the “big” people have increased. When we come to that sector of the agricultural economy which must necessarily help in the reduction of the cost of living and in providing work for the people, we find that there are excuses that the people are stealing; that they are not taking up the incentive; that there are

caterpillars, and so on. If we examine what the Ministry of Finance has done with the Ministry of Agriculture, we shall find an answer to this problem. For instance, the crop bonuses have been reduced from \$36,939 per annum to \$20,000 in 1967.

In the fishing industry - I am not talking about trawling, I am talking about the small man - it has been reduced from \$92,000 to \$50,000. The provision for veterinary and preventative measures - I shall deal with that later on - has been reduced from \$40,000 to \$27,000 in 1967. Pest control has been reduced from \$9,000 in 1966 to nothing in 1967. I understand that there is not going to be a charge for the anti-rabies vaccination. With respect to the progressive farmers scheme, \$7,000 was voted in 1966 and only \$1,000 was spent. It is clear that financial stringency, the tightening of the belt is affecting the agricultural sector of the industry in this country. This is what is happening and no excuses that the Minister can make can hide the fact that funds are not being made available for the development of new crops - where these incentive bonuses are to go and so on.

It would be instructive to pay some attention to crops other than these small ones. Of course, we know that we are paying 70 cents a pound for cabbages whereas the price could be lower if there were more assistance, not only financially but if there were more agricultural officers to go around to the farmers. The same thing refers to black-eye peas and other crops.

Let us look at broilers and eggs. In one year the Report stated that the Ministry was continuing to supply chickens to farmers. But over the last two years the Government has brought in less than 500 new breeding stock among chickens. They have admitted in one Report that there has not been sufficient new breeding stock so they keep giving out the chickens to farmers like myself, and this gives an opportunity to the big people who produce chickens for broilers and eggs to bring in chickens and sell them at high prices. The small farmers are not

getting the best in eggs. They are forced to buy the chickens outside because there is not enough to go around.

What else has happened? There has been tremendous interest by a lot of small farmers in poultry rearing, particularly for the broiling industry. The Government complained that there was not enough broken rice to supply to the feed plant. But there has never been enough broken rice for the feed plant and the plant has always had to import large supplies of corn. The Government, ill advised by the people at the feed factory, has increased the cost of feed to the detriment of the small producers. If one reads the Report of the Ministry of Agriculture, one will notice that a large amount of space is devoted to the number of chickens this operation is producing. Kenin or somebody - and not enough attention is paid to the small poultry producers.

6.20 p.m.

Most of the large poultry producers in Guyana have shares in the feed factory and so they do not lose much if the price of feed goes up because they can turn the increase over to the small man in the bottom house who rears chickens and who is going to be pushed out of the poultry industry. As a result the cost of chickens is going to go up and now that we are boasting about "chicken-in-the-rough", we are going to have a very rough time with "chicken-in-the-rough" if this Government does not reverse that decision or have another look at its decision to increase the price of poultry feed.

What else do we find in this report? [Mr. Jordan: "I thought we were speaking on the Throne Speech."] The Throne Speech refers to agriculture. The Government admits in one year's Report - the Annual Report for 1966 which the Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources (Mr. Jordan) so enthusiastically brought out that the pig industry has suffered considerably. Here is what the Ministry says about pigs. This is proof of what I have been saying. I quote:

[MR. BENN]

"The position with pigs was much the same as during 1965. No new stock was imported due to lack of funds, . . ."

In other words, what I am saying is this: The Ministry is not asking for, nor is it getting, funds although the Deputy Prime Minister is acting as Minister of Finance when the mountain climbing goes on. This is how the Report continues:

" . . . and accommodation continued to be very poor. The breeds carried on the farms are Large White, Large Black Landrace, Hampshire and their crosses."

The Ministry itself is admitting that sufficient funds are not being allocated for quick development. How are we going to get a reduction in the cost of living? How are we going to grapple with this problem if we keep spending money only on the building of roads and hotels and such things?

We heard quite a lot about a cane farming project and of the Government's ideas on cane farming. The Government's idea was commendable. What has happened to prevent the Government from going ahead with the expansion of cane farming as it promised? The Government produced legislation for cane farming to protect cane farmers, to give them credit and so on. Now, after all this hue and cry, after a large number of people, especially in villages like Plaisance and Den Amstel, have begun to look forward and to hope that now they are going to see a new day, now they are going to be able to plant more cane, now the sugar estates will be compelled to purchase their cane, now the Government will set up a committee to investigate, the whole bubble bursts and nothing has come of cane farming. This has caused a great deal of disappointment to the farmer. Why is money not forthcoming for the expansion of cane production?

Then there is the regrettable episode of the banana project. Here again a lot of hopes

were raised, but it is possible that the abandonment of the project is something beyond the control of the Government because it seems as if the Government is going to be associated in this project with foreign enterprise. If foreign enterprise is not worrying to go into it, I presume the Government will not be able to go it alone.

I notice, however, that the semi-Government -not the Government but the semi-Government - started to sell banana plants and subsequently started to give them away. I hope that the Ministry will now follow up this admirable decision by the G.D.C. and provide the farmers with such concessions as would protect the plants and plantations that are being set up as a result of the distribution of these banana suckers. It seems as if the Ministry of Agriculture is a 'sucker' to the Ministry of Finance.

We heard also about a flour mill. This is not exactly agriculture, but there is an element of agriculture that I want to introduce into it and that is that the Minister must know that it has been suggested over and over again in this country that we should not use wheaten flour exclusively and that a percentage of cassava - [Mr. Jordan: "Rice."] Never rice nor plantains - a percentage of cassava should be introduced to produce flour. If this is done it will give a great fillip to the producers of ground provisions. I hope that the flour mill will be forthcoming and that the Minister will keep this in mind and, if he has not already started discussions with the persons who want to set up the flour mill, that he will raise this question with them because it will give some fillip to the producers of cassava.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think this is a very suitable time to suspend the sitting.

Sitting suspended at 6.30 p.m.
8.07 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 8.07 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At the suspension the hon. Member Mr. Benn was speaking.

Mr Benn: I had come to the point where I was counselling the Minister to consider the advisability of associating the producers of cassava with the flour mill product. As I have already said, and as has been admitted in reports by the Government, by the Ministry, agriculture is suffering from a severe lack of funds. It is also suffering from a scarcity of trained and experienced staff. If we look at the Ministry, we will discover that a great number of the members of the technical staff - some of them with a lot of experience - are leaving the country and leaving the Ministry to go to other Ministries. A few of them have gone into the G.D.C.

I heard that Mr. Madramootoo, the Chief Technical Officer for Agriculture, has now gone or is to go to the Rice Marketing Board, and my information also is that Dr. Harry Paul will be retiring in another two or three months. Therefore, if one examines the members of the staff who are left in the Ministry one will find that even though some of them carry the Diploma of the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute and have acquired a great deal of experience, many of them are substandard in their work.

8.10 p.m.

I speak with a personal knowledge of these people and on advice from previous heads and deputy heads as well as professional heads of the Department that the Eastern Caribbean Farm Institute has not produced the type of personnel that is suitable for Guyana.

I notice that the head of the Guyana School of Agriculture and, I believe, the chairman of the School Board have gone to Trinidad to survey the facilities there and to see what it can offer us. I would not venture to say that it can offer us nothing, but I am of the firm view and my advice has been that many persons who have been produced there have not been of the best so far as this county is concerned.

Aside from the fact that Guyana is mainly an agricultural country and in any case should have its own agricultural school, one

of the prime and motivating factors for the establishment and development of the Guyana School of Agriculture is the fact that this school did not produce the best of technical officers that were needed for Guyana.

The Governor-General's Speech mentioned "extensive and concentrated training," and the hon. Minister ought to be congratulated for having introduced women for training in farm schools. In certain African countries in which they have been tried out, Ghana particularly, they have been successful. I hope that in this country we will be similarly successful in using this type of personnel.

I want to say again that the staff at the Guyana School of Agriculture needs improvement. I am concerned that during the last course the students did not do much field work. I am also concerned that certain members of the teaching staff of the Guyana School of Agriculture are completely new to Guyanese surroundings and are really freshmen in agriculture in Guyana. I want to ask the hon. Minister to use his influence, because the school is governed by a Board which should see that proper staff, better staff, or better trained staff are appointed for the Guyana School of Agriculture. If that is done, then we can be sure that this prognostication in the Governor-General's Speech about "extensive and concentrated training will be undertaken" and will bear fruit.

Another point that must bear some notice is that some efforts are being made by the marketing organisation to improve facilities. I have noted that more space has been allocated for farmers' produce, and there will be more facilities for freezing. That sector of the Ministry of Trade which sells agricultural produce must take care that the farmers are given a fair price for their produce. The time has come when some re-examination of the price structure of the marketing depot should be made, and I believe that this should be done urgently.

Indeed, the Ministry of Finance, whose heavy hand has been laid on this Ministry, is

[MR. BENN]

impeding progress. According to a Sessional Paper which has been prepared there has been reference to considerable loss in the marketing organisation. I said here on more than one occasion that in many countries agriculture is heavily subsidised. I recall that when the Minister of Finance was in the Opposition he used to say that too much money was being spent on farmers. We feel that farmers should be subsidised to a great extent. We are not a rich country, and we should do something more to help our farmers. I wish to ask the Minister to give serious consideration to this matter.

Finally, I wish to deal with the question of agricultural credit. The Agricultural Loans Bill was pushed down the throats of members on this side of the House. [Hon. Members (Government): "A Select Committee was appointed to consider the Bill."] Hon. Members on the other side of the House are reminding us of the unsavoury incidents that occurred as a result of the functioning of that Committee.

I mention the fact that the Agricultural Loans Ordinance was promulgated and the Government's spokesman said that we would get no where with our Amendments. He said he wanted to push ahead with the matter so that the farmers would be able to get credit. I am not aware that the facilities for providing credit outside the credit corporation have been set up, despite the fact that the Bill was passed a long time ago.

I ask the Minister to let us see come true, the statement here that "the new credit facilities will be created." He must ensure that these credit facilities will be created quickly. There is a great need for short-term, medium-term and long-term loans to farmers in this country, and I ask the hon. Minister to do something very quickly about this matter.

I have to point out certain of the shortcomings of the Government in agriculture. I think it is right for me to make some positive

suggestions, for it is necessary that this Department is given a push.

I think that, firstly, the Government must definitely allocate more funds for agriculture. These funds will be necessary to give direct assistance to farmers and to employ more technical staff. The Government is getting, as I said, large sums of money as loans and as grants for building roads and hotels and God knows what, and some of these funds should be diverted for the assistance of agriculture.

Secondly, the Government, because of the difficulty in producing new crops, has complained that in spite of the incentives, farmers are not turning sufficiently to the cultivation of cabbages, peanuts, and so on. What is the way out? I suggest that the Government should establish new land development schemes for its operation. It should operate its own land development schemes, that is in the same way as the Rice Development Company produces and mills rice. It should set up its own farm and on that farm should produce some of the new crops that are needed to reduce the importation of the large variety of products to this country.

In addition to this, the Government should select farmers and give them special incentives for producing some of these crops. The hon. Minister does not have any confidence in the people. That is the problem. I wish that the Government would consider using some of the lands in the Black Bush Polder. All of it is not taken up. The Government should also tackle the problem of land use as has been announced - I believe this was in the Budget speech so that people who do not put their land into beneficial occupation would have to pay a tax. It should immediately set up its credit facilities to provide credits to farmers, and it should again look at this question of drainage and irrigation to see what minor schemes should be carried out. It should carry on the expansion of the Tapacuma Scheme which would enable more farmers on the Essequibo Coast to produce crops to feed the nation.

I believe the Minister in his speech - when he was going to give us five coconut plants each; I got five - said "Let us go forward together in order that we may feed the nation and feed the world." Well if the Minister sincerely wants to feed the Guyanese nation and reduce the cost of living - certainly the increase in production is not keeping pace with the increase in population - and if he sincerely wants to put agriculture on its footing, I seriously recommend these suggestions, with the hope that the Government will immediately tackle this very serious problem of agriculture.

The Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources (Mr. Jordan): On an occasion like this when we have been able to listen, at the opening hours of this debate, to the Leader of the Opposition, we are in a fortunate position because we are then in a position where we clearly see into the minds or non-minds of the rest of the Opposition. It would be almost a joke of it were not so pathetic to listen to the Leader of the Opposition on an independent Guyana almost gleefully hoping that Guyana does not have oil, after having read a half-baked newspaper report. It is shocking to see that the Leader of the Opposition, instead of being thoughtful over a matter of that nature, is almost childishly gleeful.

I must clear up the position for the members of the Opposition. I hope that the same people who are so gleeful will be equally gleeful when oil is found, and I hope they would not then say that the Government should be running it because \$7 million has gone down the drain and not a cent has come of it. The position is this. We have been able to settle an effective Agreement, an Agreement as good as the best in the world. We have been able to force oil companies to start drilling in this country. The P.P.P. sat down on it for a number of years and not a single hole has been drilled, and up to today, if members of the P.P.P. were sitting here not a single hole would have been drilled. Even at this moment laboratory work is continuing and people who know about oil are not

bothered when two holes are drilled and no oil is found. That is, in the common parlance of oilmen, "plain wildcatting." If these idiots would learn the whole country would be better off.

The Throne Speech does not have to contain details on every matter. The broad outlines are laid down here and for a few minutes I want to develop on them. It is stated briefly in the Throne Speech that:

"The programme of increased agricultural production and diversification with the active participation of Government will continue and the distribution of lands to farmers will proceed."

8.30 p.m.

For such a long time sugar has been no problem in this country that I do not think we need bother with it, but for a few brief moments I want to attract my hon. Friend's attention, as he mentioned that so far nothing has come out of the Cane Farming Corporation, to the fact that at this stage in any people's existence any Government must think and carefully peruse the scene before is launches new people into a field that is, at the moment fraught with considerable risk. We do not plunge into fields that has more risk than is normal.

So far as increased production is concerned, I would have thought that my quoting friends would have been anxious to quote from the *Evening Post*, today's issue. The hon. Leader of the Opposition never says anything on his own. He quotes and misquotes. I wonder if he has ever said anything on his own, and that leads me to believe that a man so gifted to quoting is incapable of serious thought of his own. Let him talk for himself now.

So far as agricultural production is concerned, during the regime of the last Government, the present members of the Opposition were at great pains to increase the acreage of rice but the yield per acre of rice never increased. More acreage was put under rice but the yield per acre, which in effect is the important thing, was not

TODAY!
[MR. BENN]

improved. In the short space of time that this Government has taken office, and in spite of all the obstacles which they sought, and still seek, to put in the way of the people whom they call their supporters, the rice farmers have been able to make an improvement in the yield and today, several of them stand with mouths agape when they see what has quickly happened to rice. [Interruptions.] [Mr. Ram Karran: "Talk sense."]

Mr Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Let us proceed.

Mr. Jordan: With the assistance of the United Nations, experiments started in 1966 have more than begun to bear fruit and I know that my hon. Friend (Mr. Ram Karran), who said I should talk sense, will be only too anxious to grab some of the very seed which he says is nonsense.

When this new variety of seed was introduced into this country the mouthpiece of the P.P.P., *The Mirror*, came out with a statement that it was discrimination, that only a few people had been handed the seed, and when their minions came to me I said I would be only too happy to hand this seed for them to experiment with if they could find a number of farmers to put 15 acres in it and, if nothing came of it, to let me hear; not a word. I do not have to say this, but they did not return.

As it was, we gave this to certain selected farmers, people who were in a position to take a risk with 15 or 20 acres and today, 90 days have not yet passed since this seed was sown I have it on the authority of people who know about rice that the yield has gone as high as 4,000 pounds per acre as against a national average of 1,900 pounds per acre. [Applause.] It has risen to 4,000 pounds an acre from 1,900 pounds. [Interruptions.] I am forced to cast pearls before swine. This is hard fact. You cannot argue with the facts. If hon. Members visited some of the places where this is planted they would see

it. People, if they are wise, ought to be able to stand up and say that this is a good thing for this country.

These are the people who walked up and down this country and told rice farmers that the People's National Congress would destroy rice. We have not destroyed rice; we have increased the yield from 1,900 pounds an acre to 4,000 pounds an acre. That is not all; that is only half the story. All this is possible in only 90 days. Today the Press and 75 rice farmers were taken to see this in actual growth. Twenty-five acres of rice sown in May will be ready for reaping at the end of this month. Any farmer can go on the Corentyne and see it.

What does that mean in terms of actual increase in production? If there was one acre producing 1,900 pounds and the yield is now 4,000 pounds it means that you have more than doubled production. To go a step further, it has been done in 90 days where previously it would take close to five months. [Dr. Jagan: "Where is this"?] Although the hon. Leader of the Opposition could not tell us about his pattern, I will tell him where to find this. Some of this has been planted at East Lothian, some in the Abary, and some in the Corentyne.

It was produced by people who were willing to take a risk and now it has been proved that this is not only a laboratory experiment but a success in the field. This knowledge will be made available to all the farmers of this country. [Interruptions.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will not allow the hon. Minister to refer to an hon. Member as an idiot.

Mr. Jordan: If this is not increased agricultural production I wonder what is. For all the years that these erstwhile leaders of this country held the reins they were not able to do what we have been able to do in a short space of time.

The former Minister of Agriculture, and perhaps I should say the Ex-shadow Minister of Agriculture, has made much play about the building of roads here and of roads here

and there. The one thing he could not say was that any of these roads was abortive like the one the former Minister of Works and Hydraulics attempted to build between Parika and Makouria. All these are roads from "somewhere" and they lead to "somewhere." They are not roads which lead to "nowhere" and end up in the forest and in big drawbacks to people who held the reins.

8.40 p.m.

With the building of these roads, as has been pointed out, very much of this country which had hitherto remained unopened will become open. The building of roads is one of the bridges of progress; it is an infrastructure necessary for the expansion of agriculture. For 300 years people had been paddling in boats here and there; there was no progress. Members on the other side were content to sit down, watch and weep in silence.

The hon. Member said that there was increase in the traditional fields only. There is a reason for that. Unless and until you have provided adequate markets for all that farmers can produce, it will be foolhardy to lead them into producing products and then search for markets. The bridges with our Caribbean neighbours, against the will and liking of our friends on the other side, are being built. When they are built there will be adequate markets that are now being prepared. You cannot expand production without first preparing the markets. The markets are being prepared, and when they have been carefully prepared, production will be ready. It does not take ten years to grow tobacco.

I must reply to what the hon. Member had to say about coconuts. After all the criticisms, I was more than amused to hear him admit that he himself received five free of charge. One of the problems in this country, as I said in another place, is that, at the moment, we are not producing enough edible oil. At one time, because of the non-planning of the previous Government, coconut trees were bulldozed throughout this country so that rice could be planted at

one time, because of the non-planning of the previous Government, coconut trees were bulldozed throughout this country so that rice could be planted. [Mr. Benn: "That is not true."] I could name one place in Essequibo where 300 acres were bulldozed.

This is the position. If you go to the Pomeroun on the North West boat, you will see that water coconuts are brought from as far as there to Georgetown. This step we have taken is to provide the water coconut man in and around the coastlands with easy access to water coconuts, so that coconuts can be available on the far areas to be made into copra. I have had talks with the copra producers and the people who produce edible oil and they can only agree that this is a sensible solution because no water coconut man with any sense will buy coconuts from Pomeroun if he can buy in the nearby areas. If he buys in the nearby areas he will be able to make bigger profit because the freight charges will be less. This is a small step in the right direction.

The hon. Member also spoke about the fishing industry. A fishing centre will shortly be built in New Amsterdam. [Mr. Luck: "Do you know how shrimps are sold? Eight shrimps for eight cents."] You should be glad that the fisherman is making a decent living. We do not want school fees alone to go up. When this centre is built the farmers will be in a good position and the fishermen will be in an equally good position. At present the situation is not as good as it might be because landing stages are in one place, and without a central depot for the farmers and fishermen to put their commodities, life becomes difficult.

I must say something about the poultry industry. It is true that the price of stockfeed has gone up. It has gone up because of the lack of foresight on the part of these gentlemen. [Laughter.] Let me explain. So far, all the corn that has been grown in this country has been grown on a "catch as can" basis. During their seven years in office the members of the previous Government never made a concentrated effort to grow a

[MR. JORDAN]

plot of corn anywhere. As soon as the rains are over we are going to put 150 acres under corn, and the experiments which we have carried out illustrate that we are likely to get as much as 2,947 pounds to the acre. This will begin to make corn a viable product for farmers. We are doing something now and we have been able to go a step forward. We have been able to get the stockfeed people to undertake to go into the growing of corn. They will put ten acres under cultivation. If the members of the previous Government had done this, we would not have had to do it now. They must have known that, with the coming of multi-stage mills, there would be less broken. This is a lack of foresight on their part.

This increase in price is only temporary because when we begin to produce enough corn - which will not be long - we will then be in a position to be self-sufficient in corn. We would not have to import it and grow it on a "catch as can" basis. This is a step towards increased agricultural production.

Much talk has also been made of the banana project. Any person who is not at all times willing to review a situation must have much of the mule in them. Situations must, from time to time, be carefully reviewed, and banana, even now, is under such a review. Large quantities of the type of banana that was imported into this country some time ago are now being distributed to farmers all over the country.

† 8. 50 p.m.

This type of banana is not common or indigenous to this country, and farmers will have to gain some experience in dealing with this crop. When that experience has been gained, the situation will be reviewed by the Government. [Mr. Benn: "You do not know anything about it."] You have never brought even one banana sucker into this country, and this Government is able today to give farmers a large quantity of suckers.

The hon. Member has made much play about other crops. The production of honey

has also increased. [Mr. Luck: "You did not read the Report."] You will not know about honey because you are a drone. We know that there were staff problems in the Ministry of Agriculture. These problems will be found not only in Guyana but in all developing countries. Even in highly industrialised countries circumstances arise where countries that cannot afford to pay big salaries find it difficult to secure qualified staff. We have been taking steps towards the solution of this matter, and what should have been done by the previous Government is now being done by this Government.

Young men are being sent not to be trained in the martial art or in the manufacture of lethal weapons, but to be trained to beat their swords into plough shears. Every opportunity we get we send young men to be trained in agriculture in order that we may be able to make agriculture in this country something really viable. We have long decided that it is all well and good to have highly trained scientists. For instance, you may have an army with colonels and captains, but it will be necessary to have Sergeants - majors, corporals and privates as well.

The Guyana School of Agriculture is serving a good purpose. The students from this School will take care of the farmers, because the language of a graduate scientist will not be easily understood by the farmers. We want to take agricultural knowledge to the grass-roots, and that is why we have invited women to be trained in agriculture. We want everybody in Guyana to know that a cow head or a green bottle does not keep away "bad eye". We want the people to know that fertiliser, weedicides and insecticides are necessary if good crops are to be produced. The great mass of the people must know that there is not anything like "bad eye".

With regard to the question of praedial larceny, we are dealing with this matter. It is a matter that has been many-sided, and when the time comes we shall take the

necessary steps to ensure that it is no longer a nuisance to this country.

The hon. Member sought to give me some advice about carefully selected settlers. When he mentioned that my mind turned back to what he meant by "carefully selected settlers". Does he mean that we should select settlers along the lines on which they were selected and put in the Black Bush Polder some years ago? The position is that they were so carefully selected that, when my hon. Colleague took over the Ministry in 1965, the only chaos that might have been second to it was the chaos the good Lord found when He was attempting to create the earth. The position at Black Bush Polder was one of the most ruthless bits of discrimination ever created in Guyana. There were 1,441 settlers in the Black Bush Polder, and this is how the Leader of the Opposition, who prattles about imbalance, dealt with the matter;

East Indians.	1,305
Africans.	131
Mixed.	5

As a result of what the previous Government had done, this Government had to tackle the job of cleaning the Augean stables. They sent their supporters to squat on other people's land. That is the situation we had to deal with when we took over. It was impossible to issue a lease because one did not know who was who. If it were permissible in this House, I would have said those scoundrels but I cannot refer to them in such language. That is the position that prevailed there when we took over, and I am now told that the settlers were carefully selected. All of these are problems we have had to deal with and are dealing with successfully.

On a visit to Corentyne and Black Bush Polder, I was met by a group of settlers who told me: "We were told we do not have to pay." I said, "You ain't got to pay?" They will have to pay. *[Interruption.]* I have made it quite clear why there are not more funds available for agriculture today when your minions owe \$1.2 million.

9 p.m.

When you come to co-operatives, right in Black Bush Polder \$3.1 million has been sunk in three dead rice mills. Right now their own supporters want to take their rice out because of the inefficiency of the mills there. That is a fact and everybody knows it; \$3.1 million to build three inefficient mills! I would not mention the combines.

We are not all worried about what the hon. Member said. I could see at times that it was his duty to speak and I sympathise with him. There was no criticism that they could offer. We have pointed out carefully that behind our every action there has been careful thought. None of our actions, whether it is in connection with sugar, rice, banana, corn, poultry, etc., has come out of malice, spite or self-seeking. I know that many of the rice farmers look forward to the day when they will get two or three crops per year and a double yield for what they get now. I hope they will be men enough to tell their supporters that this was not a gift from Castro but it was a gift from the P.N.C. Government.

Now, the question of agricultural credits. These are all matters that you do not need to rush into. These are problems which, having been clearly defined, you proceed carefully to work out the solutions. We know that we are going to make agricultural credit available to farmers, but we are not going to make agricultural credit available to farmers on the same basis that you made it for them. We are not going to tell people: "But \$21 and you have a rice mill." That is why \$3 million is owed for three rice mills in Black Bush Polder today. One of the first things that we will have a title to something. It is only now that those 1,441 farmers who were put in Black Bush Polder are getting decent titles to their lands. Those people sat there all these years — perhaps you could say they were tenants at will. Some time ago I said this to them and I am saying it to you here: "It is regrettable that although settlers were here since 1960, lease are only

[MR. JORDAN]

now being issued and perhaps settlers should ask themselves if those who put them here ever had in mind issuing them leases at all, and one would welcome a statement from those people.

You have speakers to come subsequently. Tell us if you had in mind to give those poor misguided people in Black Bush Polder any leases. It goes still further. You talk about increased agricultural production. The previous Government allowed 6,000 acres of land in the hometown of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Port Mourant, to be squatted upon for 4 years and not a single cent was paid to the Government. At 25 cents per acre that would have been \$6,000. Leases were not issued to them but they made good production. When you provide people with adequate titles to land you are then in a position to start providing them with agricultural credit because, regardless of how you look at it, there must be some form of collateral.

As far as private lands are concerned, it is well known in this country that many people do not have good titles to the lands which they occupy because they have been left there by their forefathers. Right now the Land Court is working overtime to give people titles to their lands. That is the first step to providing viable agricultural credit. You do not do it haphazardly simply because you like a man's face or you want to bribe a chap to vote for you. You have to see the country as a whole and understand what it is all about.

I have before me the figures of the number of people who have received lands. In the two years - or little more than that - that we got to know them, we have given out more than seven times what the former members of the Government gave out in the whole period of their existence. The figures will show this. A question was asked by the former Minister and the answer was circulated to Members. He will note from it that in a little over two years we distributed

more than two times what was distributed in four years. The figures make good reading. The total acreage distributed was 146,746 - *[Interruption.]* These are the records and the answer was submitted to you. If you want to get it, ask a question again in this Session and I will be only too happy to give it to you. These gentlemen, if I may so call them, were not interested in giving the people lands. They wanted to hold them as chattels forever, so that they could play one against the other. But we have no such intention.

9.10 p.m.

My friends on the other side have nothing they can say against what we propose to do. We are carefully preparing for further development. Crops that already exist we are making efficient. My colleague when he speaks later will tell you all about that. Crops that up to now have only been played with we are making into worthwhile crops. For seven years the P.P.P. sat here and did not touch anything but rice. Sugar production, even though sugar can be taken for granted, has gone up, and this has happened because the P.P.P. thugs are not in the fields burning cane. It is as simple as that. It takes more than digging a hole to increase agriculture. *[Interruption.]* The hon. Member need not say that, because he has been before the Court already. When the person whom he carried pleaded justification he was in a hurry to run away. The last time that something like that happened was when Oscar Wilde pulled a man before the Court and when he pleaded justification and it was granted he received a penny in damages. So that when you took the man to Court and he pleaded justification your learned Attorney General, who was not worth \$4,000 a month, was not able to help you and you ran out of it. I must not go too deeply into these matters.

All I need say is that we are taking adequate steps to make sure that all the people in this country get more lands, that they get lands with sound titles to them, and when they have lands with sound titles

they will be in a position to seek adequate credit with which to expand. [Mr. Luck: "Why didn't you say this in the Throne Speech?"] The Speech is the framework; this is the rest of it, but some of us find it hard to understand. I would have hoped that my colleagues would understand.

The foundations have been carefully laid for this. In the few minutes that I have been talking I have pointed out that more lands have been made available and are still being made available. They are not being made available on a haphazard basis. Sound titles, twenty-five year renewable leases, are being given to every man. Some of the land will be available freehold. With concentrated efforts and scientific experiments, crops can be expanded, as I have clearly enunciated, and more and more crops will come under this treatment during the current year to make good our promise of increased agricultural production and diversification. [Applause]

Mr. Luck: This is the third Throne Speech in the life of this Parliament. A comparison of this Throne Speech with those that have preceded it is at once interesting and instructive. On the 29th March, 1965, the then Governor Sir Richard Luyt delivered the Throne Speech on behalf of the Government. He started out by promising:

"It is my Government's firm and irrevocable intention to establish ..."

a "consultative democracy". That was the term used. Through the mouthpiece of His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, G.C.V.O. on the 26th May, 1966 - this is the second Throne Speech - we hear again the Government pledging itself to observe the Constitution, a Constitution which was based on "consultative democracy", but in this Throne Speech, this talk of consultative democracy, having been exposed to the world as mere sham, no reference is made to "consultative democracy" but there are plans for national registration and for this a C.I.A. front organisation has been employed - I refer to the Shoup registration system - the same firm that rigged elections in Africa

and in America and is going to rig the elections here.

Another outstanding omission in this year's Throne Speech is lack of recognition that -

"The past . . . years of crisis and turmoil have imposed severe stresses and strains upon all our peoples. There has been suspicion, hatred, and an atmosphere of intransigence. All this must and will be eliminated as real nationhood is achieved."

I quote from Sir Richard Luyt's speech in 1965. There must be constructive and continuous work to convince every citizen, regardless of race that he is needed, that he is important and that his sufferings, hopes and aspirations are the concern of all.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent in the Throne Speech to which I have already referred also acknowledged this. He said:

"The successful execution of this programme is dependent upon the enthusiastic and intelligent co-operation of all sections of the nation and community."

Nowhere in this Throne Speech is recognition given to this simple but very important fact.

Another and very startling omission has been with respect to the Amerindian problem. Sir Richard Luyt enunciating, as he was, the Government's policy at column 59 of Hansard of 29th March, 1965; said:

"My Government's particular interest in the welfare of our Amerindian citizens may be judged from the fact that a special department of Amerindian Affairs has been created and is under the charge of a Parliamentary Secretary, himself an Amerindian."

The Duke of Kent, young boy as he was, said this on 26th May 1966:

"The Government will embark immediately on implementing the policy of doing everything to further the interests of Amerindians and to bring them into the stream of full citizenship and progress. In particular the Amerindian Lands Commission will be appointed and given every facility to carry out its task"

JCR
[MR. JORDAN]

ensuring and protecting the Amerindians' rights to their lands."

It could have escaped no one that nowhere in this year's Throne Speech is there a single reference to the Amerindian problem which remains as grave and as pressing as it ever was. A peculiar feature of this year's Throne Speech is that it presents very little that is concrete. It is only in passing that one can see any attempt to show what is going on in this country and in the world; only in passing can one see any concrete proposals.

This is the Government's statement of policy for the coming year. Let us see what happened to the previous statements of policy. I refer now to Sir Richard Luyt's speech. We note that the promise of consultation and "consultative democracy" has been a fraud.

The next thing they talked about was "Youth". I was discussing this with the gentleman opposite. A specific Department for Youth has been created and the Youth Leader has been appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry.

9.20 p.m.

Only this afternoon I asked him in the Lobby of this House, "Where is the youth counselling service?" and I formed the view, in the presence of the Minister of Information, that the hon. Member did not understand the meaning of the term "youth counselling service", which he was supposed to discharge. This Government has not set up a single youth counselling service.

Under the heading "LABOUR", on page 45, a startling and firm prediction was made:

"Workmen's Compensation Legislation will be completely overhauled with a view to bringing it up to date to accord with our present circumstances . . ."

Not a single bit of legislation dealing with workmen's compensation has been presented to this House from the 29th March, 1965, to this day. This was a firm promise, a firm

statement of Government's intention. On page 46, Governor Luyt who was speaking on behalf of the Government went on to say:

"The Ministry of Labour will have the task of ensuring fair and impartial employment practices in both the public and private sectors."

I assume that the Ministry of Labour will be set the task of ensuring fair and impartial employment practices. If the Ministry of Labour has any influence in the employment, of persons both in the public and private sectors of the economy of this country, I say categorically that that influence has never been used fairly nor impartially.

When we look under the heading "TRADE AND INDUSTRY", - and this is only in 1965 - we see that there is to be a programme for the rapid development of industry. This appears on page 50:

"... it will be possible to embark soon thereafter on the construction of a hydro-electric station."

What we are promised here, in this year 1967 in the month of August, is that the results of surveys are being examined as to the possibility of the erection of a hydro-electric station. But in 1965 it was stated positively that:

"Arrangements will shortly be made for the completion of hydro-electric surveys and, since the financing arrangements can be made, it will be possible to embark soon thereafter on the construction of an hydro-electric station."

We are told in this year's Throne Speech that what will be examined are the surveys, and it is common knowledge that the preliminary surveys have all indicated a negative result.

We come now to agriculture. In 1965 we were told:

"In so far as sugar is concerned, my Government has been able to obtain the agreement in principle of the sugar companies to the Government's active participation in the ownership in the industry's undertakings."

But what do we find? We find that far from Government sharing in the sugar companies, the sugar companies are taking a greater share in the machinery and the deliberations of the Government. In 1965 we had been promised that:

"the feasibility of re-establishing Essequibo as a sugar producing county - not on the plantation system - is being carefully studied."

I challenge the Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources to indicate where these steps have been undertaken in the entire county of Essequibo!

Turning to forests, the firm promise was made that reforestation is to be more actively undertaken. I doubt that this Government has reforested one single acre in this country, and the little that we had been doing has been stopped.

Then we come to mining. This is what we were told in 1965:

"My Government therefore proposes in co-operation with the two large Bauxite Companies extracting ore in Guyana, or on its own, in the light of certain offers which it has recently received, to start this year on a project aimed at converting our hydro-electric potential into an actual."

I would have thought that the word would be "actuality"; it is a misprint. Mr. Davis, head of the powerful Aluminum Company of Canada, came to this country - and I want this recorded in the minutes of the proceedings of this House - one day before he was scheduled to arrive for his appointment with the Prime Minister. It was urged on the Prime Minister that Mr. Davis wanted to leave the country the day following and could he please have his appointment put forward.

One knows that the Prime Minister of this country is an important fellow with a keen sense of his importance, but one realises that the President of ALCAN has, in his hands, more financial power than the whole Government of this country. He can buy all of the members of the Government, if he has not done so already. What happened - and I

want it recorded - was that Mr. Davis was unable to see the Prime Minister at his request. The next sequence of events was that, on his departure, Mr. Davis announced that his company was no longer interested in smelting aluminium ore in this country. This is a fact of history which is known to the Prime Minister, the Canadian and myself. [Mr. Merriman: "What is the point?"] Good heavens, where is the hydro-electric potential that you were to convert into an actuality?

In the field of communications, this Government promised in its Throne Speech of 1965:

"The extension of the telecommunications system in Georgetown, New Amsterdam and the rest of the country is being pursued as a matter of immediate urgency."

As soon as the Telephone Board came in New Amsterdam it was brought to Georgetown, and so you can hardly hear when you ring up New Amsterdam. It is known to this Chamber, and indeed to the whole country, that all these promises have proved false, all these hopes have been cruelly dashed to the ground.

As regards education, I will just deal with it briefly, in passing. I will return to it later. It is stated here, and quite rightly, in eloquent and gracious language that:

"My Government is deeply conscious of the fact that the success of any proposals or plans for social and economic re-construction and rehabilitation is largely dependent on the reorganisation of our educational system."

The 1965 Throne Speech goes on to state:

"The year 1965 will be a year of re-appraisal and intensive reform in education;"

The hon. Minister of Education (Mrs. Gaskin), in spite of her imagination - no one can accuse her of lack of imagination, particularly when she speaks in this House. I can only believe that she speaks from imagination rather than fact because what she says has no contact with fact,

LUCK
[MR. JORDAN]

[*Interruption.*]

9.30 p.m.

[*Interruption.*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Luck: It is also stated in the Speech:

"It is proposed to go ahead as soon as possible with plans for the establishment of at least two junior technical colleges in central rural areas."

So far as health is concerned, it is stated that:

"Pure Water Supplies are being provided apace in the rural areas, and my Government proposes to set up a national water board or commission to deal with the problem of water generally at a national level."

Not a sound is heard today. All of these things are demonstrably unfavourable. These were solemn promises made to the Nation through the Throne Speech.

We now come to housing. It is stated that

"A substantial sum will also be allocated for the provision of housing by the Government, with emphasis on the needs of the rural areas."

This is yet another example of unfavourable promises made in March, 1965. It is also stated:

"My Government has made available to the Trades Union Council approximately 112.5 acres of land for a housing scheme in the Greater Georgetown area to be substantially financed by the American Institute for Free Labour Development."

It is known, and you, sir, with your trade union connections must know, that, during the negotiations that led to the agreement, the officials of the Trades Union Council walked out over and over again because they became fed up with the unconscionable, harsh and unreasonable terms put forward by the American Institute for Free Labour Development. From 1965 to this day not a house has been built. In respect of local Government that would come under the portfolio of my hon. Friend Mr. Cheeks who

has been in receipt of a ministerial salary since 1964. This is what was said in the Governor's Speech on the 29th March, 1965:

"Local Government is considered an integral and important aspect of Government, and it has been decided to proceed at all possible speed with the implementation of the main basic proposals of the Marshall Plan for Local Government - form by stages if necessary."

From March 1965 to August 1967 the mountain was in labour and has brought forth not even a mouse. So much for the Government's statements and intentions for 1965.

In 1966 when the charming Duke of Kent and wife came here, and before Mr. Davenport, the American-sponsored economist and C.I.A. man assumed the office of Financial Adviser, this is what this Government had to say:

"This programme which promises the expenditure in the public sector alone of approximately \$300 million is aimed at increasing rapidly and significantly the gross national product and national income per capita ..."

This statement of intention made on the 26th May, 1966, conforms to the philosophic basis of the P.N.C.'s alleged political convictions. They state in the New Road, and I am quoting from a speech made by Mr. Saffee on the 20th April, 1965:

"Ours will be a mixed economy with a public and private sector. Government will own and run outright those industries which the circumstances and facts suggest. These will not be limited to infrastructural undertakings where the capital investments are heavy and the returns not immediately recognisable, but will include what are described as productive and immediate profit-bearing enterprises."

Where in God's name has this section of the New Road been applied to any item of policy undertaken by this Government to this day?

We will examine shortly the Throne Speech made, I assume, under Mr. Davenport's influence. Anyway the New Road goes on to state:

"Our Party has no interest in confiscation, and apart from its article of faith that all public utilities, must be government-owned or controlled directly or through public corporations, is not doctrinaire on the question of nationalisation."

Karl Marx some time ago remarked that the Anglican Church would willingly forgo 50 of its 51 Articles of Faith, except the Article of Faith dealing with the right to private property.

9.40 p.m.

My hon. and learned Friend has certainly foregone this Article of Faith. Anyone who has ever driven in those squalid, bug-infested, miserable, over-crowded buses that run in Georgetown at tremendous profits, anyone who has experience of the discourtesy and short tempers of the drivers - possibly because they are underpaid - must wonder what has happened to this Article of Faith.

The Duke of Kent made one last promise in his Speech on the 26th of May. He said:

"In pursuance of its intention to bind up the wounds which have been inflicted by recent difficulties in our society, the Government will pursue urgently the rehabilitation of displaced persons and others who have suffered so that all of them may be better able to contribute to the harmonious progress of Guyana."

My Government will pursue with determination a policy aimed at the preservation of law, the establishment of true equality and the enshrinement of justice."

I live in the suburbs of Georgetown and every night I am awakened by the cry "Thief!" They come one at a time and two at a time, but the other night they came five at a time. A dark and dismal area with five burglars going in a single residence!

Now, let me deal with two aspects which really fall within my responsibility. I really speak subject to what my friend the hon. Mr. Nunes said on education. Now that the hon. Minister of Education is here, may I say that in this whole melancholy statement, because it is the shallowest thing I have read, nothing is more melancholy than the section which deals with education, bearing in mind the importance which the Government allegedly attaches to education three years after it assumed office and seven years after it had been in the political wilderness. I wonder if they were contemplating what steps they would take when they became the Government. This is what they have to tell us. I have to ask the Minister in preparing the White Paper to bear in mind the following points -- *[Interruption.]* Comrade Joaquin, if this Government could prevent my children from having food it will do so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, you cannot refer to an hon. Member as "comrade."

Mr. Luck: Of all the abuses which are clamant in the educational field in this country, there is no clearer abuse than the Common Entrance Examination I opposed the introduction of that Examination and circumstances have proved beyond doubt that the Examination as it is presently being run is wholly unfair to children of poor parents and people from the rural areas. I refer the Minister to an article by Kasim Bacchus.

As a former examiner, I marked the papers and they were really scandalous. So efficient was the group of examiners led by myself that we were particularly asked by the Chief Examiner to mark the papers of St. Mary's School and it was a revelation. The standard of work there was uniformly good. Over 100 did well. But since they were paying by the number of scripts marked, I used my intelligence and said, "Look, give me all the countryside papers" because of all the schools they were the worst. Noughts! All of them! Surely that Examination needs re-examining.

[MR. LUCK]

The entire middle-class concept of the Minister of Education - her church upbringing - permeates and obstructs the work of her Ministry. She seems unable to forget her middle-class origins, unable to understand that in this day and age we want to construct -- [Mr. Merriman: "Tell us what is your opinion on education."] We have the position of children winning scholarships and going to the leading schools. As a parent of one such child, I have worked out the initial outlay, if this child is not to get an inferiority complex, to be \$376. School books alone account for \$60. My daughter likes music and they told me that I had to buy a child's violin. That was the first time I heard of that! \$50! You have to buy a bicycle and you have to insure it because they are going to steal it - \$136! Then you have to buy uniforms. You have to buy a gym suit. They tell you that you have to get green drawers and all.

9.50 p.m.

This is the actual cost to a parent. My point is that, excellent as the Bishops' High School is, something is wrong. One would assume that it is for poor people, but the children of poor people cannot attend that school without this heavy outlay. Sixty dollars for books - six English books and a dictionary, three books on Mathematics and a geometry set costing \$13.95, a history book, two science books, one Cambridge Senior Bible, four music books, one Songs of Praise.

The point I am making is that if we want Bishop's High School to be an example to this nation, we must see to it that the content of the education is such as not to raise problems in our society. For a poor man to raise this money it must mean that he deprives not only himself but his other children of the necessities of life. I say without fear of contradiction that to outfit a

child properly for Bishops' High School or Queen's College involves an outlay of at least \$300. I say it again because these dunces don't seem to understand. If a man has four children and spends \$300 on the child going to Bishops' High School, would he dare spend less on a child going to Central High School? [Interruptions.]

So class conscious is the Minister of Education that she is going to wreak havoc in Aided Secondary Schools. She proposes to introduce a scheme of grading into Grade A and Grade B Aided Secondary Schools. One would have thought that there would be some fundamental difference between Grade A and Grade B. The only practical difference, outside of status, will be in the salaries of headmasters and deputy headmasters. There will be no other difference between Grade A and Grade B schools. Why introduce this obnoxious differentiation for such a small purpose? If there were other purposes and principles involved one could understand.

To this day this Government has been unable to establish one good secondary school in Georgetown in spite of all its talking. I ask the Minister of Education to scan - and "scan" means to read thoroughly - the list of preferences of students who took the Common Entrance Examination.

Another matter which is scandalous is the high local fees charged for examinations. They are the highest in the world. The fees for a child taking eight subjects at the G.C.E. Examination exceed \$40. The local fee is \$1.50 per subject. They doubled the fee. No one could ever justify this charge. In addition they charged \$6 for an oral. For the C.P. the charges are three times the amount formerly levied by Mr. Cheeks on behalf of the secondary schools. This Government extorts for a local fee a sum in excess of three times the fees charged when the examination was under the control of the hon. Mr. Cheeks, not to speak of Mr. J.C. Luck. I speak in the presence of Mr. Cheeks. [Mr. Cheeks: "The English examiners

doubled the fees."] Then explain the local fees. The Government is extorting money from these people.

The relationship between this Ministry and the Staff Associations has reached an all-time low. It is common knowledge that the executive of both unions, the Guyana Union of Teachers and the A.M.M., found the previous Minister, the hon. Mr. Nunes, more readily available to them, more reasonable and more willing to listen than the present Minister. This is incontestable. A letter from the A.M.M. to the Ministry of Education took two months to reach the Minister. It was a request for an interview and it reached her two months after it was posted and at the time the men were going to the Minister. The minutes of meetings with the Ministry are invariably inaccurate

and reach the associations two months after the meetings.

So strangely is the Ministry run that a headmaster was once severely reprimanded - he was called a liar and all sorts of terms - because on the instructions of a senior officer of the Ministry of Education he informed the staff under him that the Government had changed its leave regulations. Reprimanded, the headmaster sought to confirm that his version of his conversation with the lady who gave him the instructions was accurate.

Two months have passed without delay.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, "That this Assembly do now adjourn until Friday, 11th August, 1967, at 2.00 p.m." - *[Mr. Bissember.]*

Adjourned accordingly at 10.00 p.m.