

# SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

*Tuesday, 3rd March, 1959*

*The Council met at 2 p.m.*

PRESENT :

**Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson**

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

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

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

} *ex officio*

**The Hon. Dr. C. B. Jagan**

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

” **B. H. Benn**

—*Member for Essequibo River*  
(Minister of Community Development and Education)

” **E. B. Beharry**

—*Member for Eastern Demerara*  
(Minister of Natural Resources)

” **Janet Jagan**

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

” **Ram Karran**

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

**Mr. R. B. Gajraj**

—*Nominated Member*

” **W. O. R. Kendall**

—*Member for New Amsterdam*

” **R. C. Tello**

—*Nominated Member*

” **F. Bowman**

—*Member for Demerara River*

” **L. F. S Burnham**

—*Member for Georgetown Central*

” **S. Campbell**

—*Member for North Western District*

” **A. L. Jackson**

—*Member for Georgetown North*

” **B. S. Rai**

—*Member for Central Demerara*

” **S. M. Saffee**

—*Member for Western Berbice*

” **R. E. Davis**

—*Nominated Member*

” **H. J. M. Hubbard**

—*Nominated Member*

” **A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.**

—*Nominated Member.*

**Mr. I. Crum Ewing**—Clerk of the Legislature

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

ABSENT :

**Mr. Ajodha Singh**

**Mr. Jai Narine Singh**

**Mr. A. M. Fredericks**—on leave.

The Clerk read prayers.

## MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Friday, 27th February, 1959, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

## LEAVE TO MEMBERS

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to announce that Mr. A.M. Fredericks is still on leave and is engaged in an Inquiry.

## ORDER OF THE DAY

## APPROPRIATION BILL

## BUDGET DEBATE

Council resolved itself into Committee to resume consideration of the Bill intituled,

“An Ordinance to appropriate the supplies granted in the current session of the Legislative Council.”

## COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

## FOREST

**The Chairman:** When last we dealt with this Bill in Committee we were discussing an Amendment moved by Mr. Fredericks for the reduction of sub-head 1 — item (1) — 1 Conservator of Forests, \$8,640 — by \$1. If any other person desires to speak on the matter he may do so. Unfortunately Mr. Fredericks is not here today, but I will put the question.

Question put, and negatived.

## DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1 — item (2) — 1 Deputy Conservator of Forests \$7,200 — by \$1. The reason for my moving this Amendment is to ask why there is no Deputy Conservator

of Forests, and whether the hon. Minister considers that this Department can be efficiently run without a Deputy Conservator of Forests?

**Mr. Hubbard:** I am rising on a point of order. Rule 33 (7) states:

“Every Member shall confine his observations to the subject under consideration, and, where more than one question has been proposed, as by way of amendment, the debate must be relevant to the last question so proposed, until it has been disposed of.”

I am submitting that the hon. Member's remarks are not relevant to his Motion.

**The Chairman:** I do not agree with you; I think they are most relevant. He moved the reduction of the sub-head, Deputy Conservator of Forests, and went on to mention something about that officer.

**Mr. Hubbard:** The hon. Member was asking questions.

**The Chairman:** Proceed, please.

**Mr. Burnham:** I am most grateful to Your Honour. As I was saying before the hon. Member rose to a point of order, I would like the hon. Minister to state whether he considers the Department can be efficiently run in the absence of a Deputy Conservator of Forests, because we have heard the Minister speak of magnificent plans which he has for this Department and the forests of British Guiana.

But I think it is common knowledge that the last Deputy Conservator of Forests left some time ago for an appointment — a better one, I understand — and there is acting in his place someone who is certainly not a qualified forestry officer, for, as I understand it, to be a qualified forestry officer one has to be in possession of certain technical qualifications, especially in the 20th century.

In spite of the fact that the last Deputy has left, I have not noticed in the Press any advertisement for the

post, and so I am wondering what it is that Government proposes to do with this Department. I also know that there are several trained forestry officers, technically qualified, with seven years' service and more, in British Guiana and in the Department. I wonder why it is that Government has thought fit to leave this post vacant and have acting in it someone who is not qualified.

**The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Beharry):** I spoke somewhat extensively when last we were dealing with the Head, Forest, and I explained to hon. Members the necessity and the need for maintaining a very good Forest Department, especially when we are to take an evaluation of this most important resource that this country possesses.

I also stated at the last meeting the need and necessity for the Forest Department to maintain a staff which is properly qualified in the utilization of the forest resources of British Guiana.

With respect to the question asked by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, realizing how important this resource is, it will be necessary for us to have a Deputy Conservator of Forests. As I see it, it would be very sad if this Department could not have a Deputy. However, I think the Chief Secretary, under whose Portfolio appointments are made, would be best qualified to say something about the appointment of a Deputy Conservator.

I knew there was a vacancy. Mr. Bagshaw has left for appointment to a post in Africa. I would like Government, through the Chief Secretary, to have this post filled. I believe that when that is done we will have a first-class Forestry Department. There is great need for Forestry officers not only here, but throughout the Caribbean, and the last conference I attended in Trinidad stressed that this particular resource had not been properly exploited

We in British Guiana have forests

and yet we import a large quantity of lumber to take care of our needs. I visualize the day when, with proper planning and improved quality of products this importation can be stopped and we can make ourselves self-sufficient.

I think it is necessary for Government to appoint a good and qualified Assistant Conservator of Forests, but I do not know how far the Chief Secretary has got in advertising for one. I agree with the hon. Member that we should advertise here and in the West Indies and further abroad, so that if there is a qualified man to fill the post, we will give our own men an opportunity to do so.

**Mr. Burnham:** I am very sorry that the hon. the Chief Secretary is not here and the Minister finds himself in a quandary. He agrees with me in practically everything I have said, but the person to agree or disagree is not here.

But before withdrawing my Motion, I desire to impress upon the Minister that (a) his colleagues in the Executive Council get down immediately to the question of the appointment of a Deputy Conservator of Forests, (b) if possible, that Deputy be recruited from British Guiana, and (c) the recruitment should take place as expeditiously as possible.

May I digress for a moment and say that very frequently in the case of these high posts in British Guiana one finds that there is no advertisement in British Guiana, which is deliberate; and we shall expect the Ministers in the Executive Council, as the guardians of Guianese rights, to see that the advertisements for these super-scale posts appear in British Guiana, and that Guianese have the opportunity to apply and to be interviewed. I shall also ask the Minister to impress upon his colleague, the Chief Secretary, the point of view, which has not been denied, that the present Deputy Conservator of Forests is not qualified—and I am sure the Conservator of Forests will admit that.

It is something really wrong with

[Mr. Burnham]

the Establishment side of this Department when we have people who are qualified not being appointed to act as Deputy, and a person who is not qualified, who is on the verge of retirement, and whose field of expertise is not that required for the post of Deputy Conservator, acting. It is wicked, it is wrong. It is not just wicked but vicious on the part of the Establishment not to appreciate what type of qualifications are necessary for what posts. For too long in British Guiana this has been happening. Kisses go by favour but it is time that kisses go by merit.

In these circumstances, Mr Chairman, I ask leave to withdraw my Motion.

**The Chairman:** In any case, undoubtedly the Minister could not have said more than he did.

**Mr. Burnham:** Mr. Chairman—

**Mr. Beharry:** I agree with the remarks made by the Member for Georgetown Central, and I would like to assure the hon. Member that I have never been silent in my support for a local person to fill a post when he can do so, and in the past I have dropped the full whip on my colleagues to bring this to bear. I have not been responsible for not allowing any local man to serve his country, and the Government is doing its best to give local men an opportunity to do so.

Item put and agreed to.

#### CENTRAL TIMBER MANUFACTURING PLANT

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 9—"Central Timber Manufacturing Plant," \$291,500—by \$1. It is a pity that we did not hear the Ministers on the Second Reading, but I feel it is time that there is some clear statement on this Manufacturing Plant.

There are at least two criticisms of this Plant. One, that a great deal of taxpayers' money is wasted and that it does not serve its purpose — it has not succeeded under its present administration in popularizing many woods which are not known to the public—and, two, that

it enters into unfair competition with private enterprise.

As at present advised, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of these criticisms, but what I can say is that these criticisms are abroad and are accepted by many persons and, as I see it, it is always the duty of Government to persuade the public, to persuade the taxpayers, whose money they spend, that money is not being wasted; and if, in this case, it is suggested that Government activity is in unfair competition with private enterprise, Government must state its policy that the department is being run for the benefit of the community, or that it is not a fact that it is an unfair competition with private enterprise.

I must not be taken as saying that everytime there is competition between Government and industry, that Government must withdraw. My point of view is that you must know what Government's policy is, and if Government is going to enter into competition with private industry in a particular industry, Government must explain its reason; probably the reason may be convincing or possibly the reason may be ineffectual.

**Mr. Beharry:** The Central Timber Manufacturing Plant is not in competition with private industry, in that private enterprise specializes in marketing greenheart timber and crabwood, but it does not handle other various species handled by the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant. The chief preoccupation of the Seasoning Plant at Kingston has been to popularize the lesser known species of our woods. It is not Government's policy to compete with private industry.

The policy is, as soon as this Plant becomes a profitable concern, as soon as it can be run efficiently and profitably, it will be offered to private enterprise. There are cases where private enterprise is skeptical to enter into undertakings like this, but Government can enter into it, develop it and prove to private enterprise that it can be done, before handing it over

to private enterprise. The forest industry falls into such a category.

I can assure the hon. Member that the forest industry today is breaking new ground. We have not been suffering the losses we experienced in the past, but last year we made a profit. That does not include interest on the capital we have been using, nor does it include the depreciation of our machines, but profit on our actual trade last year.

Another thing I would like to draw to hon. Members' attention is that last year we broke new ground. Our Forest Department has been growing and making history with respect to the worth and beauty of hitherto unknown varieties of British Guiana wood. Last year we were able to make shipments of these woods to Europe for the first time in the history of this country, and we were also able to make extensive shipments to the Trinidad market. Only two weeks ago I got the Mill Manager of the Forest Department to conclude an agreement to supply a new hotel which is to be built in Trinidad, the Hilton Hotel, with both its structural and architectural requirements, and approximately \$200,000 worth of our wood is expected to be sold to the Hilton Hotel.

We were not only thinking of the Hilton Hotel, for last year we were able to supply the decorative requirements for a community centre and concert hall in Trinidad, a Civil Service Sports Club, the Port-of-Spain Fire Brigade, the Electricity Commission, several large companies as well as Government institutions in Trinidad which have been attracted by the decorative and structural boards which British Guiana produces through the Forest Department. The workmanship is of such a high quality and the beauty of the wood after seasoning so attractive that we have been able to get the Trinidad market to absorb a great quantity of our woods.

Hon. Members will observe on the Estimate an item of \$1,500 for "Promotion of Exports." We are hoping to

cast our eyes farther afield. I do not see why we should confine our exports to Trinidad. It is hoped that this year the Department will be able to make shipments to other Caribbean islands, thereby enhancing and assisting the development of the forest industry and the economy of British Guiana.

**The Financial Secretary (Mr. Essex):** There is one thing I would like to add, and that is the aspect of competition which has worried me from time to time. I think it is a good thing that it has been brought up, and I am quite sure that Government will be very careful to see that there is no direct competition with private enterprise in a field in which private enterprise does very well. But on this question of private enterprise there is a strange misconception with some people that the Timber Seasoning Plant does saw-milling; it does not. It is in a sense in co-operation with private enterprise in that it takes large quantities of sawn timber from something like 60 small saw-millers. The Government plant deals with marginal timbers and it is hoped that it will do much more in the production of seasoned timber for the improvement of the country's economy.

**Mr. Burnham:** I am grateful to both the Minister and the Financial Secretary for their explanations, especially assuming the accuracy of the Financial Secretary's statement that about 60 small saw-millers do benefit from the production of the Government's plant. But even though I am fully appreciative of the amount of wood we have been selling to Trinidad, which, incidentally, is very good argument in favour of Federation, I would like to know whether the trade with Trinidad has anything to do with the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant. I have a shrewd suspicion that the Minister has taken this opportunity to make his "Second Reading speech," but I would like to see the tie-up between the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant and our contribution to the architectural beauty of the new hotel in Trinidad.

**Mr. Beharry:** When I said that, I was not referring to the timber industry as a whole, but to the Timber Seasoning Plant run by Government, which supplied lumber and finished board. The shipments to the various organizations and institutions in Trinidad were made direct from the Timber Seasoning Plant and not by private enterprise which has been sending greenheart to Trinidad and other parts of the world.

**Mr. Burnham:** I am very glad to hear that it was the direct result of having this plant that we have been able to get this large amount of business for the erection of various institutions and buildings in Trinidad, but I wish to ask the Minister one question before I withdraw my motion, and to say that I am perfectly satisfied that this expenditure is deserving. What I would like to know is why hasn't the Timber Seasoning Plant done anything about having mora seasoned for the purpose of railway sleepers? I have been told by many people in the field, that although we read periodically in the newspapers about Dutchmen and Pakistanis being interested in mora sleepers, we cannot supply them because our seasoning is such that by the time the sleepers arrive at their destination, in the majority of cases they have warped and are therefore not up to the standard of quality demanded by the purchasers.

From what I have been reading in the newspapers, and from my own knowledge and inquiries abroad, it seems to me that there is potentially a very good market for sleepers. Hasn't Government thought it necessary to do something? I, a layman, think that a seasoning plant is a place where we should experiment with the seasoning of mora, and I think it is time Government does something to see whether we can produce the quality of timber required for the sleeper trade which is on our doorstep, but which, in spite of newspaper headlines, we have not been able to take advantage of.

**Mr. Beharry:** The hon. Member rightly says that he is not quite certain

about the seasoning of mora. Really the problem is not the seasoning of mora but one of production. We did have an order through the Timber Seasoning Plant for half a million sleepers, and every effort was made to see if we could supply them. The Ministry called a meeting of representatives of the timber industry and the loggers of the country to consider the ability of the country to supply those sleepers, but the price offered was unremunerative. The Timber Seasoning Plant does not produce lumber. The Forest Department does not go in for logging; it simply seasons boards produced by small millers. Logging is the prerogative of private enterprise, and the production of mora sleepers is really an activity of private industry. Every encouragement was given to private enterprise when that order was received from abroad. It was really the Timber Seasoning Plant that got that order, because of its activities, and we made every effort to get private industry to supply the order, but the price offered was not attractive and the industry was unable to take up the order.

**Mr. Burnham:** I ask leave to withdraw my Amendment.

**The Chairman:** I shall put the Head.

**Mr. Tello:** I move the reduction by one dollar —

**The Chairman:** I wish Members will not try to lead me on a string. I wait and after a long time has elapsed I proceed to put the Question, then somebody gets up. It is like a small boy trying to catch at something.

**Mr. Tello:** Actually, Your Honour was not looking across this way, and I did not catch your eye.

**The Chairman:** What item do you wish to deal with?

**Mr. Tello:** Item 16—Experimental Woodworking Shop — Construction of, \$5,000. We on this side of the Table are doubtful of the wisdom of this expenditure. The Minister has explained that the

Central Timber Manufacturing Plant is only an interim arrangement, and that later it will be turned over to private enterprise. The position is quite different now. We have quite capable factories operating and it is felt that it would be better if Government would co-operate with private enterprise instead of carrying on this experiment independently and finding some difficulty in selling the results of its experiments to private enterprise later on. This matter was discussed in another place and we feel that, having expressed his intention today to assist private enterprise, the hon. Minister might agree with us that it would be better to collaborate with private enterprise.

**Mr. Beharry:** I tried to explain to hon. Members that there has been a growing consciousness, even abroad, of the quality and worth of British Guiana's woods, and it is through this Experimental Woodworking Shop that we have been able to polish and bring out the true beauty of our woods.

What is required under this vote is \$5,000 for the construction of a shop to hold the machines used in making experiments. The Department is experimenting with the machines with a view to testing the various types to see which is better. We have a lot of machinery including band-saws and so on, but we need a building for them. As soon as this building is made available the Department will be in a position to make further experiments.

The Department has shown how various woods could be utilized attractively as well as structurally in the construction of buildings. It is no use having these machines without having proper facilities for housing them. I hope hon. Members will agree that it is necessary to have a shed to protect these machines from the weather. That is why I have been asking for the small sum of \$5,000.

**Mr. Tello:** While I appreciate the hon. Minister's explanation, I am of the

opinion that \$5,000 is a rather enormous sum to spend on the construction of a shop. I wonder whether he would be good enough to explain further what he means by a shop?

**Mr. Beharry:** It would cost more than \$5,000 to build a first-class shop, but we are endeavouring to build something which will take care of the basic needs of the Forestry Department. That is the reason why only the small sum of \$5,000 has been asked for. I can assure the hon. Member that this is not an extraordinary sum for the building we have in mind.

**Mr. Burnham:** It seems to me that the hon. Minister has been caught in a dilemma. If the hon. Minister says that \$5,000 is not enough to give the Department a first-class shop, he will have to agree that this Government has been dealing in a miserly manner in so far as the project and the Department are concerned. The hon. Minister tells us of our forestry resources and he points out how rich those resources are. If what he says is true, then Government should spend more money on this project. Why spend this miserly sum of \$5,000 on such a rich project?

I congratulate the hon. Minister for his honesty. I think it is most unsatisfactory to spend only \$5,000 on constructing a shop to house so many thousands of dollars worth of machinery, in the light of what the hon. Minister in his flowery language has told us. I am not in a position to deny the Minister's prophecy, diagnosis or prognosis.

**Mr. Beharry:** I thank the hon. Member for his generosity in suggesting that I should spend much more money on this project. If this amount proves inadequate I will definitely return to this Council for an increase in the form of Supplementary Estimates, but until such time Government will endeavour to economize wherever possible without denying the country of the full use of any particular resource. Our resources are limited in this country and we will try

[MR. BEHARRY]

to make the sum of \$5,000 do as much as possible.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**The Chairman:** The question is that Head 19 — Forest — be carried out at \$598,357.

Agreed to.

## INTERIOR

### COMMISSIONER OF THE INTERIOR

**Mr. Campbell:** I beg to move the reduction by \$1 of sub-head 1, item (1) — "Commissioner of the Interior" — \$8,640. In view of the previous Government's policy, I would like to know what is the policy of the present Government regarding Amerindian affairs. The previous Government had expressed the view that sooner or later Amerindians would take their rightful places in the community of British Guiana as respectable and responsible citizens.

I wonder whether the hon. the Chief Secretary, under whose portfolio Amerindian affairs fall, is satisfied, for instance, that the Training Centres in the rural areas are really training the Amerindians to fit themselves to take an active part in the community? In 1957 when this scheme was started there was a lot of difficulty in getting teachers to train students. I think the Christian Social Council and the Government had some difficulty in starting this project.

Complaints have been made to me that the teachers who have been sent there to train the students do not get the respect or the confidence of the students. They say "What does he know; he hardly knows more than I do!" Somebody once said that the Amerindians should be taught to sharpen tools. The Amerindian certainly knows how to sharpen

tools in South America. If the training is going to stop at sharpening tools, it is not going far enough. I do not know exactly what is the state of affairs obtaining at the moment, for I have not been to the hinterland for a very long time. I wish to go back there and remain for the balance of my life, but I have to remain in town for some time to help my people.

I have heard so much talk about independence for British Guiana. This country will need trained personnel and trained people for the various activities in the community such as engineering, carpentry and so on. It is quite true that the people in Georgetown hate to go to the hinterland to work. That strengthens my argument that the boys in the rural areas should be trained in carpentry, engineering and other related vocations, and the girls should be taught domestic science and so on.

I think it would be a very good thing if an impartial Committee were set up to go into Amerindian affairs in order to find out what would be a good type of training for our Amerindian boys and girls, and whether the Training Centres there are doing good work. As far as I can see the training is not at all impressive at the moment.

**The Chairman:** You are dealing with Education again, but we have already passed that Head.

**Mr. Campbell:** The training of the people in the rural areas comes under the Department of Interior. Are you saying that I should have raised the matter under Education?

**The Chairman:** Anyway you have made your point.

**Mr. Campbell:** Yes, Sir, I suppose I will take up the question again under the Development Budget. There are many items there that I think are more relevant to the point. Until then, Sir, I thank you.

**The Chief Secretary** (Mr. Porcher,



acting): The hon. Member, Mr. Campbell, is quite right: Training Centres do come under the Development Programme, and that is really the proper Head to discuss it under.

I would like to say that the policy for Amerindian affairs remains unaltered, and I am satisfied that we are working slowly but surely on the right path. I have only returned from the Interior last week. I have been to the southern villages in the Rupununi where we are setting up village councils shortly. I found quite a lively interest among the people there, and I think the Local Government system there is starting on the right path. I think we are making slow, but steady progress, and I believe the hon. Member will be the first to agree with me that it would be a mistake to try to go too fast.

**Mr. Campbell:** I beg to withdraw the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Head passed at \$206,127.

## LABOUR

### INSPECTORS OF LABOUR

**Mr. Tello:** I beg to move that item (3) of sub-head 1—"Inspectors of Labour"—be reduced. We did not endorse this recommendation made that there should be an increase in the number of Inspectors of Labour, without making provision for a Senior Inspector of Labour.

There is the need for continuity in this Department. It is a specialized Department, but in spite of that, we have seen that for the purposes of promotion many Inspectors of Labour—who have qualified for promotion and who have been trained to fill posts in the Department—often find it necessary to accept appointments and transfers to other Departments, thereby sacrificing all the time, and energy which they put into their training.

We in the trade union field realize the great importance of the improvement of industrial relations and so we know the value of an Assistant Inspector of Labour being trained; and we wish to co-operate with his Department in initiating him into the responsibilities that are new to him. Later he finds his feet and he is of tremendous help to the Department and to the industrial life of the country as a whole.

After all the time and energy expended in training it is unfair to the industrial community not to provide the Assistant Inspector of Labour or Inspector of Labour with steps for promotion. In other Departments there are provisions for senior offices to which persons can be promoted. Out of all the Departments, the Labour Department has been set aside for this special omission, and we feel it is having a pretty bad effect in the industrial community and the Labour Department.

In another case we appealed to the Member responsible for the Establishment Department, but in this case the Minister is sufficiently informed to tell us whether this matter was examined by her and why she thought there was no need to accept the recommendation which was actually made. If one looks at the estimates for the Forest Department, one would see that there is provision for a Senior Forest Inspector and four Forest Inspectors. In this Department there are 16 Inspectors of Labour and Assistant Inspectors of Labour and no Senior Inspector of Labour, and yet it is put forward as an argument that the number is too small for a Senior Inspector of Labour.

While the two comparisons are not on all fours in the matter of status, we feel that it is not fair that an Inspector of Labour should wait until his hairs grow grey waiting for the resignation of the Commissioner of Labour or the Deputy Commissioner of Labour to get promotion, or to have to leave the Department to which he has dedicated himself, in order to get promotion.

[Mr. TELLO]

Probably the labour policy on the whole may be a good one, but we are saying that this is short-sightedness, and it not only deprives an Inspector of Labour of promotion but keeps his mind away from his job, because he knows that unless the Commissioner of Labour resigns or gets a windfall outside — and this applies to the Deputy Commissioner as well — he is nowhere. I am pleading with the hon. the Chief Secretary and I am asking the hon. Minister not to trifle with industrial harmony if she can avoid it. I am asking the Chief Secretary not to be unfair, and make it almost incumbent upon them to have their eyes on jobs outside of this Department because the door for promotion is partially closed.

**The Minister of Labour, Health and Housing** (Mrs. Jagan): The hon. Nominated Member is raising the same point he raised in the Finance Committee: his dissatisfaction with the fact that Government has not seen fit to increase the hierarchy of the Labour Department. Examining the position, one sees that there will be an increase in the Staff of the Department — from five to six Inspectors of Labour and from nine to ten Assistant Inspectors of Labour. If you add to those all the others on the Fixed Establishment — the Statistical Officer, the Chief Clerk, and so on — it gives you a total of 32 civil servants on the Fixed Establishment in the Labour Department, and above them are one Commissioner and one Deputy Commissioner of Labour.

I have examined this proposition very carefully, and I have rejected the addition of another administrative officer because I do not feel it is necessary. I feel that the Department of Labour is functioning at the moment and can continue to function for the next year with the addition of two others to its Staff. I am tremendously interested in preventing unnecessary expenditure of public funds, and myself and my colleagues have been working to keep down the cost of Government in British Guiana. Where it is necessary that certain Departments

should increase their Staffs because of expanding work, we will have to examine very carefully the expenditure on such Departments.

I am constantly amazed by the comments of the other Members of this Committee, on the other side, who protest against taxation and protest against every attempt the Members on this side of the Table make to keep down expenditure. I do not know what they want. I do not know if they think we are magicians pulling rabbits out of hats. If this country is to get ahead, we will have to economize.

If another senior officer is not appointed, this is not going to destroy the Department as it is. Hon. Members raised a hue and a cry that the Inspectors of Labour will not have an opportunity for promotion. Create another post, they say. At the moment we have a Commissioner and a Deputy Commissioner. There will always be some who cannot reach the highest posts in the Government; that is inevitable. We create posts when they are necessary in the interest of good government. Under "Medical" Members will see that some posts have been created for the purpose of expanding our health services. I have given this matter the fullest consideration, and as Minister I would like to assure the hon. Member that I have spent a great deal of time examining it. It was not a hasty decision of mine, but one which I have gone into very carefully.

**Mr. Jackson:** If the Minister of Labour had to cover the field as her counterpart has to do in other parts of the world she would have had much more sympathy with the proposal made by the hon. Member who spoke before me on this point. In other parts of the world, and particularly in the United Kingdom, where there sometimes occur labour disputes of great magnitude or otherwise, one finds that the Minister of Labour enters the field and tries to settle those disputes, and perhaps in his attempt to do so he earns respect and regard for other people in his Ministry who are given certain responsibilities to carry.

If the present Minister of Labour in this country had to approach the same problem of settling labour disputes as they arise I am sure she would realize what a task it is. It is because she is relieved of this onerous burden which members of the staff of the Labour Department have to carry, that she perhaps fails to see the justification for the plea which has been made by Mr. Tello.

Whenever there is a strike in this Colony the Commissioner of Labour does not, in the first instance, have to go and try to settle the dispute, nor does the Deputy Commissioner have to go, because they are administrative officers. It is the Inspectors of Labour who are called upon to perform those difficult tasks. They not only have to face hostile workers but run the risk of being hurt, because when workers reach a certain stage of agitation they hardly ever want to listen to anyone who suggests that they should go back to work. If the Minister herself had gone on one or two occasions—up to last November—when Post Office workers were on strike she would have seen that she would not have had the reception which she believes she would have from workers on strike, and I am sure the same situation would arise if she were to take on the responsibility of trying to settle labour disputes herself.

It is because of the difficulty of the task these officers perform that we have been advocating that this bottle-neck should be reduced somewhat. The Labour Department is a specialized department. In other branches of the Service officers can be transferred from one Department to another seeking promotion or promotion possibilities, but this is not possible in the Labour Department where officers have to qualify by experience in the task of settling disputes, which is only one phase of their duties in the Department.

The Colony lost one officer of the Department who secured an appointment

in another territory, and it would be a very disappointing state of affairs if officers who have spent many years building up the Labour Department to what it is, should have to seek promotion in their line of work outside the Colony.

It is true that the Government is pursuing an economy budget. No one would suggest that economy is not the best thing, but economy at the expense of justice is not a good policy. It is not fair to those officers who have done excellent work as Inspectors of Labour, that they should be denied opportunities for advancement. The suggestion is that an opportunity for promotion should be provided by the creation of the post of one Senior Inspector of Labour, an avenue for promotion which is provided in almost every Department.

I think it is unfortunate that the Chief Secretary is not present throughout the meetings of Finance Committee so that he could hear the points put forward by Members with regard to matters dealing with staffing, with which Ministers are really not concerned. We know that the Minister of Labour took the very definite line in Finance Committee that she did not agree with the request for the provision of an opportunity for advancement in the Labour Department. To my mind it savoured of going out of her depth, because Establishment matters come within the portfolio of the Chief Secretary who should say whether he agreed with the suggestion or was prepared to give it further consideration.

**Mr. Hubbard :** To a point of order! The hon. Member is speaking on a Motion to reduce the vote, but his remarks have been directed to show why the vote should be increased.

**The Chairman :** Please proceed.

**Mr. Jackson :** Thank you, Sir. In Finance Committee the Chairman gave an assurance that he would consult the Chief Secretary, and I wish that Ministers of the Government would confine them-

[MR. JACKSON]

selves to matters within their sphere, so that Members would know exactly where they stand with respect to matters which they raise.

If the Labour Department is a closed Department it is only reasonable and fair that in addition to the Commissioner of Labour and the Deputy Commissioner of Labour there should be a Senior Inspector of Labour. If that were done the numbers could remain at 5 Inspectors of Labour and 9 Assistant Inspectors of Labour, as there were in 1958, and there would be no need to appoint an additional Inspector of Labour and an additional Assistant Inspector of Labour as proposed.

**Mr. Davis :** I rise in support of what has been said on this side of the Table. I was surprised to hear the Minister speak about the hard work of the Labour Department, and I was not impressed by her argument. I cannot understand why consideration should not be given to provision for a Senior Inspector of Labour when such a pattern is established in many other Departments.

It is true that we are all anxious to keep the Budget down to as low a level as possible, but at the same time justice must not only be done but must appear to have been done. If there is frustration and we lose another of our experienced and efficient officers, particularly in a Department such as the Labour Department, it may have very serious repercussions.

The arguments were put forward in another form and we were not convinced by them. I am not at all convinced by the arguments put forward by the hon. Minister of Labour. I agree with the hon. Member for Georgetown North when he says that it is probably a matter for the Establishment Officer, and I think the hon. the Chief Secretary should give further consideration to this aspect of the matter rather than the Labour Department.

**Mrs. Jagan :** I am sorry I have been unable to convince the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis. Perhaps he is not as

interested as I am in the economy of this country. What I find to be a pity is that the last two speakers made certain remarks on the motion for the reduction of this post and then asked the hon. the Chief Secretary to give further consideration to the matter. In a previous debate the same hon. Members expressed the view that Ministers should be given a greater measure of responsibility, but in this instance where a Minister has something to do with the creation of a new post some hon. Members are totally dissatisfied with it and desire to put the responsibility in the hands of the Official Members of this Council.

It is known that Ministers do not pick and choose the personnel for posts but in the establishment of new posts it is fortunate that the Minister concerned has a say in the matter. As I have already mentioned in the question dealing with the Medical Department, the Minister had something to say in the creation of the new posts. I hope hon. Members will realize that Ministers have nothing to do with the picking and choosing of personnel to fill vacant posts.

In reply to the remarks made by the last speaker on the question of the hierarchy in the Labour Department, I can say that I have noted in my several months as a Minister that the tendency in Government Departments is to create larger and larger Departments. I am not referring to the Labour Department specifically, but I have observed that there is a tendency in Government Departments to extend the Departments beyond what they should be. There is a tendency to create little kingdoms and kingships within the Government. I very much fear that if we follow all of the motions and recommendations of Members on the other side of the Table we may end up with a larger expenditure and commitments than we had expected.

The Labour Department has been working quite well in the past, and I am sure it will continue to function well this year. We have been interested in increasing a number of field officers and not

necessarily senior officers as the hon. Member for Georgetown North thinks. We need more field officers. One of the shortcomings of the Department is that there are not sufficient visits paid to the remote areas in the North West and other places. We have another field officer to do that kind of work but he is not a senior officer. You will observe that provision has been made for one additional post of Inspector of Labour and one additional post of Assistant Inspector of Labour. There are a number of junior officers, and I am quite satisfied that two senior officers are sufficient to run a Department of that size.

**Mr. Jackson:** I raised the question of the responsibility of the Minister in this field, but the reply which she has given me does not alter the situation. We were told that the Ministers desired greater responsibility and we want them to face up to their responsibilities. We know what system is in operation and we will have to refer to it until it comes to an end.

The Minister has pointed out that there is a tendency in the various Departments of Government to extend into little kingdoms, and the policy of the Majority Party is to reduce those kingdoms. Of course the kingdoms may be reduced in such a way that they will fall. I maintain that this Department is a specialized Department, and as such it should not be looked upon in the same light as other Departments. Since these officers cannot be shifted around like the officers in other Departments, I think it is unfair to deny them the opportunity of promotion within their own Department.

**Mr. Tello:** I would like to join with those who are not impressed with the reply given by the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing. I want to remind the hon. Minister that the small staff of thirty-two people have three phases to deal with: conciliation, factory inspection and enforcement of the Ordinance. I am sure she is aware of the wide area these fields cover. When

making such an official announcement, the Minister must realize that, in order for this small band of workers to cope with this tremendous amount of work, factory inspection, conciliation or enforcement of the Ordinance must suffer. There should be some officer saddled with the responsibility of looking after certain things. I do not think she feels that such responsibility should be placed on the shoulders of the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Labour.

It must be remembered that there is a Senior Inspector of Labour in the Department. That is his official designation and the Commissioner of Labour refers to him as such. Unfortunately, the previous Government did not recognize the position officially, but we thought that when this progressive Government took over — the people's Government — those officers would have been given their full rights. We are making this plea not only in the interest of justice, but in the interest of efficiency. The hon. Minister did not touch on that point, however. Possibly she does not agree with us that several officers are leaving the Labour Department because they see no opportunity for promotion.

It is true that several senior officers have left that Department and are working either in other Departments or outside of the colony. The Minister says that she cannot create posts simply to accommodate the promotion of officers. Nobody is asking her to do that, but if an officer enters the Department in a junior post and rises to a post where he is officially recognized as Senior Inspector it shows that he is interested in his job.

I feel that, in the interest of industrial peace, efficiency and justice this Government should give further consideration to this matter. I would like the Minister to impress upon the Establishment Department that there is strength in our argument and we are seeking justice. I observe that the hon. Minister in rejecting this matter said that the recommendation was made by those who are qualified to make it — those who

[MR. TELLO]

have knowledge in running a Department. We are merely saying that some of the points made have not been given sufficient consideration. I hope that a supplementary estimate will be introduced later to make provision for this Senior Inspector of Labour. I now beg to withdraw the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**Mr. Tello :** Before Your Honour puts the Head, I would like to speak on another matter of reduction. In order that I would not clash with you—

**The Chairman :** That will never happen.

**Mr. Tello :** I am glad about that, Sir.

#### TRANSPORT AND TRAVELLING

**Mr. Tello :** I refer to sub-head 2—“Transport and Travelling”—\$13,500. I want to move the reduction of this item by \$1 in order to make a few comments. The reduction of this item seems to be part of a pattern in which the Labour Department cannot fit in. While it is true that the reduction of transport and travelling expenses in other Departments might not cause any inconvenience the same thing cannot be said of the Labour Department. We have just been told by the hon. Minister that what we need is more field officers. Can you give them less money to travel around now?

**The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran):** I think there is an increase in the Estimates.

**The Chairman :** Is that so?

**Mr. Ram Karran :** I am sorry, Sir.

**The Financial Secretary (Mr. Essex):** The hon. Member will find the amount set out in the report of Finance Committee. Is the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, trying to increase the vote at this stage?

**Mr. Ram Karran :** I apologize, Sir, I was looking at the wrong page.

**The Financial Secretary:** The whole tenor of his argument is to get the vote increased, though his motion is for a reduction.

**Mr. Tello :** It is merely a matter of formality. The point of order is well taken. We would like to make certain comments and that is the only way in which we can make certain comments on these matters. I think I am working in keeping with the Standing Orders.

We know that we have not got the right, but we having expressed our opinions, one would think that those who have the right to make an increase would reconsider the matter, and possibly do it. That has been the practice all over the world, including the House of Commons, and if we are wrong in doing so we are wrong with the right people.

**The Chairman :** Do you withdraw the Motion?

**Mr. Tello :** I would like this matter to be taken seriously.

**The Financial Secretary:** We discussed this matter at inordinate length in Finance Committee, and I cannot see the need or the object for this discussion now if the only reason in the first place was to bring it to the attention of the Government.

**Mr. Kendall:** It is true that we discussed all these Heads in Finance Committee, but certain recommendations were made on this side of the Table and the Bill was read the Second time without any comment from the Government as to its intentions.

**The Chairman:** There is nothing which says that discussions in Finance Committee may not reach here. If you read the debates of the House of Commons you will see that there a tremendous amount of latitude is given when the Budget is being discussed, and the books have spoken about it. That is why I give indulgence here in the Budget debate

which I might not give in other matters. It has been effective for a number of years in the House of Commons. I do hope, however, that Members will not spin out their remarks. I do not see the reason why three or four members should speak at length on one question once it is well laid. I think that is where the trouble lies.

**Mrs. Jagan:** It is quite obvious what is happening to the hon. Member. He is protesting the reduction of allowances under this Head and he has further noted that it is my hope that the additional Labour Inspector will be travelling further. He cannot reconcile the two points.

I would like to remind the hon. Member that not everybody in this world spends money or travels wisely. Some people still hop into a car just to make a few miles. During the war there was a policy of rationing the supply of gasoline to users of cars. There were certain reasons for this, and one of them was that people should make extra efforts to restrict or limit the use of these items, but this did not prevent or prohibit persons from travelling much.

We are trying to have an economy Budget. We are going through a rather difficult period. We have made efforts to reduce expenditure which we feel can stand reduction without disturbing the functions of the Departments and their officers. We feel this is for the good of the whole country. It will not prevent the Labour Department or its officers from functioning as they should. We feel that by doing this it will make the officers conscious that they are spending Government money and that they must spend it with caution. We are encouraging officers to be more patriotic to their Government and to watch every cent they spend.

I have every confidence that the officers of the Labour Department will during 1959 perform their duties very well. They will travel as much as is necessary and yet at the same time keep their eyes

on the travelling expenses and know how to prevent unnecessary trips and adopt other methods of saving money.

For example, I have heard from conversations of officers what has been done. Three officers of the Government on three different missions to New Amsterdam, and who know each other, rather than going in three separate vehicles to New Amsterdam and back would travel in one car. These are economies that can prevent excessive expenditure. In the Medical Department, for example, one officer might be going to a district and another officer also going there for another purpose. The same vehicle can be used for these officers going in the same direction. These are the things we are trying to encourage, and I do not know why Members are trying to prevent very sincere efforts on the part of Government to keep down costs.

**Mr. Jackson:** No one is trying to make efforts to prevent the policy to keep down costs from succeeding, but as the hon. Member, Mr. Tello, said, these officers have to do a lot of travelling; and he asked, if you increase the number of field officers and you want them to do work, how can you, on the other hand, reduce the travelling vote?

What the Minister said is no answer, because every officer of the Government who travels buys a car: he borrows money from the Government with interest charges, repays until the amount is cleared off, and therefore it is his car. If the Minister wants these officers to travel together Government must not suggest that if they do not do that they are not being patriotic to the Government. Government must buy its own fleet of cars. Then the Minister will see where the wisdom lies. Then they will see that it is better for officers to buy and run their own cars. If I buy my own car and am paying interest on the purchase money, who dares to tell me how I must use it? It is my car.

**The Chairman:** I do not think anything like that was said.

**Mr. Jackson:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister said——

**The Chairman:** If a vehicle, I take it, is going to the same place and there are three other persons going in the same direction, it may be well that the officers use the same vehicle. I never understood her to say that Government compels anyone to go into another person's vehicle. I do not think she said that at all.

**Mr. Jackson:** Mr. Chairman——

**The Chairman:** The whole point about it is this: when we come here and raise a matter like this, I think we should stick to the point and not run off. I think we have had a lot of that already.

**Mr. Jackson:** Mr. Chairman, with every respect to you, Sir; the Minister said that where three officers are travelling to the same area they should not go in three different cars, but as we know it, Government has not got any motor cars.

**Mr. Ram Karran:** May I ask the hon. Member if the Government has contract cars and Government vehicles?

**Mr. Jackson:** Yes. I know Government has contract cars. Therefore let the Government say that when the officer is travelling he must go by contract car.

**The Chairman:** Still it does not justify the statement you made just now, that an officer must use his car and others must be compelled to go with him. I do not think that the remarks of the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing can be construed in that way. It was a point of accuracy.

**Mr. Jackson:** In the light of our own knowledge at the moment with respect to travelling, we see a situation as it is, but even when we accept the premise that there was no ground to conclude that that was intended, the situation with respect to this Department is one that is worthy of consideration. While it might

be right and proper to reduce travelling votes in some Departments, it is unwise, because of the nature of its service, to reduce the vote in the Labour Department.

**The Chairman:** Hon. Members, the question is, that Head 21——

**Mr. Tello:** I was just getting up to withdraw my Motion, and to say that the explanation is accepted, but we are not satisfied. The hon. Minister referred to the point I made and wondered how we were reconciling the two things. She has given no answer. She said it was possible there could be a doubling up of the travelling, and that possibly there is unnecessary travelling. I do not agree.

**The Chairman:** I will put the question.

**Mr. Tello:** I have no right to move a Motion to increase the vote, and that is why I am rising. I beg to withdraw my motion.

## MISCELLANEOUS

### SANITATION, PUBLIC OFFICES

**Mr. Davis:** I move that subhead 5 — "Sanitation, Public Offices", \$900 — be reduced by \$1 in order to find out from the Minister of Labour whether it is true that one of the offices of the Department of Labour will be vacated for the purpose of the temporary accommodation of the Teachers' Training College?

**The Chairman:** How does that come under Miscellaneous?

**Mr. Davis:** I take it that "Miscellaneous" would cover it.

**The Chairman:** Surely it could have been brought up before under another Head.

**Mr. Davis:** I thought this would be the most appropriate Head. Would you please indicate a more appropriate Head?

**The Chairman:** What do you want to find out?



**Mr. Davis:** I have been informed that one of the offices of the Labour Department will vacate the present site which will be used to accommodate the Teachers' Training College.

I also have information that a branch of the Minor Industries Division has purchased, for a considerable sum of money, a site in the same residential area which is quite unsuitable. I wonder if the Minister would confirm or deny the information I have received.

**Mrs. Jagan:** The hon. Member is inquiring about the transfer, I presume, of the Labour Department to another site. It is true that the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labour have been working out an exchange of premises whereby the Department of Labour should move over to the Main Street site of the Teachers' Training College, and the College move to the premises of the Labour Department. The idea of this change is in the interest of the Teachers' Training College programme. It is felt that the building in which the Labour Department is now housed is sufficiently large and more appropriate for classrooms and for the housing of students. I believe it was felt that the Main Street site would be suitable for the Labour Department for one important reason — that the location is more central.

The hon. Member raised another point about the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund. I presume that is what he was referring to. At the moment the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund office is housed at the bottom flat of the Labour Department building. I understand that the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund Committee has purchased a property in Kingston where it is intended to build a new office. I have been quite interested in this project because I have been following with great interest the activities of the Committee and, quite frankly, I am not satisfied that there should be such a large expenditure of money from the Fund for the purchase of a very expensive property to build what I gather will be a very

elaborate and very costly building to house that office.

**Mr. Davis:** I thank the hon. Minister for her comments and I now beg to withdraw my Amendment.

**The Chairman:** I shall now put the question, that Head 21 — Labour — be carried out at \$ 172,811.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### LANDS AND MINES

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 22 — Lands and Mines — be carried out at \$ 381,903.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### LAND DEVELOPMENT

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 23 — Land Development—be carried out at \$ 705,547.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### LAW OFFICERS

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 24—Law Officers—be carried out at \$ 72,908.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 25—Local Government—be carried out at \$ 398,754.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT — SOCIAL WELFARE

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 25A—Local Government—Social Welfare — be carried out at \$ 104,546

Agreed to.

Head passed.

## MAGISTRATES

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move an Amendment for the reduction of sub-head (1), "Magistrates," \$88,093, by \$1. I feel, and it is also the view of members of my profession, that the administration of justice at the Magisterial level is unsatisfactory. In the first place may I note that there is the unsatisfactory system of having individuals acting as Magistrates for long periods. I certainly do not think it is conducive to the equilibrium of the individuals, who, like Tantalus, are left in the air, not knowing whether they are going to be appointed or not.

That is important from this point of view. I am inclined to agree with the American jurist, that the state of a man's mind can well have an effect upon his administration of justice, and other considerations, apart from learning in the law, may be very important. I feel it is highly unsatisfactory. No doubt we shall hear from the Government that there are other Departments in which this is done, but I do not think that because other Departments have this bad system it should obtain in the Magisterial Department, above all.

About a year ago I made a suggestion which Government undertook to consider, but Government has undertaken to consider so many things since the consideration of the last Budget, and the majority of the things it has undertaken to consider were too complicated for them to consider, so that they have not been considered at all. The suggestion which I made in Finance Committee last year is that there should be a regular roster of Magistrates, and instead of having a number of acting Magistrates, Government should appoint more Magistrates than it needs at any given time, so as to permit Magistrates to go on leave.

I understand that there are some parts of the Commonwealth and the world where Judges and Magistrates' Departments are on the face of it over-staffed, but that is because it permits

those individuals to take their leave without disruption of the service, and prevents having a number of individuals acting for a long time. I also question the propriety of the appointment of any individual to act under this very poor system which has obtained far too long in this country. If a person is good enough to act as a Magistrate, he should be appointed.

The accommodation provided at the Courts in Georgetown and places like Vreed-en-Hoop is most undesirable. There are some Courts in the country districts which are cheek by jowl with pounds. Happily that is not the case in Georgetown, but it is most heart-rending sometimes to see how members of the public are inconvenienced at these Courts, crowded along the stairway. Their names are called and cases in which they are plaintiffs or complainants are sometimes struck out before they are able to wend their way through the mass of people who block the stairway. I understand that some time ago it was within the competence of Government, by reason of an offer to purchase a plot of land not far from this area, to undertake the erection of another Court or Courts, but I understand that Government cavalierly turned down the offer, and the cost has now gone up about four or five times.

I should hate to believe that the attitude of this Government is that any type of accommodation or provision is good enough for the people who have to administer justice in the Magistrate's court. The accommodation for the Magistrate and his staff very frequently leaves a lot to be desired, and sometimes they experience what sardines experience in tins. This is a matter we have been talking about for over a year and nothing has been done about it.

I know that the Members of this Government are trying to run the Government economically, but the time has come when they must realize that they cannot economize on justice. The Magistrates have to dispense justice and they should be permitted to work in congenial

surroundings. I think it is time that Government take some pride in the administration of justice in the Magistrates' Courts.

**The Attorney-General:** There is something in what the hon. Member has said as there usually is, but, of course, he has not taken everything into consideration. He knows as well as I do that the Government would be only too pleased to be able to build modern courts with all the latest facilities—possibly air conditioned courts — but Government is doing all it can at the moment. It is a matter of priority and the greatest need. If Government spent more money on the courts that would be wrong, because probably a hospital or more schools should be built first.

I feel sure that Government is doing all it can to improve the courts. I would remind my hon. and learned Friend of the new Magistrate's Court at New Amsterdam. Yesterday I paid a visit to that Court, and I think it is a most up-to-date building. It was designed by the Public Works Department and constructed within a reasonable time. The Chief Clerk in the office suggested to me that he would be able to do more work in such a commodious office. I have no doubt that the New Amsterdam Court will be an example which will be followed elsewhere.

The Government admits that the accommodation in Magistrates' Courts leaves much to be desired, but there are many other things in this country at this time which have to be done. It is a matter of selecting what things should be done first in order to give the greatest good to the greatest number of people.

So far as the appointment of Magistrates is concerned, I think everyone will admit that long acting periods are undesirable. There are two ways in which judicial appointments can be made. One is by having a fairly large establishment which will cater for officers on leave, and such people should be appointed substantively. The other is to have a minimum establishment, and, when vacancies

occur by way of a Magistrate going on leave, a barrister or a solicitor could be appointed to act for him. The latter way is the cheaper way of doing it, and during the short period of acting the Government has an opportunity of seeing whether the acting Magistrate has merited the confidence which is reposed in him.

On the other hand, if the acting Magistrate does not meet the demands of his office, it is easier for Government to dispose of his services than if he had been appointed substantively. Government would be in a position to deal with his appointment in a way which would not work hardship on the public. The matter is receiving the attention of the Government at the moment. The hon. Member has raised the question and it is good for him to do so. However, he has not done anything original. I hope, therefore, that what I have said will allay his anxieties.

**Mr. Burnham:** I laid no claim to originality because, even *vis-à-vis* myself it is not original in 1959 since I raised it in 1958. Even then it was not original because I have heard it discussed by others who have made the same observations I have made. I am bothered by some of the remarks made by the hon. Attorney-General when he speaks of having a minimum establishment and acting appointments. I am bothered because the actual phrase he used was "cheaper way". I was arguing against the cheaper way of administering justice. I wonder whether, in figures, which system turns out to be cheaper, because when a person is appointed to act as a magistrate he gets an allowance for the practice he gives up. When he acts for a long period he keeps on drawing that allowance.

**The Attorney-General:** How long?

**Mr. Burnham:** It is for you to tell us that. I wonder whether it works out cheaper? Another disconcerting observation by the learned Attorney-General is that suitability is ascertained after the individuals have had some time at acting.

**The Attorney-General :** Sir, on a point of order. I did not say that suitability is ascertained. I said that, as a result of the acting appointment, Government could ascertain whether the particular individual would make a good magistrate.

**Mr. Burnham :** That is a distinction without a difference, and I accept the explanation. I cannot see that those who have to judge the ability or suitability are that opaque that it takes them sometimes two or three years to discover whether or not a person measures up to the standards required.

**The Chairman :** I thought you were talking about the period of acting.

**Mr. Burnham :** I am not sure how long they have to draw the allowances, but if I am not mistaken they continue to draw it for as long as three years. Some magistrates do not know when their acting appointments will come to an end. I do not credit those who judge the suitability or unsuitability of magistrates with much ability if it takes them years to judge whether a person is suitable.

I did not make the observation before because it would seem as though I wanted to burden the Estimates. One of the difficulties with respect to the appointment of magistrates, and one of the reasons why there are some uncertainties as to whether a particular candidate is likely to turn out suitable or otherwise is the fact that the salaries are not sufficiently attractive for these posts. If Government found it possible to offer attractive salaries qualified professional men would be prepared to make the necessary sacrifice and serve as magistrates. Government must face the fact that good lawyers are at a premium. There are several good lawyers in British Guiana, and if you want good lawyers as magistrates you will have to pay them sufficiently attractive salaries. You need not give them salaries equal to what a good lawyer can make in private practice, but you should give them sufficiently attractive salaries in order that they would be

able to keep to a certain standard of living to which they are accustomed, and also to compensate by way of gratuity for the other benefits they may have lost by joining the Service.

The United Kingdom was faced with the same trouble about a year ago. If this Government wants good lawyers as magistrates it will be necessary to pay attractive salaries to attract good lawyers. If Government continues to offer such low salaries to magistrates it will have to be satisfied with what it gets. I now beg to withdraw my Motion.

**The Chairman :** How many more do you have?

**Mr. Burnham :** I have at least four.

**The Chairman :** Proceed please.

#### COLLECTING OFFICERS

**Mr. Burnham :** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (8)—“25 Collecting Officers” — \$13,379, by \$1. The remarks I have made with respect to the accommodation for Magistrates and Magistrates' staff have even more relevancy and are more strictly applicable with respect to Collecting Officers. I have observed the difficulty of getting into the Collecting Officers' office—

**Mr. Rai :** To draw money?

**Mr. Burnham :** I do not have to pay any order through the court. You can see so many officers huddled in that office in connection with duties which bring them into contact with a large section of the population. Since 1948 wives have been carrying their husbands there so very often that I would not attempt to give the very high percentage of husbands who pay the maintenance for their wives through the Collecting Officers.

Then you have the bastardy collections. On many mornings one can see a long line of women right through the Magistrate's Court waiting to receive money, and then another time one can

see a number of men going there to pay their dues. One can also see about 11 to 13 officers huddled together in a room with less area than that taken up by the Table that stands in the well of this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, the thing is alarming! I cannot for the life of me see that this Government is so pauperized that it cannot make some temporary arrangement for relief of the persons using this area. It is inhuman! It is wrong! It is like conditions in the Belgian mines of which I read today in "Time", conditions of which the Earl of Shaftesbury spoke in the 1830s as existing in industry. There is no excuse. It is not good for the officers' health or for the health of the public. It is a disgrace. I think something should be done expeditiously, and when I say so, I am not thinking in terms of weeks, but days.

**The Attorney-General:** I am quite sure that the points the hon. Member has made will be noted. I am making a note myself which will be referred for consideration in the proper quarter. I can share his astonishment at some of the buildings in which justice is administered. About a year ago I was at the sub Registry Office in New Amsterdam, and I was shocked to find there was not enough room in the office for all the members of the staff to sit down at any one time. They can sit down if one or more officers are not in. It was an incredible state of affairs, but nevertheless the point was taken and there is now an extension of the office to alleviate the situation. I have no doubt it took much longer than two weeks. It is not possible to do all these things within a short time, but I will note the point for consideration.

**The Chairman:** I shall put the Head. The question is, that Head 26, Magistrates, be carried out at the figure of \$324,066.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

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

**Dr. Jagan:** I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Council resumed.

#### TEA INTERVAL

*At this stage Council adjourned for tea.*

#### RESUMPTION

*At 5.05 p.m. Council resumed, resolved itself into Committee, and continued its consideration of the Appropriation Bill, 1959.*

#### MEDICAL

##### DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL SERVICES

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to move the reduction of subhead (1), — "Director of Medical Services", \$10,080 — by \$1 for the purpose of getting some information with respect to a certain subject.

**Mr. Rai:** To a point of Order! I do not think a reduction can be made with respect to that subhead because the amount is provided by Ordinance.

**Mr. Jackson:** I am grateful to the hon. Member for having drawn my attention to that. I therefore move a reduction of item (2) — "Deputy Director of Medical Services", \$9,600 — by \$1. I understand that very shortly there will arrive in this Colony a team of experts to do some medical research, and one wonders whether our Medical Department is so geared as to be able to assist that team.

It is understood that the Barbados Government has appointed someone to prepare records and data of cases which have been dealt with by the Medical Department in that island. I have been

[Mr. JACKSON]

trying to find out whether in this Colony we have an up-to-date system of recording cases which have occurred and which have been treated by the medical staff at the Georgetown Hospital.

I am speaking subject to correction, but I gather that it would be a difficult thing to provide a proper record of the treatment of cases at our hospitals. I understand that the charts which are supposed to record the treatment of cases are not kept up-to-date. I do not know if the hon. Minister can give us an assurance that there is nothing to fear.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I cannot follow — to what team of experts is the hon. Member referring?

**Mr. Jackson:** I understand that a team of experts will be coming to do some research. I do not know whether they are coming from W.H.O. or —

**Mrs. Jagan:** What type of research?

**Mr. Jackson:** Research into the types of ailments people suffer from, how they are treated, and what are the results of the treatment.

**Mrs. Jagan:** The hon. Member, unfortunately, is much too vague for me to answer his question. From time to time during the last year — and it will continue this year — there have been experts coming. Experts in the medical field have come for a specific purpose. For example, we have just had two experts here in the field of typhoid disease, and they came here to examine and find out whether British Guiana would be a suitable area for research in that field. I have had a talk with them and they are of the opinion that British Guiana would be a very interesting site for them to do their research in typhoid.

In about a month we will be getting another expert in the field of venereal disease who will use British Guiana as the central point from which he will move to other areas in the Caribbean. We are also waiting for an expert in nursing ser-

vices to come here. She should have come with Dr. Rodriguez a few weeks ago, but there was some change in the plans. When she comes she will concentrate on the field of nursing services.

We have another expert coming to advise us in the field of inoculation against polio, so that when the hon. Member speaks of a team of experts I do not know what he means. We have had many experts and we are having others, but each expert or group of experts comes to work in a specific field. If the hon. Member would mention which specific field he feels that there will not be sufficient information or statistics, perhaps I could help him.

**Mr. Jackson:** I said I spoke subject to correction, but I gather that this team is coming in the very near future to carry out research in the many fields of medical science in the Colony, which will include an examination of the types of ailment from which people have been suffering, how they were treated, and the results of treatment given.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I think the hon. Member has not been properly advised. In the medical field, which is very broad, there are experts in specific aspects of medical research. We have still with us two gentlemen who are doing research in malaria in the remote areas. In all of the cases of experts who have come and are coming this year I have had talks with our administrative doctors, and they have never yet expressed to me that there would be difficulty in supplying any information which the various experts have required. I do not think the problem which the hon. Member has posed has arisen.

**Mr. Jackson:** I will accept what the Minister has said. I now beg to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

SENIOR PHYSICIAN, GEORGETOWN  
HOSPITAL

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move the reduction of subhead 1, item (6) — "1 Senior Physician, Georgetown Hospital", \$8,640 — by \$1. I see that provision is made here for one Senior Physician, Georgetown Hospital. As I understand it one is qualified for the post of Senior Physician by virtue of his holding a Membership of the Royal College of Physicians, or some other post-graduate qualification in the field of medicine. It seems to me that, in this country, we have more than one such person who may qualify for such posts.

Even assuming that we do not have enough persons qualified, I still cannot see why this Government would be satisfied with an establishment with one Senior Physician as against three Senior Surgeons. To my mind the Physicians are just as important as the Surgeons. I am not for one moment suggesting that Surgeons are unimportant. What is more if you leave your establishment of one Senior Physician there is little or no encouragement to ordinary Physicians to do post-graduate courses in order to keep themselves up-to-date with modern trends of medicine, etc. From that point of view, I cannot see why there is only one Senior Physician on the establishment.

**Mrs. Jagan:** The hon. Member compares the fact that there is one Senior Physician to three Senior Surgeons. While he admits that he is not saying that the country does not need three Senior Surgeons, he wonders how that compares with the quantity of the work done by the Senior Physician. The Surgeon has a greater amount of actual work and he spends more time with his patients than the Senior Physician.

There are really two different aspects of medicine. As a matter of fact the range of surgery is so very wide that the Surgeon can specialize in different fields. One of our Senior Surgeons has just returned from abroad and he is a specialist in bone surgery. I am of the opinion that both branches of medicine are

equally important. The activity of the Physician is a slow-moving type of work.

I have not been aware before this moment that there was a need, or an expressed desire that the establishment be increased by more than one Senior Physician. The Department concerned has never brought it to my attention, and I cannot recall hearing anything about it in this Council. This is the first time the point has been raised.

**Mr. Burnham:** I am inclined to offer my sympathy to the hon. Minister because she confesses that it is the first time the matter has been brought to her attention. In the circumstances, I would not press the matter further, so far as the Minister is concerned, if I get an undertaking from her to investigate what I have said and what I am about to say.

It may be true that the average surgeon has to spend very much more time with his patients, but it is also true that the physician has more patients than the surgeon. With respect to specialists, I am a little surprised that the Minister, who is responsible for Health, should think that specialists are more frequently found among surgeons than physicians. For instance, our Senior Physician is a pediatrician — that is his speciality in the field of medicine. There is just as wide a field of specialists in medicine as there is in surgery, and you will find specialists in both branches. I do not understand what the hon. Minister means when she says that the physician's job is slow-moving — I cannot follow her. Perhaps the Minister will be good enough to explain what she means. I am not saying that she means anything bad, but I do not understand her.

I have visited the Hospital quite frequently for one reason or another, and, though it has not been drawn to the Minister's attention that there is need for a stronger establishment of Physicians and Senior Physicians, I can say from my own observations that the Physicians in the

[MR. BURNHAM]

Hospital are worked like donkeys. What causes me a slight measure of surprise is that the Minister says it had not been drawn to her attention that more Physicians are necessary at the Hospital.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I was referring to the Senior Physician.

**Mr. Burnham:** If we are to accept what every literate Guianese accepts that there is a shortage of doctors, it would mean that there is need for an increase of Physicians in the Hospital. That need has been repeated over and over again. If you increase your Junior Physicians it seems to me *pari passu* that your Senior Physicians should also be increased.

As far as I am concerned, the major point I am making is that, since there are specialists in medicine as there are specialists in surgery, we need more medical specialists and every encouragement should be given by way of scholarships, and attractive salaries to suitably qualified persons in order to get the people we need. It may, of course, be argued by some persons with apparent justification that persons like doctors, who have sworn to the oath of Hippocrates should not be particularly interested in salaries.

There is another profession where the people concerned are supposed to have little or no necessity for money, but they do. I think we had better face the fact that we are living in a materialist world, and the demand for specialists outside of British Guiana is so high and the remuneration for services and terms of employment so attractive in places like West Africa, that unless we do something quickly the standard of our Medical Services, both Curative and Preventive, is likely to deteriorate. I am quite willing, if I get an undertaking from the hon. Minister to look into the matter, to withdraw my Motion.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I am prepared to examine the hon. Member's suggestion with the Director of Medical Services and

to promise to go into the matter. The hon. Member questioned my mentioning the fact that specialists in the field of surgery were very important and, perhaps, he misunderstood me to mean that specialists in the field of medical science were not as important. I did not mean that. All of us know that in the field of medicine the specialist physician, the product of the twentieth century, people depend on the various specialists particularly for a diagnosis of particular diseases.

A rich country can afford a number of specialists in all fields of medicine; it can afford specialists for diseases of the heart and various other diseases. Unfortunately, we are still a poor country, and I believe that such specialists as we can afford to acquire should be those who are capable of dealing with the greatest number of diseases in this country.

At the moment we have specialists for ear, nose, tuberculosis and eye diseases. We have not yet reached the stage where we can afford specialists for heart, kidney and skin diseases. There is no doubt that specialists in surgery who have had a lot of experience has a greater chance of doing a good job without making mistakes.

For example, the general surgeon has to handle delicate bone surgery, but he might not know as much about the matter as a specialist in bone surgery. He might not know everything about the various aspects in bone surgery, and he might not be able to say whether an operation will result in permanent disability or otherwise.

When I referred to the Physician I used the word "slow-moving", because the Physician observes his patient over a long period. He prescribes medicine for the patient and watches the effect of the treatment. He may not have to spend as much time on each patient as a Surgeon who has a more rapid turnover of work. The Surgeon has to consider symptoms and make quick diagnoses; he may have to spend two or three hours in doing sur-



gery and watching his patient for a long period. Whereas the Physician, perhaps, spends a long time at work, he moves at a slower pace in watching his patient. I will go into the matter with the Director of Medical Services and see what can be done.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT, MENTAL HOSPITAL

**Mr. Davis:** I beg to move the reduction of sub-head 1, item (9), "Medical Superintendent, Mental Hospital" by \$1. I know the hon. the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing visited the Ancient County recently, and I know she has been to the Mental Hospital, because there has been a fire there and I read in the Press of her visit.

May I ask if she is conscious of the fact that all is not well there as regards the Medical Superintendent? I know that there is acting at the Mental Hospital a respected old Government Medical Officer who is retired, but the whole medical Staff is, in my judgment, inadequate to cope comfortably with the situation.

We have had the benefit of a practitioner who came back recently from Trinidad. I think there are three such persons employed at his institution and each one has the qualification of a Doctor of Psychology.

It does appear to me that this is one phase of the Ministry of Labour, Health and Housing to which I should draw the Minister's attention. Many people feel, as I do, that we are not giving our people who suffer from mental illness the best opportunity of recovering, and that this is because of the lack of adequate medical aid.

**Mrs. Jagan:** The hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, has raised a most interesting point: the problem of staffing the Mental Hospital. I paid another visit to the Hospital in order to discuss the whole problem of building a new wing to replace the one that was burnt down a few days ago.

Hon. Members will no doubt hear more when we reach the stage of replacing the building, but I think hon. Members are fully aware that we are moving in the direction of replacing the western block. I would like as a side-issue to inform Members that the Staff of the Mental Hospital is to be highly complimented for the manner in which they handled the situation when the fire occurred. It is astounding that no one was injured or that no one died, and that people escaped.

When I examined the place and saw the conditions after the fire a few patients were excitable, some dangerous and others were locked up in their cells. It was surprising that all patients were taken out before the building collapsed.

Coming to the question of the need for a specialist—a Psychiatrist—I fully agree with the hon. Member. Although I am a Minister I am the severest critic. When I went to the Hospital my first impression was that it was a veritable snake pit. Fortunately part of the snake pit will be replaced, and it is perhaps a happy co-incidence that the worst part of the Mental Hospital burned down.

What is more distressing about the Mental Hospital is the fact that there is no specialist there. There is not the amount of hope as there should be for patients there that they can return to normal life. Since coming into this Ministry I have been fighting to get a Psychiatrist for this Hospital. The Director of Medical Services and myself have had several discussions with the Chief Secretary in an effort to bring a Psychiatrist to British Guiana. We have tried to make the salary and conditions as attractive as possible, and we have advertised as widely as possible.

[MRS. JAGAN]

While I am on this point I may say that a Guianese is being trained in the field of mental health, but he will not be completing his training for some time.

In the meantime we need a specialist here urgently. The only hope in our search for a Doctor comes from a discussion we had last week with Dr. Rodriguez of the World Health Organization. We asked his Organization to assist us in our search and he informed us that he believed he had a suitable Doctor to take up the post. We are now at the stage of seeking to work out such an arrangement. If we are fortunate to get a Psychiatrist, it would improve the Curative part of the Hospital; the new wing will only be an improvement, and the return of the Guianese Doctor in two years will also help. But let me say this: an institution with as many patients as the Mental Hospital will really need more than one Psychiatrist.

We probably can use three, but one of the difficulties with the mental specialists, like the scientists and engineers, is that they are greatly in demand in the world market. There are not enough of them, and they can choose the job they want and the salary they want, as well as the country they want. British Guiana cannot compete in the market as well as other countries.

**Mr. Jackson :** It is very heartening to hear the Minister admit that conditions at the Mental Hospital are very bad. It is also heartening to hear her admit that the Hospital needs not only one specialist, but more. I cannot agree more with her in that respect, because the people who go to that Hospital have in the past, and up to the present, been treated as if they were forgotten people and as if their circumstances cannot be changed from their point of insanity to one of sanity.

As I listened to her, I remembered how very recently arising out of a question of one of the Members on this side of the Table, information was sought as to whether it is the policy of the Government to have trained nurses there and

how; and it seemed to me, we could not get her assurance that steps would be taken early to see that there are people trained in the field to assist Doctors whom the Minister has in mind. It might be interesting enough, having regard to what she said to make this point, that even if you have all these specialist Doctors, the institution's work will not be as successful and effective if it does not have trained nurses in the same field.

It is admitted that specialists in that field need more money, and I am going to compliment the Minister on the efforts to get enough salary attached to the post in order to attract people with high qualifications. I would be glad to hear from her now whether she gives the assurance—in view of her realization that we need specialist Doctors at the Mental Hospital—that we need trained nurses in psychiatry.

**Mrs. Jagan :** I think I understand what the hon. Member means, but I think he is not fully aware what he himself means when he says that we need trained mental nurses. Of course we do. We need persons who are specialists in the field of mental nursing, but one cannot be a specialist until one is first a nurse. He is under the impression that an attendant can become a specialist nurse. An attendant cannot become a specialist nurse until, first of all, he becomes a fully qualified nurse. It is then that that person may go into the field of mental nursing.

We have at the moment a Matron at the institution, a highly intelligent woman. I see the Attorney-General nodding his head vigorously; he was with me yesterday. Government officers and Ministers who have visited the hospital are most impressed with this young lady who is a perfect example of a fully trained and qualified mental nurse, but there is a vast difference between a trained mental nurse and an attendant.

I pursued the possibility of training attendants, as such, with the World Health Organisation in the hope that they could offer us a special scholarship

which we could use to send away Mental Hospital attendants who showed promise, but they have informed us that there is no such training for attendants, as such, and that if an attendant wishes to go further into the field he must first of all go through the normal period of nursing training. Government has assisted in the training already of, I believe, three or more persons in the field of mental nursing, and I understand they wish to expand in that field.

**Mr. Jackson:** I happen to understand the situation very well. I happen to know that it takes three years for a nurse to become trained in mental nursing, but even if that is admitted it does not follow that at the Mental Hospital at the moment there are no people who can be selected for the purpose.

What is there to prevent Government from formulating a policy to encourage persons who are suitable to be trained as nurses to take a course? There is a nursing course which is provided locally, and if those persons are suitable for that course why shouldn't they be selected for that course?

If we cannot get them from abroad what will we do? It is better to set about training the people we have than not to have anybody at all. I know there are two persons who have qualified as mental nurses, but it is time that Government decided upon a policy with respect to treating those people as they ought to be treated, with a view to enabling them to improve their present position.

It is not that we want all to be specialists, because they cannot do everything, but if there are no nurses to take care of a patient after an operation, the patient dies. The same applies to the Mental Hospital. If we have not the nurses to give the treatment that is required, what is the use of bringing these specialists?

**Mr. Davis:** Having raised the point I have brought out some very interesting information from the Minister, and I am

sure the Council is grateful to learn that she is very conscious of the situation at the Mental Hospital. We want to make sure that people who suffer from mental diseases are not left to suffer. I beg to withdraw my Amendment.

Item agreed to.

#### CASUALTY OFFICERS

**Mr. Tello:** I move the reduction of item (22) — "2 Casualty Officers", \$7,200—by \$1 just to ask the hon. Minister if she would consult her advisers as to the adequacy of this provision for two Casualty Officers. My information is that the Casualty Department at the Georgetown Hospital cannot accommodate many persons. It is a most inconvenient arrangement. It is also said that these two officers perform other duties, and it has happened on more than one occasion that a patient's condition worsened while waiting to see the doctor. I appreciate that the expansion of the Casualty Department will involve expenditure, but what cannot be done in one way can be approached in another way.

In Barbados there is a team of consultant officers, not less than five at any time, and the casualty work is despatched very quickly and efficiently. I think we have reached the stage where two Casualty Officers are inadequate, and the Minister should seek advice from her technical officers with a view to increasing the number. It is reported that a patient died at the Casualty Department before the officer saw her.

**Mrs. Jagan:** It is well to talk about increasing the staff, but first we have to fill one post which we have been unable to fill. I believe that one of the officers is employed by Government either on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis. We are so poorly off to fill the post that we have not reached the stage of talking about expanding.

**Mr. Tello:** That is the major weakness of the system. What is really wrong when physicians do not want to accept Government appointments? There must be something wrong. There is a Medical

[MR. TELLO]

Association which should be consulted to find out what is the trouble. I am disappointed to hear that even the two officers you ought to have, you have not got. It is not everybody who finds it convenient to go into hospital as a paying patient. There must be cases which have to be dealt with as casualties. The private practitioners are already well taxed. I think the hon. Minister is sufficiently interested to find out from the D.M.S. what is the trouble. I am pleading with her to investigate this matter further and not dismiss it—

**Mrs. Jagan:** I think hon. Members should know that one of the real troubles in staffing the Service is the question of emoluments. One of the terms of reference of the Gorsuch Commission was the question of the emoluments of medical officers. It is not only in the Casualty Department that we are under-staffed but the entire Medical Service of British Guiana is greatly under-staffed, and perhaps the recommendations of the Gorsuch Commission may improve the situation.

I would like to clear the hon. Member's mind on one point. I am not sure that he understands what a Casualty Officer is. The Casualty Department deals with casualties, emergencies and accidents. People are admitted to the institution not only from the Casualty Department, but from the Out-Patients Department, or for treatment by specialist officers. So that there are various other ways of entering the institution.

There is one trouble we find in the institution, and that is that if a Casualty Officer had to deal only with casualties he might get through his work, but we have the unfortunate habit in this country of people taking to the Casualty Officer persons suffering from ailments that are not of an emergency nature. Some of the officers do complain that much of their time is taken up in doing what is strictly out-patients work.

**Mr. Jackson:** I gather that the Minister herself is very seriously con-

cerned about the whole situation in the Medical Department. From the manner in which she spoke, she is obviously perturbed in mind over the whole situation. I am of the view that, judging from her attitude this afternoon, the matter is being given further consideration, and that she will use all the means at her disposal to remedy the present situation.

One admits that there are some people who go to the Casualty Department for treatment which they ought to get in another section of the hospital, but it appears to me that even when one makes this allowance there are several cases which take quite a long time before they see a doctor. A doctor is not always in the Casualty Department; he has to do other work. He sometimes goes to the operating theatre, and as a result of having to shift around, people who are genuine cases for the Casualty Department have to wait a long time before they see a doctor. It is no fault of the doctor but of the system in operation.

Even if the Gorsuch Report is favourable to the medical officers there will still be need to find doctors, and it is hoped that the Minister will take every urgent step to see that if the salary conditions are satisfactory, those doctors are brought to the Colony at the earliest possible moment, even if it is necessary to seek the help of the World Health Organisation.

**Mr. Tello:** I am very grateful for the concern of the hon. Minister, and for the steps she proposes to take. May I also throw out the suggestion that if the Casualty Department is taxed because the public is not fully aware of its true purpose, a publicity campaign should be carried out by the G.I.S. to educate the public. I thank the hon. Minister and I withdraw my Amendment.

#### ADDITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Davis:** I beg to move the reduction of subhead 1, item 59—"Additional Medical Assistance" \$3,280 — by

\$1. The note at the bottom of page 62 of the Estimates states —

- “(59) Payment of salary to Medical Board Officers.  
 (59) Payment of salary to Medical Board Officers, etc.”

There seems to be something wrong, and I believe that one of the lines should be deleted.

Quite recently I read in the Press that a large sum of money had been stolen from the Medical Department. I understand that the money was taken to the Office for the purpose of paying employees their salaries. I would like to ask whether it is not possible for these stipends to be paid to employees by way of cheques? Government cannot afford to have so much money stolen from these Departments from time to time.

I understand that about \$12,000 was stolen from another Department some time ago, and I feel that if salaries were paid to employees by way of cheques it would prevent Government from losing so much money. I know that there will be some difficulty for employees to get their cheques converted into cash, but that should not prove to be an unsurmountable difficulty so far as Government is concerned.

**The Financial Secretary:** The question of the payment of salaries and wages to Government employees is being looked into at the moment. As the hon. Nominated Member has pointed out it is not easy to use a complete cheque system, particularly for people who receive low wages. However, Government is considering every possible system of payment in order to prevent the larceny of pay-rolls. It is not only the money for wages which disappears from time to time. There is nothing peculiar about the money for wages, except there happens to be a large concentration of money in certain Departments at a particular time of the month which is proving to be dangerous in so far as theft is concerned. I do not want to say very much on this matter at the moment, but I give the hon.

Member the assurance that I am looking into it.

**Mr. Davis:** I am grateful for the hon. the Financial Secretary's assurance that the matter is receiving attention. I hope it is not the usual hackneyed phrase we are accustomed to. I now beg to withdraw my Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 27 — Medical — be carried out at \$1,253,786.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### MEDICAL — BACTERIOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT

**The Chairman:** The question is that Head 27 A — Medical — Bacteriological Department — be carried out at \$175,211.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### MEDICAL—X-RAY DEPARTMENT

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 27 B—Medical—X-Ray Department — be carried out at \$92,940.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### MEDICAL — HOSPITALS AND DISPENSARIES

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 27 C — Medical — Hospitals And Dispensaries — be carried out at \$4,332,312.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

## MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 28 — Ministry of Communications And Works — be carried out at \$43,332.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR, HEALTH AND HOUSING

**Mr. Jackson:** I beg to move the reduction of Head 29 — Ministry of Labour, Health and Housing \$41,210 — by \$1, in order to make a few general observations in connection with the Department. In 1955 a survey was made in this Colony regarding the question of employment, unemployment and under-employment, and the Report was laid in this Council in 1958. I refer to the McGale Report. On page 46 of the Report one reads:

### "UNEMPLOYMENT

"12. At mid-July 1956, 29,600 persons were recorded as unemployed representing an unemployment rate of 18.0 per cent. of the labour force. The heaviest concentration of unemployment was in the Georgetown area with a total of 11,100, and an unemployment rate of 22.3 per cent. The rates for other areas were: Demerara, 17.9 per cent.; Berbice, 15.3 per cent.; Essequibo, 11.3 per cent."

The Report goes on to state —

"15. The rate of unemployment was particularly severe amongst young persons under 21 years of age (35.8 per cent.); they numbered 12,800, equal to 43 per cent. of all the unemployed.

16. Nearly one-quarter of all the unemployed had been out of work for periods of six months or longer and half of these long-term unemployed were in the Georgetown area.

17. Long-term unemployment was concentrated in the age group 21-40 and amongst Africans; for the total of 7,300 persons who had been out of work for periods of six months or longer there were 4,500 Africans, equal to 62 per cent.

18. Included in the total of 29,600 unemployed were some 10,000 persons who had never worked in any industry or occupation; 8,000 of these were young persons under 21 years who had no job since leaving school".

I have referred to this part of the Report for the benefit of the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing because since the Report has been laid in the Council the unemployment situation has worsened. There has been recession in the Bauxite industry, and further unemployment in several other fields including those run by the Government. However, we have not yet learnt what is the policy of the Government with respect to the question of solving this very serious labour problem.

The Minister of Labour has not at any time given any indication here or elsewhere as to what steps will be taken by the Government to relieve the unemployment situation. This question is all the more serious because the people who are unemployed are very young. Several people have not been employed since leaving school. In other parts of the world Government would have taken positive steps to find ways and means of securing employment for these people in order to relieve the serious situation.

I wonder whether the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing would be good enough to indicate to this Council what steps are being taken to deal with this very difficult and distressing situation? I believe that the Minister is somewhat concerned about this matter, because when the Report was released it was said that Government was very concerned about the labour situation.

**Mrs. Jagan:** Am I to understand that we are going to have a full-fledged debate on unemployment today? The hon. Member should be advised that if he wishes to debate the subject — he has been a Member of this Council for about eighteen months — he should present a Motion for discussion. I should like to inform the hon. Member that, if certain hon. Members of this

Council were interested in the people who are unemployed, they would assist the Government in passing this Budget. As soon as this Budget is passed several people would be employed.

**Mr. Jackson:** I indicated that I had moved my Motion in order to get from the hon. Minister of Labour, Health and Housing some indication of the policy of Government with respect to unemployment. This is the place where we should receive all of the information we require in so far as Government affairs are concerned. The Members on this side of the Table are not responsible for holding up the passing of the Estimates, because we spent the whole of last week dealing with a matter that need not have been taken. The Government postponed the debate on the Estimates in order to consider a Bill, and up to now we have not completed the discussion on the Bill.

I am not seeking to debate this issue of unemployment and under-employment at this stage. I merely want to know whether the hon. Minister has any plans for dealing with this very difficult problem. She need not get annoyed because I have raised the matter. I have raised the question in order to get information.

**Mrs. Jagan:** You are delaying matters.

**Mr. Tello:** Quite to the annoyance of the Minister of Labour, Health and Housing, we waited with some degree of patience when the principle of this Budget was being debated.

**Mrs. Jagan:** To a point of order! Sir, I understood you to agree with me that this was not the place to discuss the whole problem of unemployment.

**The Chairman:** I said before — perhaps you did not hear — that this is not the time and place to debate unemployment.

**Mrs. Jagan:** Then you are allowing the debate.

**The Chairman:** Well, I understood that he wanted to ask a question. If there is no answer, we can pass on. The hon. Member who raised the question himself did not wish to continue the debate.

**Mrs. Jagan:** I understand Mr. Tello has now entered the 'second lap' of the debate.

**The Chairman:** I do not know. I must wait and hear if the question will be answered or not. I said here before, that Ministers are their own judges, the best judges of what questions they would answer and what they would not answer. If, on the face of it, it appears that I am denying Members the opportunity to say something, that would be wrong, for if a Minister wants to say something I allow sufficient time to pass before I go on.

As Members may have observed, I have more than three times tried to put the Question, and somebody got up. I hope it is perfectly clear now what I am saying for the third time: this is not the time to debate the question of unemployment at all; but my impression was that only a question was asked.

**Mrs. Jagan:** The question asked—

**The Chairman:** I am not pressing you for an answer. That is entirely a matter for you, if you wish to answer. You must be the sole judge of that. The Chairman cannot decide. If there is no answer, then I shall pass on.

**Mr. Tello:** We have no intention of debating the policy of the Ministry of Labour, Health and Housing as it relates to employment or unemployment because we did that by that way of a substantive Motion. Throughout the discussion on this Budget we have been getting reasonable answers and there was confidence on this side of the existence of co-operation. But this is a burning question. As we move about in the community in our normal life, it is put to us and we are not qualified to speak for

[MR. TELLO]

the Government. The question is, are you aware of the unemployment situation?

**The Chairman:** I quite understand, but if five, six, seven or eight persons reply to the same question, does that make any difference?

**Mr. Tello:** It would make this difference, that it would not cause the person to understand the gravity of the situation. I am very grateful to Your Honour for your impartiality in this matter and for permitting us—

**The Chairman:** Why do you say "impartiality"? Do you mean to offer an insult to the Chair? I do not know that it is necessary to say that. It goes without saying, and it does not need emphasis. It is a matter of course, and when it becomes a point where somebody has emphasized it, it decidedly implies something that would impair the impartiality of the Speaker. There is no necessity to speak of the impartiality of the Speaker. The impartiality of the Speaker is always there, and this is unnecessary qualification of the term.

**Mr. Tello:** Yes, Sir. I know the hon. Member is worried about this matter, and I am just as worried as he is.

**The Chairman:** Well, will you move at an appropriate time a substantive Motion?

**Mr. Burnham:** Mr. Chairman, I am not asking a question. I am moving the reduction of this Head, because I feel the Ministry is incompetently run, and I feel further that the Minister has been lacking in her duty in failing so far to give any idea of what her Government proposes to do about the problem of unemployment, save for a few tears over the radio when the McGale Report was published.

**The Chairman:** I do not think that is appropriate at this stage. We do not know whether what you heard on the radio was correct or not. Can you find the script, or if it is possible, have the recording replayed?

**Mr. Burnham:** Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling, though in the course of hearing a broadcast I can remember that "X" said that and "Y" said so. But I am not going to say so now. Not only have we had no statement from the Minister on this most burning question, but during the debate on this Appropriation Bill, both in Committee and on the Second Reading, there has been just as great a lapse as in the Annexure of that Ministry to the Governor's Speech from the Throne.

**The Chairman:** I think a Motion can be tabled for that document to be discussed.

**Mr. Burnham:** Mr. Chairman, what the rules say must be carried out, but I am moving that the vote of this Ministry should be reduced, and one of my reasons is this: this Ministry has done nothing to assure us that it is interested in solving or attempting to solve the unemployment problem, and I was merely enumerating the occasions when the Head of that Ministry had the opportunity to give us an assurance, and if you rule that I must not refer to the document, I will not.

But I will ask you with the greatest respect to hear my point on this particular aspect, and this is in the Annexure to the Governor's Speech from the Throne. Each Ministry gave some indication of what it proposed to do during the ensuing year. The Ministry of Labour, however, did not even allude to the question of unemployment. In the circumstances, we must perforce assume that the Ministry is either ostrich-like, unaware of the problem, or cynically disinterested in doing anything about the problem.

We do not credit the Ministry or her colleagues with any magical power, but we want to know, (a) would they adumbrate some policy, and (b) would they adumbrate some plan for its solution? We will give them the utmost support in that case, but it is childish to assume that as soon as the Estimates are passed unemployment will vanish.



**Mrs. Jagan :** I did not say that. I said that if you get on with the Budget a few more people may be employed.

**Mr. Burnham :** Again, a distinction without a difference! They explain that when we pass the resolution allowing them to spend the money in these Estimates there will be more employment. But last year we passed the Budget before now, and we had unemployment.

**A Member :** You do not understand.

**Mr. Burnham :** I do not understand, but I am willing to learn. I cannot see how this passing of the Budget will get us on. This Council has already empowered the Government to proceed with the spending on these Estimates. That kind of thing is for the uninformed and for the illiterate, perhaps. And who is responsible for the Budget being so late? Never, as far as I know, has a Budget been produced so late; never before, as far as I know, has a Government sat down and refused to defend its policy. In other words, I say they are cowards because they have no answer to the unemployment problem.

**The Financial Secretary :** The Resolution passed in this Council was that the services should continue on the basis of the 1958 Estimates. In the 1959 Estimates, under Public Works Non Recurrent, there is \$400,000 of \$500,000 worth of work that cannot be started until the Recurrent Budget is passed. Even more so it applies to the Development Estimates, because no new Development Schemes can begin until they are passed. It is the 1958 level not 1959, which is authorised.

**Mr. Burnham :** That is interesting because most of the Development Estimates for 1958 have not been fully spent. Secondly, the \$400,000 that has been spent under Non Recurrent Public Works is to be spent over a whole year. You cannot spend it all in a few months. In any case the problem of unemployment will remain. Therefore, as far as the explanation is concerned, it is balderdash.

**The Financial Secretary :** I do not see why the hon. Member should have

the last word on this subject, especially as he gives the wrong impression when he says we may not spend all the money in the first part of the year. It is obvious that if under the non-recurrent Head you have new works you will not wait until the end of the year to start them, but begin or start some of the new works in January.

**Mr. Burnham :** Perhaps the hon. Member will regale us with all these new works.

**The Financial Secretary :** If the hon. Member is not convinced, they are carefully divided up into re-votes and new works. It is there in the Estimates.

**Mr. Burnham :** Well, perhaps the hon. Member can tell us how many new people will be employed if we passed the Estimates today.

**The Financial Secretary :** No, I cannot, and can hardly be expected to.

**Mr. Burnham :** Therefore your statement is unworthy of consideration. It is no sense telling us that if we get on with the Estimates you will find more employment for people.

**The Chairman :** I have already said that that is an aside. We are getting off the main line.

**Mrs. Jagan :** The hon. Member referred to the inefficiency and the incompetence of the Ministry of Labour. I do not know whether he was referring to the Minister or the Ministry of Labour. I can only say that I have the highest regard for the efficiency of the staff of the Ministry who, I think, are doing a very fine and wonderful job. To give just one example, there are occasions when we have urgent work to do, and members of the staff are quite capable of dispatching all the correspondence dealing with emergency work within the same day — sometimes within an hour after a decision is made. I do not call that inefficiency or incompetence; I call it first class work.

[MRS. JAGAN]

The hon. Member has suggested that there should be a reduction in the total vote of the Ministry, but if he would cast his eyes to the other side of the page he would see that there is a decrease in the travelling vote. The Ministry has also made a reduction in transport.

If I may touch for one moment on the question of passing this Budget and getting ahead with the job, I may say that people will be employed immediately after we pass the estimates with respect to sea defences, water installation, drainage and irrigation and many other jobs on which hundreds of people will be employed and will receive wages. That is for the hon. Member's information. It is impossible for us to give the exact number of persons who will be employed, but I know there are many contract jobs and other large outstanding works which will commence when hon. Members get down to passing this Budget. I do not feel that this is the proper place for a general debate.

**The Chairman:** I think we have had enough, I wish to say, for the fourth time, that this is not the time for a full-dress debate on unemployment. I think we have had enough and I shall put the question. The Motion is, "That Head 29—Ministry of Labour, Health and Housing—be reduced by \$1."

The Committee divided and voted as follows:

| <i>For</i>      | <i>Against</i>          |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Mr. Jackson     | Mr. Saffee              |
| Mr. Burnham     | Mr. Rai                 |
| Mr. Kendall.—3. | Mr. Bowman              |
|                 | Mr. Ram Karran          |
|                 | Mrs. Jagan              |
|                 | Mr. Beharry             |
|                 | Mr. Benn                |
|                 | Dr. Jagan               |
|                 | The Financial Secretary |
|                 | The Attorney-General    |
|                 | The Chief Secretary     |
|                 | —11.                    |

*Did Note Vote*

Mr. Tello  
Mr. Gajraj.—2.

**The Chairman:** The Amendment is lost. I shall now put the question, that

Head 29 — Ministry of Labour, Health and Housing — be carried out at \$41,210.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 30 — Ministry of Natural Resources — be carried out at \$54,096.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### MINISTRY OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY

**The Chairman:** The question is, that Head 31 — Ministry of Trade and Industry—be carried out at \$111,753.

Agreed to.

Head passed.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

##### PUBLIC PRINTING REGULATED BY CONTRACT

**Mr. Burnham:** I beg to move a reduction of subhead 2 — "Public Printing regulated by Contract", \$375,000 — by \$15,000. I am aware of the fact that some time ago in this Council the Chief Secretary informed hon. Members that the amount here represented perhaps the lowest price at which Government printing could be done for this year, but according to my information there was an offer from one printing company to carry out the Government contract printing with respect to certain schedules — A, C and D, I believe — at \$25,000 per month.

There was another tender for the other schedules which would amount to about \$60,000 per annum. That is my information, and that printing company which offered to do all the work at \$25,000 per month indicated to Government — and there is correspondence to that effect — that they would be willing to carry out the part they originally tendered for at \$25,000 per month, and with

respect to the other parts their charges would be the same as those quoted by the second company. \$25,000 per month means \$300,000 per annum, and the other tender, I am instructed, was for \$60,000. Therefore it seems to me that if my information is correct — and I have no reason to doubt its accuracy — Government has in fact paid more than it would have paid if it had given the contract to the other printing company.

Furthermore, may I say that Government's action in this matter of the printing contract has been unmoral if not immoral because it has been admitted that there was an advertisement for tenders. After the date had passed Government, around the corner apparently, went and made negotiations with another company and did not have the courtesy or the good sense to re-advertise so as to give everyone an opportunity to tender again.

The Government must be above suspicion. That type of conduct is good, maybe something to be commended in a private individual, but not so far as Government is concerned. After you issue an advertisement for tenders, and receive certain people's tenders, you go and discuss the price with another company and award the third individual the contract when that individual has never tendered! It is the sort of thing that leaves one flabbergasted when one hears of it coming from a Government.

That is not the only reason for my seeking a reduction of this particular amount. There is another problem attendant upon the change of the contractor. So far as I am concerned, it does not matter who does the work, provided there is no suffering.

**Mr. Benn:** Is that so?

**Mr. Burnham:** I am always hearing a noise coming from the direction of the hon. Minister of Community Development and Education. I repeat that, it does not matter to whom the contract goes, but there are two criteria as far as I am concerned: (i) that Government must be able to show us and prove be-

eyond doubt that less money is going to be expended than would have been expended otherwise; and (ii) the social problems of the country are not made worse as a result of this switch.

So far as the second criterion is concerned, it has already been admitted cavalierly by the hon. the Chief Secretary that about one hundred and fifty persons have been put out of work. But what is the attitude of the hon. the Chief Secretary, the spokesman of the P.P.P. Government, on this point?

**The Chairman:** No! No! If you say he is the spokesman that is proper, but do not bring Party into it.

**Mr. Burnham:** He is the spokesman for the Government which is the Majority Party — the P.P.P. I withdraw the remark, Sir.

**Dr. Jagan:** May I ask the hon. Member to tell us something more about the Constitution?

**Mr. Burnham:** I am not here to give lectures on the Constitution.

**Mrs. Jagan:** Who is the head of the Government?

**The Chairman:** If Members are going to answer across the Table, I will have to adjourn the meeting.

**Dr. Jagan:** The hon. Member must not give us half-truths.

**The Chairman:** I have already spoken on the matter. Perhaps hon. Members did not hear, and they want to make a ruling themselves. I have already ruled that he may not refer to the hon. the Chief Secretary as spokesman of the P.P.P. Government. The moment the words were out I checked him at once. If hon. Members would rather say it themselves, I can adjourn and give them an opportunity to say it tomorrow.

**Mr. Burnham:** I immediately withdrew my distinction and made an accu-

[MR. BURNHAM]

rate distinction. The hon. the Chief Secretary has, in this Council, admitted that this Government does not consider it, or the Government of which he is a Member and for which he is speaking, does not consider it its duty to look after or to make provision for the extra one hundred and fifty persons who were thrown out of employment.

In this issue we, on this side of the Table, have no interest in the financial implications or the struggle between big companies. We are interested in the number of people who come to us each day asking for jobs; we are interested in the fact that in 1955 there were seventeen persons out of every hundred employable persons who could not get employment even if they were not lazy. To add to that figure of seventeen — I am sure it is nearer twenty now than seventeen — another one hundred and fifty persons and merely say “we are not responsible, it is not our responsibility” is, I submit, an admission by Government that it is not interested in carrying out its duty to the citizens of British Guiana and the tax payers whose money it spends.

I am going to assume, for purposes of this aspect of my argument, that what the hon. the Chief Secretary said about the present contract being cheaper than an offer which Government received in October, 1958, is true. But the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, referred to the fact that in the 1930's, when there was a reactionary Colonial Office Government, when economic conditions were bad, when there was a deficit budget, extra work was found for people because of the gravity of the unemployment situation. Today we find that this Government, because it says it wants an economic budget — —

**The Chairman:** Just one second; I want to see how far you are going. You are reducing the vote by about \$15,000 and I understand that you are dealing with two criteria. Well, I can quite understand your reference to that, and also your speaking for quite a while, but please do not convert this lapse from the

main thing into a debate on unemployment. I know you appreciate that, because as a legal man you would see the difficulties, and a reference which is relevant may be relevant as a reference in making good a main point, but certainly it may be absolutely irrelevant if it is going to adumbrate or, at any rate, start a debate. It must be debated on a substantive motion.

**Mr. Burnham:** As Your Honour pleases, but the point I was making was that this switching of the printing contract has put out of employment 150 people, as admitted by the hon. the Chief Secretary, at a time when there is an unemployment problem. My submission is this, that at times of crisis like this, Governments, even though they may be able to exercise strict economies, are prepared to provide work for people which may not be particularly productive, but work which has the effect of giving employment to people who are willing to work and cannot otherwise find employment.

Therefore I am saying, Sir; assuming that there is a saving of \$150,000 here, it is worthless unless there is some specific proposal to utilize that saving for providing work for as many persons as have lost their employment as a result of the saving. This is one of my reasons for moving this reduction.

There are Members of this Council who have criticized a private concern, the Sugar Producers, for making their industry more efficient at the cost of reducing labour and causing unemployment. I feel that the arguments are perfectly sound and even though they may be answered by private industry by saying, “After all, we, as private industry, are not here to ensure that there is the maximum of employment”. But the arguments apply even more strongly so far as the Government is concerned, because Government cannot shirk its duty and cannot say it is not concerned with keeping the unemployment figure at its lowest possible level. Therefore, on all scores this particular vote for Public Printing ought to be reduced because of my information that it is higher than what the Govern-

ment has paid otherwise and, secondly, because it displays an inhuman lack of interest on the part of Government in the troubles of the unemployed.

**The Chief Secretary:** To take the hon. Member for Georgetown Central's first point. His statement about costs is true, up to a point. But of course he has left out the most important thing. The Argosy Company, when Government was negotiating the possibility of purchasing some of its equipment, did undertake to continue doing Government Printing in 1959, on a month to month basis, at a cost of \$25,000 a month for divisions A and D in the Contract. It was also stated that the other divisions of the Contract would be carried out by the Daily Chronicle Ltd. at the rates pertaining in 1958. That, as the hon. Member said, would have cost Government \$360,000 a year. But what he has not said is this: that the Contract we are talking about does not include another \$100,000 worth of printing — when this Contract was put up for tenders there was \$100,000 worth of additional printing to be performed off the Contract.

The Agreement which we made with the Lithographic Company cover all Government Printing with the exception of about \$16,000 to \$20,000. If you look through the Estimates you will see that a lot of printing has been taken out of Departmental votes and is now included under this one vote under the Controller of Government Printing.

Had Government accepted the offer of the Argosy Company it would have cost about \$460,000 a year: as it is, we are getting the work done at \$375,000.

The other point I would like to make is this: the offer of the Argosy Company was for precisely the same thing for which they had tendered three months before, and their second price — on a month to month basis without security of a Contract — was \$90,000 less than their original tender.

Well, one does expect an accurate tender from an experienced firm, but their quoted price, without rime or reason, was \$90,000 less; even then, it was a good \$60,000 to \$70,000 more than what we are paying now. So I think that disposes of the hon. Member's first point.

**The Chairman:** I think the second point can be taken tomorrow.

**The Chief Secretary:** I will not take very long, Sir. I would like to tell the story how things went. It is being suggested that Government went around the corner, and I want to tell how straight down the road Government did go. I will take probably more than five minutes.

Council resumed and adjourned until the following day, Wednesday, 4th March, 1959, at 2 p.m.