

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Friday, 4th November, 1960

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. Major I. O. Smith, O.B.E. (acting)

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

Financial Secretary, Hon. W. P. D'Andrade.

} *ex officio*

The Honourable Dr. C. B. Jagan

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

„ B. H. Benn

—Member for Essequibo River
(Minister of Natural Resources)

Janet Jagan

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

„ Ram Karran

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

„ „ B. S. Rai

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

Mr. 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, Q.C.

—Member for Georgetown Central

„ S. Campbell

—Member for North Western District

„ A. L. Jackson

—Member for Georgetown North

„ S. M. Saffee

—Member for Western Berbice

„ Ajodha Singh

—Member for Berbice River

„ Jai Narine Singh

—Member for Georgetown South

„ R. E. Davis

—Nominated Member

„ A. M. Fredericks

—Nominated Member

„ H. J. M. Hubbard

—Nominated Member.

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

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

ABSENT :

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

Mr. A. G. Tasker, O.B.E. — Nominated Member — on leave.

The Clerk read prayers.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 3rd November, 1960, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The Chief Secretary: (Major Smith): I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Volunteer (Amendment) Bill, 1960.

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

Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1960.

ORDER OF THE DAY

BILLS — FIRST READING

The following Bills were read the First time:

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Volunteer Ordinance".

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Estate Duty Ordinance".

MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Chief Secretary will move the Second Reading of the following Bill:

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Marriage Ordinance."

The Chief Secretary: Mr. Speaker, I wish, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill intituled an Ordinance to amend the Marriage Ordinance, to say that this is a simple Bill. Under the existing legislation, Section 15 of Chapter 164, the Governor may appoint any District Commissioner or any officer to be Superintendent Registrar of a marriage district. What has been found in

general practice is that if the Superintendent Registrar of marriages is absent for any reason, or illness or death occurs suddenly, there is no one, until the Governor, under the Ordinance, appoints another officer as Superintendent Registrar, to perform any marriages that may have been arranged. Therefore, this is just to facilitate the public to ensure that if the Superintendent Registrar is not available for any cause, the Governor may appoint a fit person as deputy of a Superintendent Registrar of marriages. I formally move that this Bill, which appears under my name, be read a Second time.

The Attorney-General (Mr. Austin): I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 and 2 passed as printed.

Council resumed.

The Chief Secretary: I have to report that the Marriage (Amendment) Bill, 1960, was considered in Committee and passed without Amendment, and I now move that the Bill be read the Third time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

TIMBER CONCESSIONS TO CUBA

Mr. Speaker: We will now resume consideration of the following Motion:

"Whereas the leader of the Majority Party of the Government, in a press interview of Friday, 10th June, stated that as a result of the recent visit of the Cuban delegation, Government was considering entering into a partnership with Cuba to exploit the timber resources of this Colony;

And whereas the majority of the inhabitants of this Colony are at present opposed to the idea in view of the present political situation in Cuba:

Be it resolved: That this Council recommends that Government should not enter into any negotiations with the present Cuban Government, Cuban Companies or individual Cubans for timber concessions in this Colony."

On the last occasion when this Motion was being debated, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, was speaking. I think he has nearly exhausted his time.

Mr. Tello: Your Honour, I recall quite well your stating that I had just another minute to conclude; but I also remember that I was trying to impress upon this Council that there is need, and almost an obligation on the part of Government, to bring a White Paper to this Council so that we can clearly see the true intentions of the Government and exactly what actuated their approach to Cuba in this matter. The circumstances surrounding this approach to Cuba do not lend themselves to this Council for acceptance and approval. Possibly, if we had a White Paper before us with all the facts written down, rather than relying on slight references in a broadcast and on an almost sketchy Press release, we might have been in a better position to decide whether or not this Motion is as commendable as I see it.

If we look back on the sketchy history of this transaction —

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I beg to move that the Member be allowed 20 minutes more.

Mr. Fredericks: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Tello: I was saying: If we look back on the history of this transaction, we would see that there is a great deal that is expected of Government that is not coming forth. Let us carry our minds back to the delegation that left this Colony on the same matter of finance in the interest of the Development Programme and of development as a whole for British Guiana. If our memories serve us well, we would find, and I am sure it would be supported by the records of this Council, that the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry left the Colony accompanied by the Financial Secretary. If we were to trace his movements since he left the Colony we would have seen that in the important talks in London for the raising of money, and in most of his important talks relating to finance and financial business, he did not, at any time, enter into these important discussions without the aid and assistance of the Financial Secretary.

According to the information received through the columns of the Press and the radio, we find that he moved about quite a bit in Europe, and he also went across the Atlantic Ocean to New York; and the information received is that in all those places talks on financial matters and business relating to money were entered into, and in each of those talks the Financial Secretary was there to advise the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry. Indeed he was quite right to have at his assistance one who is accepted in Government as qualified to advise on such matters. But we find on this particular occasion in Cuba,—I see it reported in certain sections of the Press that the Minister arrived in Cuba to transact this most important business without his Financial Secretary who, it would appear, was left in New York. It is quite a new form of approach in international business, and almost an innovation to us in this part of the world.

[MR. TELLO]

I must say that the history of the political activities of the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry must cause us some uncertainty about his visit to Cuba which was no accident. It must have been pre-conceived, minutely worked out and planned that he was going to Cuba to discuss this matter, and he must have known that it would have involved some sort of financial arrangement. Yet we find that while the Minister admitted that he was not qualified to enter into such discussions in other places — and his admission is made public by the fact that he welcomed the presence of the Financial Secretary and moved around with him especially in the U.S.A. — he arrived in Cuba without him. This is what the "Guiana Times" magazine for the 2nd and 3rd quarters reports on page 35:

"Dr. Jagan arrived in Havana, Cuba, on Sunday afternoon, April 3, for a five-day stay. Soon after his arrival he was at once taken to see puppet president Osvaldo Dorticos and two cabinet ministers, Senor Armando Hart, Education Minister, and Senor Raul Rao, Foreign Minister. They in turn arranged for a meeting with high-up communist boss Senor Ernesto Guavera, president of the National Bank, who is directing the economic dovetailing of Cuba with the Soviet bloc".

Hon. Members will notice that this announcement makes no mention of the presence of the Financial Secretary, but they will observe that shortly after his arrival in Cuba the Minister met the big boys in finance, which was not a mere coincidence. It had been planned and well thought out. What does it connote? The Minister knew he was going to Cuba to discuss important financial matters on behalf of British Guiana, and one would naturally expect that the officer who is paid a fairly high salary to advise the Government on such matters would have accompanied him. Why in this particular transaction the Finan-

cial Secretary was not present? Is it that the talks would have been too confidential even for another Member of the "Cabinet" to be present? Is it that there were matters more important than finance and so confidential that even a Member of the Executive Council could not be admitted to the secret talks? The whole transaction becomes more and more suspicious as we think of it.

I feel that many of us on this side of the Table will admit that we are not qualified to deal expertly with matters of finance, and we do not agree that because a man has become popular with the people he automatically becomes an expert on financial matters. Perhaps it is because there is doubt as to the soundness of what was done, that we have not had a White Paper on the subject.

I would like to view this matter as a business transaction, as to whether or not it is in the best interest of British Guiana that we accept this Motion and reject this transaction purely as a business matter which does not come up to expectations. But when one reads of these things and sees all these sins of omission and commission one wonders whether there was much more in these trade negotiations than one sees on the surface. All sorts of things have been happening, so that my mind has become active and a little more active.

We were told in a broadcast that the Cubans were interested in a timber deal, and that they were prepared to assist us with technicians. Since when has Cuba reached such a stage of development that she can begin to export her technicians? A financial magnate who has had talks with the Minister, has been quoted in the "Guiana Times" as saying

that Cuba's finances were in a precarious state. These little things cause us to look further, and we find that in April the Cubans became interested in our forests. Up to that time, of the sum of \$12,610 allocated to be spent this year on Forests under the Development Programme, very little of that allocation had been spent, but between April and June, almost immediately after the talks in Cuba, the sum of \$7,898 was spent. I wonder whether that acceleration of expenditure in the case of Forests was influenced by the talks in Cuba. I ask that because I do not see the same speedy expenditure in the case of other allocations.

For instance, under Public Works there was a total allocation of \$5,576,770 for this year, of which there was an expenditure of \$1,466,898 up to the end of June, with an expenditure of \$769,369 between April and June. With a total allocation of over \$5½ million for the year, during which the Government was faced with the intolerable situation of having to retrench people employed by the Public Works Department, either because the money was not available or could not be handled properly, Government allowed a sum of nearly \$4 million to remain idle. But in the case of Forests, shortly after the talks in Cuba there was a great acceleration of development expenditure.

We were told by the Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran) that the Cubans and their Eastern associates are anxious to offer us better deals than the Western countries are prepared to do, and he went so far as to remark that the British Government were just doling out some "blood money" which they had collected over a period of years. I agree that while historically there is some truth in the statement that exploitation took place not only in the British colonies but in the Spanish, French and Dutch colonies, it is also true to say that those British

Guianese who are better placed also exploit their fellow Guianese, because man likes to use the power which money gives him. We have seen that Guianese employers have not been more generous to their employees than employers who are importees. We see it every day in our trade union activities. We have the same problem trying to convince the local employer that it is only fair and just that their fellow Guianese whom they employ should enjoy a reasonable standard of living by being paid a fair wage. I know some employers —

Mr. Speaker: You are not forgetting the Motion, are you?

Mr. Tello: No, Sir. This matter of exploitation is an historical fact. It seems to be a human weakness. It must be recognized that we are human beings and are entitled to be treated as such. I am talking about the business transaction. The Minister of Communications and Works must not make specific statements "that all we have been getting is blood money." Russia has perpetuated the same thing, and I will prove it by referring to Russia's transactions with Cuba. I have certain figures from "Time" magazine, and I challenge anyone to give me a better authority. "Time" magazine is one of the highly respected magazines in the world. I have not yet seen anyone challenge it. It is a fact that the United States bought sugar from Cuba at a price calculated at 5c. per pound. At that time the world price for sugar was 3c. per pound, and the people referred to as "exploiters", the British, paid a preferential price equal to 7c. per pound for Cuba's sugar. The Russians paid Cuba at the rate of 2½c. per pound. Is that generosity? They are now in the stage of exploiting, and it has been said that the others are paying back what they are supposed to have exploited. But we are not dealing with that at the moment.

[MR. TELLO]

When Cuba traded with America, Cuba was in a better position. The financial expert in Cuba tells us that Cuba's economy is in a precarious state. Do we expect Cuba to barter with us and pay us better and higher prices than current world prices, when Cuba is trading on sub-normal or sub-world prices and at a time when its economy is in a precarious position? I think we will be correct in accepting the hon. Member's Motion. I feel that we should be very grateful to him for bringing it here, because we have not yet seen the slightest bit of evidence to indicate that this contemplated transaction will benefit British Guiana one iota. The only thing that can accrue from it, and it has been emphasized by my colleagues who are qualified to speak on the matter, is a closer association with the communists.

I do not think that British Guiana can afford to gamble with our small resources merely to obtain friendship. We have nothing to gain from this transaction. Cuba has no money to give us. The Government itself exists in a state of uncertainty. It would not surprise me if there is another revolution in Cuba tomorrow morning and another type of Castro or, possibly, democracy takes over after such a long period. I know that the Cubans themselves would be the last people in the world to admit that they have at their disposal technicians to export to an undeveloped country like ours. Undeveloped as we are, we are in a better position than Cuba at the moment.

The Prime Minister of Cuba spends 90 per cent of the time of his life, when he is not sleeping, spreading propaganda. This morning Reuters said that he is only a figure-head, and the same financial big voice who said that there is little money in Cuba is the big boy who is controlling things in Cuba. What advantage is

there for us? Cuba cannot buy our products cash, and it cannot assist us technically. Russian technicians are now going to Cuba to take the place of American technicians who have left the country. What is this trade about? What will be British Guiana's share in this bargain?

I am satisfied that the hon. Member for Demerara River has done us a great service by bringing this Motion here. I feel that if the Government and Members on the other side of the Table will view this matter dispassionately and examine it as a business transaction, they will support the Motion until such time as the Government has the courage to present us with a White Paper that will satisfy us. I make the claim that this is something new; we are not following the beaten track, so the Minister cannot look back and be guided by what happened in the past. What does he know about bartering? It is new business for all of us. The hon. Minister of Trade and Industry grew up in an atmosphere where we sold for cash. Sometimes we credited people, but we collected dollars for our products. Because of this sudden departure from the beaten track, Government owes it to this Council and to the colony as a whole to present us with a White Paper setting out everything clearly so that we can examine it and see the benefits or shortcomings. It is possible that we may be converted when we see things in a particular form. I challenge Government to give us a White Paper, if the Members of the Government have faith in this transaction.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Never in my life have I heard a greater colonial mental approach by so many members on a subject than I have heard during the course of this debate. It is a colonial mental mind operating on the old beaten track. [An Hon. Member: "It is a disease."] I am reminded that it is a

diseased colonial mind and, having inculcated certain things through the centuries, certain people find it impossible to depart from the beaten track.

Several irrelevant issues have been brought into this debate. The question of independence is a sacred thing for those who have been born in this country. The independence of this nation has been trod upon as if it does not matter. They talk of grants and doles from the United Kingdom without taking into consideration the tremendous amount of exploitation that has been going on for 150 years in this country; its natural and human resources as well as the investment of blood and sweat of Guianese. The exploiters have taken everything to the United Kingdom, and they are now giving it back to us in little dribbles.

Of course, this country is destined to be a great nation, and it will stand upon its feet. We will then be able to do away with grants and doles, and we will develop our natural resources as we think fit. So many quotations have been made from the Press, "Time" magazine and even from the Conference at Costa Rica! The United Press and the magazines are the servants of the capitalists, and they give out the public opinion they wish to form. In 1953 when the British Government thought it fit to overthrow a legitimate Government in British Guiana, in order to justify its actions, it encouraged Reuters, United Press and the Associated Press to distort the news regarding what was taking place in this country. In a few mornings, according to the newspapers, we would have had the whole of Georgetown burnt down. Not a single fire was set in this country! According to Reuters and United Press this City should not have had a single house standing. That is how the great nations operate, and they operate in such a manner that you can hardly see their subtle move as snakes in the grass. That is the move that has been dominating the scene of mankind for centuries.

At this time I am reminded of a quotation by my hon. Friend on my left—a quotation from Abraham Lincoln: "God has loved the common man, because he has made so many of them". The common man, who exists in this world, has been left unprotected for generations, but the common man is coming into his own some day. It is our duty to protect the common man and to foster his welfare in every way we can.

As I have said, the Mover and the Seconder of this Motion have traversed every possible field. They went into the field of communism as if we were debating communism; they went into the field of capitalism as if we were debating capitalism; they have debated the leadership of this country as if we were debating the leadership of this country. They have debated everything except what they should have debated, and they have thrashed things out from one end of the Table to the other. I think that the Members who have spoken have lost their sense of patriotism and nationalism, which should be their first responsibility to this nation. They have spoken so much about democracy. The Western World has been "footballled" from one corner of the earth to another. For the past 150 years they have given us democracy which is nothing but autocracy.

Around this Table, according to our present constitution, there are 14 members elected to this Council by the people of this country—about 550,000 of them. The British Government, sitting at Whitehall, through the instrument of His Excellency the Governor, has the power to appoint 11 Nominated Members. He has appointed only six; and he has the power to put three officials here. Is this democracy? Is this democracy for the majority or democracy for the minority? This is not democracy; this is autocracy and bureaucracy that the United King-

[MR. JAI NARINE SINGH]

dom Government has given us. It is time they learn that we all have ideas and are capable of thinking as a nation.

This country wanted a loan. The one who had to speak for us tried to raise the money in the United Kingdom. He was denied. He went to the Swiss Bank and tried to raise the money, but he was not given the authority. If he was speaking for the people of this country, why had he not been given the authority to do so? Yet the one man who has the right to give that authority had been able to say he could not do so. The same thing is happening with Cuba today.

I have been to Cuba more than once — even before the Leader of the Majority Party. I have been through Latin America. What is happening is just the efforts of man for emancipation. It is not Castro. He is only a figure-head, but if he is to die tomorrow his ideas would not die. The whole of Latin America is in revolution. Only on the 15th of September 14 new nations were admitted as sovereign nations by the United Nations. Is it not that the down-trodden man is coming into his own? The fact is that no man-made instructions can survive unless its fundamental objective is aimed at making good for the majority of the people of the country.

This entire debate has been brought about by this Government taking purely an administrative step to see how it can foster trade and carry on this Government and the governments to come, so that there can be more employment and more industrialization and more happiness in this land. With that objective, this approach was made to the Cuban Government; now we are called upon to debate a Motion that we should not grant concessions to Cubans or have anything to do with the Cuban Government. Let those who oppose the idea

of granting concessions to Cuba understand what the Governments of the United Kingdom and Canada are doing now. They are rushing madly with delegations to Cuba to see how they can capture the trade that the United States of America has left behind as a result of strained relationships, politically and commercially. That is happening now. Why they do not read the "Time" magazine sometimes and be informed of what Canada and the United Kingdom are doing with respect to trade with Cuba. If the United Kingdom Government is going headlong into this business to capture the Cuban market, what is wrong with this Government allying itself, so that it too, may be able to profit from that market to the advantage of both nations.

I cannot see how doing business with a nation can, in any way, prejudice a nation, politically. The United Kingdom has a tremendous trade agreement — £100 million — with the U.S.S.R. to last four years. When the United States of America objected to the United Kingdom trading with Red China, what did the U.K. tell the U.S.A.: "You do what you want with your strategic material, I shall live off my trade." People who cannot get off the beaten track of colonial thoughts should think twice. We are a down-trodden people. We are doing our best for ourselves in this tremendously depressed mental state. Britain is a debtor nation. The majority of its industries are controlled by the United States of America. How can we expect great help from a debtor nation. Britain is doomed to become a small nation and to be forgotten like Spain. Let not history repeat itself. Rome, the great empire, was lost. Let there be glory even when you are dying—and even with the United Kingdom expiring slowly in this field, let there be glory.

I have been taken back by what these hon. Gentlemen have said—that we are seeking to ally ourselves with Cuba where people had been put

against a wall and shot. Let us recall what those who are ruling us had been doing not so long ago—shooting the mau-maus in Kenya when they were running away; and what the United States did in the last war, when they dropped two bombs on Hiroshima killing so many thousands of Japanese people. These are matters which need great consideration and should be taken as a whole.

I will be the first, when independence comes, to oppose any move that will not be in the interest of the people; but until we get independence, nothing tangible can be done for the community. There is a fallacy which is being fostered. One man has said that he can raise \$100 million here, but put him in the saddle he cannot even raise a cent [Laughter].

When the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, visited Russia he was given a grand reception. When Khrushchev and Bulganin visited the U.K., they were greeted with cheers and it looked as though there was going to be peace on earth for some time; but when a colonial visits Russia or a communist country, he is looked upon as a communist. That is the truth of things and we must face them as they are. We cannot escape the realities of things; consequently how can my friends reasonably say we must not have anything to do with these people. Why do they not go into the Administrative Chair and run the Government and not say that the Minister had not done much, because they can only do as much as their masters will permit them to do?

One of the great liberators of colonialism, I know, was Mahatma Gandhi, and he said: "I will open my house and let all the winds come into my bedroom; but I shall only keep what is good." We must have alliance; we must talk to people. What is good we shall keep and what is bad we shall reject. Those are facts. Why are we afraid to

talk? Why are we afraid to do business with Cuba? We are under constant threat by the West Indies that they will not buy our rice if we do not join the Federation. Cuba imports 200,000 tons of rice annually. Soon we are going to have a surplus of rice and we must begin to think about new markets. Are we going to refuse to have trade relations with a country because some people say it is run by a communist Government? Even if they are communists are we going to refuse to have trade relations with them because of their ideology? Why is Britain trading with Red China quite openly? Millions of pounds go from Russia to the people of Britain who are quite happy about it, because without trade the British people's standard of living would be lower.

I receive documents regularly from Cuba and from the anti-revolutionary people. I read some of them and throw others aside, but they give me an idea of what is happening in Cuba. I am in a position to say that the majority of the people in Cuba today are behind Dr. Fidel Castro, not because they love him but because of the reaction to what has taken place in the past, and the difficult times they have had. The Cuban workers have agreed to pool a part of their wages in order to push their country further ahead.

Mr. Bowman: That is not true.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: It is true. If you do not know you should find out. The Cuban workers have voluntarily agreed to contribute 4 per cent. of their wages to a common pool for the welfare of the Cuban Government, so that they may be in a better position to defend Cuba and Cuban rights. It is indeed a very interesting subject. We in this country say that we are free, but politicians are being spied upon; Members of this Legislature are being spied upon. Political parties are being spied upon and

[MR. JAI NARINE SINGH]

telephones are being tapped. That is what we call freedom—freedom to govern—but they bring troops. That is the freedom of British democracy which they want people like us to accept. That is the democracy with which they have been governing this land for generations—the extraordinary thing which my friends with colonial minds desire—

Mr. Speaker: I think it is time that I draw Members' attention to Standing Order 34—Rules for Members not speaking. I shall read it:

"34. A Member present in the Council during the debate —

- (1) shall enter or leave the Council with decorum;
- (2) shall not read books, newspapers, letters or other documents save such as relate to the business before the Council;
- (3) shall maintain silence when another Member is speaking, and shall not interrupt, except in accordance with these Standing Orders;
- (4) shall otherwise conduct himself in a fit and proper manner.

A word to the wise, I hope, is sufficient.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Thank you, Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: I hope I will not have to read the Rules to Members who are speaking. [*Laughter*].

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Let me get on with this matter of what happens in this country, and let me say that this is the reaction to the exploitation that has been going on in this country for generations. But before I get on to that subject—

Mr. Speaker: Only four minutes more.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: Somebody may be kind. There is the question of military alliances. It will be remembered that in 1939—

Mr. Speaker: Always remember the Motion before the Council.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I am remembering the Motion. I am trying to deal with what the seconder of the Motion has been dealing with. Between 1939 and 1945 there was a military alliance with communism between Britain and the U.S.A. There was an alliance with Russia to fight Nazism and Fascism, and Japanese imperialism. Whither are we drifting? Yesterday's allies are today's enemies. The world is perhaps set for a new battle, and we are going to be mere pawns in whatever may take place tomorrow. Let those who direct the nations beware. I do not think we will ever be able to do something worthwhile for our country unless we become an independent country. We are still half slave and half free, incapable, because of our present status, of carrying to finality whatever decisions we make, whether in the Legislature or in the Administration of the Government.

What I say is: let us get freedom, and then we shall be able to move forward. Let those who support this Motion remember what Sir Winston Churchill said during the war—that he was willing to ally himself with the devil in order to achieve victory for the country he loved so much. What we want is victory for the common man who has been downtrodden for generations. Why not ally ourselves with all those who are willing to help us?

It is only since 1953 that we have seen some development in this country. Before then it was mere marking time, and the people of the country were the sufferers. There is a continuous cry for independence in this country, because it is through independence that a Motion like this could be carried to finality

Some say "Independence now", as I will say, and I will go a little further by saying "absolute independence". There are some who do not fully appreciate what will take place in August, 1961, and I would like to enlighten them, because we may not go much further. In 1961 responsibility for foreign relations will remain with Britain. We will not be able to bargain or borrow money outside as we would like. That is the issue, and it is time that my friends be reminded that Great Britain does not give freedom easily to those whom she rules. Freedom does not descend upon colonial people; they have to rise and take it. Lip service to freedom is not freedom. In the old days we had a Colonial Secretary. That designation was changed to Chief Secretary, but he acts in the same way. We had a Colonial Treasurer which was changed to Financial Secretary, but he still performs the same duties. A change of words does not change the facts of a situation.

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mr. Hubbard: I move that the hon. Member be allowed to continue his speech for another 30 minutes.

Mr. Tello: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: I will not be as long as that. During this debate the question of unemployment and under-employment was delved into *ad nauseam*. The point is that a Government which is responsible to the people will only grant concessions after very careful consideration, and this Council always has the right to ask Government to place the details of such concessions before it, and also to ask for a debate.

Members must bear in mind that the Cuban rebellion is not a revolution for export; it is a revolution of the

Cuban people. It is not a revolution to be exported to British Guiana. That is the impression I got from the remarks of the hon. Mover of the Motion—that if this Government made a timber deal with the Cuban Government we would have Cubans coming here with guns and ammunition to create a revolution. I cannot conceive how he has come to that conclusion. If that were so then with the trade relations between the United Kingdom and Russia and Red China international revolution and communism would have been carried to the United Kingdom. But we have seen that communism has not been able to get beyond a certain point, and has in fact reached a dead end. Why can't we, if we really love our country, absorb ideas from throughout the world and steer our ship and nation where we want?

So far as the question of freedom is concerned, I would like to cite the case of Ghana. Since it became an independent country Ghana was able during the last four months to borrow £30 million from the United Kingdom Government, £30 million from the United States of America, and £14 million from Russia. Is it not due to the fact that they were able to speak independently and manoeuvre the affairs of Government in an independent manner? If that is not enough, we have a very singular example cited either by the hon. Mover of the Motion, or the Seconder with regard to Egypt. Egypt wanted a dam built at a tremendous cost running into billions of dollars. Both Britain and the United States of America were flirting around with Egypt for a long time over the question of building a canal and entering into a series of negotiations. The negotiations broke down after a while. Egypt then turned to the U.S.S.R. and was able to complete arrangements for the construction of the canal. The dam has been built largely from the assistance of the U.S.S.R. If we are to believe in the information which reaches us, Egypt is no ally of

[MR. JAI NARINE SINGH]

Russia, despite the fact that its capital is tied up with the U.S.S.R. who have sent technicians to Egypt. These are facts which are irrefutable, and I wish to bring them before this Council.

During the debate Egypt was referred to on several occasions. The question of how Cuba was nationalizing or confiscating people's property was also dealt with. An hon. Member referred to the circumstances surrounding the Suez Canal. So far as the Suez Canal is concerned, it was a question of whether the compensation was to the satisfaction of Britain and France. Egypt was invited to deal with the matter on an international level, and, through international pressure from the United States of America and Russia, Britain and France have had to withdraw from Egyptian soil, after leaving a lot of trouble behind them. Cairo airport was devastated; Port Said was devastated. The British Government and the French Government, the great imperialists giants of yesterday, had to accept such compensation as the Egyptian Government was willing to offer. These are realities and have been cited by Members of this Council.

Even the great leader of the neutral world, Pundit Nehru, has been quoted here. It is said that he has ideas bordering on socialism, communism and capitalism. Some people think he is nearer to socialism and communism than anything else. Whether he has lived up to that in the administration of the Government is another matter. Pundit Nehru has followed a liberal form of approach to the Western and Eastern Worlds: to the United States of America as well as Russia. There is Russian industrial development as well as American industrial development going on in India, both sides competing to see how much good they can do for the nation. We want to be able to do things in our

country in the same way as Pundit Nehru is doing in India; we want to do what Dr. Nkrumah has done for Ghana; what Nasser has done for Egypt; what Macmillan has done for Britain, or what Kennedy or Nixon will do for the United States of America. There should be no strings attached, or hindrances put in our way when carrying out these objectives.

During the course of this debate, the Hon. Mover of the Motion cited the Organization of the American States which has a charter—a charter which is largely followed in Britain. It is more tradition than actual fact. Does this Council realize that the Organization of the American States was until recently a mere pawn in the hands of the United States of America?

Mr. Bowman: I never quoted the Charter of the Organization of the United States of America.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: The workings of the Organization of the American States should be remembered, and I want to remind the hon. Member for Demerara River that, if his reports are correct, when the deliberations took place in August/September in Costa Rica with respect to the issues between the Foreign Ministers of the various Latin American Governments and the United States of America, it was no longer possible to infiltrate into their minds the ideas of the United States. That is why Cuba was not condemned, or tremendous pressure placed upon her. As a result of that, the manoeuvre which took place in 1954 when the Organization of the American States moved against Guatemala did not succeed. Cuba was able to carry its case direct to the United Nations.

Mention has been made of the fact that foreigners have exploited the Guianese, and that the Guianese are greater exploiters of their brothers. Maybe there

is a considerable amount of truth in that. Who taught the Guianese the culture or system of exploitation? Is it not those who have been exploiting Guianese? Is it not the foreigners who have set the standard for it? The foreigners have set the economic structure in such a way that when the Guianese finds himself in a strait jacket, he must find a way out of it. I feel that this Motion should be rejected without giving it a second thought.

Mr. Hubbard: The business of granting or withholding concessions for timber or minerals is the business of the executive arm of a Government. This Motion would seek to have the legislature circumscribe the executive's authority in that field, and for that reason alone I consider the Motion ill-considered if not entirely ridiculous.

There is just one other point about the Motion that is worthy of mention; that is: where the Mover declares what he considers to be the opinion of the majority of the inhabitants of British Guiana. It reminds me of a near blasphemy committed some years ago by the most flamboyant political figure in modern history, Sir Winston Churchill, when he said at Fulton, Missouri, "that it is the will of God that the English-speaking peoples should unite". It is arrogant, thoughtless, and overweeningly ambitious people who seek to declare that their personal judgment is the judgment of God, or the will of the people.

There is a social machine for determining what is the will of the people, and we have used it here as recently as 1957. It is not a particularly good machine, for it was designed to achieve a quite different objective from that which came out of its working. Nevertheless, it can be said to have given us some representation of what was and is the will of the people.

Until we have some other manifestation of the real will of the people, we will have to accept that judgment.

These remarks are really all that this Motion merits, but in our debate we have dealt with a much wider range of questions. I would like, with your indulgence, Sir, to touch upon one or two things. Let me say, first of all, that business is business. Business is like the law; you do not turn away a customer because he is a murderer. Indeed, if you are a lawyer a murderer may be your best customer. [*Laughter.*] The nation, the people, and the Government, must seek to do business where they get the best terms. We have done business for as long as we have been a British Colony, for just under 150 years, in very circumscribed and disadvantageous circumstances.

We have, indeed, had our economy tied; we have had to buy expensively and sell cheaply. We are manufacturers of some of the world's finest sugar, but we do not refine it. We are told that we must not refine sugar, it is bad for us. But then, we are British and what is bad for the British is necessarily bad for us! Yes, Sir, we have been so circumscribed that in these 150 years we cannot bandage a wound until cotton has travelled from some country—Egypt, America or India—to Britain to be spun and woven and then put on ships and brought here. That is the pattern of our trade.

We produce sugar. We produce bauxite; and it is only now that the bauxite ore which we produce is being processed so that we can get some little advantage out of it. But it is not fully processed. It is only being partly processed. That is how our economy has been tied and remains tied. Of course, my friends, the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, and the hon. Member for Demerara River would not know those things because they live in little isolated cells far removed from the

[MR. HUBBARD]

realities of life. They do not know those things; that is why we have to point them out.

We have heard representations that it is immoral to enter into trade with Cuba or certain other groups because of the social conditions that exist in those countries. They say there is no freedom; there are killings; there are arbitrary arrests and the like. Well, nobody likes arbitrary arrests; nobody likes peremptory killings, but they are inescapable facts of today's life and they exist in a very large part of the world; and if we are going to decide that we will not trade with this person or that person because we do not like what is going on in their country, we are not going to eat Madeira onions or Spanish sardines and there are many things we will have to do without.

Who are those gentlemen who represent themselves as being such champions of freedom that they cannot bear the thought of trading with people who do not have freedom? — the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello. He was, himself, an arm of a dictator in this country. He was, himself, such an arm because when Sir Alfred Savage dismissed the Elected Government of British Guiana and set up his barbed wire fences and put people behind them without trial, the hon. Member did not have anything to say against it. The people who were behind the fences were possibly people he did not like. Therefore, I cannot give any weight at all to his statements about a love for freedom. He does not love freedom; what he loves is his own skin [*Laughter*]. That is the kind of man who gets up and tells us about freedom — you must not trade with people because you do not like the way they live.

When the hon. Member for New Amsterdam was an arm of the dictator and when the Police and the troops crept up upon the sleeping township of

Port Mourant, set off their star shells and had pregnant women and little children jumping through windows in terror, where were these champions of freedom? Where were they, and these gentlemen of the Press? Where were they? They were nowhere near. Perhaps, they did not even know about it. So that these considerations of freedom are not really considerations; they are sham considerations; they are just red herrings upon our plates to spoil our appetites for an otherwise good meal. And let me say this: I do not like arbitrary shootings whether they be done in Malaya or Cuba or the Soviet Union or Spain or anywhere. I do not like it. There are few people who like it. But you live in a world where social change is occurring all the time, and social change does not come easily. People do not like to surrender their privileges. To many people, the earnings of endeavour are not as desirable as the largesse of patronage; so that social change is not an easy thing; and in a world where social change is taking place over such a far-ranging area, it is well-nigh impossible to find normality.

We all know that in times of war you have to restrain freedom — “sealed lips save ships” in war-time; in war-time you have to restrict people's movements and impose censorship of the Press and things like that. When there is a social revolution it is war. It is not an international war, but a national war. Let me give you an example: In 1953, a Government was elected here to carry out a certain social programme. After the election, everything was beautiful in the garden. One gentleman — an English gentleman — told me after the election, during the Queen's coronation celebrations, that the Governor of the day was a Fabian Socialist. I told him that I did not think a Colonial Governor could hold the Queen's commission if he was further “left”, than a Liberal. “You have your opinion, I have mine.”

Government seemed close together, but when that Government got into power it did not forget its manifesto, and do the orthodox thing. It proceeded to implement its programme; and all the peace and calm that prevailed were shattered. The harlot Press suddenly became raging, fighting machines. The Government was a bad government and it was overthrown. A counter-revolution was organized and it was overthrown. People discovered fire plots after the suspension of the Constitution, and things like that happened. But what took place here? The Elected members of the Government were restrained and put behind barbed wire. But that is a fact of life.

Today we have a limited Elected Government and, remember, next year we will have another Elected Government and what will be necessary then will be another counter-revolution if the Government persists in doing what it promised the electorate to do. Whether that counter-revolution will succeed is another matter, but a lot of people are planning that way. But it was during that dark period that we had a chance to know our local people who are assigned as reporters for the foreign Press. Just before the troops landed, one newspaper correspondent came to me with a telegram that he had received. He was a representative of the Associated Press.

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed very wide scope. I would ask that you relate it to the Motion. I have been very indulgent.

Mr. Hubbard: We have had a lot of references to Press reports to justify Members' feelings on that matter. But the question is that they are not always reliable. As I was saying: In 1953, I had a Press correspondent coming to me with a telegram which read:

"United Press have rioting and blood-shed please let us have ours"

—and it was a Guianese who said there was rioting and bloodshed. Those are the facts of life; they have nothing to do with international trade. The suggestion that trading with a country is dangerous because of ideas that may come along with that trade is a complete absurdity. Ideas are not kept out of a country by walls. If walls could have kept out ideas there would have been no Reformation; there would have been no Lutheran and no Methodist Church; in fact there would have been no Protestant Church at all.

There is a law here which says that a half-educated clerk can tell me what I may lawfully read. That is the freedom my friends talk about. Ideas do not have to wait on trade to gain currency; they are generated by the very circumstances in which people live. Critchlow brought subversive ideas here when he found conditions at the waterfront intolerable. But when we spoke in tribute about Critchlow recently I remarked how one heterodoxy succeeds another, each becoming respectable in its turn; and this heterodoxy of seeking to break an established trade relationship and widen the field of trade is another heterodoxy that will become respectable in time.

I would like to close by referring to an article in today's issue of "The Daily Argosy", Friday, 4th November, which states:

"Havana. Nov. (Reuter)—A Canadian-British project to operate a 'pool' of machinery, spares, chemicals and advisory services in Cuba for oil and sugar is at present under consideration by Dr. Fidel Castro's Government here, authoritative sources said today.

The sponsors of the pool plan to invite West European concerns to participate by supplying such items to the pool for Cuba's needs. Cuba would sell the pool sugar at current world prices less the bulk purchase discount, and 94-octane petrol at prices possibly permitting the purchasers to undercut major international oil companies.

[MR. HUBBARD]

"Price scales acceptable to the operators of the projected pool have already been agreed to by the Cuban Sugar Board and the Petroleum Institute, the sources said.

"Purchasers operating through the pool would be insured against the failure of oil supplies by a 50 per cent. monetary guarantee held in Swiss banks, the sources said.

"In the case of an interruption of Cuban oil exports over a five-year period, it was envisaged that supplies to the pool might be maintained from 'another world source', but they declined to name this source.

"Cuba's output of oil refined from Russian crude is estimated at nearly 40,000 barrels per week more than the island's own requirements.

"The sources mentioned the possibility that British tankers already shipping the Russian crude to Cuba might carry the refined oil to Canada and Western Europe for distribution.

"The pool plans to become effective by February, 1961".

That is my closing piece. If trading with Cuba is good enough for the British and for the Canadians, then it is good enough for us.

The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan): We have before us a Motion which seeks to limit the activities of this country at what I regard as a very critical time, not only in the history of British Guiana but indeed generally in the history of the world. For when we look around us we find all around shouts for more employment, for more land and for more social assistance, and the very champions of this Motion who get up and criticize the Government for not doing enough are today saying that we must restrict our trade relations with certain countries because those countries are subversive, or because they do not enjoy freedoms.

I do not want to speak in defence of the Cuban revolution, but because so much nonsense has been said here, and

because we have been told that "Time" magazine is now the authority, I think it is only right and fair that I should read from some other authoritative journals so that we can get a true picture of what is happening in that country today. I will proceed in a moment to deal with economic questions, but because there is the view that we should not trade or have any commercial relations with that country it is better that we clear the air and understand precisely what this Government represents, because while today we may be discussing the matter of a timber concession, tomorrow it may very well be the question of the acceptance of a loan which has been offered to this country. So I think opportunity should be taken at this time to clear the air to see precisely what is happening.

The hon. Member for Georgetown South (Mr. Jai Narine Singh) and the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Hubbard, referred to the tremendous upheaval in the world today, and it is well that we should note the economic forces which are behind these upheavals. Certain people are determined to hold back the tide of history. Speaking on behalf of vested interests as they do, I feel certain that their efforts will fail, but those efforts can do a great deal of harm in misinforming the public, because those people unfortunately have on their side mass means of communication, and they are able to spread their propaganda far and wide.

As we know, "Time" magazine certainly has a very wide circulation, but speaking from personal experience I know that when anything is written in that magazine about British Guiana it is more often than not a distortion of the facts. One tends to accept news published about other countries as gospel truth, but if one were to judge from experience here then one could certainly say that a lot of what is published in that journal is not necessarily gospel truth.

What about the Cuban revolution? I have with me a magazine called the "New Statesman", an English publication. My friend, Mr. Tello, probably does not read this journal, but it is a highly recognized journal in the United Kingdom. It is not communist. In the issue of July 9, 1960, we read the following on page 43:

"In short, the Cuban revolution is a genuine one, and this, ironically enough, is a rarity in Latin-America. Most Latin-American revolutions, even of extreme left-wing complexion, involve little more than a change of personnel at the top. The overthrow of Peron in Argentina and Jimenez in Venezuela, and the subsequent election of left-wing governments there, have led to few structural changes; both these regimes govern under the watchful eye of the armed forces. In Bolivia, where widespread expropriation has been carried out, an immense gulf still separates rich and poor. Even in Mexico, which has had 50 years of 'revolutionary' government, it was recently claimed that there are still over 1,000 *latifundia*, including one of over 500,000 acres. But in Cuba, the wheels of revolution have really begun to bite, and for one very simple reason. Unlike almost every other revolutionary in Latin American history, Castro did not come to power with the support, active or passive, of the armed forces, but in the teeth of their resistance. In fact, in order to come to power he had to destroy the Cuban military establishment, and this he did totally and forever. Hence, there is no built-in, institutionalised restraint of his policies, not the remotest chance of a counter-revolutionary coup. On the contrary, the revolutionary army is an integral part of the regime and its leaders are the most fanatical proponents of change. Castro, like Mao Tse-tung, was carried to power on the backs of the armed peasants, and they will keep him there."

This article then goes on to state that one of the first things done by the revolution was to carry out a system of land reform. My hon. Friend who quotes from "Time" magazine should enlighten us about certain other things, because only a few weeks ago "Time" carried an article regarding the need for land reform. In Latin America there is a cry for a basic system of land reform.

The people want to change the system of land tenure under which millions of people have very little land whilst a few hold tremendous holdings.

In Cuba, as I have said, one of the first things done was to carry out a drastic system of land reform. This magazine goes on to state:

"... Most of the Latin-American economists to whom I talked, however, were convinced that the reform is working. One of them — viewing Cuba from the relative objectivity of the F.A.O. — told me emphatically: 'The Cuban land-reform is the first in Latin-American history to have raised production during the first year of its operation.'"

One can go on quoting and, perhaps, it is well to do so because of the misinformation of the Members in this Council and elsewhere about what authorities have to say about the things taking place in Cuba today.

Mr. Ernest Hemingway, an author who is well-known for writing good novels, who has won a number of prizes for his works, and who has taken part in revolutions in Spain and elsewhere said this to a representative of "Fair Play" magazine — a magazine published in the United States of America. I quote:

"I was disposed to join the guerrillas of Fidel Castro in the Sierra Maestra, but I suffered an accident in Africa which prevented me from making any rough movements. I regretted it very much, truthfully.

"I would have had a great theme for a good story. Perhaps I will do something with the moments we are living now in Cuba, but I haven't thought about it.

"I am not a theorist, I cannot give specific reasons, but I can say that I am totally in accord with Cuba and its revolution."

Mr. Campbell: When was that written?

Dr. Jagan: On September 9, 1960. Then there is Jean Paul Sartre, another respected individual in the literary field.

[DR. JAGAN]

He is a Frenchman. After visiting Cuba recently with a group of prominent writers, authors and artists from the United States he had this to say:

"The full realization of the Cuban Revolution implies a complete solidarity of all of the Latin-American peoples. This is not to say that each nation must not seek its own road. It does mean that Cuba is the point of departure, and that for the first time an effort is being made for the total solidarity of all of the Latin-American peoples against the imperialism of the United States.

"Cuba represents the first attempt of a Latin-American nation to reach total independence, without the tutelage of anyone. In order that the Cuban Revolution assume full significance, it will be necessary for Latin-America to consider the Cuban course as if it were its own".

I mention this because it is necessary to put the other side of the picture before the Council. Today Latin America, of which we are a part, is in a great turmoil. Those of us who have read the reports of the Economic Commission on Latin America are worried, because we see that the recession, depression, and so on in the United States are having a deleterious effect on the economies of these countries. We have seen studies after studies being undertaken in Latin America in order to overcome the ills of their lopsided economies: a dependence on one crop or one mineral, a dependence generally of a colonial economy.

Some people say that Cuba is now making a break—a break in the economic sense. Let us be concerned in this matter. We cannot live in isolation in this country. Some Members of the "Opposition" will say that this is a small country, and we must not worry with what is happening outside. But we must worry because we are part and parcel of the world. Everyone knows that not too long ago, in 1958, we suffered in this country as a result of the

recession in the United States. Right now we are being told that things are not very rosy in the United States. In that country there is grave concern over the state of its economy. In an editorial in "The New York Times" of the 18th October, 1960, I see:

"... Industrial production last month declined to the lowest point of the year, falling back to the lowest level since last year's strike. Retail sales fell appreciably. Wage and salary incomes declined, but personal incomes reached a new high, primarily because Government transfer payments such as unemployment insurance, veterans' benefits, and Social Security payments rose. Unemployment dropped somewhat, but at 5.7 per cent of the labour force it was still too high."

Any setback in economic activity in the United States can have dire consequences in Latin America; hence the statement: "When America sneezes Latin America catches a cold". This equally applies to British Guiana because, generally speaking, we in this part of the world, in Latin America and South America, are still relatively underdeveloped. We still have a relatively low *per capita* income. Therefore we must be concerned about what is taking place around us, and endeavour to grasp economic opportunities as long as they are in our interest. That is why I have taken time to debunk some of the propaganda by the hon. Mover of the Motion and those who have supported him. I see no reason why we should not embark on a normal commercial transaction.

I was rather surprised to see a recent article about Cuba in the "Guiana Sunday Graphic". In spite of the daily doses of propaganda against the Cuban people, the Cuban revolution and the Cuban leader, we see a glimmer of truth. I do not know how the article passed the censors and managing directors. Mr. Herbert Williams, a sub-editor of the "Graphic", has recently returned from Cuba and he has given us the benefit of what he saw there in an article written

on October 9, 1960. What a strange picture he paints! I do not see my hon. Friends, the Members of the "Opposition", reading from Mr. Williams' statement, but they read all of the propaganda which is dished out by the reactionaries all over the world. I will read what Mr. Williams has written. He states:

"I was somewhat surprised by the situation in the island as I found it. Of course, there were very "definite" ideas in my mind of what was happening there. There was the impression—created by some reports—of turbulent times—of a people tottering on the edge of a precipice, facing inevitable catastrophe.

This is, to say the least, far from the truth if what I saw in my short stay is any real indication of the situation as a whole.

Admittedly, in four days, any observation of the situation in the sugar-rich republic cannot be but somewhat superficial. But again the real position cannot best be determined from anywhere else but in Cuba.

The Cubans emphatically deny that there is any real opposition movement to threaten the Revolutionary Government.

It is claimed that two months ago, when the last popularity census was held, 87 per cent supported Castro. There are still some people whose sympathy is with the Batista regime; and another set who are more or less fluid.

Although there are these three sides to the Cuban make-up, basically they express equal love for their country. The sort of nationalism I encountered there was truly amazing (it is entirely non-existent in British Guiana), and one wondered whether it was peculiar to the Cuban nation or characteristic of Latin American countries in general."

Sir, here are the words of a Guianese who had gone there and seen.

We have heard a lot of nonsense that the people are forced to pay 4 per cent. of their wages towards an industrialization programme. How is it that these workers are forced to pay 4 per cent. of their wages and these are the same workers to whom Castro has given guns to defend their revolution? How is it? As the author

said in the "New Statesman", the regular army has been disbanded, and in its place there is a people's militia. Every worker, every farmer, every schoolteacher, every clerk has a gun. It is all well and good to talk about democracy. Dr. Castro is criticized for not being democratic, but has shouted back to those who accuse him and said: Put guns in the hands of the workers and we will see how long so-called freedom and democracy will last; when oppressors talk about freedom, they mean their right to exploit the workers.

There is a great scare that because Castro has seized properties; that because there were some shootings, imprisonment and so forth, that everyone inevitably everywhere will do the same. The last speaker who spoke a few moments ago said that we must recognize the fact that there is a revolutionary upsurge all over the world. Let us accept it as a fact that a revolution has its own timetable, that a revolution has its own justice and that revolutions are not formed only because a few people shout; because if a revolution could have come about by a few persons shouting, then we would have had a revolution long ago in British Guiana. The mover of the Motion himself, was fighting fire with fire a few years ago; and another Member of the "Opposition" had not very long ago told us how "over my dead body they will come to our shores." [Laughter].

Mr. Speaker: I do not know to whom you refer?

Dr. Jagan: The hon. Member for Georgetown Central. Revolutions do not come because a few leaders get up and preach revolutionary slogans. They are not imported or exported. Revolutions come from the people when they are fed up, when they are so dissatisfied that they will rather die than continue living, and this was the stage reached in Cuba, as was reached in the United States of America, in France, in Russia. Today,

[DR. JAGAN]

all over the world, we see demonstrations led particularly by the youthful revolutionary intelligentsia. So-called democratic regimes are toppling everywhere. Menderes of France and Syngman Rhee of Korea were all great democrats of the world. But lest it be said that Cuba alone is a banditti country and that Castro is a dictator who is out to get blood, let us just go back.

Mr. Speaker: Before you go back I think you will have to get a Motion to continue.

The Minister of Communications and Works: (Mr. Ram Karan): I beg to move that the speaker be allowed another half an hour.

Mr. Ajodha Singh: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Dr. Jagan: Let us just refer to the American War of Independence because I feel we have many historical parallels. We are a Colony and the 13 American territories were colonies too, the only difference is that they were freed. They fought for independence in 1775 and we are still trying to get ours here at the present time. There are some who tell us that the American War of Independence was based on idealism, was fought merely on the issue of freedom—freedom of the Press, freedom of assembly and religion and so forth. Certainly wrapped up in all revolutionary wars is the question of basic freedoms. But more than that: revolutions have an economic basis. In this book, which is a textbook on “American Politics” by Odegard and Helms, we read at page 13:

“The American Revolution was in many ways one phase of the struggle of small farmers, free laborers and the rising merchant class, against the merchant-landed aristocratic system of entailed rights and privileges.

‘The American Revolution,’ wrote Millen Chamberlain, ‘was not a quarrel between two peoples... it was a strife between two parties, the conservatives in both countries in one party, and the liberals in both countries as the other party.’”

In these days epithets are hurled all around. Nowadays one hears all sorts of derogatory remarks and abuses about who is a communist or who is a marxist, but when the American War of Independence was being fought there was no Fidel Castro who was said to be sympathizing with the communists or setting up a communist base in Cuba. In those days what were the revolutionary leaders called? — “wretched banditti”. One lawyer said: “When the pot boils the scum will arise.” Who were the people? Professor Van Tyne says:

“In one sense the American Revolution was a social and economic rebellion of the lower classes against the domination of the colonial aristocracy... The lists of refugees, banished Loyalists, and persons sent to places of detention during the war read often like bead-rolls of the finest and oldest colonial families. The culture, the dignity, the official ranks, the inheritors of wealth tended to support the old order.”

Wherever you go, whether to the French Revolution or the American Revolution or, indeed, the silent revolution which is taking place all over the world today, it is the same old story. And as to the seizing of properties, it was not only Fidel Castro or the Russians who have seized properties. I would like my hon. Friends to know this because this is very important.

As I said, a revolution has its own timetable and its own system of justice. At page 20 of this book, “American Politics”, we read:

“Equally significant were the social and economic consequences of the war. Royal restrictions on the acquisition and use of land and forests were wiped out. Crown lands fell into the possession of the states, and quit-rents were abolished. More important still was the abolition of

those rules of law, entail and primogeniture, which had been designed to establish and perpetuate a landed aristocracy. Moreover, the vast estates held by Tories and their sympathizers were, with a few exceptions, confiscated and broken up into smaller holdings. The land seized was sold to ready purchasers. The De Lancey estate in New York went to 275 persons, Roger Morris's to 250, New Hampshire confiscated twenty-eight estates, and "in Massachusetts a sweeping act confiscated at one blow all the property of all who had fought against the United States, or had even retired into places under British authority without permission from the American government." New York sold confiscated lands to the amount of \$3,000,000, Maryland realized over £450,000 from the same source, Pennsylvania nearly £1,000,000, and other states lesser amounts. No compensation was paid to the owners, and it was left to the British government to reimburse the Loyalists to the tune of over £3,000,000 although their claims were as high as £8,000,000. American manufacturing and trade were released from the imperial restrictions imposed before the war . . ."

Let us remember that the value of money in those days was far more than it is today and what is happening in Cuba to the billions is no exception in a revolution. And let those who suppress and keep down the masses remember these facts because justice will be meted out measure for measure. As you treat others, so treatment will be meted out unto you. The British Government reimbursed those whose properties were confiscated in the same way as slave owners, when slavery was abolished, had been compensated by the British Government.

I think I have given enough to show that today, whether in Cuba or elsewhere, there is a world situation in which the masses are not content to live as they now do and where the economic order must change.

A United Nations survey disclosed in 1950 that 18 per cent. of the world's population, less than 1/5, in the highly-developed countries — the rich countries

—owned a little over 2/3 of the world's income. On the other hand, nearly 2/3 of the people living in Asia, Africa and Latin America had less than 1/5 of the world's income. This does not come about as a result of the laws of God. This came about because of the economic order under which we are caught up by the forces of imperialism. Capitalism is dying, and in its death throes it is carrying along some of us. We owe a duty to ourselves to see how changes can come about; to see how we can free ourselves from the tentacles of imperialism.

What is the position in our timber industry? British Guiana is exporting roughly \$2 million worth of timber per year. The Cuban Government is importing about \$23 million worth of timber in various forms—boards, poles, etc. The Party which I have the honour to lead has been saying time and again that foreign capital is not going to be the salvation of this country. Only last night we were told by an expert who works with the Economic Commission for Latin America, that in Latin America today the people are generally wary of foreign capitalists and foreign capital. In some cases they restrict them; they can only come in under certain conditions, and in some places they cannot come in at all. In Brazil, for instance, there is a big fight as to whether the oil industry should be open to capitalists from outside. In Venezuela right now the Government is under heavy pressure because it was preparing to give Reynolds the right to establish an aluminum smelting plant there. They have a large hydroelectric development at Coroni, but the people feel, in view of their experience in the past, that they would not benefit, hence there is this tremendous opposition.

We have said that foreign capital alone is not going to be the salvation of this country. We must plan and make a proper assessment of our resources and try to develop those resources. But it is

[DR. JAGAN]

the Opposition which has been telling us that foreign capital will be the salvation of this country. It has not proved so in other parts of the world—in Asia, Africa or Latin America. I do not wish to tire the Council with all the facts and statistics, but Latin America's experience is that when a few dollars come in more fly out. Between 1945 and 1955 foreign investments yielded \$7 billion, of which \$1½ billion was reinvested. In the same period \$2 billion of new capital came in, thus leaving a net outflow of \$3½ billion. That is the balance-sheet of imperialism. Our friends have been saying "Let capital come in." Government says "In this period of under-development and stagnation, let us have our timber industry developed." In Latin America they do not have any tax concessions. The point to note is that these are the people who have been telling us to open our doors.

We are accused by the hon. Member for Georgetown Central (Mr. Burnham) of being imperialist-minded, of perpetuating Cuban imperialism; that while we are opposed to imperialism we do not mind encouraging Cuban imperialism. I wondon whether the hon. Member has forgotten his textbooks and all his readings about socialism. Socialists have a different creed; they live on principles; they do not live only on the philosophy of "dog eat dog." They believe not only that there should be justice inside a country but also justice between one country and another. Some people cannot understand this, but they will learn in due course.

Whether the Cubans accept a concession or not, if it is taken it is going to be granted on strictly commercial lines, as we do with anyone else. We give concessions to all and sundry. There are certain laws laid down. If the Cubans come here and accept concessions they will have to abide by the laws of the country. We are told that they will come

here and probably bring guns and tanks instead of bulldozers. That is puerile nonsense. Revolutions cannot be exported or imported. I think we should grasp this opportunity which has presented itself. Members should be happy.

I have not heard the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Davis, on this question. I refer to him because we will soon have to be thinking in terms of a market for rice. We have been told that if we do not join the West Indies Federation where are we going to sell our rice? We were told just now that 200,000 tons of rice was imported into Cuba, and no doubt with the increased economic tempo and a rise in the standard of living of the people they will be in a position to purchase much more rice. Let us not forget that 18 per cent. of Cuba's population was unemployed and land hungry, but very soon the position will be changed. I have just had a letter from a company offering to establish 18 factories in Cuba as a Government enterprise which, incidentally, will pay for themselves out of profits, like the electricity undertaking which Government has recently acquired.

Look at the list of the timbers in which the Cubans are interested —

Aromata	Baromalli
Crabwood	Dalli
Brown Silverballi	Determa
Dukali	Kanakudiballi
Kereti Silverballi	Locust
Manni	Mora
Purpleheart	Tatabu
Tauroniro	Wallaba

This country has been spending thousands of dollars year after year trying to encourage the use of these secondary species, but what do we find? Government has to subsidize these timbers to encourage the utilization of these species, the extraction of which our timber people are not concerned about. They extract what timbers the people will buy and what is most profitable to them. We

are told that there are limited quantities of greenheart in our forests, and that selective logging is a very expensive proposition. The Cubans are not bound by prejudices; they know what they want and they know the physical characteristics of our timber, and they are prepared to buy them. If they want to set up a wood grant and to extract the secondary species they want we have to see that we get royalty and impose conditions so that this country gets the best out of the deal. If we could capture even half of the Cuban market we may be able to multiply possible by six times our present production of timber.

Some of us have shed crocodile tears about our unemployed. If they were really concerned I think that instead of attacking the Government the hon. Member of the Motion and those who have supported him should praise the Government for taking these steps. Other countries are doing these things, going hither and thither trying to find means whereby they can solve their present-day economic problems. I agree with the hon. Member for Georgetown Central that we must take care that in any deal we get the best bargain for this country; that before we accept loans at low rates of interest which are tied up with the purchase of equipment, we should make sure that we are given competitive prices. There is no need for fear about that. We have seen that prices in some of these territories are generally lower.

In Italy, Switzerland and Eastern Europe, you will find that in many cases prices are cheaper in certain fields. The same people who are objecting to Government making trade deals are making money by trading with Czechoslovakia and other places. This trade will be in the interest of the country. If the Government were to make a deal on terms which were not advantageous, by all means criticize us. But what we find in this Motion is not merely a question of giving a concession.

The Cubans have said that they are not interested in a concession. They are prepared to loan this Government money and give technical advice and assistance when we need them, so that we can establish our own undertaking. Even if they were prepared merely to take a concession, I would say give it to them because I feel that we would get a better deal when we are able to utilize certain species of timber which would never have been sold in the open market.

When the C.D.C. came here we were told that they would make plywood, veneers and so on. But they are still restricted to greenheart and purple-heart, perhaps, through no fault of their own, because they have to deal with the jungle of the capitalist market. We have to sell what the customers will buy. Only greenheart is known abroad, and big undertakings like C.D.C. have to limit their undertaking mainly to the extraction of greenheart.

Here is a concern which would be prepared to set up its own undertaking and utilize practically all of the timbers in our forest, because it has a planned economy. I went to a factory in Cuba where they were producing paper from bagasse. They are producing 60 per cent. of their requirements and were importing the balance from abroad. They told me that if they had wood pulp to mix with bagasse they could produce cheaper newsprint. There is unlimited demand for other industries in that country.

It is one thing to produce rice; experts will tell us that it is not a difficult thing to produce. The last expert who came here told us that we have the best conditions for manufacturing glass. He said that in 1947 he advised Bookers on the subject, but up to now a glass factory has not been constructed in this country. We can produce glass, but it will be difficult to sell it abroad. So far as timber is concerned, we do not have to worry about selling it. If the Cubans set up

[DR. JAGAN]

their own undertaking here they will have to extract the species they are interested in, and it will be their hard luck if they fail to get the desired results. After they enter into a contract with us, having loaned us money and told us what species they want, we will supply them with what they have contracted to buy. They will be repaid in terms of the products which they have contracted to buy. What can we lose? These opportunities do not come everyday.

Here we have people either from prejudice, bigotry or, perhaps, ignorance, objecting to this proposed arrangement, because there is a great deal of ignorance about what is going on today in Cuba. If I could spend the taxpayers' money, I would charter a Dakota and take the whole Council for a tour of Cuba. The hon. Member for Georgetown South, a Reporter from British Guiana, and Dr. Nicholson have seen what Cuba looks like. Let us get rid of these prejudices; the world is moving on and we have to move with it.

Mr. Speaker: Only one minute more.

Dr. Jagan: It is surprising how people turn when they leave us. In this last minute I will deal with the hon. Mover of the Motion. In June 18, 1953, when he was a Member of the House of Assembly and the People's Progressive Party he said, and I quote:

"Another complaint is that we are sick to death of the restraints being placed upon us by the British. Today we cannot even make friends of our own choice. We cannot sell our produce in the world's markets; we are being told who must be our friends and where we must sell our goods. We intend to use every possible effort to get rid of these restrictions. The Americans, in the first paragraph of their Declaration of Independence say:—

"When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands..."

Even the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Fredericks, is now accustomed to quoting this same revolutionary statement. Some people seem to forget what they have fought for, but this is no time to forget. If you forget, perhaps, history and the people of British Guiana will certainly forget you.

Mr. Jackson: If ever there was an occasion which demonstrated the need for broadcasting of debates in this Council, this is the one occasion. We have listened quite attentively to the several Members speaking for and against the Motion. We have listened to the justification of a revolution; we have listened to the fear of the arrival of communism; we have listened to the veiled threats of what will happen later; we have listened to the events of 1953 and all that came with them. I am sure that those of us who have been treated so very generously would have been happier if the country as a whole had been enjoying this generous treatment given by those who represent the people of this country.

I wonder whether the hon. the Chief Secretary has not regretted that he and his colleagues have not accepted the Motion for broadcasting the debates, which take place in this Council? I have listened to references to the common man coming into his own, and I am left wondering who is the common man to whom these references have been made. I am wondering whether the common man is restricted to a class, or whether he is covered by the existence of man in general. I am left wondering, because it is my conviction that if it is believed that the common man is restricted to a class, then the basis on which some people talk about it will never become a reality — will never become something which can be hoped

[MR. JACKSON]

for, because it will result in further struggles which will not only bring about a revolution in its own time, but will result also in the need for further revolutions. Perhaps what we will find is a continuity of war instead of peace, about which some people speak so very glibly.

It is regretted that in this world in which some people talk of peace, they fail to realize that consideration should be given to the mental stability of the people in the world as well as those who are talking of peace. Peace looked at from a purely objective end is the peace which will not often be dreamed of as a reality. We have observed that even when they have internal revolutions which cannot be exported that they are followed by subsequent revolutions. Hence, the people who have got into power by way of revolutions are always sitting on hot ashes because they, in turn, are afraid that some other person will rise up by way of a revolution and overthrow them.

When we talk in terms of revolution — not mental revolution but physical revolution — of the type we have heard so very much about, we must recognize the very important fact that it is likely to be followed by another revolution. Therefore the people who have not grown up in an atmosphere of revolutionary fervour must sometimes be somewhat concerned as to why these

things should be made possible, and why they come in our lifetime. I mention this because it is very important to observe that if a change is to come, we must make sure that we have something proper to replace what we have — something which most of the people are willing to accept as a substitute or alternative.

It is somewhat important that out of this emotion which we have witnessed in this Council during the course of the debate on this Motion—I take the word from the Minister of Communications and Works when he said in another place there must not be emotionalism but reason—that all we have got from the time the debate on this Motion had been introduced is emotionalism running to its highest point. I make this point in the hope of refraining from emotion, and I hope to approach this matter as objectively as possible. It is getting close to five o'clock, Sir.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary: I beg to move the Adjournment of this Council until 2 p.m. on Wednesday, 9th November, 1960.

Mr. Speaker: This Council is now adjourned until 2 p.m. on Wednesday, 9th November, 1960.

Council adjourned accordingly, at 5 p.m.