

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 3]

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE THIRD SESSION OF
THE FIRST LEGISLATURE CONSTITUTED UNDER THE BRITISH
GUIANA (CONSTITUTION) ORDER IN COUNCIL, 1961.

15th Sitting

Wednesday, 8th January, 1964

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

The Assembly met at 2.20 p.m.

Prayers

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Present:

Members of the Government

People's Progressive Party

Ministers

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Dr. the Honourable C. B. Jagan | <i>—Premier and Minister of Development and Planning (Member for Corentyne — East)</i> |
| The Honourable B. H. Benn | <i>—Minister of Agriculture, Forests and Lands (Member for Demerara Coast — West)</i> |
| The Honourable Ram Karran | <i>—Minister of Works and Hydraulics (Member for Mahaica)</i> |
| The Honourable R. Chandisingh | <i>—Minister of Labour, Health and Housing (Member for Lower Demerara River)</i> |
| Dr. the Honourable Charles Jacob, Jr. | <i>—Minister of Finance (Member for Vreed-en-Hoop)</i> |
| Dr. the Honourable F. H. W. Ramsahoye | <i>—Attorney-General (Member for Canals Polder)</i> |
| The Honourable E. M. G. Wilson | <i>—Minister of Communications (Member for Boerasirie)</i> |

Parliamentary Secretaries

Mr. G. Bowman	-Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Home Affairs (Member for Corentyne Central)
Mr. L. E. Mann	-Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education and Social Development (Member for Mahaicony)
Mr. S. M. Saffee	-Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Lands (Member for Berbice West)

Other Members

Mr. G. L. Robertson	-(Member for Leonora)
Mr. M. Bhagwan	-(Member for Essequibo Islands)
Mr. J. B. Caldeira	-(Member for Pomeroon)
Mr. V. Downer	-(Member for Berbice - East)
Mr. M. Hamid	-(Member for Demerara - Central)
Mr. D. C. Jagan	-(Member for Suddie)
Mr. H. Lall	-(Member for Corentyne - West)
Mr. M. Shakoor	-(Member for Corentyne River)

Members Constituting the Minority

(i) People's National Congress

Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.	-(Member for Ruimveldt)
Mr. W. O. R. Kendall, Deputy Speaker	-(Member for New Amsterdam)
Mr. J. Carter, Q.C.,	-(Member for Werk-en-Rust)
Mr. E. F. Correia	-(Member for Mazaruni-Potaro)
Mr. N. J. Bissember	-(Member for Campbellville)
Mr. W. A. Blair	-(Member for Berbice River)
Mr. R. S. S. Hugh	-(Member for Georgetown - South)
Mr. J. G. Joaquin	-(Member for Kitty)
Mr. R. J. Jordan	-(Member for Upper Demerara River)
Mr. C. A. Merriman	-(Member for La Penitence - Lodge)
Mr. H. M. S. Wharton	-(Member for Abary)

(ii) United Force

Mr. P. d'Aguiar	-(Member for Georgetown - Central)
Mr. R. E. Checks	-(Member for Georgetown - North)
Mr. E. V. Viapree	- Clerk of the Legislature (Ag.).
Mr. F. A. Narain	- Assistant Clerk of the Legislature (Ag.).

Absent:

His Honour the Speaker, Mr. R. B. Gajraj	on leave
Mr. S. Campbell (Member for North West)	on leave
Mr. E. E. Melville (Member for Rupununi)	
Mr. B. S. Rai (Member for Demerara Coast - East).	

2.22 p.m.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS
AND REPORTS, ETC.

The following Report was laid
on the Table:

Annual Report on the
Treatment of Offenders (Pro-
bation, Essequibo Boys'
School and Prisons) for the
year 1961. (**The Parliamen-
tary Secretary, Ministry of
Home Affairs**).

PUBLIC BUSINESS
APPROPRIATION BILL
BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The As-
sembly will now resume the debate
on the Motion for the Second
Reading of the Bill intituled:

"An Ordinance to appro-
priate the supplies granted
in the current Session of the
Legislature."

2.25 p.m.

Mr. Jordan (Upper Demerara
River): We have once again been
subjected to what, perhaps for
want of a better term, we have to
call a Budget Speech. After
perusing it very carefully I have
come to the conclusion that for
the sake of discussing it we
could best divide it into two
parts. The first part is crudely
irrelevant and the second part is
grossly inaccurate. [**Opposition
Members:** "Hear, hear!"] And it
is the Minister himself who ad-
mits of the irrelevancy of the
first part. In trying to excuse
himself in his first paragraph he
clearly accuses himself. I

"..I shall devote more at-
tention than usual to matters
other than financial and
economic - matters by no
means irrelevant in this con-
text ..."

While the Minister was being
irrelevant and while he was being
inaccurate I saw it in this wise.
In the first part he chose to
bury his head in the sand and we,
as men of the world, know that
when your head is buried in the
sand and the rest of your anatomy
is exposed what you must of
necessity expect. In the second
part, the Minister chose to throw
dust into the eyes of Guianese
and that is what concerns me at
the moment. Let us ask our-
selves at this time what is meant
when the Minister says:

"At the outset, let me
quickly end further specula-
tion and put Honourable Mem-
bers in the frame of mind
which one expects at this
holiday season by announcing
now that this year's Budget
has been balanced..."

[**Dr. Jacob:** "To your regret."]

Now, we are going to examine
exactly what the People's Pro-
gressive Party means by a bal-
anced Budget, and we have to ask
ourselves: "Is it sufficient in
a country like this for a Govern-
ment by under-spending and under-
collecting, through its own
fault, to come here in a country
with a rising population and,
without a doubt, with rising
expectations with this Budget?"
We want better health facilities,
better housing, better sanita-
tion, better education and this
Government, which calls itself

MR. JORDAN

should be called "retrogressive", is satisfied to budget at the beginning of a year for \$67 million and, through its own pig-headedness ends the year with a revised expenditure of a mere \$60 million and then comes before this House to say that it has balanced its Budget. What in fact and in truth has been the case? The Government has been completely out of step with the people of this country and, because it has been, the position is this: I quote from page 20 of the Budget Speech:

"With the fall in incomes and consequently in the demand for less essential goods and services, the effect of the disturbances on production for home consumption and on imports has been more severe."

Who says there were disturbances? Let me ask the hon. Minister to pause for a while. When the history of this country is written, tell me, in the name of all that is good and honest, which historian will refer to those glorious days as disturbances? Those eighty days will go down in the history of this country, in the history of the West Indies and in the history of the world as the effort of a valiant people fighting for their liberty. Any historian who describes them as disturbances, as the Minister does, thinking that he will do anything to sully the pages of history that are yet to be written, is sadly mistaken. They will go down as great days in the history of this country, when the people rose and fought against a would-be sawdust dictator.

2.30 p.m.

I continue from page 20:

"With the fall in incomes and consequently in the demand for less essential goods and services, the effect of the disturbances on production for home consumption and on imports has been more severe. Imports this year are expected to total \$125 million - \$5 million less than the 1962 level which had itself been depressed below the high level (about \$147 million) of 1960 and 1961, for similar reasons.

The data are insufficient to make a good estimate of production lost as a result of the interruption of work . . ."

The interruption of work! The general strike.

". . . in those sectors of the economy producing for home consumption. But the loss appears to be of the order of \$7 million.

The total loss of production this year in all sectors of the economy is therefore probably of the order of \$22 million - 8 per cent of the projected total production for the year."

Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. Minister trying to say there in trying to excuse himself? It was the time when Guianese workers were writing their own Magna Carta - not against some old-fashioned King John, but a modern dictator Jagan.

It is the duty of a good Government to find money. In ordinary parlance we hear it said that "a bad workman always blames his tools" and it is very bad for this Government that has promised Guianese the world and has not delivered anything, to come before this House and complain in these terms:

"The expectations, when the 1963 Budget was introduced, of a high level of economic activity this year, were rudely disappointed."

The Government should not come before this House and talk in these terms when it has done everything to prevent prosperity, when, in spite of all the warnings it has received from the right, left, and centre, it chose to take in April last, the course it took that led this country to the brink of terror - the Premier of this country shooting like a cowboy in High Street! That is what I mean by terror. The people are let loose in this country all because a dictator wanted to have his way. I said that it is the duty of a Government to find money, and taxation is only one source, and it is limited. People can be taxed so far and no further, but there is something more than that - confidence is an even greater source, and it is limitless.

This Government, on its own admission, has been unable to engender any confidence in the local investor and it has been able to engender even less in the foreign investor. If it has been able to engender confidence in the local investor, let it tell

us why it has found it necessary to prevent people moving funds from British Guiana across to Trinidad. Let it tell us why its best supporters have been smuggling money out of this country. Let it tell us why, since it has come to power, foreign investors have given this country the wipe-off. Let it tell us how many industries it has brought to this country while our neighbours have started to flourish. [Mr. Benn: "Who? Surinam?"]

I know for a minute the members of the Government may be tempted to say - and I have heard some of them already beginning to say - that there is sugar, so many millions have been spent in putting a factory here and there, and Demba's talk of building bridges across the Demerara River. I do not believe any member of this Government would be so naive as to believe that these things are done because of the P.P.P. If any member had been so naive, let me disillusion him now and tell him that it has not been because of the P.P.P., it has been in spite of the P.P.P. [Dr. Jacob: "Talk about finance."]

Mr. Speaker, I am not being irrelevant; even if I am only talking on the background to finance, I am not being irrelevant. Mr. Speaker, when this Government comes here and talks of a restricted Budget, it says in these words - and perhaps I will have to pause a while to explain what this is going to mean in terms of everyday life to Guianese. This is what the Minister says on page 24:

"Works votes (for maintenance, replacement, etc., of

[Mr. JORDAN]

public works) must therefore bear the brunt of any cuts in expenditure necessary for quick adjustment of expenditure to the needs of a faltering revenue. But in the past two years (when expenditure was about \$2 million per annum lower than now proposed) deferment of maintenance and replacement have been carried as far as prudence will allow."

"Prudence" as a word has never been more misused. Mr. Speaker, do you know what that means? It means that this Government is allowing buildings to run into disrepair, and those of us who wander around this country would see Government buildings crying out for repair. I have never in my life seen Government buildings in the state of disrepair that I am seeing here today. The People's Progressive Party is saying that, in order to balance the Budget of this country, it is letting public property go to rack and ruin. Bridges are in a state of disrepair, and worst of all, Mr. Speaker, are the people who do the repairs to these buildings. They are carpenters, painters, masons, tinsmiths, labourers - most of them too intelligent to support the People's Progressive Party - and the People's Progressive Party takes the easy way out to balance its Budget by victimizing these people.

These are the hard facts as they exist today, whether you like it or not. [Mr. Wilson: "Race, again?"] This is not the first time in the history of mankind that men have been willing to sell their birthright and the

P.P.P. seems capable of finding so many of them so often.

On Government's own admission, Mr. Speaker, it says that taxation so far is at its hilt and it is not that the members of the Opposition had not warned them. We had told the members of this Government but there are some people who only learn the hard way. Some people can be advised, some people can be coaxed, but others can only be coerced. This year Government has not put on any taxes because it is benevolent to the citizens of this country; it has nothing further to tax. So to come forward and say that this is tax free and that is tax free is just so much nonsense. What could you tax? There is nothing left for the Government to tax. What, in fact, is needed now to make this country better would be to introduce industry, introduce something more, but there has been nothing to tax and the Government admits it on page 22 of this Budget.

2.40 p.m.

This Government does not know what every channa vendor knows. If you make the price of channa too high, people will eat something else; and if you make the measure too small, the people will turn to peanuts. That is why it says at page 22:

"The higher prices of excisable liquors since the higher rates were introduced in 1962, and the lower consumer incomes which the events of 1962 and 1963 occasioned, have curtailed the demand for alcoholic liquors and induced a reduction in stocks so that

excise clearances were severely depressed in these years."

This Government has been so stupid on so many occasions as to believe that, if it carried up the tax, it would automatically collect more revenue. As I have said before, every seller knows that if he makes the measure too small, the people will buy something else. **[The Premier:** "What about saw-milling?"] I will tell you about that later.

The only new industries that have flourished since the P.P.P. took over are "choke and rob" and the "Bushie trade". We have never had so much "Bushie" in this country! Where the Government could have collected more revenue by imposing a reasonable tax, it was stupid enough to put the price of rum beyond the reach of the poor man, and it has driven him to make "Bushie" on which no tax can be collected. I do not know—perhaps the Government wants to have things that way.

To come to the real, hard, facts of the Budget, in 1963 the Estimated Revenue of this Government was \$67½ million. In 1963 the Revised Estimate was \$60½ million - a difference of \$7 million. In 1964 the Estimated Revenue is \$69½ million. Now what are the Revised Estimates going to be? Which one of us can believe that in the space of a single year, in the context of this country as it is today, the revenue is going to be increased by \$9 million?

The hon. Minister of Finance must be either naive, dumb, or stupid. Never in the history of

this country has the revenue risen by as much as \$9 million, as is mentioned in this Budget Speech. I wonder whether it has been put before us in honesty and truth! Does the hon. Minister really believe that in a single year, if he does as badly as he has done in the preceding year, some magician will wave a wand and he will get \$9 million? This is where I believe that the hon. Minister of Finance has attempted to throw dust into the eyes of the Guianese people, and has buried his head in the sands. **[Dr. Jacob:** "If you do not loot and burn, it will be collected."]

The 1963 Estimates of Expenditure was put down as \$67.7 million, and the Revised Expenditure as \$60.4 million. The hon. Minister would have us believe that in 1964 he proposes to expend \$67.7 million! Neither he nor his party has done anything to generate the confidence of the people, and, if some measure of confidence or stability has returned to this country in recent weeks, neither the hon. Premier nor the hon. Minister of Finance can lay any claim to it. It has returned in spite of their rantings and ravings, and it will stay in spite of what they have to say. I have been careful not to say "do", because I know what they can do.

To say that 1964's Estimated Expenditure is \$69.3 million - if that is what the hon. Minister expects, he must be a dreamer. If he is not a dreamer, he must be a great stranger to the truth, or perhaps a lineal descendant of Ananias. To talk about \$69.3 million expenditure in 1964 is plain eye-wash, and the hon. Minister knows that he cannot get

[Mr. JORDAN]

lect that amount. In the context of Guiana today, there cannot be a rise of \$9 million in revenue over what the amount was last year. [An hon. Member (Government): "Wait and see."]

There are a number of people in this country who still have no confidence in the P.P.P. If the members of the P.P.P. feel that the people have confidence in them, let the hon. Minister of Finance raise the ban on people who desire to send money out of this country. [An hon. Member (Government): "Why should people send money out of this country?"] The hon. Minister of Finance knows that he must have his Customs Guards to make sure that the people do not smuggle money out of this country. Why? Because some of the same people who subscribe to the P.P.P. -- [Inter-ruption.] It has been brought to my attention, and I have heard that the hon. Ministers are sending money to Switzerland; but, perhaps, that is their prerogative and the prerogative of rascal-politicians. [The Premier: "Let us have something sensible now."] [Mr. Ram Karran: "You should say that outside."]

Talking about \$69.6 million being collected this year - the hon. Minister of Finance knows, and history will prove what I am saying is true, that no such sum of money can be collected this year. [Mr. Wilson: "Repeating that does not make it a fact."] Somebody is trying to fool somebody, and this is a flagrant attempt to fool the Guianese people. It is going to take a lot of luck even to collect the \$60.2

million the Government anticipates.

2.50 p.m.

To go back to the 1964 expenditure, this is what the Minister says on page 23 of his Budget Speech:

"The 1964 Estimates call for provision of \$69.4 million - \$1.7 million more than was provided and \$9 million more than was expended this year. The only significant increases are under the Annually Recurrent and Non-Recurrent votes of the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics (an increase of \$0.7 million) and under Education votes of the Ministry of Education and Social Development (an increase of \$0.7 million). The increases under the first are inescapable. The harsh economies that were forced on the Government in 1962 and 1963 have inevitably tended to fall disproportionately on these votes. . ."

I wonder why the Minister chose the passive voice. Who forced those economies on the Government? The Government plunged itself into it, as we shall see later when we go through the Estimates in detail.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Correia (Mazaruni-Potaro): I move that the hon. Member be allowed a further 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Joaquin seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Jordan: When we go through the Estimates in detail

we will discover how this Budget was balanced: short work in the Public Works Department, less rations at the hospitals, less repairs in every Government Department. The Government is so conscious of it that the Minister of Finance writes: "deferral of maintenance and replacement have been carried as far as prudence will allow." Prudence is not an exact term, but I wonder what is prudence where the P.P.P. is concerned. Is it waiting for the steps of Government buildings to fall down? When is it going to fill vacant posts in the Civil Service? Our roads are turning into marches. The only decent road is the road from Georgetown to Atkinson Field. There are millions of dollars on the Estimates, but they are just figures, for instructions are given to the engineers not to proceed with certain works. The engineers must of necessity be frustrated because they are not given the necessary funds to carry out the works, and the taxpayers lose in two ways because the Minister of Works must know that if there are no labourers in the field his engineers have to sit in their offices twiddling their thumbs, and money goes down the drain in two ways, all because of the P.P.P. Is this how the Government balances its Budget? If a shopkeeper balanced his scales this way the Inland Revenue Department would charge him for using false scales.

We have had some idea of what the P.P.P. Government calls prudence: allowing Government buildings to go to rack and ruin, allowing men and women to be out of work. I say that in putting up a Budget the least a Govern-

ment should do is to attempt to ensure that all the people of the country - men, women and children - go to bed at night with full stomachs.

There has been other talk about spending. I emphasize the word "talk" in order to show how much reliance we can place on the Finance Minister's figures. I wish to quote from his Budget Speech for 1963 at page 12 where he said:

"The 1963 Development Estimates as presented to the Assembly, call for expenditure of \$25.5 mn. The main provisions are for sea defences (1.7 mn.), drainage and irrigation works (\$5.6 mn.), land clearance (\$1.0 mn.), roads (\$1.6 mn.), railways, steamers and harbours (\$2.0 mn.), posts and telecommunications (0.6 mn.) , credit for industry and agriculture (\$3.5 mn.), public buildings, including a building for the Credit Corporation and the proposed Bank of Guyana (\$2.0 mn.), schools, including the proposed College of Liberal Arts (\$0.9 mn.), housing (\$1.4 mn.), health schemes (\$0.4 mn.), water supply (\$0.6 mn), public parks and swimming pools (\$0.1 mn.). It is proposed to develop the area now occupied by the Golf Course into a public park and playground, and to construct public swimming pools in Campbellville and Albouystown."

That is what the Minister of Finance said in 1963. On page 26 of the present Budget he says this of the Development expenditure in 1963:

[MR. JORDAN]

"Development expenditure this year should total \$12.3 million. Of this, about \$4 million was spent on the two major drainage and irrigation projects - the Black Bush Polder and Tapakuma; \$1.2 million on sea and river defences; about \$1 million on agricultural and land development schemes; \$1 million on roads, railways, steamers and airways; \$1.3 million on the British Guiana Credit Corporation from the I.B.R.D. loan (which is now closed at \$1.6 million); nearly \$1 million on geological, hydrological, topographic and other surveys of the country's resources; \$1 million on housing and rural water supply schemes; and nearly \$0.7 million on health and educational institutions and surveys."

It is quite clear that last year the Development expenditure was to have been \$25.5 million. This year the Minister tells us that it was cut to \$12.3 million, a 50 per cent cut! I have no quarrel with the Minister for cutting his spending, but what I want to know is whether the Minister or the Government was so stupid that they did not know what they could do or what they could not do; or are they seeking to deceive the public? We can place absolutely no reliance on figures put up by the P.P.P. Government, because we have waited one year to find out that the Development expenditure proposed for 1963 was cut by 50 per cent. The Minister of Finance, on page 27 of this Budget, puts it this way very euphemistically:

"All but \$11 million (sufficient to cover the firm commitments and the unassailable priorities) of the proposed provision is to be reserved pending the procurement of additional funds to support the other schemes"..

3 p.m.

The Minister must be wasting somebody's time when he knows that he only has \$9 million. He comes and wastes the time of Members of this House; he is wasting the time of people, who would have been more productively employed, by preparing a Budget calling for \$20 million when he only sees \$9 million. Let him say that more than half of it is not in sight and therefore nothing like what is mentioned in the Budget can be done.

Perhaps this is the way of the People's Progressive Party. This has shown that these gentlemen have no love for truth. What is more, in spite of all we have told them, in spite of all that has happened in this country, they further go on to say this on page 27. I quote:

"The Parika-Bartica Road will also bring further contractor-finance, but not until 1965, since the previous payments on bonds and in cash to the contractors are some \$2.7 million in advance of work done."

We knew that a long time ago. This was told to them a long time ago and again they persist with this. In the report of the Director of Audit for the year ended 31st December, 1961. on

page 12 at paragraph 106 a criticism was made about this kind of contractor-finance, yet these people for some reason perhaps only known to themselves seem bent on returning to this system. This criticism must have been made very early in 1962 and yet these hon. Gentlemen make this plan for 1965. I shall read paragraph 106:

"Contractor-Finance arrangements. After protracted negotiations, the Government formally entered into a contract in December, 1961, with a foreign construction firm under which the latter undertook to build and largely finance, under certain terms and conditions, an all-weather road 36.45 miles long, referred to as the Parika-Bartica Road, for the sum of \$8,333,333. Tenders had not been advertised for, but bids had been invited from a local firm and from six outside firms. Only two bids were received, one being the local firm's, and the Governor-in-Council decided in favour of the foreign firm. The Government undertook to pay to the Contractor the sum of \$75,000 in cash on the date on which the contract was signed and, as the work progressed, a further sum of \$2,583,333, in cash instalments, and to issue to the Contractor negotiable interest-bearing bonds, maturing between two and ten years from date of issue, to a total nominal value of \$3,000,000, in respect of the remainder of the contract sum."

We all know what happened. The

virgin forest had begun to invade it. [Mr. Benn: "How could it be virgin forest? You mean secondary growth."] The virgin forest had started to invade it again. People, who know, state this: the condition in which this road now is, the Government is faced with the loss of most of the \$3 1/3 million already spent and, commitments to incur debt to the extent of a further \$7 million in order to complete the work. This involves an increase of \$2 million above the original estimate on a contract similar to the first. The Government was misguided and unlucky, but these are the inherent dangers of this form of contractor-finance.

This happened when the Government did not have the knowledge; but it knows now and makes another attempt at contractor-finance. The members of the Government must either be incompetent, stupid or pig-headed. That is the state of affairs and, for what reason I do not know, they include it in this Budget Speech. It is something that any self-respecting Government would have put out of the way and kept out of the way, but this plague which inflicts this beloved country of ours holds on.

Now, there has been a great deal of crying because of shortage of funds, but we have always been told that if we make the best of what we have we will always be certain to receive more. I admit that so far as the spending of development funds is concerned, this Government has inherited an unfortunate tradition. It has done nothing to change the tradition and the trouble is that

[Mr. JORDAN]

follows a similar pattern, will continue to be plagued by it. Much of this has been unproductive expenditure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Correia: I beg to move that the hon. Member be allowed another 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Joaquin(Kitty) seconded.

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Jordan: The Government has on other occasions, in this House and outside of it, been warned against what is called unproductive expenditure but, as I said, it inherited a tradition and it has chosen to exploit it because, as a certain Minister said in this House, when it spends money in that way it buys votes. I remember very well hearing that remark. This is now a millstone around the necks of taxpayers in this country. I quote paragraph 82 on page 9 of the same report of the Director of Audit for 1961;

"Development Programme - Unproductive expenditure. Large sums have been spent since the beginning of the Development Programme in 1954, on certain projects which do not appear to have produced the desired results or to have yet served satisfactorily the purposes for which they were intended."

The Government has no right to cry. This is of its own doing. What headaches it has are all of

is that we, the inhabitants of this country, have so far suffered for the misdeeds of this Government. [Mr. Ram Karan: "What about Hamilton?"] We can talk about that in the lobby; I will give you the answer. The Government wants to look benevolent and on page 31 of the Budget Speech under "Tax Concessions" we read:

"...I am now able to announce that the Government proposes to withdraw the minimum income tax on 2% of the turnover of manufacturing, mining and mercantile business (inserted as section 14A in the Income Tax Ordinance, Chapter 299), subject to such related amendments to other provisions as may be necessary."

3.10 p.m.

I do not think any of us believe that the Government has suddenly taken shopkeepers to heart. I do not believe that the Government has not collected any revenue from this 2% tax; it has collected. Well then, Mr. Speaker, why is it that the Government is so anxious to withdraw this 2% turnover? One cannot help wondering what is the truth. I challenge the Government to deny it!

We all know in this House, that during the eighty-day strike, the Government's right arm - GIMPEX - imported, into this country, several million dollars worth of stuff and with this 2% turnover tax, GIMPEX is going to be hit very hard. The Government, in its own self-interest, has taken this step and is

tants of this country, to let them believe that, because of representations it is willing to forego this 2% turnover. The Government is saving its own skin and it knows it. Deny it when the time comes. GIMPEX has imported several million dollars in this country and the Government knows that it should deduct the income tax. I do not want to be too caustic, but how could it deduct the 2% turnover? If this is not political chicanery, I want to know what is. The Government withdraws the tax because GIMPEX is going to suffer. That is the typical rascality of the People's Progressive Party Government and it wants Guianese to believe for a minute that it is making a gift of the 2% tax. What gift? Gift, my eye! You will hear more about it, but that is the truth.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there are limits to taxation, but there are no limits to the confidence that the Government can engender in this country. Financial confidence has long left this country and when efforts had been made by the P.P.P. to shackle it, to tie it, it has still, like love, found a way out. Throughout the Minister's speech, he has not hesitated to say that he has confidence in this country and that people have confidence in this country because they are spending money. But what I would like very clearly to point out is this: that the confidence in Guiana today is quite distinct from confidence in the People's Progressive Party.

If people in this country - and I include the best supporters

of the P.P.P. - knew that their futures rested solely in the hands of the P.P.P., we would see just how much confidence is in Guiana today. But people in this country, alive and awakened, know that there is more to it than that. All of us have our different reasons, but we all know that the future of this country, for certain, does not lie in the hands of the P.P.P.

In spite of the dispute about whether this country is bankrupt or not - I am not going to go into that today - all is well with the finances of this country, if all is clear and above board, if there are no skeletons in the cupboard, if this Government is not seeking to hide rotten bones, why hasn't the Government brought to this House a Motion that was not tabled, but retabled on the 30th July, 1963, in the following terms?

"Whereas the Report of the Director of Audit on the Accounts of British Guiana for the year ended 31st December, 1961, reveals an alarmingly unsatisfactory state in the administration of the Colony's finances:

Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly recommends to the Government the immediate appointment of an Independent Commission to hold a Public Enquiry into the administration of the Colony's finances."

This Motion was retabled on the 30th July, 1963, after the ignoble end of the last session. Not a word has been said about it, it has been in cold storage. Let

[MR. JORDAN]

us find out! Air it in public! Can your finances stand the light of day? We will know who is lying from who is telling the truth. There will be no argument about what will come out of it then. But because this Government has run away from this Motion, we can only arrive at one conclusion. The People's Progressive Party never loses a propaganda opportunity - we know it too well - and if this would have shown it in a pretty light, this Motion would have been taken the next week. But because it will show it in a true light, because the country and the world will know it for what it stands, it will keep it for the next prorogation of the House so that the Motion will again lapse. That is typical of the P.P.P. If all is well, let us have it out Elections year, let us have a public enquiry into the finances of this country, and see what will happen. I dare the hon. Minister of Finance or the hon. Premier to bring this Motion before the House at any time and pass it. The Government has the votes so let us have a public enquiry. It always wants commonwealth commissions and this and that commission. Bring it before the House and bring down an independent firm of accountants and auditors and let us put some people in front, who, after their contracts had been ended, supplied Government with goods and paid Government funds to the P.P.P. It has happened in the Ministry of Communications. You have them here. Let us see if all is well.

Mr. Speaker, you know

you? If confidence is in the air of this country today, it is because Guianese are people who do not lose hope easily. Guianese in this country have faith in the People's National Congress. They know only too well that they could never be enslaved as long as this party is in existence.

The Minister concludes, he says:

"Guianese are not impressed by the rhetoric of the cold war, nor do they wish to become pawns in any rivalry between giants."

I am not disposed to go into that, but let me tell you this: as far as this country is concerned, if there never was Jagan, it would never have known anything of the cold war for it is clear that it was brought by him and it was crude of the Minister to mention that here.

Mr. Speaker, we all have confidence in the future of Guiana for different reasons. I have confidence because I know that the thousands who support my party will continue to support it, and I have confidence that the good sense of many of the former supporters of the P.P.P., who have awakened out of their nightmare, must prevail in this country and that is what is worrying the People's Progressive Party. It has been able to fool all the people some of the time. It has been able to fool some of the people all the time. It has not been able to

3.20 p.m.

Confidence in this country is well placed, but there is a big difference between people having confidence in Guiana and also in the P.P.P. Guiana has to do more than balance its Budget. It will balance its Budget and have a surplus when the P.P.P. is out of the way for all time; when this country is truly free, when this country is threatened by no menace, and when all men in this country again live like brothers.

Mr. Jagan (Suddie): Having listened to the hon. Member for Upper Demerara (Mr. Jordan), who is supposed to be the "Shadow Finance Minister of the P.N.C.", I wondered what would have been the state of this country's finances, if the People's National Congress had formed the Government? **Mr. Jordan:** "Very good." I have listened to the hon. Member's speech, but there was no constructive criticism in what he said about the Budget Speech. Throughout his speech he kept harping about the lack of confidence in the Government, and stressed that because of the alleged lack of confidence there were no new industries, and so on.

Before the People's Progressive Party came into power in 1953, where were the local investors? Were they afraid of the people who governed the country at that time? The P.P.P. cannot be blamed for the lack of confidence in the Government prior to 1953. The hon. Member has stated that the Budget was balanced merely because of under-collecting and under-spending.

When the 1963 Budget was approved it was based on a revenue

yield of \$67.7 million. The expenditure, therefore, for that period was calculated on the basis that that amount would be collected. In the course of 1963, the Government realized that \$67.7 million could not have been collected and, therefore, as a very prudent Government would have done, it had to under-cut proposed expenditure. The reason why the amount was not collected was due to either disturbances, strikes, or lockouts. **Mr. Jordan:** "Strike." The hon. Member takes objection to the word "disturbances", but whether there was a strike or not there were disturbances throughout this country. No one can deny that fact.

I would not put the blame on any one here for what occurred during 1963. The hon. Member referred to the workers fighting for their liberty. I would say that the strike was politically inspired, and that cannot be denied. Mr. Willis, who came here on the invitation of the T.U.C., has stated that the strike was politically inspired. Be that as it may, because of the stoppage of work due to strikes or disturbances the production of sugar, bauxite, and a few other minor industries had to be curtailed.

As we all know during 1963 the price of sugar was very high in the world, and if this country had supplied the estimated amount of sugar, which it could have done if there had been no stoppage of work, then there would have been a greater collection of revenue by the country. But apart from the exportation of sugar, during the stoppage of work for a few months, there was

[Mr. JAGAN]

hardly any importation of goods into this country. As a result, the commodities which would normally have been imported were not imported, and no import duties were collected.

The hon. Member said that it is impossible to raise an extra \$9 million within one year. He also said that the hon. Minister of Finance mentioned in his Budget Speech that the revenue for this year would be \$69.7 million, and it was impossible for him to raise that amount in a year. As the "Shadow Finance Minister of the P.N.C.", I am surprised at his logic and reasoning - [Mr. Wilson: "That was not logic."] - because if the expected yield of import and export duties were realized in 1963, then the amount collected would have been \$67.7 million, and there would have been a difference of \$2 million only. The hon. Minister of Finance has estimated for an increase of \$2 million over the amount which could have been collected in 1963, and it is this extra \$2 million which, in fact, is estimated to be collected during 1964 over the 1963 Approved Estimates.

If the hon. Member had read pages 20 and 21 of the Budget Speech, he would have seen the details set out therein. He read a part of page 20, but he omitted to read the relevant part which dealt with sugar and bauxite. He also failed to refer to page 21. If he had done so, he would have realized that the amount of \$69.7 million with the excess of \$9.2 million over the Revised Estimates 1963 could be raised within

one year. The hon. Member has stated that the Government cannot raise finances abroad.

3.30 p.m.

But we have stated that it is no use taking loans, even if it is possible to obtain loans, at such high rates of interest as 6 and 7 per cent per annum. Our Debt Charges rose from \$1.7 million in 1953 to \$10 million in 1963, and, as the Minister of Finance has said, by 1968 it will leap to \$18 million. What is necessary is for the Government to obtain loans, if possible, from countries at low interest rates or without any interest at all.

[Laughter.] From what we have seen with respect to other countries, this is not impossible.

[An hon. Member: "Cuba?"] My hon. friend has mentioned Cuba, but I do not have Cuba in mind. I have in mind countries that are independent but which were dependent not so long ago, like Ghana, India, Ceylon, Malaya and Singapore. Before those countries became independent, particularly India and Ghana, they also suffered from lack of development. The amount of money they could have raised by loans was limited. The interest charges were very high, and it was only after they became independent that they were able to borrow money at very low rates of interest, in some cases at 2½ per cent and in other cases interest free. It cannot be denied that large development schemes were opened up in those newly independent countries by loans obtained after Independence.

This is one of the reasons why the People's Progressive Party has always demanded Inde-

pendence for this country. My hon. Friend for Ruimveldt (Mr. Burnham) has stated that he does not care where the money comes from, and that he would borrow from the devil so long as it is beneficial to this country. But the only way we would be able to borrow any money from those countries is if we become independent. This cannot be denied. Before the advent of the P.P.P., which is today being blamed for everything in this country, loans were difficult to obtain. The hon. Member for the Upper Demerara River (Mr. Jordan) has stated that local investors and foreign capitalists have no confidence in this country. He said that the Demerara Bauxite Company and the sugar companies who have extended their holdings and invested a large amount of capital since the P.P.P. came into power, have done so, not because of the P.P.P. but in spite of the P.P.P. How can one answer this type of logic? If those firms did not invest capital the P.P.P. would have been blamed for preventing them from investing. Now that they have invested more money the suggestion is that it is not because of the P.P.P. but because they wanted to increase production and profits.

Before the P.P.P. came into power there were industrialists in this country and people with money, but how many of them invested their money for the benefit of the working-class people in this country? How many of them opened up industries so as to employ the working-class people of this country? We have had very few of them. In 1953 the British Government declared that the P.P.P. was a Communist Party,

and that was the reason why the Constitution was suspended. But the hon. Member for Ruimveldt campaigned in England and India against that allegation. Those things were done because the British Imperialists and the local capitalists, who used to exploit the working-class people in this country, tried to divide the working-class people who had come together for the first time in 1953. They were not satisfied with just the suspension of the Constitution, because they realized that the working-class people of the country had been politically awakened, and the mere suspension of the Constitution would not prevent their forward march. Since 1953 to the present day, although in the intervening period there was a split in the ranks of the P.P.P., the British Government has spared no pains in its effort to divide the working-class people of this country.

It is not due to lack of confidence in the present Government that there are not more industries in this country, or investment of foreign capital. The British Government, in league with some people in this country, would be happy to see the working-class people divided.

3.40 p.m.

The disturbances during last year and 1962 were most unfortunate. Only if the working-class people of this country are united will we be able to move forward. During the period of the strike and disturbances in 1963, I was happy to see that the people of this country used so many different types of goods which were produced here. It is true that

[Mr. JAGAN]

because of the lack of imports the country lost a certain amount of income, but it would be far more beneficial to us if the inhabitants of this country could use the products of this country.

My hon. friend also stated that he cannot rely on the figures supplied by the People's Progressive Party Government. I have seen in today's *Guiana Graphic* that an editorial appeared in the *London Times* yesterday and from the report it would seem that even the *London Times* accepted the figures that were submitted. It was stated in this newspaper that from the Budget Speech there was a balanced Budget and if the *London Times* came to that conclusion then it must have, in effect, accepted the figures that were given.

The hon. Member attacks us also for withdrawing the 2 per cent turnover tax, but even members of the P.N.C. opposed this tax from the time it came into effect and agitated for the repeal of this provision. It is strange that when the Government promises to repeal this measure it should be accused of trying to help Gimpex. The hon. Member has stated that Gimpex will no doubt try to evade the payment of income tax; or he implied that. He has stated that Gimpex imported most of the goods that came into this country. The Inland Revenue Department will know how much profit Gimpex made. I cannot see how Gimpex can evade taxation. The Government not too long ago was accused of bringing goods into this country, handing them over to Gimpex and letting Gimpex

collect the money. If that is so, then the amount of money realized from the sale must be easily ascertainable. I do not see how Government can be blamed for this. The hon. Member for South Georgetown (Mr. Hugh) is one of those, I think, who have always agitated for the withdrawal of this tax.

The Government has been accused of under-spending and the hon. Member has referred to instances of lack of work in the Public Works Department, disrepair to buildings, lack of repair to roads, lack of facilities in the hospitals. It is very easy to make general statements. My learned friends would substantiate that. When the Government, as any prudent one, - my friend took objection to the word 'prudent' - realized that the amount which it thought would have been collected could not be collected, it decided, as any prudent Government would have done, to cut down on proposed expenditure. No doubt a building here and there might have fallen into disrepair because of that, but it is not the Government to be blamed for that. [Mr. Burnham: "It is the P.P.P."] It is the trade unions to a certain extent. My learned friend cannot deny it. Even Mr. Willis, who came here at the suggestion of the T.U.C., said, in no uncertain terms, that the strike originally might have been industrial but toward the end it was definitely political. [Mr. Wilson: "The P.N.C. jumped on the band-waggon."]

The fact that revenue was not collected because of the fall in production is the fault of the people who were responsible for

the strike, the persons who took part and those who instigated the workers to remain out on strike,

The hon. Member has stated that supporters of the People's Progressive Party have taken this money out of the country. [**Opposition Members:** "True, true!"] That may be so.

3.50 p.m.

But, sir, the People's Progressive Party cannot be blamed. [*Pause.*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Jagan: Even if the money had remained in the country, would it have done this country or the working-class people any good? If money was taken away during the period from 1961 to the present day, what difference would it have made had it remained here? Most of these people who have taken away their money are afraid. [**Mr. Burnham:** "What about your family?"] I do not know of any of my family. My hon. and learned Friend no doubt has a certain person in mind, but I do not regard that person as a member of my family. [*Laughter.*]

As I have stated, the lack of confidence referred to by the hon. Member, throughout his speech, is not due to the People's Progressive Party. In fact, many people whose premises were burnt down during the disturbances, are afraid to rebuild because of hooliganism and violence. This is not due to the People's Progressive Party. It is due to misguided advice by members of the Opposition and so-called trade union lea-

the working-class people of this country. Sir, I have always appealed to members of the People's National Congress who claim to represent the working class people - I know that the P.P.P. represents the working-class people - that if they claim to represent the working-class party, then the only way —

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Burnham (Ruimveldt): I beg to move that the hon. Member for Suddie be allowed a further 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Joaquin seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Jagan: Your Honour, I must thank my learned and hon. Friend because I think whenever I speak, he always moves a similar Motion.

Sir, in conclusion -- [**An hon. Member:** "What! Already?"] My hon. Friend said that I should speak until tea time and that is only 5 minutes more. Sir, as I was saying, the only way this country could progress, the only way the working-class people could benefit, is to have the parties that claim to represent the working-class people come together, and the leaders to forget petty differences and form one united party to lead the working-class people.

Sir, as I have stated earlier, before 1953, when the people were divided, this country was run by a certain privileged

[MR. JAGAN]

class only, and that is why, since 1953, not only the British Government, but other capitalists in this country, have tried to divide the people in order to exploit them. They would always try to divide the working-class people and keep them separate and apart.

Your Honour, the disturbances in 1962 and 1963 — [Mr. Merriman: "Strike."]. Whether there was a strike or not, there were disturbances also. The disturbances in 1962 and 1963 were most unfortunate because it was the working-class people who were fighting each other and that should never have happened in this country. What we want here, is to have the working-class people, regardless of race, to be united so that they can fight the common enemies — the imperialists and the capitalists — who intend to continue to exploit them. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members I think this is an appropriate time to suspend the sitting.

Sitting suspended at 4 p.m. for half an hour.

4.40 p.m.

On resumption --

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I take it that the hon. Member for Suddie (Mr. Jagan) has concluded his contribution.

[The hon. Member for Suddie was not in his seat.]

Mr. Carter (Werk-en-Rust): After our experiences in 1962 and 1963, I had expected that the members of our Government, with

these experiences behind them, would have made the occasion of the Budget Speech one for the cementing of national unity. I hoped that this would have been an opportunity to change the image which they have presented to people in this country and abroad. I hoped also for a change in their attitude to the Opposition Bench and in their attitude to their traditional friends of British Guiana.

This occasion, to my mind, is an opportunity to make a change in the approach to our Overseas friends and to effect some sort of reconciliation with the Opposition in the hope of gaining early independence, and also to achieve national development at a pace commensurate with the increase in our population and commensurate with the aspirations of the people in this country.

4.47 p.m.

Indeed, when the Minister of Finance started his Budget Speech on New Year's Eve I thought this was going to be the theme, because on the first page he refers to co-operation and goodwill, and on the next page he speaks of "an atmosphere of high hopes that the country would be permitted to move forward constitutionally and politically." But then in the next paragraph the normal theme arose again. We heard about "conspirators against progress". Then we were reminded of the disorders of 1963 which, we are told, prompted British intervention. Well, this is cant and dissimulation of a type I have never before seen, because what I think happened in 1963 was that the Premier of this country requested

the British Government to send troops to protect himself and his colleagues. That was the position. It was not a question of prompting British intervention. How could it be interpreted as British intervention when this Government appealed for British troops for its own protection?

4.50 p.m.

These British soldiers were not stationed at the homes of members of the Opposition; they were stationed at the homes of the Premier and members of the Government. So, if it was British intervention, the British intervention was in favour of the Government. Now that tension has eased the British help which was sought by the Government is referred to as "British intervention". Then we read of "another year of infamy", "the rape of democracy in Guiana", "gerrymandering of constituency boundaries in 1957 and 1961", "foreign-inspired and financed plots and acts of sabotage". We read of the attempt of the British Tories to secure the election to power of known "agents of imperialism". [Dr. Jacob: "That is true."] On page 3 we read of "British imperialism".

Now, after all these attacks, which are presumably directed against the Opposition, we have this striking sentence in the second paragraph on page 3 where "all Guianese" - presumably the arsonists, the rapists, the looters and the conspirators all included - are appealed to "to forget the unhappy recent past and to live and work together as one people." [Mr. Benn: "You don't want that." I want it; I

advocate it, but is this the way to make an appeal?

On the same page the Minister states: "Many former colonies are now independent". He confesses this, but he does not analyse why British Guiana, which was so far ahead ten years ago is now so far behind that other former British colonial territories have come and passed us and have secured their independence. How can this be attributed to British imperialism. [Interruption.] I did not sign; I did not ask Mr. Sandys to impose a solution. How can you talk about British imperialism and at the same time admit that other British territories have gained their independence. To any sensible and reasonable person this could only be interpreted in one way: that for some reason, peculiar to British Guiana, independence has not yet been granted, and that reason can only be found in the People's Progressive Party Government. Nkrumah has achieved independence; Sierra Leone, and other British and French colonies are independent. Who are the people who could have led us to independence? Nkrumah started with internal self-government and other leaders, Eric Williams and Bustamante, had internal self-government just as we had it and, because of their competence and their capacity, they have led their countries to independence. So how can the Minister speak of British imperialism in this context? Does British imperialism only apply to British Guiana? [Mr. Benn: "Read the next sentence."] The first ten pages consists of many inconsistencies, half-truths and misrepresentations.

[MR. CARTER]

On page 4 the Minister again speaks of "plots, sabotage and other treasonable acts promoted and financed by internal and external agents of imperialism". He does not mention whether this is Russian imperialism or British imperialism or both. After speaking of these agents of imperialism he goes on and speaks of "engendering co-operation and spurring economic and social changes". At this stage one would believe that he would appeal to the better natures of the members of the Opposition. But what happens? He speaks of "sordid schemes contemplated to prevent these changes"; he speaks of "the treachery of willing colonialist politicians". [Mr. Benn: "Like you."] He mentions the "phoney rhetoric of demagogues and the wicked propaganda of the privileged and the foreign cold warriors".

After calling all these names - presumably in an attack on the Opposition - the Minister in the next paragraph once again appeals for national unity; he says "all should learn to live and work together for the common good". Does one inspire national unity by calling other people all these names, "agents of the capitalist imperialists, racists" and so on and then come back and say that "all should learn to live and work together"?

One would believe that this was the end of the attack on the Opposition forces, but the Minister once again speaks of imperialists executing "subversion in

concert with local opponents of the Government". Here again he refers to members of the Opposition as persons who "execute subversion", but this is supposed to be an appeal for national unity. This is the manner in which the Government appeals for national unity and if my Friend on the other side cannot see that this is a most awkward way of doing things, well no one can help him.

He speaks of forgetting the past, but does he forget the past in the first ten pages of his Budget Speech. I would like to see unity; I know my Party would like to see national unity in this country, but the members of the Government pretend they want national unity. It is either that they do not wish to see national unity or they do not know how to go about achieving national unity because, although in that paragraph the Minister appeals for national unity, he also speaks about "the powerful machine at home and abroad geared to the dissemination of vicious political and racist propaganda". Then he speaks of the "foreign and a few native exploiters, but at the top of page 6 he hopes "to recapture the spirit, unity and comradeship" that once existed and he is fortified in his belief that the "innate commonsense and increased political wisdom of the Guianese" will make for national unity. Imagine this: the Minister castigates people, calls them all kinds of names, and then says all the people, all the rascists, the arsonists, the agents of foreign powers who want to subvert the Government, will move toward national unity because the Minister so asks.

5 p.m

Then we go on to hear of an organized conspiracy to overthrow the constitutional Government. We have heard this *ad nauseam*. I would have thought that in 1964 we would have forgotten the Government's catch-phrases which have been used like gramophone records and that the Government would have made a general appeal for national unity. The Minister again makes reference to the conspirators and then he says - at last one breathes a sigh of relief:

"It is vitally important, therefore, that the unhappy events of this year be forgotten, and that everyone think clearly and act rationally now and in the future."

Good; we are with him entirely. But in the next four lines he refers to the vicious racist propaganda disseminated by agents supported and being financed by imperialism, and then a little further on he makes another reference to national unity.

The hon. Minister devotes the next two or three pages to the very good, trusted friend of the Premier Mr. Duncan Sandys. Well, now, all that is *passee*. He goes on to denounce what he calls "the cynical and unpatriotic attitude of those who, in their mad drive for political power, are heedless of the harmful consequences of their actions to their native land and their countrymen." Now this is an appeal for national unity, and this is how he does it. Then in the next line he refers to Oppo-

sition Members as political neurotics and political psychopaths. What an appeal for unity! After referring to the Opposition in these terms, in his next page he says:

"I am confident that all Honourable Members will agree that the defamatory statement made by the Right Honourable Duncan Sandys, M.P., should be withdrawn forthwith."

The Minister is now appealing. Now that he wants backing against Mr. Sandys, the Opposition Members are no longer "political neurotics and psychopaths." The same political neurotics and psychopaths, on this side, are now asked to support him against Mr. Duncan Sandys. You see what a brilliant way the Government has of doing things? The Minister refers to disloyal Guianese, and then suddenly after being "political neurotics," we all become "Honourable Members". He wants all Honourable Members to support him against Mr. Duncan Sandys. The Minister must take one line, he cannot take two lines. If the Opposition Members are political neurotics, well, do not ask them to support you against Mr. Sandys - they cannot move both ways. If the members of the Opposition are racists and imperialists stooges, let them remain racists and imperialist stooges. Do not call on them for any help, that is not the way to call for national unity. Before it can redeem others, the Government has got to redeem itself and the P.P.P. Government is beyond redemption, there is no hope for it.

[MR. CARTER]

I have no quarrel with the Minister's exposition of the Malthusian theory, nor with his theories on the under-developed countries. These are obviously taken from some well-known work, but at the bottom of page 11, there comes out of the mouth of the Minister of Finance, the greatest indictment of his Government. He says:

"In British Guiana (still colonial), economic growth was slow over the last decade."

A decade is a period of ten years. This Government has been in power for the last seven years, that is since 1957. For 7 out of 10 years in the last decade, the economic growth has been slow. Do you want any greater indictment of the present political party in Government, an indictment which comes out of the mouth of the so-called Minister of Finance?

We have had excuses for 1962 and 1963 - there have been strikes. What about the period between 1957 and 1961? There were no strikes then, nobody went on strike. What steps has this Government taken to accelerate the economic growth in this country in the last decade? Why has its economic growth been slow?

[An hon. Member: "Independence."] I heard a whisper about Independence. Independence is not going to be a cure all. Trinidad was able to advance even before Independence during a period of their internal self-government. It has been admitted by many leaders, and by the

Premier, that Independence, mere Independence, is not going to bring a millennium. Mere Independence is not going to be a panacea for all the ills and all the problems we have in this country, but this Government has admitted here that the growth has been slow over the last decade, and, as it has been in power for seven-tenths of that period, the blame must fall squarely upon the shoulders of the Government Ministers.

Then, of course, irrelevancies are brought in. We are treated to a long statement on Latin America. What have we got to do with the owners of capital in Latin America and U.S. imperialism in Latin America? This might have been an oblique attempt to attack U.S. imperialism, but when did the Government discover that U.S. imperialism exists? [Mr. Benn: "We always talk about it."] "We always talk about it," says the Minister of Agriculture. If the Government always knew there was U.S. imperialism, why did the Premier go cap in hand, in 1961, to the late Mr. Kennedy begging him for financial aid? And then this Government turns around and calls the Americans imperialists. Do you mean that this Government was going to subject this country knowingly to U.S. imperialism? Is that the answer? You say they are imperialists. This is the nonsensical thing which, I suppose, catches votes, but does not fool any sensible person. But even the people are beginning to find this Government out. So we are treated to this long treatise about foreign exploitation in Latin America; this was all quite unnecessary.

This Budget Speech could have been recorded in about 14 pages, with facts and figures which speak for themselves, instead of being set out in this off-hand manner with an oblique appeal for national unity, which, in effect, is no appeal for national unity. It was more in the nature of abuse than an appeal.

5.10 p.m.

If this country is to move forward; if this country is to develop economically, the Members of this Government must realize two things - there are others, but these are two important things: First, they have to seek foreign aid - their attempts so far have failed - foreign aid not only from official sources and Foreign Governments, but from investors. It is sometimes difficult to understand what the members of the Government have in mind on this particular point. They say that they are not against private investment. If they are to secure foreign aid, either from a foreign Government or from private investment, then it is necessary for them to show some sort of responsible image. You cannot call people Imperialists at one stage, and at another stage go cap-in-hand begging them for money.

They speak of non-alignment and a policy of neutrality, but they only pay lip-service to neutrality and non-alignment. The connotation of neutrality and non-alignment is that you are neither for one side nor the other, and we say that the members of this Government have not been neutral since they came into power. Has their attitude pointed them out as neutralists

as we understand it, and as Nehru in India understands it? It is obvious to any fool in this country that this Government favours only one side of the two sides in the Cold War. Nehru took from both sides, and he had the sense to do that.

The second thing that is necessary, apart from adopting an attitude of complete neutrality, is to inspire confidence in the people in British Guiana. But confidence is not inspired by abuse, especially in this case where the Government is a Minority Government. There are more people against the Government in this country than those in favour of it. But the difference between this Government and the Government of other countries is that other Governments woo the Opposition whereas this Government abuses the Opposition. That is the reason why the People's National Congress has had to insist on proportional representation as the only means of ensuring that any Government, whether it is the People's National Congress, the United Force, or the People's Progressive Party, would have to consult with the Opposition forces because the margin would be so small that it would be necessary to consult them, and any high-handed domineering manner on the part of any Government would never succeed.

We would hope that, after a period of two years, the members of a democratic Government would accept the principle of consultation with the Opposition, and it would be well established. That cannot be easily established in this country under existing conditions. How can they establish

[Mr. CARTER]

that here when they have a document like this in which the Opposition and others are abused in the first 10 pages? The hon. Minister of Finance says in his Budget Speech:

"I hope all hon. Members will come and support us in development."

They must understand what are the prerequisites for development. No matter how much money the members of the Government get, no matter how many technical officers they get, development will not come to this country until the Members of the Opposition are sitting on boards and corporations in greater numbers.

For the benefit of the members of the Government, I should like to state that the Chairman of an Industrial Development Corporation in India is Mr. Meta, a member of the Opposition. Why don't you take a lesson from that? Look at what happens here? Just as the hon. Minister goes around arranging the order in which hon. Members should speak in order to get their co-operation, when it comes to the question of appointing members on a Board, why can't the hon. Minister responsible seek out the Leader of the Opposition and find out what members he would like on a particular Board? That is how national unity can be achieved, and I am teaching the Government how to achieve it. That is what is done in England and in any democratic country.

When Members of Parliament visit British Guiana and other places, the Conservative Party

brings along a member of the Labour Party - it is a question of consultation all the time. They have a big majority and they do not have to equalise it. Years ago they had to do so. [Interruption.] Let me tell the hon. Minister for Agriculture, Forests and Lands - [Mr. Benn: "Address the Chair."] I am addressing the Chair. The most important ministry in this country is Agriculture. You nearly killed us with Russian flour a few months ago. It is time that the hon. Minister becomes responsible because --

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Correia (Mazaruni-Potaro): I beg to move that the hon. Member be given 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Merriman (La Penitence-Lodge) seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Carter: I was about to say that the economic development of this country is very important. The members of this Government have failed hopelessly to bring this about and to make any significant impression on the economic growth of the country. They have failed for many reasons; they have failed, as I have already described, because they have not been able to inspire local finance to invest in this country; they have failed because even their own supporters have used every means possible to take money out of British Guiana. Do not these things call for a change of image? Do not these things call for more responsible statements from Ministers of the Government?

5.20 p.m.

They make it appear that in 1963 they were unable to do much in the way of development because of the strike and what they describe as "disturbances". And they seek to blame the Opposition for this. But what was the cause of the strike? They have only discussed the effect of the strike, but what was the cause of the strike? The cause was the pig-headedness of members of the Government who were entreated to withdraw the Labour Relations Bill. They were asked to defer it for a few weeks but they refused to do so. They were asked to meet the T.U.C. but they refused to do so. Let it go down on record that as the result of the attitude of the Government, the trade unions went on strike and today, at least 10 months after, the Labour Relations Bill is not law.

We are told that the loss of production through the strike was \$22 million. Why? Because the Government wanted my good friend, the hon. Member for Corentyne-West (Mr. Lall) to take over by chicanery the sugar workers of this country. So that in many ways this hon. Member can say he is worth \$22 million, because that is precisely what he has cost the people of this country, apart from the lives that were lost, and apart from the number of P.N.C. supporters who were viciously attacked and lost their homes at Tain, and lost their lives at Enmore and elsewhere.

We hear that the outlook is good for sugar in the next year, and they expect that production will be 330,000 tons. I am happy to see that the Government is en-

couraging cane-farming. [Mr. Benn: "You are a cane-farmer yourself".] Yes, I have a distinct interest. The trouble is, of course, that it will be left to the Government to see if it can accelerate progress in peasant farming. A Committee has been set up. That is a good thing, but all the big shots are on the Committee; not a single peasant farmer is there. There are some good men on the East Coast with years of experience, some of your own members, who could be put on the Committee. But it is not enough to appoint a Committee. Government must help with the financing of production and the supply of machinery in the various areas in which development can take place. Whether it is C.I.A. or Khrushchev or the P.P.P., as long as the money goes to the poor farmer he would not care two farthings. But the trouble with the Government is that it cannot get money from the United States of America or the Soviet Union. It got some bad flour from Cuba and some derelict machinery and a derelict printing press - left-overs. I expect that the Russians will very soon be sending snow ploughs for use on the East Bank.

The economic development programme has suffered. We are told that Government needs another \$49 million in additional finance which has to be found. On page 29 of his Budget Speech the Minister of Finance says:

"It was hoped originally, that international organizations as well as foreign governments would have contributed substantially towards filling this gap. To

[MR. CARTER]

this date, all that has been received from such sources totals less than \$5 million."

That is a pathetic admission, but the Premier told us last year that he had "friends with rockets and guns." We do not want friends with rockets and guns; we want money. Where is the money to come from? I would like to be enlightened. There is nothing in this Development Programme to show where the money is to come from. They speak of over-spending and commitments that could not be met. Government has even admitted that in respect of the Parika-Bartica road the contractors have already received \$2.7 million in advance of the work done. [Mr. Ram Karan: "Ask Peter d'Aguiar."] I think that hon. Member warned about the particular contractors who have taken the Government for a ride, and have had the temerity to sue the Government for \$4 million. Those are the friends of the Government. I would like to get an explanation of how the Government could pay the contractors \$2.7 million in advance of the work being done. I think the House is entitled to an explanation. I do not want the Minister of Works and Hydraulics, sometimes referred to as the "Minister of humour", to laugh this matter out of the House. I want a solid explanation from him because this road is vital to the development of the country. It was to have been completed in 1964, but we see that a start will not be made until 1965.

Again we hear of the Bank of Guyana. We heard about it in the 1962 Budget Speech. Reference is

also made to the Tapakuma Extension Scheme for which money has to be found, but in fact this is a very scrappy and meagre Development Programme. Even if it is carried through this year - and I rather feel that with the long wait people are continuing to lose confidence in the present Government - the Government will be hard put even to meet its recurrent expenses, much more to find money for development.

5.30 p.m.

The Minister of Finance speaks of disappointing people because he balanced the Budget, but the man who walks the streets without shoes and with ragged clothes balances his budget too. He does not owe anybody because he cannot get credit and the little money he receives he ekes out. In the same way this Government cannot obtain money and so it does not appoint officers. In the Department of Agriculture there are vacancies for over 20 officers and these vacancies have not been filled. The Government calls this a saving, but how is it a saving? It then says that it balances the Budget, but at what price? It is no feather in the cap of the Minister of Finance to say he has balanced the Budget. [Government Member: "Have you balanced yours?"] I can borrow; I am credit-worthy, but this Government is not credit-worthy and that is the trouble. That is why it has been unable to raise money. It will balance the budget again next year; to achieve that, all it has to do is to refuse to appoint officers and to carry out works of improvement. Look at the Ministerial Building across the road! It is a shambles; it is

a disgrace. Visit the smallest country and you will see a Ministerial Building that is worthy of the name. Don't speak of balancing the Budget when there is an airport to be built and a number of things to be done. [Mr. Jacob: "Stop planning destruction and we will all be better off."]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Bissember: I beg to move that the hon. Member be granted another 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Merriman seconded.

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Carter: We read of the overdraft, and development funds, about additional financial commitments. A pathetic picture is painted of Government's ineptitude in handling the affairs of this country. This is a situation which has continued, as the Minister of Finance admits, for the last decade - for seven years during which this Government has been in power.

The theme on which I wish to end is this: we are in the year 1964; we have been through very bad times. In the years 1962 and 1963 we have had violence and disorder of a kind never seen here before. There must be a compromise. The Government has a majority on that side and if there is to be a compromise it must come from the stronger forces, because the weaker forces have nothing to give up. All the Opposition seeks is consultation on national development matters. It asks that members of the Opposi-

tion should share in the work of public corporations, and that the governing party should not have a vested interest in them. I speak of corporations like the British Guiana Credit Corporation. [Mr. Benn: "The I.D.C."] There is just one member of the opposition on a Board that consists of ten or twelve members, and that does not give any representation at all to the Opposition, especially when all the other members are supporters of the P.P.P. This is a serious matter. The head of almost every corporation, where he is not a public servant, is a supporter of the P.P.P. Government. The majority of the members of these Boards are members of the People's Progressive Party and it has reached a stage where a police officer, who was making an application for a house, put on the application form - in order to be sure that it was accepted - "I am a member of the People's Progressive Party". [Laughter.] This is no laughing matter. It means that Government has created the image that there will be priority for members of the People's Progressive Party. [Mr. Benn: "You helped to create it."]

Let us take a look at the members of Public Corporation Boards and try to analyse which of them happen to be members of the Opposition. It is very easy to do this in this country. It is a disgraceful situation and it is not the way to achieve the co-operation which must be had before national development can take place. It has reached a stage where people are so bitter against this Government that they will not be

[MR. CARTER]

what the Government produces. There are people who will not drink "Guyana Instant Coffee" I have had a personal experience of this. There are people who refuse to drink "Guyana Instant Coffee" because they feel that the P.P.P. had something to do with it. [Inter-*ruption.*] I drink it and I have tried, because I am a responsible person, to influence others to drink it as it is good coffee and my friend on the Government side, the Member for Pomeroy (Mr. Caldeira) is a big coffee planter and we must support our friends.

All I have done is to call to the attention of members of the Government that this abuse contained on the first ten pages of the Budget Speech is not going to help anybody in 1964. It is not going to educate the young people of this country. Let us call it a day. I call upon the Premier - [Mr. Bissenber: "He called upon Sandys." (*Laughter*)] I call upon the Premier without the aid of Mr. Sandys to create a new image in this country. It is no laughing matter; we are going down and down. The Minister of Finance must have had several headaches in trying to present any document that would even tend to look respectable. In his most inner mind he must know that he is not even scratching the surface of development. He read the speech extremely well, without his usual bitterness and gall, which I have described on previous occasions. He was more objective. In spite of that the language was very extravagant, to say the very least and presumably it sets the lead

The Premier these days is a very tired man. He seems to be suffering from fatigue; his hair is becoming white. I know he has not much energy left, but his remaining energies should be devoted to courting the Opposition in order to work out a programme for national development. Let him forget about his friends with rockets and Latin America. Let us get to British Guiana and sit around a table, the Premier, the members of the Opposition and, of course, the members of the Government, and let us work out a plan for the development of this country, and let us keep to that plan. If the Premier is capable of doing this then I think the future of this country can be assured.

5.40 p. m.

I would like to tell the Premier that there is no point in any Minister of the Government referring to Opposition Members as political psychopaths and neurotics. It is extravagant language which is meaningless and which does not improve relations. To speak of imperialists and stooges is meaningless. If this Government really wants to go ahead, it has to change its attitude towards the Opposition and its attitude towards the traditional friends of this country. [*Applause.*]

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Lands (Mr. Saffee): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that my hon. Friend for Werk-en-Rust would have really made some sensible and constructive criticisms of this Budget Speech, but he has

"You try." He said, in his opening remarks, that he thought the Government would have taken the opportunity to present a Budget that would have created the atmosphere to cement the differences among the different races in this country. Well, I think this is clearly set out in the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance calling for national unity and for the people to work together in order that our country may develop, in order that our people may move forward to a better and more prosperous life. This was set out very clearly in the Budget Speech - I do not know if the hon. Member read it - and this, obviously, is the primary objective of any Government, to work towards the development and the advancement of its people. This is what the People's Progressive Party, since it took over the reins of Government, has been endeavouring and has tried its utmost to bring about, so that our country can move forward.

My hon. Friend said he thought that the Government would have tried to change the image it had created in 1962 and 1963, the image it had created at home and abroad, and I take it he is incriminating the Government for being responsible for the disturbances in 1962 and in 1963. As far as this is concerned, nothing could be further from the truth. As I said, this Government has tried its utmost, has tried with whatever resources available, to get the country to move forward. This has been substantiated by various prominent persons and people locally and abroad.

The Government tried, in 1962, to raise the

that it could accelerate, it could push forward its development programme, but, because of the disturbances which came about as a result of an irresponsible Opposition, the country's economy was badly shattered so, instead of the country moving forward, it had to mark time. This is no fault of the Government. This is not to be labelled against the Government, but, certainly, the Government has put forward constructive proposals. This was substantiated by the Riot Commission that came here to investigate the disturbances in 1962, and it has said -- [An. hon. Member: "Riot Commission again?"] -- I am trying to clear the point that was made by the hon. Member when he said that he thought the Government would have tried to cement the differences which exist in our community. How can we? When the members of the Government try, on one hand, to get things moving forward, when we put up constructive proposals, on the other hand, we find that some people in the Opposition plan to destroy these constructive plans. How can we have unity? How can we have development?

On the one hand we hear, Members clamouring for development, for us to solve the unemployment problem, for us to solve the various problems we have in this country, and, on the other hand, we find that their policy is completely in conflict with progress. This is what I feel our hon. Friends should take seriously into consideration. The members of the Opposition should not come and attack the Government, and try to tear the Government to pieces or

[MR. SAFFEE]

one hand, and, on the other hand, shed crocodile tears saying this is to be done and that is to be done. How is it going to be done when you are not prepared to make your contribution, when you are not prepared to perform and share the responsibility? There is no reason for you to come here and shed crocodile tears about unemployment and about this and that.

My hon. Friend talks about the Government calling people stooges and what-not and going cap in hand begging. The Government has every right to criticize and to be criticized. [Laughter.] This is democratic freedom, democratic right, and I can assure you that when the Government criticizes it puts forward constructive criticism, you can be sure of that.

My hon. Friend said that the Government's pigheadedness in 1962 was responsible for the disturbances, but Sir Jock Campbell thought that the Budget was a constructive one. The *London Times*, a prominent newspaper, praised the Budget. The Riot Commission—that came here said that the Budget was a constructive one.

5.50 p.m.

But what did we find here when the Budget was presented in 1962? We saw the members of the Opposition in the P.N.C. joining the ranks of the destructive elements, and that is what they peddle in order to oppose the Budget.

This is what appeared in the Riot Commission's Report in 1962. I will quote from page 15:

"But there was a section of the press in British Guiana itself, which was strongly, almost viciously, critical of the budget. *The Daily Chronicle*, which is under the effective control of Mr. d'Aguiar, leader of the U.F. and *Argosy*, which is also hostile to Dr. Jagan, opened their assault on the day following the introduction of the budget. *The Chronicle* said that the Government was going to squeeze dollars from the workers, and a few days later it carried a headline "Tax Avalanche will Crush Working Classes". Another headline stated "Slave Whip Budget" and went on to say "Budget is Marxist'."

Hon. Members of the Opposition took a very unrealistic approach to the work of the people, and as a result we had disturbances, riots, and looting in this country. That is not to be blamed on this Government. My hon. Friend said that we have created this crime. This Government has not committed any crime. The Government has to put forward constructive proposals. The members of the Opposition have been too slow to absorb and understand what the Government is doing, and they resorted to irresponsible actions which resulted in disturbances and riots in this country. Those are the facts of the situation. [Mr. Jordan: "Like what was done to the Speaker."] Do not worry about that.

My hon. Friends in the Opposition are determined to be unrealistic, and the destruction and procrastination which face this

country should be laid on their doorsteps. [Mr. Carter: "Take your hand out of your pocket."] My hon. Friend said that the economic growth of this country has been slow. [Mr. Carter: "Not me, the hon. Minister of Finance."] Why has it been slow? It has been slow because of the type of economy we have in this country - an economy that is geared to benefit the metropolitan powers. [Mr. Bissenber: "From 1957 your Party has been in power."]

I will prove to my hon. Friends the reason why economic growth has been slow. This is the pattern which has been set by our Colonial masters not only in British Guiana, but in all Colonial territories. I wish to quote one example. Some time ago the C.D.C. came here and expressed the view that they were interested in the cultivation of rice. They examined the situation very carefully, and a company was formed to produce rice. This company was known as the British Guiana Rice Development Company. I repeat that the C.D.C. were interested in investing in rice production but, having examined the situation, they changed their plans and decided to loan to the British Guiana Government certain sums of money to establish this project. As a result the Company was set up, and the British Guiana Government has to pay a large amount of interest to the Company on the money which it borrowed.

In 1954 the interest paid to the C.D.C. from the Rice Development Company was \$63,375.45. In 1955, it was \$112,212 in interest, and so it goes on. Up to the end of 1961, this Company paid

the C.D.C. nearly \$2½ million in interest charges bearing rates at 6½% to 7% interest. We do not want to borrow people's money for nothing, but what the Government wants is loans on low-interest rates. But our hon. Friends on the other side are opposed to that.

Between 1954 and 1955 this Company operated at a loss of nearly \$1,844,000 mainly because the interest charges were high, and the remuneration from the production of rice was very low. It shows clearly that, unless we can get money to borrow at very low interest rates, our country will not be able to move forward at the rate we would expect it to go. What I want to show is the economic pattern that obtains in this country, and the reason why we cannot move forward at the rate we would like to move. Everything is due to the economic pattern in which we have to operate.

Take the Rice Marketing Board, for instance. In 1963 it had to pay the bank \$333,000 in interest charges at the rate of around 6½% to 7%. That is the pattern in which we have been raised, and that is what happens in all Colonial territories like British Guiana, Trinidad, Barbados, Jamaica and other territories.

6 p. m.

Let us look, for instance, in the commercial field. We have big firms importing machinery and spare parts and making huge profits. Some time ago the Government carried out a survey of the percentage of profits those firms were making on the importation of machinery and parts, and it was

[MR. SAFFEE]

discovered that in some cases the profits were as high as 150 per cent. It was found that a spare part which cost \$1 was sold for \$2.50. Those firms import tractors, draglines, bulldozers, ploughs, cars and spare parts for those machines, on which they make enormous profits. The effect of this is that the economy of this country remains stagnant; we cannot move forward because of these huge profits, and because the Government does not have the control of the economy in its hands.

Recently we saw that the B.G. Electricity Corporation awarded a contract for fuel oil to a local company, as the result of which the Corporation was able to save about \$50,000 in one year. It shows clearly what large profits are being made by the oil companies. All this is the result of the economic pattern we have to follow in this country, but the United Force and the People's National Congress had a lot to say when the contract was awarded to the local company. They openly attacked the deal - for what reason I do not know. In Trinidad too we find that large profits made by the oil companies are being taken out of that country. In 1958 the Apex Trinidad Oilfields, Ltd. made a profit of £773,000 after paying tax. The Shell Trinidad, Ltd. made a profit of \$4,722,240 in 1954 and \$6,459,629 in 1955. I have here the report of the Presidential Address to the 3rd Annual National Convention of the National Union of Government Employees which was held in Trinidad in 1962, from which I wish to quote the President's remarks on unemployment:

"I turn now to what NUGE considers the two major internal economic problems facing the territory today: Unemployment and the growth in the labour force. NUGE is deeply concerned over the existence of about 65,000 workers totally unemployed, and an additional 32,000 partially employed in a labour force of 293,000 with a potential supply of 5,000 to 7,000 workers to be added to the labour force yearly."

How are we going to solve the unemployment problem? How are we to expand the economy of the country when there are large concerns extracting huge profits and exporting them from the country? This is a problem which is also affecting the people of Trinidad. The Trinidad oil companies have been able to pay large dividends to their shareholders. In 1945-46 they paid 12%, in 1946-47, 14%, in 1950-51 and 1951-52, 16 2/3%, and in 1952-53 and 1953-54, 20%. It shows clearly that in spite of the fact that Trinidad is an oil-rich country, and in spite of the enormous profits being made by the oil companies there is still the same unemployment problem in Trinidad as we have in this country. I have in my hand a United Nations release of May 30, 1962, from which I quote:

"The developed areas of the world (United States, Canada, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa) increased their share in world exports from 65 to 67 per cent between 1938 and 1960, while the share of undeveloped areas of

the world decreased from 25 per cent to 21 per cent in the same period."

6.10 p.m.

I have here an article which was published in the *Guiana Graphic*. It is reported that the President of the World Bank, who has now retired, in an address at a meeting held in the United States of America said that -

"A serious situation was facing the under-developed countries because they were having to pay more for their purchases from the developed countries while their own sales were bringing lower prices

"If the momentum of development is to be maintained it can only be by grants or by loans largely at very long term and at very low interest."

This goes to show clearly that if we want development in this country, if we want economic advancement, it is absolutely necessary that we must find new sources for raising loans, long-term loans, at lower interest rates. Let us look at the figures to see what we have paid in interest charges for money we have borrowed from foreign sources. During the life of the Interim Government large sums of money were borrowed and squandered. My hon. friend, who was a member of the Interim Government, had a mouthful to say today about the unemployment situation, but he was part and parcel of the Interim Government, and large sums of money were borrowed and wasted.

heavy interest charges. Let us look at some of the figures.

[**Mr. Hugh:** "Let us look at the Bartica-Parika road; \$2.7 million paid and no work done."] In 1957 we had to pay \$2.7 million in interest charges. In 1958 we had to pay \$4 million; in 1959 we had to pay \$4.2 million; in 1960 we had to pay \$5.8 million; in 1961 \$6.6 million; in 1962, \$8.2 million; in 1963, \$9.4 million and in 1964 it is estimated that we will have to pay something in the vicinity of \$11 million. [*Interruptions.*] It is not a question of repaying the loan; the question is that the interest rates are very high and as a result create a great hardship on the economy of the country. These are the facts of the situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Caldeira (Pomeroon): I beg to move that the hon. Member be granted another 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Hamid (Demerara-Central): seconded.

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Saffee: As I said, this question of raising loans at low interest charges and repaying them over a long period is an important one. Unless we are able to do this we will be faced with the same situation. The country will not move forward at the rate it should and we will not be able to solve the numerous problems which are facing us. What is the position today? We find bauxite responsible for 9 per cent of the Gross Domestic Produce but it only employs 1.8

[**MR. SAFFEE**]

this country. Sugar is responsible for 17 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product but only employs 11 per cent of the labour force, Rice contributes 6 per cent to the Gross Domestic Product but employs over 40,000 people

[**Mr. Correia:** "What per cent?"]

I am not here to help you. This shows clearly that sugar and bauxite are in fields that make more profits than any other industry in the country, but they employ very few people in comparison with the rice industry. It shows that they are engaged in more profitable fields; they make higher profits but employ a smaller percentage of the people in comparison with other industries.

This is the pattern and the Government must go into certain fields where it can raise incomes so that it can bolster the economy of this country instead of only concerning itself with sea defences, roads and so forth. Government must venture into the sector of industries that can make profits in order to bolster the economy. [*Laughter* (Opposition)]

My friends laugh because they would like to see the Government continue in sectors where it has to offer subsidies, where it has to suffer losses year after year. But this is the pattern and unless we make up our minds to change this pattern, unless we make up our minds to move ahead, there will be unemployment, backwardness and bad roads in the country. Let us get the facts straight. There is a United Nations report from which I would like to quote. On page 9 - [**Mr. Joaquin:** "What date?"] - 12th December, 1962 - this is stated:

"Africa, with 8 per cent of the world's population - an estimated 240 million persons - produces only 2 per cent of the world's total production. This is equal to about one-half the value of the annual production of the United Kingdom and about equal to that of Italy, a study by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) points out.

"Per capita income at \$110 per year is less than one-tenth of that in the industrialized countries, the study shows, but even the very inadequate surveys of its natural resources 'suggest a vast potential'. The continent already produces nearly one-seventh of the world's mineral production, while its energy sources - principally coal in the south, hydro power in the central part, and oil and gas in the north - 'are considerable' "

6.20 p. m.

Sir, it goes to show that this also is a pattern. It goes to show that what holds us back and what prevents us to move forward has also faced the people in Africa. This is what the members of the Opposition cannot understand. They say we are responsible. When we tried to move forward what happened? They put obstacles, they create disturbances. They create obstacles so that the country cannot move forward. We have people in the Opposition who are not prepared to learn, who are determined to remain ignorant, to remain in darkness. They are not prepared to be realistic, and this is what

is responsible for the situation which exists in British Guiana. Every step that this Government takes to move forward, they operate in the opposite direction and they come here and giggle and laugh like irresponsible people.

Sir, I wish to conclude and say that this country will not move forward unless the pattern which exists today is changed and is changed very rapidly. Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. Hugh (Georgetown-South): Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult and indeed useless to attempt to find substance in what has already been said by the speakers on the Government side equally so as it is difficult and impossible to find any substance in this election Budget.

I would have imagined that after several barren Budgets, this year, the Government would have been prepared to make a genuine attempt to present a Budget that could really win elections for it - I mean the party in Government. Instead what do we have? We have 35 pages that could have been reduced to 2 - if so many - and lots of time could have been saved in this House and at least the patience of the Opposition Members would not have been so tried in listening to what Mr. Sandys said, how much national unity there must be, who are neurotics, what happens in other countries and what does not happen in other countries and this continuous state of affairs since 1961.

If one were to go through this Budget Speech of the hon. Minis-

ter of Finance, one would find that the Minister contradicts himself many times and this lends suspicion that this Budget was not written by one person. If one reads through these 35 pages and is keen enough, one will see the variation in the use of grammar, the variation in the style and usage of words and, as I said, contradictory statements here and there. For instance, such a thing like "innate commonsense" does not exist, that is one. [Mr. Saffee: "Nonsense."] For an ignoramus anything is nonsensical. Yes, sir, I am very much impressed with the statement by the Minister on page 34, second paragraph. He said, and I quote:

"I have tried in this Speech to analyze the causes of unemployment and poverty in Guiana, and I have indicated what has already been done and what is proposed to bring relief to the masses. This Government did all that was possible in existing circumstances to reduce inequalities and inequities within our society."

I think it is time that we examine what this party in Government has done and what it proposes to do in the context of the Budget Speech before us. What has it done? The party in Government has, so far, created distrust in the minds of established investors at home, and has exported this commodity overseas. It has created conditions -- [Dr. Jacob: "Who wrote that for you?"] Stanley Hugh. It has brought on a series of unrest in the country. It has created unemployment in public works and elsewhere in order that it may

[MR. HUGH]

say that it is solvent. It has spent its two terms in office campaigning in every way for the next elections. It has abused everybody who did not give it large sums of money willy-nilly and those who did not agree with what it said and did.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think this is an appropriate time to adjourn. The House will now adjourn until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Adjourned accordingly at 6.30 p.m.