

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 7]

**PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE NATIONAL
ASSEMBLY OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF GUYANA UNDER THE
CONSTITUTION OF GUYANA**

53rd Sitting

2 p.m.

Wednesday, 18th December, 1974

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Speaker

His Honour the Speaker, Mr. Sase Narain, J.P.

Members of the Government – People’s National Congress (50)

Prime Minister (1)

The Hon. L.F.S. Burnham, O.E.,
Prime Minister

(Absent)

Deputy Prime Minister (1)

Dr. the Hon. P.A. Reid,
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of
National Development

Senior Ministers (8)

The Hon. H.D. Hoyte, S.C.,
Minister of Economic Development

*The Hon. S.S. Ramphal, S.C.,
Minister of Foreign Affairs and Justice (Absent)

*The Hon. H. Green,
Minister of Co-operatives and
National Mobilisation

*The Hon. H. O. Jack,
Minister of Energy and Natural Resources (Absent)

*The Hon. F. E. Hope,
Minister of Finance

*The Hon. S. S. Naraine, A.A.,
Minister of Works and Housing

*The Hon. G. A. King,
Minister of Trade and Consumer Protection (Absent – on leave)

*The Hon. G. B. Kennard, C.C.H.,
Minister of Agriculture

Ministers (5)

The Hon. W. G. Carrington,
Minister of Labour (Absent)

The Hon. Miss S. M. Field-Ridley,
Minister of Information and Culture

The Hon. B. Ramsaroop,
Minister of Parliamentary Affairs
and Leader of the House

*The Hon. Miss C.L. Baird,
Minister of Education and Social Development (Absent)

*Dr. the Hon. O.M.R. Harper,
Minister of Health

Members of State (10)

The Hon. M. Kasim, A.A.,
Minister of State for Agriculture

***Non-elected Ministers**

The Hon. O.E. Clarke, Minister of State – Regional (East Berbice/Corentyne)	(Absent – on leave)
The Hon. P. Duncan, J.P., Minister of State – Regional (Rupununi)	(Absent)
The Hon. C.A. Nascimento, Minister of State, Office of the Prime Minister	(Absent – on leave)
The Hon. M. Zaheeruddeen, J.P., Minister of State – Regional (Essequibo Coast/West Demerara)	(Absent)
The Hon. K. B. Bancroft, Minister of State – Regional (Mazaruni/Potaro)	(Absent – on leave)
*The Hon. C.V. Mingo, Minister of State for Home Affairs	
*The Hon. W. Haynes, Minister of State for Consumer Protection	(Absent)
*The Hon. A. Salim, Minister of State – Regional (East Demerara/West Coast Berbice)	(Absent)
*The Hon. F.U.A. Carmichael, Minister of State – Regional (North West)	(Absent)

Parliamentary Secretaries (7)

Mr. J.R. Thomas,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Works
and Housing

Mr. C.E. Wrights, J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Works and Housing

***Non-elected Ministers**

Miss M.M. Ackman,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the
Prime Minister and Government Chief Whip (Absent – on leave)

Mr. E.L. Ambrose,
Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Agriculture

Mr. S. Prashad,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of
Co-operatives and National Mobilisation

Mr. J.P. Chowritmootoo,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education
and Social Development

Mr. R.H.O. Corbin,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister (Absent)

Deputy Speaker (1)

Mr. R.C. Van Sluytman, Deputy Speaker

Other Members (17)

Mr. J.N. Aaron

Mrs. L.M. Branco

Mr. M. Corrica

Mr. E.H.A. Fowler

Miss J. Gill

Mr. W. Hussain

Miss S. Jaiserrisingh

Mr. K.M.E. Jonas

Mr. M. Nissar

Dr. L.E. Ramsahoye

(Absent – on leave)

Mr. J.G. Ramson

Mrs. P.A. Rayman

Mr. E.M. Stoby, J.P.

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

Mr. C. Sukul, J.P.

Mr. H.A. Taylor

Mrs. L.E. Willems

Members of the Opposition – Liberator Party (2)

Mr. M.F. Singh, Leader of the Opposition

Mrs. E. DaSilva

OFFICERS

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

Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly – Mr. M.B. Henry, AMBIM

18.12.74
2 p.m.

National Assembly

2 – 2.05 p.m.

PRAYERS
ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Leave to Members

The Speaker: Leave has been granted to the hon. Member Dr. Ramsahoye, the hon. Member Mr. Clarks, the hon. Member Mr. Nascimento, and the hon. Member Mr. Bancroft, for today's Sitting and to the hon. Member Miss Ackman for today's and tomorrow's Sittings.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS – FIRST READING

The following Bill was introduced and read the First time.

Rent Control (Special Provisions)(Amendment) Bill 1974 – Bill No. 41/1974
**[The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House on behalf of
the Minister of Works and Housing]**

PUBLIC BUSINESS

MOTION

APPROVAL OF ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE 1975

Assembly resolved itself into Committee of Supply to resume consideration of the estimates of expenditure for the financial year 1975, totalling \$458,687,527.

Assembly in Committee of Supply.

The Chairman: Pages 52 to 55.

HEAD 18 – MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Question proposed that the sum of \$2,916,188 for Head 18, Ministry of Information and Culture, stand part of the Estimates.

Mrs. DaSilva: Page 52, subhead 1, item (18), page 54, items (104) and (105), and page 55, subheads 18, 20, 23, 25 and 30. On page 52, subhead 1, item (18), Information Assistant, we note that in 1975 there will be fifteen Information Assistants. It goes on to state in the legend “Twenty-two posts reclassified by Supplementary Estimates in 1974. Two posts abolished.” I should like the hon. Minister to give us some information about these Information Assistants. Are these fifteen new people? How does it work out? In 1974 there were 22 posts, now there are 15. How is it that we are asked to vote \$45,000 for this year when the Approved Estimate 1974 was \$48,576? Maybe, the reclassification was done during this course of this year and that is what explains the 1974 Revised Estimate being \$7,500. I should like the Minister to give information about these Information Assistants and how the posts now work. Some posts have been reclassified. As I said, it only appears to be fifteen now when it used to be twenty-two before.

2.05 p.m.

On page 54, item (104), “Sports Adviser to the Honourable Minister.” We are asked to vote \$7,200 and the legend states: “Fixed Salary.” I wonder why the hon. Minister needs to have a special adviser to her when there are so many people in this Ministry connected with sport who could give her advice. I do not want to put anybody out of a job, but on the other hand we are talking about the need to save money, and it does seem to me that we are providing a job where it is not necessary there are so many qualified people in sports that the hon. Minister can truly get all the advice she needs without creating a special post.

The legend against item (105), part-time Coach, states: “To provide for seasonal coaching in several sports.” I did not know we had seasons in Guyana. [Interruption] I did not know we had Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter. We have the rainy season and dry season, but things have got so mixed up that we do not know which is the rainy and which is the dry season.

The fact remains that in Guyana we play our games – football, cricket, hockey and tennis – from January to December rain or sun. Anywhere you go you will see the boys with bats and balls; the potential Ramadins, Kanhais, Gibbs and what have you. [**Interruption**] The point is this: I did not know we have seasons and that there was a need to appoint a coach for the seasons as such. I shall be glad if the hon. Minister will tell us about this.

We come to page 55 under the Ministry of Information and Culture. I did not list subhead 2, Transport and Travelling; I do not know if you would allow me to say a few words on this, sir. The legend states: “See Form 6 – 6a for details. The increased provision results from the creation of new posts and the transfer of open vote employees to Personal Emoluments.” The vote still appears to be extremely high, it is more than double in the revised estimate for this year which is \$36,000. We have been asked to vote \$93,500 and we would like some explanation on that.

Subhead 18, Expenses – Film Censorship. We are asked to approve \$1,000 for 1975; the revised estimate for 1974 is \$2,490, the approved estimate was \$4,490. I am not going to deal so much with the sum of money that we are asked to provide although it is one place where this Ministry manages to make a small saving of about \$1,600. I wonder if the hon. Minister is going to ask us for more later in the year in the supplementary provision. However, that was not what I wanted to talk about.

The Minister has recently re-constructed the Board of Censors and we look for improvements in the type of films we are getting. But I wanted to ask her if she is aware of this situation. I mentioned this in my contribution to the budget debate I am sorry I have to raise it

again, but the hon. Minister was not here and I wanted to have her views on it. Could the hon. Minister tell us what is the position with the cinemas regarding the issue of half price tickets to children? I understand last week Thursday that a family of four children went to the 9 o'clock show at the cinema as the school was closed for that day. The eldest child is 14 years of age and so she must pay for an adult ticket. The others are 10, 8 and 7 years and each had to pay the price of an adult ticket. When the parents went to enquire from the cinema proprietors why they were being charged the adult price when they should have paid half price, they said, first of all, that they had no half-price tickets; the Ministry had not given them any half-price tickets. Secondly, they said they had not been notified by the Ministry of Education that they should allow children to be admitted that morning, so anybody who went there would have to pay the same price as an adult. Surely they are fleecing people, because if they were not notified that it was open to children and if the children had no right to be there they should have refused to admit them. But they admitted the children and charged them adult prices. Is the Minister aware that this is going on? Are there any problems with the cinemas getting half-price tickets for children?

Similarly at a drive-in cinema the charge to enter is \$1 except on a special night. But I am referring to the normal dollar tickets. One family went along and the charge was \$1 for each adult. But the two children were given one adult ticket price \$1 and were told to pay \$1.20. Is the Ministry collecting from this particular cinema revenue on the extra charge of 20 cents? Is the Government collecting revenue from the cinemas which sell children adult tickets when they are supposed to pay half-price? If not, the Government is being deprived of money it ought to have. I should like the hon. Minister to say what is the position.

We come to subhead 20, Publishing and Publicising. I am sure the hon. Minister realised before I even started speaking, that I would speak on this subhead. I note the legend states: "The cost of publishing 'Guyana Today' and promotional leaflets transferred to this subhead from PR where they were charged at the commencement of operations." I thought we have paid already for publishing "Guyana Today" and I did not know we still had to pay for this.

18.12.74

National Assembly

2.05 – 2.15 p.m.

As I said earlier on, we have nothing against publishing and publicizing as such. It is a very necessary part of the development of our country because it is one means of getting across to the citizens of Guyana all the various ways in which we can assist our growing nation. We need to publish and publicise leaflets and pamphlets on agriculture, on growing more food, on animal husbandry, on poultry, on education, on health education. There is the immunization scheme in the Ministry of Health which it is hoped will be implemented next year; people do not know about it, they do not understand what it means. There would be no co-operation with the Government unless the people knew and understood. This is the Ministry to do this and we appreciate this fact. But unfortunately we know that this Ministry uses its publishing and publicizing vote to publicise the work of the People's National Congress. All of it or the greater part of it is just party propaganda.

2.15 p.m.

In view of the statement by the Prime Minister the other evening to the effect that the Party is above the Government, I am beginning to wonder whether I should have said anything in this House. Maybe the Party is the Government and we just have to take that. But, as I say, if this vote is used to publish and publicise from an educational point of view we will not complain; we will be very happy, but the Government must not misuse the vote and waste money by publishing and publicizing party propaganda. [Mr. Singh: "The taxpayers' money."]

This year we are being asked to vote \$395,000 for publishing and publicizing. We have publishing and publicizing in their other forms by other names. There is publishing and publicizing in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as we shall see in a little while. Every Ministry does its own bit of publicity. The Ministry of Information and Culture is not covering every Ministry. Yet, look at this big amount of money that we are spending in Guyana on publishing and publicizing, mainly to distribute to the Guyanese who have gone overseas, who, really and truly do not care about how we are suffering and sweating here in Guyana to make two ends meet. They have gone and left us to it and we fool ourselves by sending literature to them and

telling them what a wonderful country we have; they must come back home. However, they know better and stay right where they are. Some of them do come and then some of them regret it and go back again.

We would like the hon. Minister to say whether she has any new scheme this year for publishing and publicizing – perhaps some new slant that we have not heard of before – to justify this big expenditure of \$395,000.

We turn to subhead 23, the Board of Trustees of the Georgetown Cultural Centre. I am not criticizing the Cultural Centre or the Board of Trustees. I am using this subhead to give the hon. Minister an opportunity to tell us and through us, the nation, what is happening, how the Cultural Centre is progressing and when it will be opened. That is all I am asking. Could the Minister tell us how the Cultural Centre is coming on; how soon it will be opened and what plans the government has for it?

We know that we are sharing cultural ties with India and that we have received offers of help from India. We know also that the Indian High Commissioner has two persons at the Indian Cultural Centre who teach Indian dancing, give recitals and so on. Could the hon. Minister tell us about the Georgetown Cultural Centre and whether these activities will be shifted there? Will the Centre be used frequently and not just be a great, big expensive “white elephant” that is used occasionally? We would like the hon. Minister to tell us what her plans are.

Subhead 25, Sports Training. The Approved Estimate in 1974 and \$19,000. This amount was revised to show that we expect to spend \$41,720; this year we are being asked to vote \$15,000 and the legend states:

“Salaries of the staff N.S.C. transferred to P.E. Provision made for games equipment used by coaches and expenses of foreign coaches, local counterparts and sports trainees.”

If we turn to page 54, under item (97) we will see “7 Coaches” and under item (98), “9 Sports Organisers.” Does this not seem to be a duplication? Could the hon. Minister explain these additional coaches and the reason for them?

Under subhead 30, Electricity, the legend states: “New Subhead”. For the first time we are being asked to provide for the electricity bill and the sum requested is \$47,500. I only hope it is paid in time. Could the hon. Minister tell us who paid her light bill before?

The Chairman: Hon. Minister of Information and Culture.

The Minister of Information and Culture (Miss Field-Ridley): Sir, may I thank the hon. Member Mrs. DaSilva for the very clear formulation of her questions. She has not asked very many under the Ministry of Information and Culture. In fact, had she read her Estimates correctly, she would not have had to ask even those.

Let us look at the questions she has asked. On page 52, she raised a query on subhead 1, item (18). She queried how 22 Information Assistants had become 15. She pointed to the note which said that two posts were abolished, but, if she looks under explanatory note (17), she will see:

“Five posts created in substitution for five posts of Information Assistants.”

So, 5 and 2 make 7: 15 and 7 make 22. There were originally 22 posts; two posts were abolished, according to the note at the foot of the page; five were exchanged for the other posts according to the note at (17). That is how seven posts were lost from the 22 posts, leaving 15 posts. I think my mathematics are correct.

On page 54, the hon. Member’s next question was on item (104), “Sports Adviser to the honourable Minister.” This Ministry is charged with responsibility for sport, for Information, for

Culture and a few other things. If hon. Members look at one section, for example, Information, there is a Chief Information Officer who is Chief Adviser as well as Executive Officer. If we look at the structure in sport, there is no such person. The people employed in Sport are at two levels. There are people who have specific functions either in relation to a specific game or a specific region. One example is the football coach who, therefore, would not be able to advise on over-all sports policy. There is the other kind of specific adviser who task takes him to a regional area. For example, we have an adviser stationed in the Berbice area who is responsible for the sporting activity in that area. Again, because of the sectional nature of his task, he is not in a position to give over-all advise on Sport.

We have a National Sports Council of which the Chairman and all the members are voluntary. They function in an executive sense. In other words, there is no officer – full –time or part time – who is charged, and capable because of his functions, to give advice to the Minister who is charged with the responsibility of Sport. Therefore, it was necessary to create a post of sports Adviser because the Minister needs to be advised about Sport just as she or he needs to be advised about any other function of the Ministry.

The hon. Member raised a question on item (105), Part-time Coaches “to provide for seasonal coaching in different sports.” I think she answered her own question when she admitted that Guyana has seasons. I do not think that we, in this honourable House, should be led to think that the only possible seasons are winter, summer, spring and autumn. We do have seasons.

If hon. Members look at a sport like cricket, for example, they would see that there are certain times of the year when first-class cricket is played. We have a policy in the Ministry that we employ, out of season, people like Lance Gibbs, Roy Fredericks, Kallicharran – people who play first-class cricket. They spend their out-of-season time coaching the young people around the country and they are paid from this vote and this is the principle we follow.

[Miss Field-Ridley contd.]

2.25 p.m.

On page 55, the hon. Member raised a question under Transport and Travelling first of all. Again, if she reads the explanatory note, the reason for the increase becomes self evident. The explanatory note says:

“The increased provision results from the creation of new posts and the transfer of open vote employees ...”

In order words, there were under “Other Charges,” certain votes which met the salaries of open-vote employees as well as their transport and travelling expenses. Since the exercise by the Public Service Ministry, we have rationalized the position and we have transferred the staff to the “Personal Emoluments” section, but travelling and transport still has to be met from “Other Charges,” and this is the proper vote under which it now appears. It is only seemingly an increase. It is not in fact an increase. We have transferred the money from other votes to put it all together.

Under subhead 18, the hon. Member raised the question concerning expenses of film censorship. She congratulated the Ministry for having saved \$1,400. Much as I am happy to welcome congratulations from the other side, I should like to point out that it is not really a saving. Again, had the hon. Member read the explanatory note she would have seen that from this vote the salary of the Secretary of the Board of Film Censors has been met in the past. This post, too, has been transferred to Personal Emoluments. Again, it only seems to be a saving. It is not in fact a saving. It is a rationalization.

She raised the question about half-price tickets for children, about some children who turned up at a cinema and were asked to pay a full price. I wonder if those people went to the police, because, I think that that is the action that ought to have been taken. If the cinema proprietor takes a full-price ticket for a child then, obviously, he should have been put in the

hands of the law. And I should like to believe that the hon. Member gave that advice to the person who told her of the situation. Perhaps it is not too late and a report to the police might well be timely.

She mentioned another case of overcharging. Again, it is a matter that I think should be taken up with the police because I do share her concern that Government might well be losing revenue in these areas.

I should like to point out, too, that the excuse given by the cinema proprietor that the Ministry had not issued half-price tickets is completely a fabrication since the Ministry does not issue tickets at all. The cinema proprietors have undertaken to print their own tickets. This is monitored. We do not issue tickets to them, therefore, we issue neither half-price tickets nor full-price tickets. It is their responsibility to get the tickets printed and monitored by the Ministry of Finance, but the point still remains that the law needs to step in there.

The hon. Member raised the question under her favourite subhead, Publishing and Publicising. First of all, she thought Guyana Today had been paid for and, therefore, we ought not to be asked to pay for it. Guyana Today is a quarterly publication, therefore, every time it is published we have to pay, and having paid for one issue, we still have to continue to pay for other issues as and when they are published, or we will be in the hands of the law. [Interruption] I will remedy that defect immediately.

She also raised the question of our using this vote to publish what she calls party propaganda when leaflets and pamphlets are needed on agriculture education and various subjects. If she wants to regard what we do as party propaganda, it is entirely her privilege in a democratic society. The philosophy of the party, the People's National Congress, does inform everything the Government does and this is as it has to be, because it is the party in power and in Government. Therefore, when we publish from the subhead as we do, and as we have done, leaflets on rice for information of all members including the members of the Opposition, it could

be described as party propaganda because it is to the credit of the party in power propaganda because it is to the credit of the party in power that it has done so much for the rice industry. I would have thought it met her criteria for informing people about what we are doing.

We have used this subhead, and we will continue to use this subhead, to publish information on specific subjects of all kinds. We have recently published a book which puts together Government's achievements over the last ten years. Again this is vital information for the people of Guyana. It is useful for people to know where we have travelled in ten years, where we have come from, where we have gotten to, and where we are going to. **[Interruption]** And how we got in power. We have no apology to make. We are proud of our democratic processes. If the hon. Members of the Opposition want to regard that as party propaganda, by all means let them do so.

Again, it is to the credit of the party that we have moved from years of chaos, when there were bombings, when there was bloodshed, when there was strife, to a situation now when we meet in peace without barbed wire around our fences; when we can go home and sleep in peace, when we see progress around us, when we can look at the healthy state of all our citizens, including the hon. Members of the Opposition. If this is party propaganda, then it is the function of the G.I.S. to let people know what is happening.

Again, the hon. Member made the point that we publish mainly for overseas readership. This is not true but even if it were true, it is necessary because of our past, because of the reasons which we all know, which led us at Independence to inherit a country which was economically decadent, because of reasons, which again we all know, which caused many of our citizens to be overseas, to continue to remain in touch with them, to continue to let them know how much the country has changed since the days before Independence. But the majority of this money is spent on local publications, and if the hon. Member is not in receipt of them, I will ask my Permanent Secretary to make sure that both of them receive all our publications.

Also, under subhead 23, the hon. Member raised a question concerning the cultural centre. This vote has nothing to do with the cultural centre. It is the vote that pays expenses for the Guyana Society. Perhaps if I said R.A. & C.S. the hon. Member would remember that more clearly, but since Independence, it is Guyana Society. And that is a long time ago.

The cultural centre when completed will be national centre for the creative arts. Hon. Members will remember I discussed with the House during the last Budget Debate, the plan of the History and Arts Council to have a system of regional centres, which will be involved in activities like dance, music, folklore, oral history programmes, writing, drama. These things are going to be centrally co-ordinated. The auditorium which the hon. Member sees is only the first phase. There is provision later on for rehearsal room, for workshops, for things like that that are related to activities in the field of art.

Under subhead 25, Sports Training, the hon. Member made the point that she saw on the previous page votes that dealt with coaches and sports organizers, and she thought that this vote on page 55 gave us a super abundance of coaches. Again, if she read the explanatory note carefully, she would see that this is the vote to provide games equipment used by coaches, and expenses, not salaries, of foreign coaches, local counterparts and sports trainees. Salaries are not met from this subhead; they are met from the previous subhead to which she referred.

Finally, the hon. Member asked me who paid my electricity bill in the past.
[Interruption]

2.35 p.m.

It was paid by the Ministry of Works and Housing, as were all other electricity bills, but they have now been transferred to the relevant Ministries.

Head 18, Ministry of Information and Culture - \$2,916,188 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 56

DIVISION XI – MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND CULTURE

Question proposed that the sum of \$2,795,190 for Division XI, Ministry of Information and Culture, stand part of the Estimates.

Mrs. DaSilva: Page 56. The heading reads: “Details of Current Expenditure.” I think it should read” Details of Capital Expenditure.” Is that right, sir?

The Chairman: Yes, it should be “Details of Capital Expenditure.”

Mrs. DaSilva: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister’s very valued, vivid and imaginative explanation of all that her Ministry does and I am sure that she appreciates that I gave her an opportunity to spread more of her propaganda.

We come now to Capital Expenditure and I will deal with subhead 1 and subhead 5. Subhead 1, Development Programme – Publicising. The legend states: “To provide for publicizing the Development Plan.” A little while ago we voted \$20,000 for the printing of the Development Programme and now we are spending \$65,000 to publicise the Development Programme. We are spending a terrific amount of money on its publication. The hon. Minister could have used money from the \$395,000 voted for publishing and publicizing. I want it to be borns in mind that I am not saying this to be difficult, malicious or vindictive. I am saying this to try to save money. The hon. Minister of Finance keeps saying that we must save money. We are trying to save money and here is the Ministry of Information and Culture helping to fritter it away. The hon. Minister was provide with \$395,000 for publishing and publicizing under

Current Expenditure. Some of that could be used for the Development Plan. If we can save a little bit here and there the poor, old people whom we are always talking about can get increased aid.

How much more publicising do we need for this 1972 – 1976 Development Plan. In another couple of days it will be 1975 and then in twelve months time 1976 will be here. We have almost come to the end of the period that this Plan is to run and we will be getting ready to publish another one, having just wasted money in publishing one that has only a year to go.

We should like the Minister to tell us what is the reason behind the publicizing of the Development Plan. I took it that we were publicizing during the past years. As the hon. Minister pointed out, if she used it under the form of what our Government has done for us it is publicizing what the Development Plan is all about. So, all that was done before. This Ministry has been doing all that they are doing now, all that they have to do. Could we not try and save money?

Subhead 5, Development of Sports, is “to provide for various sport facilities” and for this purpose \$500,000 is being asked to be voted under this Capital Expenditure. It is not that we do not want our nation to be a nation where young people do not take part in sports and games. I think we have always accepted this. As a matter of fact, Guyana is noted all through the years – even in our very bad colonial days – for providing very good footballers cricketers and things like that. In the past we have had people in sports and we will continue to have them. But in these days we have to establish priorities and put first things first. We cannot afford to waste money or use money in the wrong place especially when our health facilities are so poor and when our old people who are on Social Assistance receive no little. These things have to be taken into consideration first before we can allow ourselves the luxury of sporting on this grand scale.

We are not against sport. Every school has its little sporting team and cricket team. We have a good record down the years. All the schools in Guyana have their organized sports and games. We are not against the question of advocating sport but maybe this is an area in which a little self-help could be done. The few that we have could help the others. Again, as we keep saying, in the interest of the nation and in the interest of cutting costs, put first things first. But maybe in her reply the Minister would tell us something we do not know concerning this additional expenditure.

Miss Field Ridley: Mr. Chairman, I think the questions asked by the hon. Member under the Capital Expenditure merely demonstrate the wide gulf there exists between her ideology and mine. I am a socialist and she is a capitalist and I think that the way her questions were formulated makes this very, very clear. The hon. Member, by the formulation of her questions, believes that there is development and progress, if a small sector of your country progresses. I do not accept this.

If I may start with her second question first of all, I think I can demonstrate very clearly the point I want to make. The hon. Member said she is not against sport – at one time I even wondered whether she was using “sport” in the colloquial term of fete – but rather she felt that sport could be indulged in at a lower expenditure. The hon. Member then referred to those bad colonial days when we did well at cricket, for example. The hon. Member remembers those bad colonial days. The people who played cricket and lawn tennis were a small elite group, the people who could afford to play. When anyone out of that elite group made the team it was news and no one out of that elite group could become captain. Do you think a Clive Lloyd could have been Captain, Mr. Chairman, in those bad colonial days? It would have been completely impossible.

It is necessary to spend this kind of money on sport because we believe that the opportunity to participate in sport should be shared by all the people of our country. Sport is an important contributor to character building, to personal development. In sport many people, who

because of our own background, have not had the opportunity for intellectual exposure and, therefore, cannot find themselves in that area, can and have found themselves in the area of sport. They have performed well and built their self-confidence and through building self-confidence in the area of sport they have grown to walk tall with their heads held high because they know they are worth something. This does not happen accidentally. If one left it only to the fortuitous circumstances of chance, then a limited few would take part in our sport and only a limited few would leave this country to represent us.

This expenditure represents, first of all, the building of a Sports Hall. We have no facilities at all in this country for playing indoor games. Even games that could be played outdoors, like basket ball, played on the Burnham Park, is really a boon to the people of Georgetown. In addition, the Association cannot collect any kind of entrance fee or gate fee, even a small token sum, because there is no way of controlling the gates. Recently we had a Caribbean Badminton Tournament, Mr. Chairman, and if you had the time and opportunity to see it you would understand how we have suffered because we have no place to play a sport like that.

2.45 p.m.

The other people who came from the Caribbean with better facilities had a different style of play which made use of the height of the room. Our players, accustomed to playing in Queen's College canteen had not even explored that possibility and so their standard of play was different because their style of play was limited and this is the sort of thing we need to do something about.

In addition to which, long ago lawn tennis was played – and I maintain it – by a few elite. It was one of the social games. In collaboration with the Ministry of Education we have tried to put lawn tennis in many schools but there is one large inhibiting factor. We do not have hard courts and to play lawn tennis in a country like this you need hard courts. When just a handful of

people play they can play on the limited number of courts we have and in any case they were the kind of people who could afford a court in their back yard. Now we have children who do not have that kind of possibility so we have to put up a scheme, a system of hard courts throughout the country. This is the vote that will do this. We have to provide facilities in terms of grounds for all sports in the country so that the ordinary little man about whom we socialists are concerned can find a way to express himself through sport. It will no longer remain the preserve of the elite.

About publicizing the Development Programme, again it is a problem of ideology. We feel that true development can only come through the full participation of every citizen of our country. Development for us is not the development of a small group. Development for us is not the progress or development of a small group of businessman, it is total development of every single citizen in our country, his own personal development and the development of the country. You cannot have this if in area “X”, situated in the Rupununi for example, the Development Programme calls, as it does call, for public participation to build a school and the people do not know. One has to publicise the Development Programme in such a way that every farmer, every housewife, knows what role he or she has to play, every citizen must know that he or she has a role to play in the development of his country. This is why the Development Programme has to be specially publicized and this is why it takes a mammoth expenditure to do it. It is not enough for us to print the books and pass them around to those who can read and who are not intimidated by a book this size. Those are the elite, those are the fortunates; we have to get at the grass-root level. We have to use every communication channel available and therefore we need this input.

The Development programme, in addition, is not a once-for-all effort. The current Development Programme will come to an end, and a revised Development Programme will continue it. It has to be an on-going programme for publicizing your Development Programme if you expect, as we do, the participation of all our citizens.

If we felt that we only needed the co-operation of a few businessmen, a few entrepreneurs, then it does not matter who knows about the Development Programme. But for us it is absolutely essential that that man, that woman, that child at the grass-root level has a part to play in the development of this nation. And we have to make sure he knows that road.

Division XI, Ministry of Information and Culture - \$2,795,190 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Pages 177 to 179.

HEAD 70 – MINISTRY OF CO-OPERATIVES AND NATIONAL MOBILISATION

Question proposed that the sum of \$1,619,298 for Head 70, Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Page 177, subhead 1 and I will take items (4) and (6) together.

The Chairman: Are those the only items on that page?

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Singh): Item (14) also. I thought I would cut down on the time by merely dealing with the items in sequence as I did yesterday. The post of Economists, subhead 1, item (4) and the post of Sociologist, item (6), are both new posts, and appropriate amounts of money have been assigned to them for 1975. In view of the shortage of these specialized people I wonder whether the hon. Minister could tell us what are the prospects for filling these posts. Because it seems not quite right that we should be creating posts if there is not expected to be filled in 1974 because nothing is put in the Revised Estimate even though they were created some months ago. But there seems to be some prospect of filling them in 1975. I wonder how realistic these prospects are.

tem (14), Co-operatives Auditor II/Co-ops Auditors I, on the salary scale A18/22/A16. There are supposed to be twelve of these goodly gentlemen. In the 1974 Approved Estimates the sum asked for was \$43,296; in the 1974 Revised Estimates this sum is considerably reduced to \$28,787 and the estimate for 1975 again has one up to \$47,970 nearly \$48,000.

If you look at this particular Division all the other heads have been either spent or overspent. But this most important item of auditors is underspent for 1974 by approximately \$15,000. There are twelve posts; obviously there are vacancies otherwise it could not have been so very much underspent. How many of the twelve posts are in fact vacant? Is it not true, as I have been told, that the audit of a number of co-operative societies is several years in arrears as a result of this shortage of staff? Will the hon. Minister elaborate on that?

Page 178. Subhead 1, item (28) and I will go on to subhead 4, and then subhead 10. Dealing with subhead 1, item (28), Station Allowances, the 1974 Approved Estimate was the sum of \$4,620, the 1974 Revised Estimate was \$27,072 and for 1975 we move on to more or less the same figure that was asked for in 1974. We are asking for \$4,820 for 1975.

2.55 p.m.

Obviously, the questions are: Why is it that we spent approximately \$23,000 more for Station Allowance in 1974? And, in view of the fact that we are asking for only \$4,800 approximately in 1975, how do we propose to bring this 1974 expenditure down to this level in 1975? There must be some thing drastic that the Ministry will do to bring down an expenditure in 1974 of \$27,000 to approximately \$5,000 in 1975. What does the hon. Minister propose?

In respect of subhead 4, Telephones, the figures are very interesting indeed. The 1974 Approved Estimate was \$25,000; the 1974 Revised Estimate was the same \$25,000; the 1975 estimate is \$80,000 and the legend states:

“Increased telephone charges and arrears.”

I have talked about not providing enough money to pay to the Guyana Telecommunication Corporation in the past and I have been very, very concerned about this. But, I should not like to know that we are moving from one extreme to the other. If \$25,000 was sufficient for 1974 – that is all that is asked for as Revised Estimate for 1974 – how then do we require \$80,000 in 1975, approximately \$55,000 more than was require in the Revised Estimates for 1974? The legend mentions “arrears.” Can we conclude that there is a sum of arrears to the extent of \$55,000 in respect of this Ministry?

One would presume that the revised estimate was a realistic amount that the Ministry estimated to be the cost of its telephone services for 1974. But if \$80,000 is needed for 1975 and the Telecommunication Corporation has not increased its charges during 1974, then, is the \$55,000 the amount in arrears? If it is arrears, I am very worried because if we have arrears to the extent of \$55,000, why did the Ministry not make some effort to pay this during 1974 rather than merely put it down for 1975? And if this is so, this is the reason why the Telecommunication Corporation cannot pay the millions of dollars it owes the Cable and Wireless Limited for services, overseas calls etc. This is very worrying state of affairs and I am sure if the hon. Vice President of Guystac were here, he would share my concern about this.

Subhead 10, Films and Visual Aids. The Approved Estimate for 1974 was \$4,346; the Revised Estimate is the same amount \$4,346. The sum of \$10,000 is being asked for 1975 as against \$4,346 for the previous year and the legend states: “Increased Activity.” Sir, what we should like to know is: Why is this not an activity of the Ministry of Information and Culture with which we have just dealt, with its fantastic financial resources for publicity, publications, etc.? Surely, this is an appropriate subhead for that Ministry. I am a little concerned. It seems to me that husband and wife want to share ministerial responsibility in this respect.

Let the Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation hand over that subhead to the Ministry of Information and Culture and let that Ministry deal with it. It is an appropriate Division for the Ministry of Information and Culture which has the funds to deal with it. We

have just read about the fantastic sum of money that the Ministry of Information and Culture has requested to deal with publishing and publicizing. That Ministry has the facilities to deal with a subhead of this kind. If it is that the hon. Minister does not have any forceful voice in this matter, than I am sure he should be able to appeal to the hon. Minister of Finance and, indeed, to the Cabinet to make an executive decision on the matter.

The Minister of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation (Mr. Green): Mr. Chairman, on the first question, with regard to the economist and sociologist, when we come to Capital Expenditure, perhaps I will deal with the whole concept of the operation of the Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation for 1975. I will also remind my hon. Friend of the commitment this Government has, to make the small man a real man and that the institution of the co-operative will be a major organization and instrument to achieve this objective. I cannot go beyond saying that "Hope springs eternal in the human breast." I do not want to attempt to give a precise answer because, in these days, Guyana, like every other developing country, has a difficulty in recruiting certain qualified personnel. All that I can say is that we will be able to fill these posts early in 1975.

On the question of subhead 1, item (14), Co-operative Auditors, he, in fact, gave the answer. We have a number of vacancies and additional efforts are being made to fill these vacancies. We have the agreement and we have different scales and I feel that in 1975 there should be no difficulty filling the majority, if not all, of these posts.

On page 178, subhead 1, item (28), Station Allowances, the reason for the increase was additional activity in the Youth Corps. The figure has again been estimated at \$4,820 because this Ministry is no longer responsible for the Youth Corps and that additional expenditure is no longer anticipated in 1975.

Subhead 4, Telephones: We always have difficulty in accounting and I myself have expressed concern about the speed with which accounts move. I suppose that is a special area

18.12.74

National Assembly

2.55 – 3.05 p.m.

for accountants and people who deal with accounts. The fact is that the accounts for late 1974 will be paid in 1975 there are some arrears. In addition, the Ministry, since it has expanded and is concentrating on the rural areas, has had to pay additional money for the D.D.D. calls outside of Georgetown.

Subhead 10, Films and Visual Aids. This is particularly for the Community Development Division and the Co-operative Organisers so that they will have aids, visual and otherwise, to assist them in selling their programme and ideas to the people in the various areas. It is not always convenient for a Ministry which operates in the field to rely on the single agency responsible normally for this type of prop and what we have in mind what we have in mind is a slightly different work than will be done by the Ministry of Information and Culture. That Ministry has the over-all responsibility for selling information to the people in the nation. The Ministry deals with certain specialized areas which we prefer to deal with in a particular way.

Head 70, Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation - \$1,619,298 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

3.05 p.m.

The Chairman: Page 180.

DIVISION XXVIII – MINISTRY AND NATIONAL MOBILISATION – CO-OPERATIVES

Question proposed that the sum of \$4,900,000 for Division XXVIII, Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation – Co-operatives, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: We do appreciate that these are estimates with limited space in the

explanatory notes and that is why we have a Committee of Supply so that we can get the ancillary information from the hon. Minister. We start with subhead 1, Purchase of Equipment. We are asking for \$50,000 (Guyana) for 1975. There is no aid here. The Approved Estimates column for 1974 shows a sum of \$300,000 but in the Revised Estimates column, the sum was cut down to \$100,000. I suppose we will be told that was as a result of the fuel crisis, as indeed we may be told for all the other Heads that are reduced.

If we take the next subhead, Co-operative Development, the approved estimate for 1974 was \$900,000 and the revised was \$400,000. In respect of Kuru Kuru College, subhead 3, the approved estimate for 1974 was \$500,000, the revised was \$350,000, and for Co-operative Settlement, subhead 4, the approved estimate was \$00,000 and the revised was \$25,000. We did finish the year with a favourable balance and even though we note that the hon. Minister of Finance said that the capital head was underspent because of all the fears and speculations, this does not quite completely answer the question. These heads did not involve any particular delivery time for equipment other than in respect of subhead 1.

But dealing with the amounts requested for 1975, under subhead 1, a provision of \$50,000 is sought for the purchase of “miscellaneous equipment”, according to the legend. Miscellaneous equipment like what? We would like to know. And to what areas with this equipment be diverted?

Subhead 2, Co-operative Development. The tremendous sum of \$4 million is being asked for in respect of co-operative development. Again I repeat, we note that in 1974 all that was asked for was \$900,000 even though we started out by being so optimistic. Of course, the revised estimate is \$400,000. The legend states: “Development of Co-operatives in all regions.” That does not really tell us anything at all. So many other Ministries are allocated funds to encourage co-operatives to engage in activities in their particular provinces. Ministries have identified funds where they prepare the ground for co-operatives just to come in, so that it is not

that this Ministry has the job of actually going in and doing infrastructural works in order to set up a co-operative. Other Ministries do that, therefore, what is this sum of \$4 million going to be used for? Let the hon. Minister tell us of the plan. There must be proposals for the expenditure of this \$4 million. One would expect they would not pick the figure out of a hat. We would expect the hon. Minister to tell us in clear, unambiguous and precise terms what the proposals are for the expenditure of this \$4 million for 1975.

We do not object to spending money on co-operatives. We know that co-operatives have had a bad record. We know there are certain co-operatives that the hon. Prime Minister has said are really companies – co-operatives like the Greenland Co-operative – big companies which hide behind the façade of co-operatives in order to get away from the obligations of limited liability companies. And the Prime Minister has said that there are such co-operatives.

[Interruption]

We believe in co-operatives, farmers' co-operatives. We believe in people getting together for collective services and such like. What we object to are those co-operatives which were criticized by the hon. Prime Minister, those co-operatives like Greenland Co-operative, which should be limited liability companies, and are merely a collection of party people getting together to use their position to head a co-operative in order to get benefits for themselves.

We believe in people coming together in a co-operative so that the small man would be able to improve his lot, co-operatives where the small man with be able to achieve for himself the position where he can even think of himself as a capitalist. Let us face it. Every single person who has shares in that very successful local company, Banks DIH Ltd. – and there are a lot of small people spread throughout the length and breadth of this country who have shares in Banks DIH Ltd – who reap rewards and receive dividends. Very small people can be termed capitalists because they have shares in a big capitalist organization.

That is the kind of thing we believe in; people's capitalism, not capitalism for the exploitation of the ordinary masses, and to the extent that co-operatives will foster and encourage the idea of people's capitalism, to the extent that co-operatives will encourage the ordinary man to be able to get returns, we believe in them, and we would like to see this sum of \$4 million being spent very constructively. We would like to see it being spent very realistically to improve the lot of ordinary people, but we can only do that if we have a plan, if we have a set scheme, if we sit down and think out and visualize and actually make sure that we have the kind of programme that we can realistically achieve.

I should like to know what the proposals are. As I said, I have no objection to the level of expenditure but I certainly would like to know what the proposals are in respect of this expenditure of \$4 million. I do not wish airy-fairy statements but specific details. Let us deal with the specifics rather than with the general principle of what the co-operative can do and what areas they can invest in.

In respect of subhead 4, Co-operative Settlement, the total amount being requested for 1975 is \$100,000 and the legend says, "Settlement of Co-operatives." Here again the item deals with co-operatives and we have no objection to this. We have Co-operative Development, \$4 million, and Co-operative Settlement, \$o-operatives." Here again the item deals with co-operatives and we have no objection to this. We have Co-operative Development, \$4 million, and Co-operative Settlement, \$100,000. There must be some difference between development and settlement, therefore, we would like the hon. Minister to give us the distinction. Let us know exactly what the proposals are in respect of this \$100,000. Tell us: settlement where? We are going to take careful note of what the hon. Minister says and, next year, we are going to ask where the settlements are and how the \$4 million was spent, so will the hon. Minister bears this in mind. We certainly would like a realistic programme to be told to us.

18.12.74
3.15 p.m.

National Assembly

3.15 – 3.25 p.m.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, on the first subhead, the Purchase of Equipment, this vote is primarily for vehicles and other things to transport staff around in many of the remote parts of the country.

On the question of Co-operative Development, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has made some rather strong and, I must confess, interesting observations and he has tempted me to reply in some detail. I think fundamental to our development thrust is that both sides of this house, all the people in the nation, should really understand in clear and, as he says, in unambiguous terms what this Government and the Party mean when we talk about Co-operatives, Co-operative Socialism or Co-operativism, when we talk about making this small man a real man. The Comrade Leader has made it very clear on several occasions, but it seems as though it is that task of his other colleagues, on occasions such as this, to repeat, perhaps in different styles and different ways, what we believe in.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about Banks DIH and he says he believes in that sort of people's capitalism or whatever term he used. But in his introductory remarks and when we had a brief exchange across the table, he said that – and I suppose he spoke for the United Force – they accept the principle of co-operativism and that, in fact, they support it. The two things are inconsistent. The Government has said on several occasions that there is, at least for some time, a place and there will be a place for the private sector. It is significant because the ideal socialist state will not encourage the private entrepreneur such as we understand the word. Capitalism as we understand it, will have to be something of the past. What we are attempting to do is to secure the persistence of true socialism, as we understand it, and to see that there is not an emergence of a second capitalist stage of development. We make no apologies for that.

But when the hon. Leader of the Opposition says he supports co-operativism and at the same time refers to Banks DIH and small people having a share in it, this is where we have a

serious and fundamental difference. The man who has a share in Banks has a share and at the end of the year, with the involvement of another person or another agency, hopefully, he will get a return. The particular enterprise to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has referred has continued and we hope will continue, to make profits. But that man to whom he referred has very few shares in terms of the total quantum and is not involved in the planning and the direction in which Banks goes. That man cannot determine whether Banks should be used in the development of the State. And too often people see the co-ops merely as an economic exercise. To us it involves so much that the Government has to take a major role.

The Westminster model of Government, for example, functions as an agency to preserve the balance between the various sectors. As far as this Government is concerned, we feel that there must be radical and substantial changes. When we see reflected in our Estimates \$4 million for Co-operative Development, it is to take a serious step and to make a serious effort so that the whole machinery of Government would function with a bias, without apology, in favour of the development of the whole concept of co-operativism.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about believing in this movement of people's capitalism, I do not want to enter into an ideological argument today but I am not sure what people's capitalism is I never really was a capitalist. But I wish to say that we hope to produce a society that is individually, as well as nationally, self-reliant, where the group does not rely upon a person or a small group of people. Herein is the substantial difference between Guyana and the United States and Russia and other States that have, within their system, the co-operative movement. In those foreign countries to which I referred, the co-operatives are allowed to function on the periphery, the sidelines as an incident. We have said, and I wish to quote the Leader of this Party when he addressed the Special Congress of the People's National Congress at Sophia on Saturday, 14th December, 1974. He said:

“ . . . the P.N.C. needs no preaching on the Co-operative to evoke conviction. That it is essentially and by definition the little man's institution and instrument of liberation is

accepted. So also is the fact that it is a most important machine in the development of the nation.”

In one of the two countries which my friend is familiar with, the economy is controlled by a few entrepreneurs and in the other state the economy is really controlled by the Party bosses. What we are attempting to do with the co-operative movement – and we have serious deficiencies which we must correct is to give people a sense of belonging and to let the little man, the man who has not had an opportunity before and has so far not had an adequate opportunity, to feel that he can seriously contribute to national development and not see himself in the capitalist context of merely being a wage earner and depending upon the skill, the wisdom or, in some cases, the treachery of the other man in order to exist. We are talking about people’s involvement.

This is an ideal which the Leader of the Party to which I belong has set as a goal and I am confident that with the continuous effort of all of us in this place and with the re-education of many people who say they support co-operativism and yet talk about capitalist enterprises as the thing, we hope to change the society and to produce a new man who is completely self-reliant, who is confident and proceeds with a sense of purpose and determination.

It is customary, as my friend said, to talk about the public sector, the private sector and the co-operative sector. Many of my critics, like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, have pointed out that the co-operative sector is, indeed, part of the private sector. We heard this during the election campaign. But this is only partly true because it fails to take into account the type of assistance that must flow from the Government to co-operatives and from certain financing institutions which will function with a deliberate bias in favour of well-organised co-operative groups.

May I pause to say that there are a number of registered co-operatives that are malfunctioning. This is no secret. The task of the Ministry, the Government and the people of this

country is to ensure that we do not have people who proceed with the belief that they alone must get benefits from a particular system. The difference is that these institutions, these banks, have been created to help the small man so that the Mortgage Finance Bank, the Small Industries Corporation and the Agricultural Co-operative Bank will not function as the old commercial banks did and ask a group of ten or twelve people to provide collateral and chase them back into grasping hands of the capitalist. The banks and the Government will accept the determination, the labour and the willingness of that group to work as their collateral. That is how these banks are intended to function.

3.25 p.m.

Therefore to answer the question specifically, the money we have asked for under this head is to accelerate in 1975 this programme that will in fact translate the Party's, and therefore the Government's ideology in action and put it on the ground. [Interruption] We have legion problems because the major influence in the society has still, so far, been capitalist oriented. It would therefore take an intensive and massive extensive programme of education using the Kuru Kuru College and other agencies and using the party and other agencies to instill a new working-together arrangement amongst people, bringing them back to the days that existed before the introduction of capitalism, imperialism, and the other organizations to which I referred, which took the Amerindian out of his native co-operative sector and made him capitalist oriented, made him an individual, put him in the "class" society. It was a system which took the slaves, who worked together on a basis of equality, and produced a man who was interested in himself and himself alone. The effort here is to create this new man, the new man who would have a feeling for his brother. Therefore the co-operative must not be seen merely as a retail shop exercise.

We have a number of co-operatives to rehabilitate in 1975, a fairly exhaustive list which I have before me. We have a programme of education, a programme for agricultural projects, to bring people in, to teach them the skill of management. This is a responsibility and I promise my hon. Friends that if they wish and I have made this offer many times; the last time I made it, it

was not taken up by the other half of the Opposition – to sit with us because I feel that if the co-operative is to succeed, the Opposition, first of all, needs to understand the objective of co-operative socialism.

It is clear when the hon. Member talks about shares he is missing the central point. The central point is real meaningful involvement and the removal of this system of paternalism and one industrial entrepreneur mixing sugar and water while we sit back, and merely buying a \$10 share hope to get an extra \$5 at the end of the year. We want people to be involved, to be their own masters and to use the co-operative institution, which is ultra democratic. Irrespective of the number of shares an individual has, at that meeting of the co-operative, there is the principle of one man, one vote. It is the ultimate in democracy.

I would urge the hon. Leader of the Opposition to speak to me at any time and we can discuss this in great detail. In fact, I should like to help whatever is left of his group to get them into viable co-operative enterprises so that they will repudiate the old and out-dated capitalist system which has brought so much of ruin, chaos and hardship to millions of people in the world. Even the capitalist empires are cracking today. We hear about recession and all sorts of thing. The answer for the world is a new socialist man and a man who is willing to work together.

Mr. M.F. Singh: I should like to make the observations. First of all, when you put your money in the Co-operative Bank you are, so to speak, a shareholder in the Bank expecting returns, expecting interest. It is analogous to putting your money in shares in Banks Breweries and the Government is advocating that the people put their money in the Co-operative Bank so that they get returns, so that they get interest. They get something out of it.

Secondly, up to now we have not had one word as to the exact programme, the scheme to be utilized in respect of the expenditure of the vast sum of \$4 million. We have not been told. What are the plans? What is the programme? Exactly what is the division, the way in which

they propose to allocate the \$4 million? All we have had is the usual ideological stuff which is being turned out so very often.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, as my senior colleague and deputy Leader just pointed out the order is to understand the concept and the ideology before we can proceed. But we have 1,306 societies to examine in 1975 in addition to those that are in the process of formation. We must have a careful look at every one of the consumer societies and provide the societies with competent management initially. This is management that will get with the people and help them, teach them the fine points of co-operative management.

We also have a programme to train over 100 young men and women in the art of co-operativism so that they will go out into the fields – to use the United Force term, they will go in the highways and byways- and get the little people to work together. The building and construction co-operatives need to be rehabilitated and put on a sound footing with the necessary technical assistance. These things cost money. At the Kuru Kuru College, acting on the instructions of the Prime Minister, from next year all courses will be free. Additional funds will have to be found from this vote to make that a reality.

In so far as the housing co-operatives, the fishing co-operatives, are concerned here again I can go the whole length. In the case of the agricultural co-operatives we hope to put on each scheme, along with the officers from the Ministry of Agriculture, a group of co-operative officers who would virtually live with the people to see that they function effectively as a co-operative.

In addition, we are recruiting a number of trained personnel to monitor some of these co-operatives which are in fact prostituting the fact that Government is promoting co-operatives and are really functioning as small limited liability companies. They will have their registration certificates cancelled.

Division XXVIII, Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation – Co-operatives - \$4,900,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Pages 181 to 183.

**HEAD 71 – MINISTRY OF CO-OPERATIVES AND NATIONAL MOBILISATION –
(LOCAL GOVERNMENT)**

Question proposed that the sum of \$2,879,000 for Head 71, Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation (Local Government) stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: page 181, subhead 1, items (11), (15), (16), (24), (30) and (31). I will deal with some of them collectively. I am not sure whether the system of calling each item is really desirable. I thought the system yesterday was quite satisfactory. Certainly the hon. Minister of Agriculture seemed to have done very well in respect of my merely dealing with the items as I went down the page, but as you like, sir.

Subhead 1, item (11), Senior Clerk (General). The 1974 Approved Estimate was \$4,584. The Revised Estimate however, is \$18,984, approximately \$19,000, and the estimate for 1975 is \$4,800. The question here is obvious. If the Ministry expected to spend and asked for \$4,584 in 1974, why has it revised the 1974 revised estimate to approximately \$19,000? This obviously needs some explanation!

Moving on to Local Government Division, items (15) and (16), we note that there are two posts listed here: Commissioner of Local Government and Deputy Commissioner of Local Government. The legend against each states: “New post created by Supplementary Estimates in 1974.” What are we doing here? First, some years ago, we completely abolished these posts. We had various reasons given at that time for their abolition. Now, we are reintroducing both of them again. Did we abolish them merely to get rid of the incumbents at that time? What is the

rationale for having first abolished them and now – a few short years later – reintroducing them? We would like the hon. Minister to tell us that.

Dealing with the general heading “Valuation Division” I have some general comments, and then I will deal with the Valuation Officer in item (24). This Valuation Division has recently concluded assessments of properties in Georgetown. We have had several complaints. In fact, “several” is an understatement; we have had innumerable complaints. Dissatisfaction seems to be rampant in respect of the assessments which have been put on properties in Georgetown as compared with what they were before. We recognize that as long as people are called upon to pay more than they used to pay before, there will be dissatisfaction. There are no two ways about that.

What has been worrying us is the apparent disparity in the assessment of properties. We appreciate that this is a new division and that there will be “teething” problems. But certainly, there seems to be need for a consistent effort to be made to be – if I may repeat the word – consistent in the pattern of assessment. We do hope that this Ministry will settle down to some systematic and some realistic assessments of properties to prevent the gross dissatisfaction which is at present rampant among taxpayers in Georgetown.

This is important because we need good public relations. It is important, otherwise we would have, first of all, a host of appeals to the Courts against the assessments and secondly, we would have a latent hostility of taxpayers against their revenue collecting authorities for what they consider to be unjust and iniquitous taxation. We do not want that.

We want all the people of Georgetown and Greater Georgetown to co-operate. We want them all to have a fair deal. We want them to be satisfied with their assessments. Fair enough, we shall never be able to satisfy everyone but at least we should try to reach the stage where John Public does not have to say: “Mr. X has been assessed at such and such an amount. Look at

his property as compared with mine which is of a lesser value, and yet I am assessed more than he has been assessed.”

We know that this Division has been recently started. We know, as I said before, that there are “teething” problems. We would not like to say anything further at this stage but we hope that the Division will settle down to making a more realistic and a more satisfactory assessment of properties as far as taxpayers generally, are concerned.

Item (30) under the Community Development Division is the post of Chief Community Development Officer. What we note here is that the Approved Estimate was placed at the figure of \$12,012. The Revised Estimate for 1974 is only \$3,750, whereas, the estimate for 1975 is \$15,000. Similarly, in the case of item (31), Deputy Chief Community Development Officer, the Approved Estimate for 1974 is \$10,356. The Revised Estimate is only \$33,096 which is considerably less but the estimate for 1975 is \$12,384.

These are not new posts. They are posts which have been re-classified and if we look at the 1973 Estimates, we will see a figure which is much more than the 1974 Revised Estimate. This leads us to believe that these posts were not filled. If the posts were filled, certainly, the whole amount approved for 1974 would have been expended but since the amount is so much less than what was approved, then there is need for some explanation, particularly, in view of the fact that the Government is placing such great accent on the Community Development Division. Are these posts really filled? Have they been recently filled? What is the position?

Turning over the page to page 182, I will deal with subhead 1, items (33), (34), (35) and (51) and also subhead 4. Item (33) deals with Assistant Chief Community Development Officer and item (34) with District Community Development Officer II and District Community Development Officer I. It is the same argument that I have used in respect of the Chief and Deputy Chief Community Development Officer, item (33) the Approved Estimate was \$6,674. The Revised Estimate is only \$1,668, considerably less than the 1974 Approved Estimate and the

estimate for 1975 has gone back to the 1974 approved figure of \$6,672 which again leads us to believe that there was not an officer occupying this post throughout the year.

3.45 p.m.

In respect of District Community Development Officers, item (34), there are supposed to be 19 such officers under this subhead. The approved estimate for 1974 was \$88,668, the revised estimate is \$60,584, and the 1975 estimate is \$87,900, which is in the vicinity of what was asked for in 1974. There again, considerably less is estimated to be spent in 1974 than was approved for 1974 for the 19 posts, leading us to believe that there are vacancies among these officers.

Under the heading, World Food Division, the same sort of situation exists in relation to item (35), Manager, Food Unit. The 1974 approved estimate was \$10,776, the revised estimate was only \$2,904, whereas, the 1975 estimate has gone back to the 1974 approved figure of \$10,776, which shows that there was not an officer in the post for the year to draw the entire salary which was approved for the post.

We mention these because these are divisions on which, the Government has placed such great accent. Surely the Government would realize that if there is not an officer in the particular post throughout the year, the Government's programme will not suffer, then we do not need to provide so much money because the job is being done at a much lesser cost. If these figures are realistic, well, then, we do need the posts and we should have them filled.

Moving down on the same page to item (51), Acting Allowances, under the 1974 Approved Estimates the sum of \$100 was provided. Under the 1974 Revised Estimates, the sum of \$11,796 is reflected, but yet for 1975, all the department is asking for is \$100. I have asked this question in the past and I have been told in respect of acting allowances that it is normally merely a token provision made. The Ministry would have us believe

that this is the accepted accounting procedure and pattern and, therefore, we should accept it. But this is not so. It is not borne out by the Government's own Estimates.

If the hon. Minister were to tell me that the sum of \$100 for Acting Allowances is a nominal sum and that is how it has always been, let him look at page 47, under the heading, Attorney General. We will see under subhead 1, item (20), Acting Allowances, where the figure under the 1974 Approved Estimates is \$3,000, the figure under the 1975 Estimates is \$3,600. No business of \$10, \$50 or \$100. They are using realistic figures because they are basing their calculation on their 1973 Actual, which was \$4,314, and their 1974 Revised which was \$3,500. For 1975 they are estimating to spend \$3,600. If a Ministry spent \$3,500 this year, then it should provide \$3,600 next year, because we feel it would be in the same vicinity. Do not let us have the answer that this is normal accounting procedure. Page 47 does not bear that out. I will not accept that answer on this occasion.

Turning over to page 183, subhead 21, Community Development Workers, the approved estimate for 1974 was \$53,500. That was the considered opinion of the Ministry at that time, that for 1974, only \$53,500 would be required in respect of its programme, Community Development Workers. What do we find? The revised estimate was \$300,690. This is approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ million more than what the Ministry thought it would need to spend for 1974. The hon. Minister of Finance cannot properly balance his budget, if the Ministry tells the hon. Minister of Finance it will spend \$53,500 and then revises it to \$300,690.

For 1975, the Ministry seems to be adopting a realistic figure vis-à-vis the 1974 revised expenditure. It is not asking for \$53,500. It is asking for \$350,000 for 1975 and the legend says, "Increase in number of workers." This needs an explanation, the Minister having overspent by nearly $\frac{1}{4}$ million for 1974, and now coming for \$350,000 for 1975 in addition to all the other amounts which we have come across for this kind of work.

I have said this before and I am forced to say it again. The unfortunate fact is that these Community Development Workers are no more no less than P.N.C. party agents and activists throughout the country, being paid for with taxpayers' money out of the general revenue of the country. It is a very sad state of affairs. I am not sure how much good it will do to appeal to the hon. Minister to desist from this sort of thing.

I am not very enamoured of doing this because of the recent declaration that the party is paramount and the Government is subservient to the party. It may be that we will have the continue at this frustrating exercise where year after year we will see in the Estimates, taxpayers' money, more and more, being utilized to finance the activities of the party. If that is so, we have come to a sad state where we do need to make drastic changes in our Constitution to let the people know that we are no longer trying to operate in the traditional democratic fashion, but we have made it a state in which anything for the party is okay and the taxpayers must pay for it.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, you can see my heart bleeding for my hon. Friend and Leader of the Opposition. I want to assure him, and I do not want to anticipate what my colleague, the hon. Minister Dr. Reid will say in a few moments.

3.55 p.m.

I would wish to plead with my hon. Friend with emotion matching his of a moment ago, to understand that in a country like ours, that is, an ex-colony, which has had injected into it all sorts of ideas and beliefs which resulted in attitudes which cannot help in the development process, a socialist Government such as this, has to take the whole question of people's education and re-orientation seriously.

The alternative is to have a system where a few people dictate for the rest of the State. I do not want to repeat. Our dream, our goal is to have a self-reliant people. The Community Development Worker is an important person in this quest for socialist development and I do not

want to think that my friend is making a serious charge when he talks about party activists. It may be difficult to find the point he is really trying to make because the party has to set the direction that the people and the Government must go. If he is suggesting that a qualification for a Community Development Worker is an understanding of the philosophy of the People's National Congress; that a qualification is that his ideological position must not be inconsistent with those of the Minister or the Party Leader, I admit that that is a qualification for a Community Development Worker. But I cannot go beyond that qualification.

I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition read the Leader's Speech and he will note that one of the things he said is that in 1974 we will look at and make changes in the existing Constitution which has produced certain problems in terms of the revolution of which we are in the vanguard. So we are about to change the Constitution of which the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be a part.

I do not know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition means by the Civil Service and the Police, but they are part of the whole development process. If we have a Civil Service that is not involved in the process of development we are wasting time and the taxpayers' money. The specific answer to the question is that last year, because of the importance put upon these people known as Community Development Workers, the team which looked at the salaries of all public servants recommended increases for this group. The reason for the increase, primarily, is that they are in receipt of increased emoluments.

Item (51) and others deal with the whole question of the way in which these Estimates are presented. I share my friend's concern; they even confuse a layman like me sometimes. But I am advised that in the case of the Chief Community Development Officer it is presented in this way because the person who functioned in that capacity for 1974 was only acting and, in fact, is in receipt of a substantive salary under another item. What you see reflected here as Revised Estimates, represent the acting amount. The post has not been filled. This goes for the other two

references the hon. Leader of the Opposition made. The same thing goes for the Manager of the Field unit at item (51).

The need for public relations in so far as a Valuation Division is concerned is noted. I want to thank my hon. Friend and I hope the Ministry of Information has enough money to do the public relations which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has proposed for the Valuation Division.

It is not fair, however, to say that there is no consistency in the pattern of assessment. What has happened is that in the past there was no scientific formula that was followed in so far as Georgetown assessment was concerned. For the first time we have had a very thorough and scientific assessment made of all property in Greater Georgetown. It has thrown up a number of previous deficiencies with the result that some properties are now valued less than they were before and, in other cases, more than they were before. But I have looked at it carefully myself and I am satisfied that the formula and method used by the Valuation Division is an excellent one.

In fact, I wish to publicly congratulate the Valuation Officer and his team of hard-working officers who did a very difficult job in a most admirable fashion. In any case there is provided, under the law, a period during which my hon. Friend and those who are dissatisfied could appeal. We are at the moment examining a number of appeals which have been brought in the proper manner. I want to assure my friend, however, that the increased rental value of the property need not necessarily mean that you pay more rates and taxes and I suspect that is his concern. The Municipality has come down from 22 per cent last year to 14 per cent this year and water rates will be 4.5 per cent. Where there is sewerage, the sewerage rate is 7.5 per cent. Those are the rates for next year. Some people will pay more and some people will pay less but this is to correct the old deficiency.

There was a question in relation to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Local Government. When the posts were abolished, there was an Administrative hierarchy with a Permanent Secretary in charge of the then Ministry of Local Government. Local Government is part of the Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation and even though it is reflected as a separate Ministry in these Estimates it functions under one Permanent Secretary. Therefore, we felt it necessary to have a person with experience and knowledge to head that section of the Ministry. He is called, for want of a better description, the Commissioner of Local Government. In fact, I hope to amend it. I do not like to have too many Commissioners. It smacks of the old system. We will probably call him A Chief of the Local Government. It is a more egalitarian term. That is the simple explanation. It is now under one Ministry and one Permanent Secretary and we need someone to head that particular division.

Head 71, Ministry of Local Government - \$879,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 184.

DIVISION XXIX – MINISTRY OF CO-OPERATIVES AND NATIONAL MOBILISATION
LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$4,300,000 for Division XXIX, Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation – Local Government, stand part of the Estimates.

Division XXIX, Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation – Local Government - \$4,300,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

Assembly resumed

The Speaker: *Sitting is suspended for thirty minutes.*

Sitting suspend at 4.05 p.m.

4.32 p.m.

On resumption –

The Chairman: Page 86.

HEAD 29 – MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$2,531,200 for Head 29, Ministry of National Development, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Sir, this is the Ministry of National Development, a Ministry of the Government of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana headed by no less a person than the hon. Deputy Prime Minister also leader of the People's National Congress, which post, as some people say, he recently took over from the heir-apparent to the Prime Ministership of the country. I am not sure who is the heir-apparent now. But this is a Ministry headed by a very important person. What have we really got in this Ministry? A Permanent Secretary, a Principal Assistant Secretary, and headed by a very important person. What have we really got in this Ministry? A Permanent Secretary, a Principal Assistant Secretary, an Administrative Assistant, and Other Charges.

Under Other Charges, we see subhead 2, National Development: Expenses of, and the figure of 1975 is \$2,500,000. What does this really tell us? What can we debate in Parliament? What can we realistically question in Parliament? What is this really? [Interruption] Hon. Members on the back benches can deal only with introducing Private Members Bills concerning churches and the like. They never say anything otherwise. I am not sure whether anyone of them has bothered to read more than one or two pages of this book. I have to study every single

page of it. How many of them have bothered to read anything at all that is in this volume? But they have the cheek to sit there and tell me to sit down. My function here is - -

The Chairman: Hon. Leader of the Opposition, do not let them bother you. You have been going on very well.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Thank you, sir. I agree with you, one has to make allowances for the lesser ones. But one will remember very distinctly that two hon. Ministers in this House, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Labour for whom I have the greatest respect went to great pains to explain that their Ministries were involved in an operation to give to this honourable House as much detail as possible. The hon. Minister of Agriculture went to great pains yesterday to tell us that his Ministry had moved towards getting away from block votes.

You will recollect yesterday that the hon. Minister of Agriculture said that in an effort to give this honourable House more information they have taken out specific posts from the block vote and, particularly the casual people and open vote employees, were being listed thus reducing the block vote so that Parliament can have a more realistic idea of how the money is spent.

The hon. Minister of Labour also, responding to the compliment paid to him by my colleague Mrs. DaSilva, said very forcibly that not only was he involved in a similar exercise, but his officers were involved, and they were involved again in splitting up the miscellaneous votes, as, indeed, I have notices being done in the vast majority of the Ministries. The miscellaneous votes are being broken down. The wages of charwomen are taken out from the Miscellaneous votes and listed separately; maintenance of equipment is taken out from the Miscellaneous vote and listed separately.

This seems to have been the definite aim and objective of those two Ministries and it must necessarily have been the aim and objective of other Ministries because at least in respect

of the Miscellaneous vote this pattern prevailed in respect of other Ministries. One wonders what is the reason for this apparent conflict. Why is it that we are moving towards identifying, itemizing and giving details in respect of some Ministries and for this particular Ministry, headed by such an important person as the General Secretary of the ruling party, and we bear in mind what the hon. Prime Minister has said the details are not given. I am not sure whether the hon. Minister is the heir-apparent as his predecessor was, but he is the General Secretary of the party. Therefore, one would have expected that he would have emulated the example of his colleagues and would have tried to give us a detailed breakdown of this anticipated expenditure in 1975, this sum of \$2,500,000 that he is requested.

4.40 p.m.

Since this information is not forthcoming, it does raise questions in our mind. We, naturally, are suspicious of something which deviates from the ordinary pattern, particularly, when the pattern is set intentionally as his colleagues said. They have not referred to the past; they said that it is their intention in the future that this should be done. This is a futuristic prediction by the hon. Ministers.

Why then has the hon. Minister of National Development resorted to merely a block vote? Is he trying to hide the details from the Director of Audit? Is he trying to make the work of the Director of Audit more difficult? Is he trying to deny us, in this Parliament, the concession so far afforded to us to examine these Estimates? If this is the policy, perhaps we should have a definite statement on it.

Let us say that in respect of the Ministry of National Development we will have no debate; we will entertain no questions. The P.N.C. has its two-thirds majority here. If it wants to make an exception of this Ministry it can do that but it should not try to throw dust in people's eyes and say it is coming to Parliament to debate a Head like the Ministry of National Development and merely tell us \$2,500,000 is required for expenses of National Development,

particularly bearing in mind that so many of the other Ministries seem to be dealing with the same business of development.

We have heard the hon. Minister of Economic Development holding forth as to the great amount of things that his Ministry was proposing to do in respect of development. We have heard also from the hon. Minister of Agriculture as to the plans which his Ministry has in respect of development and we have heard of plans for development from other Ministries also, like the Ministry of Co-operatives and National Mobilisation. Millions of dollars are being spent in respect of development. Therefore, one wonders whether this is the new policy of the P.N.C. Is it that this sum of \$2,500,000 will be spent, as I suspect it will be, on the party rather than on the Government because the party comes first and the Government second? Is this putting into operation the plan whereby the \$2,500,000 block vote will be spent for party purposes rather than for Government developmental purposes?

This would not have caused any objection on our part if it was the P.N.C.'s money but this is taxpayers' money. We are all taxpayers in this country. When a man buys a box of matches, he pays taxes because there is tax on it. When he buys cigarettes, he pays taxes; when he buys a razor blade to shave, he pays taxes. When he buys a shirt to wear, there is a tax put on the shirt, and the people in this country wear clothes so that there is a tax imposed on people all around the country and these are certainly not all the taxes.

One only had to see the rally in the National Park last week-end and one will realize how many people are divorced from the mainstream of the Government support. And yet the Government claims that it has crossed the barriers. One only has to look and see that that is not true; that a significant portion of the country is not, in fact, supporters of the P.N.C. Therefore, since taxpayers' money is involved here, we would certainly like to know what is the plan. Is this money going to be spend on advancing the P.N.C. or is it really going to be spent on development for the country?

If the money is going to be spent on development of the country, as long as this House is supposed to operate on the democratic pattern that has been set down, the hon. Minister, like his hon. Colleagues, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labour, has an obligation to give us details rather than supply this block vote which he is attempting to push down our throats.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Development (Dr. Reid): Mr. Chairman, it was envisaged that this would be the same story as was spoken not so long ago when we dealt with the Supplementary Estimates. I must admit that I have failed to get my hon. Friend to absorb the lesson I gave the last time, but old teachers like myself never give up. There are some people who will learn at the first lesson; there are others who can only learn after several repetitions. I shall proceed with one of the repetitions in the hope that I will enlighten my friend.

He has attempted to compare the Ministry of National Development, this new Ministry, with the Ministry of Agriculture and some others. In those Ministries it was clearly stated that the money will be spent to dig canals, buy machines, put up factories, get other equipments and implements, build roads and dams and all those kinds of things. That is one part of development. It is not a difficult exercise to tabulate the cost and give a reasonable estimate.

In the Ministry of National Development, because of our ten years of experience in Government, it has been found that if one spends on those things without trying to develop people themselves, then development slows down. This new Ministry is endeavouring to develop people but if it is to succeed, then it has to be able to operate in a very flexible way. It would be wrong to bring to this House a kind of estimate that may not be right at all. It may be such a far guess from what will actually happen that it is better to bring to this House this vote that will be spent in areas to help people themselves to develop.

We are not thinking that P.N.C. people are the only people in this country. We have a majority of people in the country, of course, but we do not have all the people in the country. There are people who have other political persuasions. When we come down to develop it is development of all the people and when we carry out these exercises in trying to motivate and inspire people, no one at all is left out.

We have demonstrated over the years that we do not discriminate when we get out into the fields to operate among the people of this country and evidence is there to support that. We have had to do this with this Ministry, concentrating on all people, because in the final analysis it is people that matter. If all the other developments take place and people are not taken care of, then there would be nobody to maintain the structures for them.

It can be said very fairly that this Ministry shall give support so that when the canals are dug and the dams are built and the roads are established and the factories built, there will be people who themselves are developed not only to operate them but to take care of them so that development can move on with speed; so that there can be people who will contribute of their best, who will not just give 20 per cent of their working capacity but will strive to give more of their ability and capacity but will strive to give more of their ability and capacity for work so that we will get more and more production. We have seen this in action. Where people have been inspired to do things, we have seen the results one gets from such people as compared with people who are not inspired at all. I am certain that my friend will now understand the difference between this Ministry and some of the other Ministries.

I want to tell him, however, that the Director of Audit never examines this kind of estimate. The Director of Audit examines after the expenditure has been met. That is the time he comes around and he examines them. What is he going to examine now? At the time when this expenditure of \$1 million is met there will be evidence to show how the money has been spent. At that time the auditors will look at the accounts and examine them, analyse them and report on them.

18.12.74

National Assembly

4.50 – 5 p.m.

[Dr. Reid contd.]

4.50 p.m.

They do not report on this now. They report long after the expenditure has been made. I just want to pass that fact on to him.

I am glad that he had something to talk about in here, and I hope that this second lesson will be more successful than the first.

Mr. M.F. Singh: The hon. Minister has not told us how he will share out this \$2,500,000.

Head 29, Ministry of National Development - \$2,531,200 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 87.

DIVISION XVII – MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$500,000 for Division XVII, Ministry of National Development, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: This honourable House is certainly a place where one's emotions swing from one direction to another. Yesterday when the hon. Minister of Agriculture was dealing with his Ministry, I felt full of hope for the future. I felt the same when listening to the hon. Minister of Labour. Now I feel a sense of frustration. What can I ask in view of the refusal of the hon. Minister to answer my questions in respect of the last Head?

Here we have subhead 1, Development Work, \$½ million, and the legend states: “To provide for minor development works.” I got no answer in respect of my request for details for \$2.5 million. This is what makes one seriously question the operations of this honourable House because there is the silver lining when we listen to Ministers like the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Labour and some others; the hon. Minister of Economic Development Mr. Desmond Hoyte was very good too. The most I could ask is: What are the minor development works? And hope for the best.

We certainly got no answer to the question about how the \$2.5 million was to be distributed. We don't know if it will be handed out. Where did the figure of \$2.5 million come from? Was it picked out of somebody's hat? Maybe we might get something else here. But what can we ask?

The Chairman: Perhaps, hon. Leader of the Opposition, you may get the third lesson.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Is it the third lesson in frustration? Are you suggesting I am going to get a further lesson in frustration? If it is a further lesson in frustration, after the last week-end, what can we do? Apparently we have to take it all.

Dr. Reid: I am very glad that my hon. Friend raised the question: What will this money do? It is not a new experience for people in other parts of the world to find out sometimes that no matter what they do with the big projects, development does not reach certain people. When you go into an area and motivate the people by film shows, by slides and cultural shows, and so on, and they are ready to perform, then they will get the opportunity of identifying a small project; it might be a koker, it might be just a small trench, but it may be vital to what they have to do. Then you have this small sum and you can say, “You are ready; you say you can do this job, begin.” You do not have to look back and find out what is going to happen, if this is on the Estimates, if this item is correct, but the people know this will be useful to them.

Sometimes you get into an area and you want to do all sorts of things which in the end are not very useful to the people, but you follow them along with this, and then you see them demonstrate their capacity to perform. You get them in the act, you see that job done, and before your very eyes you see them benefiting from this small project. It may be only \$10,000 spent and this is why we have this part of the Estimates under the Capital.

It is not only a talking exercise because if you talk to them this week, you go back and you talk next week, and a little thing cannot be done, then as my hon. Friend would say, you leave them frustrated. But when you can do a project promptly with their co-operation, you see them throw themselves into it, and they get inspiration to go on for future work. I am hopeful now that my friend has learnt.

Division XVII, Ministry of National Development - \$500,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Pages 19 and 20.

HEAD 2 – SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE

Question proposed that the sum of \$824,536 for Head 2, Supreme Court of Judicature, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: page 19, subhead 1, items (16), (21), and (24), and just a short comment on item (30).

Subhead 1, item (16), Registry Officers. The sum approved for the 1974 Estimates was \$60,288. The revised expenditure was only \$13,772. For 1975, the figure asked for was \$58,128 approximately what was asked for in 1974. There has been a tremendous underspending in 1974

as compared with what was asked for originally, suggesting there are vacancies among Registry Officers. This is a very important department dealing with the administration of justice and one would hope whatever vacancies there are in this category of officer would be filled very expeditiously. Could the hon. Minister say how many vacancies there are and how soon it is proposed to fill those vacancies. We are dealing with fourteen posts of Registry Officer as reflected in the Establishment column.

Going on to item (21), Legal Secretaries, we note that the sum of \$9,000 was provided for 1974. The revised expenditure is \$3,576 and the anticipate expenditure for 1975 is back to \$9,000.

5 p.m.

The first question, sir, is: Who are these Legal Secretaries? To whom are they attached? What do they do? It seems to be a new appellation. We have had three of them since 1973 but the expenditure revised for 1974 is so small that it leads us to believe that the posts are not filled. Are they, in fact, filled? Why was there this under-expenditure in 1974? In fact, if we look at the actual expenditure for 1973 we will see that that also was \$3,735 so that there has been an underspending in 1973 and 1974. We wonder what the position would be in 1975 even though we are being asked to provide the full amount of \$9,000.

Item (24), Court Reporters. Here again, the 1974 Approved Estimate was \$33,600. The Revised Estimate is \$18,800 and the Estimates for 1975 is \$34,320. There has been a significant underspending, therefore, in 1974, a reduction from \$36,600 to \$18,800. Surely if we have a shortage in our complement of Court Reporters, and it is only seven we are dealing with, this must affect efficiency and create problems. What does the hon. Minister have to tell us about that? How soon will the position be remedied?

I have a short comment to make on item (30). If we look in the explanatory notes column, the legend states “Previously provided for under subhead 3.” That is a misprint it should be “subhead “because that should be Miscellaneous and the Miscellaneous subhead is subhead 5.

Page 20. Page 20. I shall deal generally and use subhead 4, Transport and Travelling for my comments. I take this opportunity to deal with the plight of Judges’ chauffeurs. Formerly, salaries of Judges’ chauffeurs were the same as the salaries of chauffeurs to the Ministers. The salaries of Judges’ chauffeurs have remained fixed at \$165 per month while the salaries of the Ministers’ chauffeurs were revised upwards to \$235 per month at first and then more recently to the scale \$287 to \$335 per month. It is not only that, but Ministers’ chauffeurs receive a gratuity of 22½ per cent of their basic salary payable at six monthly intervals or on the termination of their service.

It is argued that Ministers’ chauffeurs may be employed only by Ministers and it was pointed out that they have a limited term of office because of the way Ministers go and come. It is also argued that there is insecurity of employment. Employment might be for four or five years, depending on performance, or how soon Ministers fall out of favour, whereas with a Judge the chauffeur is permanent and it is on a more lasting basis.

But let us remember that Judges are normally appointed in the evening of their days, so to speak, and the chauffeur who serves out his time with a Judge may be serving only nine or ten years until the Judge retires. But the fact of the matter is that even while he is chauffeur to the Judge he is employed at pleasure and can be dismissed at any time at all. If a chauffeur serves a Judge very well and very faithfully for, perhaps, eight years and then the Judge is involved in an accident – and I bear in mind that only recently a friend and colleague of mine, Mr. Tony DeSouza, was involved in an accident – and I bear in mind that only recently a friend and colleague of mine, Mr. Tony DeSouza, was involved in an accident – and his chauffeur is without a job, what does he get? For those eight or ten years’

service he gets absolutely nothing. There is no provision whereby he would get anything for the eight or ten years service, whatever it may be, with the Judge, paid by the Judge through monies by the Government.

It is true and I recognize that the relationship is a personal one where the chauffeur is an employee of the Judge. But on the other hand, the money to pay the chauffeur comes from the Government. If the Judge does not have a chauffeur then he cannot in all honesty draw that money. It remains with the Government Treasury. In the final analysis the Government provides the money so you can say in a somewhat indirect way that the Government is the employee. This has been recognized in the case of Ministers' chauffeurs. It is as a recognition of this situation that Ministers' chauffeurs to get a gratuity at six monthly intervals or on termination of their service equivalent to 22½ per cent of basic salary.

I am making a very strong and urgent plea for the Government to give consideration to improving the lot of these people. We would like the Judges to be good employers but they cannot be good employers unless the Government gives them the wherewithal to be good employers.

The Judges get from the Government at the present moment only \$165 to pay their chauffeurs. Ministers get between \$287 and \$335 to pay their chauffeurs. Surely, we are not saying that you must bring them up to the same level of Ministers' chauffeurs. We take the point that one may be working harder than the other, one may have more exacting hours than the others. But in these days of spiraling prices and the spiraling cost of living, can we really expect a Judge's chauffeur who has a family and who invariably has to do evening duties also to live to a decent, reasonable standard at the rate of \$165 per month and nothing else?

I repeat the point. If after ten years the Judge's chauffeur is out of that employment there is nothing else that he can expect. If he was getting the 22½ per cent, at least he could bank it

and put it up for the evening of his days or he could take out an insurance policy and pay for that insurance from his 22½ per cent gratuity. But he gets absolutely nothing else.

It is an unfair state of affairs to my mind and I am pleading with the Government to give consideration to the plight of these people. Let them have something more. The amount of \$165 and nothing else is not a reasonable figure in these days. The Government has given the Ministers' chauffeurs increases, therefore give these people something. I do advocate that in addition to the little something to be given to them, put them on the same kind of basis as the Ministers' chauffeurs where, at intervals, they will get a gratuity which they can either save, as I said, in the National Co-operative Bank to get interest for the evening of their days or use to buy an insurance policy with some approved Government body. They can even buy Government bonds. That is the plea I would like to make on behalf of these people.

Dealing with telephones, subhead 6, the voted provision for 1974 was \$24,000. The revised provision is \$54,750 and the amount asked for in 1975 has gone down to \$36,000. It is very commendable that the department expects to spend so much less in 1975 than it envisaged spending in 1974.

5.10 p.m.

Is the hon. Minister satisfied that this is really the correct position? Because if the sum of \$54,750 was spent in 1974, only \$36,000 will be spent in 1975 then we expect to hear that there is something being done to cut down on expenditure for telephones, otherwise you will end up with the same level of spending unless, of course, there are arrears present somewhere in the 1974 revised figure. If there are arrears, then we go back to the problem of the Government Departments not paying their bills and leaving the Telecommunication Corporation in a difficult position. Perhaps the hon. Minister will confirm that the Ministry does intend to keep within that self-imposed limit of \$36,000 for 1975.

Dealing with subhead 11, Law Library. The voted provision for 1974 was \$6,000, the Revised Estimate is \$3,508, the estimate for 1975 is \$6,000. I feel very strongly about the necessity to keep a well stocked and an up-to-date law library. We need to be more up to date in the books we have available in our law library. I am somewhat perturbed at the low level of expenditure in respect of this Head in spite of the fact that we have been approving higher sums for this item.

For example, in 1973 we approved \$6,000 and only \$2,767 was spent; in 1974 we approved \$6,000 again and only \$3,508 was spent. I should like to see the money spent in respect of this item. I know we have been advocating economy, but this is administration of justice. We need these books to keep a well stocked library so that our Government officers and our other people can be able to help the judges by quoting what the various legal positions are. I should like to appeal to the people, the agency concerned, to use up this money in the future and let us have a proper stock of books in our law library.

In respect of subhead 10, Expenses of Witnesses, I should merely like to deal with an aspect encountered by certain witnesses. I am referring particularly to something that appeared in the Press and has had wide publicity. We read in the Press recently of warrants being issued for doctors to present themselves in court to give evidence. We read also of magistrates who apologised to doctors for having kept them waiting only to be told that the courts could not proceed with the case because counsel was asking for a postponement.

Let us recognize that there are faults on both sides. Some doctors are difficult, there are no two ways about that. But let us also recognize the realities of the situation and that is that Guyana is desperately short of doctors particularly at the Public Hospital and most of the doctors who are required to give evidence come from this Hospital. They give evidence in prosecution cases and invariably the police take the people to the Public Hospital to be examined.

I say that the doctors should be given adequate notice to attend court. I say also that their evidence should be taken expeditiously after they arrive in court. Or, if for any good reason, the case cannot be proceeded with then they should not be kept hanging around the place. They should be promptly told what the position is, otherwise while they are kept waiting in the courts people may be dying, or people may be denied urgently needed medical attention to alleviate suffering which they may be going through at that particular time.

I think that perhaps the answer to that problem would be for the Chancellor to issue a suitable directive in this matter. I am sure that it is not beyond his ingenuity to appreciate the situation and issue a directive so that we can have a little less conflict, a little less sensational news about our doctors who are so very necessary and who are so much in short supply in our country at the present time.

The last item is subhead 11, Editing Law Reports. We note that the Approved Estimate called for an expenditure of \$2,880. The Revised Estimate is \$500, and the estimate for 1975 is back at \$2,880. Obviously there has been an underspending in 1974. I merely want to ask what is the position in respect of the editing of law reports. How much are we in arrears? What generally the situation here?

There was a question on subhead 19 but we have been provided with the answer already.

Dr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, at this time I think we will go through the items in detail, as this can be done in this Ministry. There are an inadequate number of persons in the Registry and I want to assure my hon. Friend, from the information I have, that there are applications now that are being processed and hopefully these vacancies will be filled.

We can say the same for legal secretaries and court reporters. It is strange that my hon. Friend who is not a stranger to the practice of the law should ask what these secretaries do. These are legal secretaries who are assigned to the Justices of Appeal. It is well known that there

has been an increase of that number from three to four, in addition to the Chancellor and the Chief Justice. Recruitment is now in progress and we hope that these vacancies will soon be filled.

I am grateful that the hon. Leader of the Opposition observed that charwomen should be under the heading “Miscellaneous”. That is a correct observation.

On the question of chauffeurs for the Judges, it must not be forgotten that there was a time when the Judges carried their chauffeurs’ wages all by themselves. After a time by way of relief to supplement what they gave their chauffeurs, the Government took the position to give a stipend to help in this exercise. So far, whatever the Government is giving to the Judges to help to defray expenses for keeping the chauffeurs is just part of what the chauffeurs should get. There was a time when the Judges carried that burden all alone.

The hon. Member has agreed that you cannot compare these chauffeurs with the chauffeurs who work with the Ministers; he himself has been a Minister and he knows – unless he was not really exposing himself to all the work that a Minister has to do – the long hours. When I say long, I mean really long hours, not in ordinary circumstances but in very difficult circumstances. Sometimes these chauffeurs have to labour on without food.

5.20 p.m.

The chances of dismissal are far greater for them than for a chauffeur who works with a Judge. Just think of the circumstances in which the Minister himself might be relieved of his portfolio very suddenly and the chauffeur would therefore be without employment. So, there has to be some difference in the treatment of Ministers’ and Judges’ chauffeurs.

The Judges, of course, can work on until 62 or 65 years, normally, without any interference and they usually do this all the time. Also, it will be a good thing if we do not forget

that at one time Judges paid their chauffeurs all by themselves and this is a supplement that is given to the Judges to help them to increase whatever they were giving their chauffeurs.

Subhead 6, Telephones. A large sum is required for 1975 because of arrears as my friend suggested. He has always been telling us that we ought to pay up our arrears and even when the Ministry pays up, he is still not quite satisfied that it has paid its arrears. We hope that next year the amount will be unless when we do not have that kind of arrears. But I want to say this: One can never be too sure whether the sum allocated will be sufficient because one can never tell. This is an area where one really has to guess and once can never be too sure.

Subhead 7, Law Library. An effort is being made to stock this library as best we can but the officers do not just spend the money because the money is there. They have to be able to identify the books; they have to order the books and all sorts of things before the money can be spent.

Indeed, I too am in sympathy with these witnesses who have to stand there all the time but sometimes, even though one can make an observation which is worthwhile, it is not always very easy to find a ready solution to the problem. When arrangements are made it is probable that they will be called at the very same time. So, this is a matter which has to be studied a little more. It may be very complex and not so easily resolved.

Law Reports: We were slow in getting these reports together because of shortage of manpower. I understand that there is now a Council that will be doing active work on this and this year we should do much better than in previous years.

Head 2, Supreme Court of Judicature - \$824,536 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 21.

HEAD 3 – MAGISTRATES

Question proposed that the sum of \$1,130,677 for Head 3, Magistrates, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: I have one question on subhead 1, item (1). It concerns the new posts created by supplementary estimates in 1974.

“(1) One post of Chief Magistrate.

(2) Three posts of Principal Magistrate in substitution for three posts of Magistrate.

(3) Three posts of Senior Magistrate in substitution for three posts of Magistrate.”

I welcome these additions when they were brought before this honourable House. I said at the time that it was a very good thing. It took away the feelings of frustration, feelings that Magistrates had harboured that they were stagnating in their particular positions. It certainly seemed as though it was going to act as a morale booster for our Magistrates, in addition to generally improving the administration of justice in the country.

I note that the posts have been reflected in the Estimates here. The Approved Estimates here. The Approved Estimate was \$193,056; the Revised Estimate is a lesser amount - \$180,380 – but the estimate for 1975 has gone up to \$229,680. I know for a fact that these posts are not filled as yet and since I feel it would make such a tremendous difference, all around, I wonder whether the hon. Minister could give us some idea when these posts will be filled. I do hope they will be filled very shortly.

Dr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my friend has observed that this is a useful incentive and agrees with me here. It is unfortunate that the posts were not filled. The post of Chief Magistrate, especially, was not filled and still is not ready to be filled because there is

some amount of legislation that has to be brought before the House and work is being done with respect to that. My advice is that early next year this legislation should be brought before the House so that the Chief Magistrate can be appointed.

Head 3, Magistrates - \$1,130,677 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 28.

HEAD 6 – OMBUDSMAN

Question proposed that the sum of \$29,605 for Head 6 – Ombudsman – stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Sir, I only have one general question to ask on this Head. For years now, we have had no report presented to us from the Ombudsman. As I understand it, he presents his reports to, I think, yourself, Mr. Chairman, as Speaker of this House and you would then present them to the House.

What perturbs me is that recently we read in the newspapers that he had presented a report in respect of his investigations of allegations against two former Ministers. Again, from the newspapers, one was found “guilty” and the other – by some way which I do not understand – was found “not guilty”. We know that one of the Ministers, who was Ambassador to China at the time the report came out, resigned, or was invited to resign, but up to this day, in spite of all we read in the newspapers, we have had no such report presented to this honourable house. Nothing at all has come before this honorable House which is entitled to receive any report from the Ombudsman.

The question, of course, is: “Why?” Government must have the report. The report must be somewhere. Certainly, I think it is wrong for the report not to have been laid before

Parliament. Also, we are concerned with the general reports which for years now have not been laid before this honourable House.

Some time ago, the hon. Prime Minister gave this House an undertaking that the powers of the Ombudsman would be enlarged. Up to now, nothing has been done. Is something, in fact, being done about this? If so, what is being done? It is agreed that the powers of the Ombudsman need to be enlarged. Until this is done, this office will not be serving the purpose for which it was intended when it was established in the Constitution.

I was at the Independence Conference and I remember well the arguments all around and the agreement to establish the post of Ombudsman in the Constitution and what it was supposed to do. Certainly, it is not functioning according to the spirit in which it was established and, indeed, perhaps according to the law which exists in respect of this post.

5.30 p.m.

Dr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the Ombudsman, as you know, was able to produce a general report that came to this House as far back as 1970, but, as we all know so well, after that, although the Ombudsman was suffering very seriously for a very long time, he was able to produce that special report which came out. The report was made public. The complainant usually gets a copy of the report; it is not a secret report. The facts of the report are available and action has been taken in keeping with the recommendation of the Ombudsman. Now that the Ombudsman is not as unwell as he was, we are hopeful that more general reports will come before this House. [Mr. Singh: “What about the reports concerning the two Ministers?”]

The Chairman: That was not the report. That was a special inquiry. It was not sent to be laid before Parliament. That will form part of the larger report for the year 1974.

Head 6, Ombudsman - \$26,605 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 30.

HEAD 8 – PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

Question proposed that the sum of \$188,661 for Head 8, Public Prosecutions, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: By and large, these Estimates have been very well prepared for the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions but something which struck us forcibly was the disparity between the salary of the Director of Public Prosecutions and that of the Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions. We are dealing with subhead 1, item (5), Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions and the post, as we note in the legend, was reclassified by Supplementary Estimates for 1974. Presumably, after the job evaluation, the Appeals Committee met and this was its final ruling. So now we have to appeal to the Government to review the situation, having gone through all the machinery dealing with job evaluation etc. I submit there is still too great a difference between the emoluments of the Direct and the Deputy.

If we look at the top of the page we will see that the Director of Public Prosecutions earns \$21,600 per annum, which is equivalent to \$1,800 per month. The house allowance is \$250 per month, the deputy allowance is \$250 per month, entertainment allowance is \$100 per month, and one would presume that there are travelling expenses which seem to work out, when the total is divided by twelve, to \$213 per month. It seems to have fluctuated in previous years so I would not say with certainty it is \$213 but it must be in that vicinity. The allowances, apart from travelling allowances, total \$600, plus a salary of \$1,800.

His Deputy earns a salary of \$13,620 per year, and when that is divided by twelve, it means that his salary is \$1,135 per month. I quoted the other figures so anyone can see what the comparison is.

After all, in the absence of the Director, the Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions is in charge. The post of Director of Public Prosecutions is a constitutional one. It is part and parcel of the Constitution. At least that has not been changed as yet by the administration. We do not know what next year will bring but he is a constitutional officer in charge, and his deputy in his absence will be in charge. We would urge the Government to shorten the gap and make the situation more realistic.

We do appreciate that when that happens there may be the necessity to also send up the emoluments of the Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions, but as it is now, there is too great a gap between the Director and his Deputy.

The other subhead I would wish to deal with is subhead 6, but perhaps we would get the same answer, it is the same problem. Every year, the sum of \$2,000 is being voted for the library in the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, and every year – at least 1973 and 1974 – it is underspent. There are no two ways about it. There are so very many works that can be made available in the Library that are not there at the moment. I am sure both our Government officers and our Judges would like to see a well-stacked library in the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

If they ask us to vote the money, we would expect that they had thought that they would be able to spend it. I am not advocating that they must spend for the sake of spending but we approve it on the basis that they would like that amount. If they feel that they would like that amount to spend for a year, we expect them to spend the money, particularly when we know that there are so many legal works that can be up dated. There are so many books that are not quite up to date in the law library. We do hope that efforts will be made to improve this situation.

Dr. Reid: The Director of Public Prosecutions holds his post under the Constitution and his salary is so fixed but in the job evaluation, his deputy's salary was taken into consideration.

There is now an appeal to the Public Service Ministry, and since that appeal is before the Public Service Ministry, I do not think we should say too much on that. That is the position now.

As far as the library is concerned, I want to repeat that even though they have estimated that sum of money, unless they get the books that they think are useful, it is no point pressing them to just spend the money. I am certain that as soon as they can spend that money wisely they will not want to hold it because they too are interested in stocking that library as well as possible.

Head 8, Public Prosecutions - \$188,661 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Perhaps it may be convenient to deal with all the legal Heads, so we will turn to pages 47 and 48.

HEAD 15 – ATTORNEY GENERAL

Question proposed that the sum of \$431,309 for Head 15, Attorney General, stand part of the Estimates.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Again, sir, we notice the same difference between the salaries of the Chief Parliamentary Counsel and the Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel. I did touch on this before. I am not sure what the position is in respect of appeals. I was under the impression that the appeals had, in fact, been heard because the last legend did state “Post reclassified.”

Nevertheless, I would like to make the general comment that I have the greatest admiration for the hard work and dedication to duty in this department. This department is

headed, as I said previously, by two of Guyana's most brilliant sons. They are most able and competent men and, further, no one can gainsay the fact that apart from the Attorney-General and the Solicitor General, the two gentlemen to whom I was referring, the drafting department is a very efficient and industrious department. It is staffed at the top by people who, I am sure, can command much higher salaries outside of Guyana for their drafting skills. They have opted to stay and service Guyana, therefore let us appreciate the kind of legislation they have had to turn out, invariably at very short notice.

Hon. Members realize that even Private Members' Bills for the Incorporation of Churches, which seem to be the sole contribution of bank benchers of the P.N.C. to the proceedings in this House, have to be vetted by the drafting department of this Ministry. From what I can gather, they are normally submitted having been drafted by outside lawyers who have very little experience in drafting but who may be very good at criminal cases. As drafting is a specialized matter, I would rather suspect that invariably the Bills have to be redrafted.

I may not agree with all the legislation which comes out of the office of the Attorney General, what I do admit is that it is not the fault of the drafting people. They have to carry out instructions. If they receive instructions with which I do not agree, then I cannot hold it against them. They work very hard and they work very industriously. To my mind they must receive a pay commensurate with their ability, with their work and with the skills they are contributing to Guyana. Certainly, Guyana cannot pay them for the skills they are making available.

I repeat that the gap between the salary of the Chief Parliamentary Counsel and that of the Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel is too great. It is \$1,800 for Chief Parliamentary Counsel as compared with \$1,135 for his deputy. If this is being dealt with by the appeals people and they do not do too good a job with it I will again deal with it on the next occasion and ask the Government to do something about it.

Moving on to subhead 1, item (8), Law Revision Officer. This is a new post created by Supplementary Estimates in 1974 as stated in the legend, and the revised expenditure for 1974 is \$7,110. The 1975 Estimates is \$7,470. Since it is a new item, perhaps the hon. Minister would like to take the opportunity to tell us what the system that will be put into operation is. We do have our copies of the Revised Laws and there is provision for loose leaf additions to be supplied. I am not sure what the system is or will be but what I do know is that copies of the Revised Laws were presented to us in December last year, shortly before we broke up, by the hon. Minister, Mr. Ramphal, and a year has passed. Perhaps, the hon. Minister would take the opportunity of telling us what the proposals are in respect of updating these volumes.

Page 48, Other Charges, subhead 5, Telephones. The Approved Estimate for 1974 was \$53,511, the 1974 Revised Estimate is \$86,031. This is a very significant increase. The 1975 Estimate is only \$30,000. The decrease is \$23,511 from what was originally asked for in 1974, not what is going to be spent. The legend is very interesting, it states "Switchboard provided for in 1974 no longer required." Would the hon. Minister care to explain how the switchboard which is no longer required would result in a saving of \$56,000 for this Ministry? I am very pleased to note that the amount is reduced. I warned that I would be looking out to see whether this amount is significantly increased. One cannot say with any great accuracy what the figure would be, yet one would look for significant increases. If the figure is increased by \$20,000, that would be too much. That is not within the realms of estimates, that is within the realms of Guesstimates. Now that the Ministry has estimated \$30,000 as against the sum of \$86,000 spent in 1974, it is saying that the absence of this switchboard will result in a saving of \$56,000. If this is the case, I would hope that we try and get rid of many switchboards that are in the Government Ministries because it certainly is a tremendous saving. If we do that we can end up by saving hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Dr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, in the re-classification that has been done by the Cabinet for the Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel, it has been agreed that this matter be put before the Public Service Ministry for an appeal so there is not much more to be said about that.

The Law Revision Officer will be concerned in making sure that the law is brought up-to-date year by year. At the end of the year and the beginning of the new year he will look through all the amendments and, if it is necessary for an entire leaf to be removed, that will be done. The Revision Officer is constantly at this work. For instance, to bring the books up-to-date now amendments stretching from 1970 to 1974 must be inserted. He will look at all those and once they are resolved he will make the necessary changes.

It is interesting to see how my friend has nerved himself up to talk about this switchboard. The fact is that there is a saving because the switchboard was not bought any more. The cost of the switchboard is not \$50,000 but \$30,000. In that allocation, there is an amount that is put in for arrears, as usual, so that the arrears will be cleared. The switchboard has not been purchased any more because of the fact that the office where they are now is to be re-sited. I think it is old, and threatening to fall down so there is no need to put a new switchboard there. When the office is re-sited then we will come back to get an allocation to purchase the switchboard.

Head 15, Attorney General - \$431,309 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

5.50 p.m.

The Chairman: Page 49

**HEAD 16 – ATTORNEY GENERAL
OFFICIAL RECEIVER**

Question proposed that the sum of \$120,730 for Head 16, Attorney General – Official Receiver, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Just dealing briefly with subhead 1 items (1) and (2). The requirements for these posts have recently been changed by law in this Parliament. As regards the qualifications they need no longer be solicitors, they can be barristers. We want to ask what is the staffing position now? There have been complaints in the past that because of the shortage of solicitors the posts could not be properly filled; there were acting appointments and there were **ad hoc** filling of vacancies with contract officers. Now that we have changed the law, and bearing in mind that my information is still that there is a tremendous backlog of work in this Official Receiver's Department – there are significant arrears of work there; we should like the hon. Minister tell us whether any new appointments have been made and what is the present position in respect of the top posts in this Department.

Subhead 6, Legal costs, fees, etc. In the 1974 Approved Estimates the sum \$48,682 but all we are requesting for 1975 is \$24,000. In view of the fact that \$48,682 is being spent in 1974, is it realistic to ask only for the sum of \$48,682 but all we are requesting for 1975 is \$24,000. In view of the fact that \$48,682 is being spent in 1974, is it realistic to ask only for the sum of \$24,000 in 1975? Will this figure be sufficient for legal cost, fees, cost, etc.? I know that one cannot say this with any degree of certainty but if we do take the level for 1974 then I think perhaps we are not doing justice to the Department by giving it only \$24,000 in 1975.

Dr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the story is fairly simple. There is an improvement in the Office of the State Solicitor because since the change has been made one State Solicitor is now acting as Deputy State Solicitor. He moved over not so long ago and we still have the State Solicitor there. Also there is a request to advertise so that additional vacancies can be filled.

The answer to the question on legal costs is that there was some outstanding amount to be paid to the Privy Council. I hope that is the last payment. I do not know if they will pick up some bits and pieces along the way but that was an outstanding debt to the Privy Council that has been paid.

In addition to that, in one of the Missions, I think it was the Mission in the United Kingdom, a legal firm had to be retained and payment had to be made for their services. We hope that this year this allocation will meet the expenditure.

Head 16, Attorney General – Official Receiver - \$120,730 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 50.

HEAD 17 – ATTORNEY GENERAL DEEDS REGISTRY

Question proposed that the sum of \$174,447, for Head 17, Attorney General – Deeds Registry, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Dealing with subhead 1, item (5), Registry Officers. The sum of \$20,928 was in the Approved Estimates. In the Revised Estimates it is only \$16,209 and the estimate for 1975 is \$18,768. It does give us the impression – and we have checked on this – that there are vacancies. We should like to see these vacancies filled in view of the importance of this Department in the general scheme of things in Guyana. We should like to know what steps are being taken to fill the vacancies.

I did raise another point last year and since nothing appears to have been done after one complete year I will raise it again to refresh the memory of hon. Members of this House as to position. There are certain posts in the Deeds Registry which in previous years had been known as Notarial Officer and Conveyancing Officer and when the two Registries were one, the Deeds Registry and the Supreme Court Registry, there was another staff post of Judicial Officer; all three went together; Notarial Officer, Judicial Officer and Conveyancing Officer; they enjoyed exactly the same status.

By some means or the other, the Judicial Officer seems to have moved up and he is now on the salary scale A25, the Assistant Registrar's scale. He is one of the three categorized officers on salary scale A25. The Judicial Officer is on A25, but his former counterparts, the Conveyancing Officer and the Notarial Officer, have unfortunately been left behind and they are still on salary scale A20 which is on the scale of a Senior Registry Officer. I am contending that they should be put on the same salary scale A25 as the Judicial Officer. Their position as staff heads should be the same as the Judicial Officer's position. Let us take, for example, the Notarial Officer who has to know trademarks. He has in addition to know all about companies; he has to know all about patents.

6 p.m.

He has to know all about designs, about trade unions, about business names, about deeds generally, about contracts. He has to be completely familiar with the Deeds Registry Ordinance, the Evidence Ordinance and such like.

The Conveyancing Officer has to know all about conveyancing generally, intestate succession, the Deeds Registry Ordinance, Town Council Regulations, the Health Regulations in respect of the passing of Transports. These officers have very great responsibilities. Like the Judicial officer, they have staff under their control. The Judicial Officer has under his control the Judges' clerks but he has very little at all from day to day to do with those Judges' clerks. So even though he may have more staff under him, his responsibilities are not more than the Conveyancing Officer or the Notarial Officer.

If, perchance, the salary scales of the two officers cannot be revised, I would appeal to the Government to recognize the realities of the situation; recognize what the position was before; recognize the responsibilities of the officers and correct this anomaly. The two officers should be put in the same category as their counterpart the Judicial Officer, so as to correct the imbalance.

It seems to me that the figures against Other Charges that are in the 1975 column under “Establishment” should be in the Subhead column. Subhead 4, Telephones. The Approved Estimate for subhead 4, Telephones was \$2,500; the Revised Estimate is \$1,277. I have not noticed this anywhere before. Many Ministers have told us that telephone costs have gone up, activities have gone up, so I am very happy to note here that the budgeted expenditure for 1974 in respect of Telephones for this Deeds Registry Department has not been spent and will not be spent. The Department is spending not \$2,500 but \$1,277. This is very, very good. My compliments go to the Deeds Registry Department for this commendable saving in the use of telephones.

I am wondering whether perhaps this is not due to the system which I saw in the Deeds Registry. I noticed a lot of the sectional heads have padlocks on their telephones and perhaps we could recommend to other Ministers that they introduce this system in their Ministries. If padlocks on the telephones helped to bring down this telephone cost to \$1,277, then certainly, we should introduce some system like that in the rest of the Government Service.

Subhead 6, Land Registration. Again, this is something that makes me feel very pleased indeed. The legend states:

“Increase due to creation of Land Registry Section Sub-Registry New Amsterdam.”

This is long overdue. The Land Registry legislation had envisaged the almost immediate setting up of a Land Registry in Berbice. Indeed, this is one of the recommendations. The position, as I knew it recently, in respect of Land Registration areas – and there are significant areas under Land Registration in Berbice – was that people had to come all the way down to Georgetown to claim title, to effect transfers, to register encumbrances and the like. I did not have a chance to check what the actual n is now but I certainly would like to hear from the hon. Minister whether the Land Registry has in fact been properly and firmly established in New Amsterdam and

whether the people in the Berbice area can go to effect all transactions in respect of Land Registry and Land Title under the Land Registry Ordinance at this office in New Amsterdam.

Dr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, there is just one vacancy in the Registry our hon. Friend has spoken about and that once vacancy is really due to the fact that someone there is noting in a higher post. However, there are several vacancies in the Office of the Legal Clerks. As a matter fact there are vacancies for all of them but applications have been requested and it is hoped that these vacancies will soon be filled.

We note again the transaction that has been made with the Emoluments but this too, is one that is before the Public Service Ministry Appeals Committee. Even though my friend is free to make recommendations, I do not think I should prejudice the decision of that Committee by saying anything much on that.

It is difficult to say whether it was the padlocks that caused the reduction in the telephone charges. The Deeds Registry is now by itself and that might help as well. Probably the kind of business they did during the period is also responsible for the reduced cost. This is an indication that if there are not enough telephone calls to warrant the expenditure then there will be a balance but if in some cases one needs to make several calls to carry on the business of Government, then the allocation will not be sufficient and one will need to increase it. I just want to point that out so that my hon. Friend would see that it works both ways. Sometimes the amount will go up and sometimes it will go down but this Government will make sure that it is always fair and right.

The Land Registration Section has been firmly established in the Berbice region and that is an indication that regionalism is at work. Sometimes, though the hon. Leader of the Opposition will criticize regionalism, he can see the use of the decentralization that is taking place. It has been properly established and everything has been running very harmoniously in Land Registration.

Head 17, Attorney General – Deeds Registry – 4174,447 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Pages 43 to 45.

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Question proposed that the sum of \$7,954,556 for Head 14, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stand part of the Estimates.

6.10 p.m.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Page 43, subhead 1. I propose to speak on items (7) and (13) together, and also on item (23).

Item (7) Chief Accountants. We note that the approved estimate for 1974 was \$13,344, the revised estimate was \$7,100, and the estimate for 1975 is \$15,504. In this Ministry, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which spends – perhaps we should say fritters away – so much money, there is certainly a need for maintaining a higher standard of accounting, yet we note that only half the vote was spent in 1974 in respect of Chief Accountants. There are two posts of Chief Accountant. Does it mean one is vacant, since only half is spent? And if this is so, how soon will the other one be filled in order to keep a proper standard of accounting?

We note that the same position obtains in respect of item (13), Assistant Accountant. The approved estimate for 1974 was \$8,520, the revised estimate is only \$3,200. The 1975 estimate has gone up to \$7,872. From \$8,520 for the two Assistant Accountants, we are spending only \$3,200 in 1974.

We need to strengthen our accounting staff in this lavish spending Ministry. That is why I am perturbed over the fact that of all the things on which we should be cutting down expenditure, it seems to be in the field of accountants, who are to do the job of keeping down expenditure, that this is being done. Are we trying to get rid of them?

Under item (23), Domestic Staff, the approved estimate for 1974 was \$65,000. The revised estimate was \$180,000, and the 1975 estimate is \$220,000. What does the legend say? The legend says: "Increase in staff and rates of allowances."

This is really fantastic. A sum of \$65,000 was budgeted for 1974 and \$180,000 was spent in the same year, 1974. This is an increase of nearly 200 per cent on what was budgeted for in 1974. Surely the staff and the allowances could not have increased to that extent, unless it was done on the very lavish and extravagant scale that seems to be the pattern in this Ministry. Not only must we tell Guyanese here to tighten their belts. We must also tell our overseas representatives that they must tighten their belts; they must also cut down on staff. I agree that domestic staff must be paid a living wage but have not reached the stage where we must economise and cut down on our domestic staff so that we can cut down on this type of expenditure? If you budget \$65,000 and you spend \$180,000, something is radically wrong somewhere.

We turn over the page. Subhead 9, Entertainment Expenses. The approved estimate for 1974 was \$25,100. The 1974 revised estimate is \$80,989. The estimate for 1975 has come down to \$35,000. The revised estimate is very considerable indeed. It is an increase of more than 300 per cent. If this was the level of expenditure in 1974, I hope that we will get an undertaking from the hon. Minister that what they are asking for in 1975 is in fact a realistic figure. It is unfair to the hon. Minister of Finance and to this House, if they spent \$81,000 in 1974, to ask for \$25,000 in 1975, merely to make the figures look good, when they have every intention of coming back to this honourable House for a supplementary provision. Is it realistic in view of this year's expenditure?

The approved estimate for 1974 for subhead 10, Rents, rates, insurance premiums, etc., was \$1,028,200. The revised estimate for 1974 was \$1,223,605. The estimate for 1975 is \$1,523,000. This is \$½ million more than the budgeted provision for 1974. The legend says, “Increase in rentals due to inflation”, and also it says: “Additional Missions to be established.” What I should like to ask is: What additional missions do we now propose to establish bearing in mind the increase in the amount asked for? I thought we have enough Missions, but if we are going to establish more Missions, I should like the hon. Minister to tell us where these additional Missions are going to be established.

Subhead 13, Expenses for printing and distribution of information material. The approved estimate was \$26,000, the 1974 revised estimate was \$42,805, and the provision for 1975 has gone down to \$33,300. This is a fantastic sum of money, to be spent on information in 1974 and 1975. Today we dealt with the Ministry of Information and we saw what significant sums are being provided for that Ministry. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs receives information material from the Ministry of Information. Why is it necessary to spend in 1974 nearly \$50,000 and in 1975 \$33,300 on printing and distribution of information material? Why can we not make use of the material produced by the Ministry of Information and not indulge in printing and distribution in other places also?

Subhead 19, again Publicity and Information. If you cannot catch it. If you cannot catch it under one subhead catch it under another. The approved estimate for 1974 was \$2,000. The revised estimate for 1974 is over eight times more than the approved estimate. After having thought that they would spend \$2,000, they revised it to \$16,198, and the provision for 1975, has gone back to \$2,000.

6.20 p.m.

We are spending a large sum of money in 1974 on Publicity and Information in addition to all the other subheads for information, propaganda etc., which seem to permeate the whole of this

document here. I wonder whether the hon. Members will be able to tell us whether, in fact, the hon. Minister will keep within the provision of \$2,000 for 1975. Will it be \$2,000 alone at the end of next year or will we get the figure of \$16,198 again as the revised amount for 1975?

Subhead 20, Hospitalisation and Medical Expense – Heads of Missions. The figures are not particularly important here, it is the wording of the subhead. It states “Hospitalisation and Medical Expenses – Heads of Missions.” What does the legend state? If we look at the bottom of the right hand of the page we will see that the legend states “New subhead created by Supplementary Estimates in 1974 to cover two-thirds of medical and hospitalization expenses where medical insurance is not available to overseas staff.” What is conflicting is that the legend speaks of overseas staff whereas the subhead itself speaks of “Heads of Missions.” I would hope that this egalitarian Government is not differentiating between the Head of Mission and, let us say for example, his deputy or his first Secretary. If the medical insurance does not exist, not only should the Head of Mission enjoy the benefit under this subhead but his deputy, his first Secretary, his staff generally should also enjoy the benefits here. Let us not make this kind of differentiation. If that is the position then I would respectfully submit that the words “Head of” be taken out and put the words “Foreign Missions” or some such words. Certainly putting “Heads of Missions” is very misleading, if it is that it is intended for other than Heads of Missions.

Subhead 37, Expenses of Foreign Service Inspectorate. All I can ask for is an explanation of this. This legend states “New subhead” and the Government is asking us to approve \$30,000 in 1975. What is this Foreign Service Inspectorate. I shall not speculate. Let the hon. Minister tell us what this Foreign Service Inspectorate is. I am sure we would all like to know. It sounds very military to me.

Subhead 38. Again, this is a new subhead and it states “Expenses at Turkeyen Third World Lectures” and the sum of \$20,000 is being requested for 1975. Will the hon. Minister

take this opportunity to tell us something about these Turkeyen Third World Lectures that presumably will take place in 1975?

Page 45, subhead 39, Expenses of Cultural Commission. Again, the legend states “New Subhead” and the sum of \$25,000 is being requested in 1975. What are these expenses for? Have we not wasted enough money on all these cultural projects? The legend states further. “Cost of attending and/or hosting Cultural Commission Meeting.” Presumably, we do not know whether we shall be attending or whether shall be hosting the Cultural Commission Meeting. This seems to be in the air still. Certainly, we would welcome an explanation from the hon. Minister.

Dr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, it is strange to hear my friend talking about the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as frittering away money. I do not think he listened to the Budget Debate to hear what contribution this Ministry has made towards the development of this country.

It is a little difficult to understand when the hon. Leader of the Opposition should think that this Ministry is frittering away money when this Ministry, because of the high level of service that it has been giving, has been able to attract friends to Guyana. Even those who, at one time, were serious enemies to this country have made financial contributions to help us during our crisis. At one time when we could not get things like cement, our friends from overseas rose up to help us because of the work that was being done through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I think this total sum for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is a small amount for the amount of work these officers do. I wish the hon. Leader of the Opposition will reconsider such a statement and not have it stand in the records against his name.

We need Accountants, no doubt; we need to have qualified people, but sometimes it is difficult to get the type of accountants we wish, especially the Chief Accountants. There is a vacancy in the Ministry. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition raised the question of overseas allowances because this is very interesting. This will bring to us very forcefully the high increase in costs overseas. Sometimes we think that the cost of living is rising in this country. But those officers who are working overseas find it so difficult that unless something is done it will be impossible to retain some of them to work overseas. When I think of the inflation that is taking place in those countries I am certain that they operate at a very great sacrifice.

There was a question on Entertainment and Allowance. Development is dynamic and it is difficult to say for certain what the entertainment costs will be over any one year because in several cases people make requests to visit; it might be Heads of Government, it might be other Ministers who would wish to come to Guyana. Since you get similar treatment when you visit overseas it would be very strange behavior for Guyana to say that the allocation is already expended and nothing can be done. I hope that time will never come.

Again, the hon. Leader of the Opposition talked about rents and rates of insurance. I would mention that the general inflation that has taken place would be a very definite reason why additional amounts must be allocated to the Missions.

The hon. Leader was asking where new Missions will be established. I wish my friend to know that the establishment of new Missions is a very delicate matter. We do not tell people long in advance because we have to talk with people, negotiate with them, sometimes bargain with nations where a Mission is to be sent. In a debate like this, if you should shout out where a Mission will go, probably you will be talking too early. You have to recognize that it is chiefly diplomatic.

18.12.74

National Assembly

6.30 – 6.40 p.m.

[Dr. Reid continued]

6.30 p.m.

With respect to the question on Printing and Distribution, one Ministry can never, in difficult circumstances, meet the needs of all the Ministries. This year is one that has to be considered difficult when we still have the confrontation with Reynolds. When something has to be done promptly, you cannot really wait to have one Ministry do it all. All kinds of work have to be done and not just the printing and distribution. I explained that to this House and I hope my hon. Friend will be able to understand.

He is advocating that all the staff should be treated in exactly the same way as Heads of Mission. I hope that one day that will be done. Of course, as we produce more and as we have more funds in our socialist thrust that is just what we would hope to do but we have to go step by step and not commit ourselves to do things that we know financially would not be possible.

Foreign Missions need from time to time to be visited so that we can know what is going on. Sometimes there may be a special visit to those places so that we can meet the officers and some of our nationals, and so that we can have conversations with them in order to give the best possible service.

With respect to the Third World lectures at U.G., this is a very historical thing that is happening. It started with the visit of President Nyerere and nobody would wish not to continue this. It is very significant that it has started at the University of Guyana and it will continue. In the cultural exchanges there is much to learn. All of us remember Carifesta, that great cultural exchange. In time, other places will want to mount similar occasions. We will attend, we will send people. And so this exercise goes on. All this is in keeping with a dynamic development that is taking place in Guyana.

I think I have dealt with all the issues.

Head 14, Ministry of Foreign Affairs - \$7,954,556 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 46

DIVISION IX – MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Question proposed that the sum of \$665,300 for Division IX, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stand part of the Estimates.

Mr. M.F. Singh: this page it is so bald in respect of explanatory notes that perhaps the most we can do is ask for explanations and hear what the hon. Minister will tell us.

Subhead 2, Acquisition of Overseas Offices and Residences. The sum of \$268,000 is being requested. The legend states: “To provide for the purchase of buildings.” If it is not a State secret, like the establishment of additional Missions, we certainly would like to know where we are buying new buildings now.

In respect of subhead 3, Heads of Missions’ Residences – Redecorations etc, the sum of \$130,000 is being requested for 1975 and the legend states: “To provide for the refurnishing and redecoration of residence.” We should like to know whose residence or what residences are now being refurnished or redecorated. We have to keep a check on this to see how often we are refurnishing or redecorating the same residences perhaps as the Ambassadors or the High Commissioners change their wives or they themselves differ in taste from their predecessors. We understand this is what has been happening and that is why we need to know what these residences are so as to make a note of them and see how often they come up for redecoration and refurnishing.

The same thing applies to subhead 4, Overseas Offices – Furnishing etc. The sum of \$80,950 is being asked for “to provide for the restructuring and furnishing of offices.” If these

are old offices, which ones are these? If they are new offices, according to the hon. Minister, it is a State secret and we shall not be able to get the information.

Dr. Reid: There is no State secret in this. Since we have been in office the policy has been wherever possible to purchase building instead of renting. In the early days when we were hamstrung with the Coalition the then Minister of Finance resisted this very strenuously to our great disadvantage because since then prices have soared up and up. We are no longer in the three-legged race. We have been able to purchase facilities in Jamaica, in London, and Washington, and we will proceed to purchase.

At this stage we cannot tell where we are likely to purchase but where there is a good bargain going then we must have this allocation ready to seal the negotiations so that we can proceed to carry out this policy. As we purchase, the other operations follow. We have to refurnish and redecorate, establish offices, and so on. If we had done this seven years ago it would have been quite a saving to this country. This time we shall not make that mistake.

Division IX, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, \$665,300 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

Assembly resumed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Speaker: Hon. Members we will complete the other heads tomorrow.

Resolved, “That this Assembly do now adjourn until Wednesday, 18th December, 1974 at 2 p.m., 1974 at 2 p.m.” [The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House]

Adjourned accordingly at 6.40 p.m.
