

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
OFFICIAL REPORT**

[VOLUME 3]

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

10th Sitting

2 p.m.

Tuesday, 11th March, 1969

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Speaker

His Honour the Speaker, Mr. R.B. Gajraj, C.B.E., J.P.

Members of the Government

People's National Congress

Elected Ministers

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

The Honourable P.A. Reid,
Minister of Finance

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

The Honourable M. Kasim,
Minister of Communication

The Honourable H.D. Hoyte,
Minister of Home Affairs

The Honourable N.J. Bissember,
Minister of Trade and Parliamentary Affairs

The Honourable C.M.L. John,
Minister of Local Government

The Honourable W.G. Carrington,
Minister of Labour and Social Security

The Honourable S.M. Patterson,
Minister of Education

The Honourable B. Ramsaroop,
Minister of Housing and Reconstruction

The Honourable M.W. Carter,
Minister of Information

The Honourable H. Green,
Minister of Works and Hydraulics

The Honourable H.O. Jack,
Minister without Portfolio

Parliamentary Secretaries

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

Mr. J.G. Joaquin, O.B.E., J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Finance

Mr. W. Haynes,
Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Works and Hydraulics.

Mr. A. Salim,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of
Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Mr. J.R. Thomas,
Parliamentary Secretary,
Office of the Prime Minister.

Other Members

Mr. J.N. Aaron
Miss. M.M. Ackman
Mr. K. Bancroft
Mr. J. Budhoo, J.P.
Mr. L.I. Chan-A-Sue
Mr. O.E. Clarke, Deputy Speaker
Mr. E.F. Correia
Mr. E.H.A. Fowler
Mrs. P.A. Limerick
Mr. S.M. Saffee
Mr. D.A. Singh
Mr. R.C. Van Sluytman
Mr. M. Zaheeruddeen, J.P.

Members of the Opposition

People's Progressive Party

Dr. C.B. Jagan, Leader of the Opposition
Mr. Ram Karran
Mr. R. Chandisingh
Dr. F.H.W. Ramsahoye
Mr. D.C. Jagan
Mr. E.M.G. Wilson
Mr. A.M. Hamid, J.P.
Mr. G.H. Lall
Mr. M.Y. Ally
Mr. R.D. Persaud, J.P.
Mr. E.M. Stoby
Mr. R. Ally
Mr. E. L. Ambrose
Mr. Balchand Persaud
Mr. Bholu Persaud
Mr. I. Remington, J.P.
Mrs. R.P. Sahoye
Mr. V. Teekah
Mr. R. E. Cheeks
Mrs. E. DaSilva
Mr. M.F. Singh
Mr. J. A. Sutton

Officers

Clerk of the National Assembly - Mr. F.A. Narain
Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly - Mr. M.B. Henry

Absent

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

Dr. the Honourable S.E. Talbot,
Minister of Health

Mr. C.E. Wrights

- on leave

Mrs. L.M. Branco

The National Assembly met at 2.00 p.m.

[Mr. Speaker *in the Chair.*]

Prayers

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER**LETTER FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL**

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I am in receipt of a letter from His Excellency the Governor-General, Sir David Rose, which I shall read to you. It is dated 6th March, 1969:

“Dear Mr. Speaker,

Thank you very much for your letter Parl: 14/2XIV dated 28th February, 1969, forwarding copies of a Resolution passed by the National Assembly on the 26th February, 1969, thanking me for the Speech addressed to the assembly, on the occasion of the ceremonial opening of the First Session of the Second Parliament of Guyana, on the 14th February, 1969.

May I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the arrangements made for the Ceremonial Opening and to ask you to convey my sincere good wishes to all members of the National Assembly.

Yours sincerely,
David Rose,
Governor-General.”

LEAVE TO MEMBER

My second announcement is to state that leave for today has been granted to the hon. Member, Mr. C.E. Wright, who is indisposed.

**MOTION RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OR SITTINGS OF THE
ASSEMBLY AND MOVED BY A MINISTER**

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Parliamentary Affairs, Mr. Bissember, is not here to remind us and I do so on his behalf, that the arrangements for this particular debate are that we shall, where necessary, go on until 10 o'clock in the evening.

PUBLIC BUSINESS**MOTION****APPROVAL OF ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE 1969****BUDGET DEBATE**

Assembly resumed debate on the Motion moved by the Minister of Finance on 28th February, 1969, for the approval of estimates of expenditure for the financial year 1969, totaling \$146,698,155 (excluding \$20,567,751 which is chargeable by law).

Mr. Speaker: When we adjourned last Friday, the hon. Member, Mr. Van Sluytman, was speaking. He may now resume.

Mr. Van Sluytman: When the adjournment was taken on Friday afternoon last, I was presenting to this House comparative figures during the operation of the Guyana Marketing Corporation under the regime of the P.P.P. and those of the Corporation under the P.N.C. I also said that the figures we found when we took charge of the board were operative only from December, 1964, when the election campaign was at its height. Be that as it may, we have found these figures and I quote from a copy - to bear out that I am speaking the truth - of a price list signed by the then Manager of the Guyana Marketing Corporation.

2.10 p.m.

I quote:

11.3.69

National Assembly

2.10 - 2.20 p.m.

Item	Price in 1964		Price in 1967	Increased Percentage
Plantains	4¢ per lb.	to	6¢ per lb	50
Sweet cassava	1½¢ “ “	“	4¢ “ “	166
Eddoes	2½ ¢ “ “	“	6¢ “ “	140
Tannias	4¢ “ “	“	7¢ “ “	75
Yams	4¢ “ “	“	9¢ “ “	125
Sweet Potatoes	4¢ “ “	“	8¢ “ “	100
Oranges	2¢ each	“	3¢ each	50
Grape fruit	2¢ “	“	3¢ “	50
Cabbage	17¢ per lb.	“	23¢ per lb.	35
Black Eye Peas	16¢ “ “	“	22¢ “ “	37
Pea nuts	24¢ “ “	“	34¢ “ “	41
Corn	6¢ “ “	“	6½ ¢ “ “	8
Banana	4¢ “ “	“	6¢ “ “	50
Coffee beans	22¢ “ “	“	45¢ “ “	104.5
Pumpkins	2¢ “ “	“	3¢ “ “	50
Tomatoes	30¢ “ “	“	35¢ “ “	18.66

Mr. Speaker, what is of importance is the item corn. The PPP had challenged the PNC, through the Minister of Finance, saying that he is afraid to tax the big businesses. Before December 1964, the farmers were paid 4½¢ per lb. for corn; the processing factory was selling this corn at 6¢ per lb. The fact is that the PPP wanted to win the elections at all cost, so they bought the corn at 6¢ per lb. and the very corn was sold at 6¢ per lb. at the big businesses. For instance Stockfeeds, the PPP was not only afraid to tax big businesses, but subsidised same.

The Guyana Marketing Corporation, under the PNC, has included on its list of purchasing, several items of produce which the PPP never thought of buying. I quote the items and the prices we are paying for them. They are as follows:

Item	Price
Hard Yams	6¢ per lb.
Bananas (Apple and Sour Fig)	3½¢ “ “
Bitter cassava	2¢ “ “
Peppers	16¢ “ “
Dasheen	4¢ “ “
Squash	4¢ “ “
Cucumbers	8¢ “ “
Pears	Ranging from 4¢ to 6¢ according to size
Tangerines	\$1.50 per hundred
Golden apples	4¢ per lb.
Lemons	\$1.50 per hundred
Limes	8¢ per lb.
Water melons	4¢ “ “
Cocoa beans	24¢ “ “

We have included on the purchasing list, seventeen new items. Originally, the PPP bought only eighteen items from the farmers. There is now a total of thirty-five items.

At the end of 1964 there were two purchasing points apart from the head offices in Georgetown and New Amsterdam. These were at Charity and Parika. There are additional buying centres and I will list them for the benefit of hon. Members: Diamond, Pomeroun River, Dartmouth, Essequibo coast, Wakenaam, Essequibo River and Berbice River. When the PNC took office in 1964, there were only two outlets: that is the one in Georgetown and the other in New Amsterdam. Now, there are outlets at Beterverwagting, Plaisance, Hopetown, Berbice, Buxton, E.C.D., Adventure, Essequibo Coast, Success, E.C.D., Everton, Berbice, Corentyne, Rosignol, East Lapenitence and Wismar, Demerara River, to mention a few.

11.3.69

National Assembly

2.10 - 2.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, a brief resume of the Board's activities in the past will reveal the gross incompetence of the PPP Government, I have in my possession, figures from 1961 to 1964. The best year for this incompetent Government as regards trading was the year 1964. After having had a subsidy of \$631,614, goods were purchased to the tune of \$4,372,410 and these goods were sold for \$4,210,268 on the actual purchases. As a result, \$162,142 was lost.

In the year 1968, the Guyana Marketing Corporation, under the leadership of the PNC, took produce to the tune of \$6.6 million and the sales were \$6.9 million – the gross profit was \$.3 million (G). What was a run down and dilapidated institution and what seemed to be going nowhere, is now a viable one and it is the pride of all Guyanese. May I go a little further and say this: as from 1966, the subsidy to the Guyana Marketing Corporation was merely \$500,000 and by dedication and hard work and by people being placed in the right positions, we were able in 1966 to underspend the subsidy by \$20,000; and in 1967 we were also able to underspend it by \$94,000.

2.20 p.m.

For the first time in the history of farming the farmers had an opportunity to sit at a conference with the officials of the Guyana Marketing Corporation to arrange prices for their produce. In 1967 prices were fixed and they are still maintained until today. Several other conferences were held between the farmers and the Guyana Marketing Corporation. One was held in October last year at the Guyana School of Agriculture at Mon Repos and one was held on the 15th February at the head office at Lombard Street.

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mr. Correia: I beg to move that the hon. Member be granted an extension of 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Persaud: *Seconded.*

Mr. Van Sluytman: Government, through the Guyana Marketing Corporation, has given new inspiration, wider vistas, a place and honour in the economy of this country to the farmers. I am somewhat bothered. Save and except for the one member of the Opposition – the hon. Member Mr. Harry Lall who says that he is the shadow Minister of Labour – the other hon. Members have not declared themselves and as I see it they have been shadowing even themselves. But the hon. Member Mr. Ambrose has been rather consistent in his speech about agriculture and particularly about rice. He was at great pains to tell this Assembly that the Guyana Rice Marketing Board made a profit of \$3.5 million. He was also at great pains to tell this House that money should have gone back into the pockets of the Rice Producers Association. He even suggested that the farmers should have been given an increase per bag of padi.

I gathered from the hon. Member that he is a rice farmer and a politician. I expect that they must have travelled for some time in areas where rice has been planted and would know that many farmers are bankrupt even in Government schemes. He would realise that there are people who have land and who by virtue of their financial ability were able to level the land and to make some money. But he must also remember that a large number of farmers are placed on land that is not prepared and is not suited for rice planting.

We were at pains to tell the P.P.P. that we would not give the rice farmers a higher price because of the increase in profit to \$3.5 million. We told them we were going to use the money to prepare the land. The hon. Member Mr. Ambrose claims to represent the working class people and small farmers. If that is so he is not doing his duty because the man who is on bad land, which needs preparing, will not be able to produce.

Let us say that an acre of land produced 15 bags of padi and that an additional \$1 will be paid by way of profit. If \$1 is multiplied by 15 it gives \$15, but the man who spent a lot of time

on his farm and produced no padi at all will get nothing because 0 multiplied by 15 is 0. This would not be developing the rice industry; it would not be helping the small man. It would be putting money into the hands of those who already have and would continue to drain money from the small man.

I doubt whether the People's Progressive Party whose members are big businessmen will ever represent the small man. Therefore, when the hon. Member harps about throwing back the \$3.5 million to the rice farmers he must realise that we are going to give the farmers but not in the way he wishes.

The Opposition, both the major and the mini sections, accused the past administration of discrimination in employment. The hon. Member Mr. E.M.G. Wilson, in particular, said that people will continue to fear. Unfortunately Mr. Wilson is not here at the moment. He said that the Employment Exchange has been removed from Regent Street to Congress Place and is now at the Ministry of Works and Hydraulics. But I can remind the hon. Member that the Central Agricultural Station at Mon Repos had absolutely no regard for the Labour Exchange. When we checked the record at Mon Repos at the end of 1964 there were 199 unskilled employees, 188 of who were supporters of the People's Progressive Party and none had labour cards. The remaining 11 persons were not members of the People's Progressive Party and they had labour cards. So, of the labour force of 199 only 11 persons were not members of the People's Progressive Party and the 188 who supported the People's Progressive Party never had labour cards. In fact, the Labour Bureau and Employment Exchange were foreign terms to these people. Mon Repos, of course, is famous for having blasted the telephone exchange to atoms and also for shooting Ackbaralli to death. Nobody saw these acts although they were done in daylight.

The P.P.P. Government never bothered with the Employment Exchange and yet the members of the P.P.P. speak about discrimination employment. They say that the People's National Congress will only put its own people in jobs. Let us take a look at the Guyana School of Agriculture at Mon Repos. In the year, 1963, of the 15 students who were for the diploma

11.3.69

National Assembly

2.20 - 2.30 p.m.

course 13 were children of the members of the People's Progressive Party; 13 were East Indians and 2 were of mixed descent. Of the 12 students who were enrolled for the certificate course 5 were Negroes and 7 were East Indians.

2.30 p.m.

In 1964, the number of students enrolled at the institution was as follows: 7 for the diploma course – 6 East Indians, 1 Negro and the 6 East Indians were children of members of the P.P.P.; 16 for the certificate course – 1 Amerindian, 4 Negroes, 11 East Indians. The members of the P.P.P. are afraid that what the meted out to members and supporters of the Opposition will be meted out to them now. [Mr. R.D. Persaud: "Tell us the position now."]

Before I take my seat, there are still a few words I should like to say to the "mini" Opposition. The hon. Member Mr. Sutton said that if the major partner had taken advice from the junior partner when the Coalition Government was in office, things would have gone well and there would have been no uprising in the Rupununi. Of course, all of us are aware that the U.F. was involved, lock, stock and barrel in the uprising in the Rupununi. I will tell the hon. Member that we do not need the advice of the members of the U.F. In fact, as we know, they cannot even advise themselves.

I often wonder what number of men these people are, if, in fact, they are really politicians and if they are really Guyanese. I have come to the conclusion that the members of the "mini" Opposition are neither men nor beasts. They do not even believe in their manifestos *Economic Dynamism* and *Highways to Happiness*. They professed on their platforms that they believe in Guyanisation. They spoke about the magic circle of roads bursting into the Interior, better salaries for the workers, and so on. But we found it rather strange that when the minimum wage was increased from \$3.04 to \$4.00 per day, the "mini" Opposition was opposed to it. [Mr. Checks: "Nonsense."] We found that when roads in this country were being constructed, the

former Minister of Finance, the leader of the United Force, said that the workers must be retrenched, that they were going too fast with the roads. We found also that when a qualified Guyanese was given a senior position in this country, the U.F. was opposed to it. That is why I say that the members of the “mini” Opposition are neither men nor beasts because they never stood for the things in their manifestos.

I have been able to inform this House of the benefits the farmers have derived since the P.N.C. took control of the Guyana Marketing Corporation. I have been able also to label the lie that minimum guaranteed prices to farmers have been removed. I have been able to set the records straight and I hope that by now the Members on the western side and the Members on the north-western side of this house are prepared to stand up to the tasks ahead of the Guyanese people.

Mr. Checks: The time has come to speak of many things.

“The time has come, the Walrus said,
To talk of many things:
Of shoes – and ships – and sealing wax –
Of cabbages – and kings - ”

In the course of my brief remarks, I should like to refer to what certain Members on the Government side said.

I should like, first, to refer to some remarks made by the hon. Minister without a Portfolio (Mr. Jack) who, unfortunately, is not in his seat now. In the course of his brief talk he said that the party which I represent never propagated the idea of land ownership for Amerindians. Now I can only say that that hon. Minister has not been following the course of recent history in Guyana. I would suggest to him that he get some information from the Prime Minister or any one of his colleagues who accompanied us to England in 1962, 1963, or 1965.

I should like to remind him or to tell him, that it was the late Stephen Campbell who took up to London a petition prepared by the United Force in which he insisted that Independence should not be granted to Guyana until the rights of the Amerindians were secured. It was the most difficult thing to get Stephen Campbell, as representative of the Amerindians, to agree that we should have independence only with an agreement to appoint a Commission to investigate their rights and to have them enshrined in the Constitution.

The idea of Amerindian rights was one which dominated the entire operations of the U.F. wherever we went the question of lands for the Amerindians was always a very important topic. I remember that in London in 1965 members of the Government were inclined to brush aside the whole idea of Amerindian land rights. It was the United Force which insisted night after night when the Constitutional provisions were being hammered out in London that rights for the Amerindians must be protected and, finally, it was agreed that a Commission should be appointed and that the terms should be enshrined in the Constitution. We tried to get Stephen Campbell, who was a Member of the House of Assembly, a member of the United Force and a representative of the Amerindians, to accept what was finally agreed upon.

I do not think that nay one who was in any way involved in the affairs of Guyana between 1961 and 1968 can doubt the sincerity of the U.F. in trying to see to it that the Amerindians receive their rights. The people themselves knew who their friends were in spite of all that the other parties in the country – the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. – tried to tell them. In the 1961, 1964, and 1968 elections, the people themselves showed which of the three parties they believed.

2.40 p.m.

It was necessary in accordance with what we agreed in London that a Lands commission should be appointed. The Amerindian Lands Commission turned out to be one of the most important bodies because many things depended upon it – the distribution of lands in the interior,

the Amendment of the Amerindian Ordinance, the distribution of land to the ranchers, and many other important decisions – in fact, the report of the Amerindian Land Commission held up activity in the interior on many points but in spite of that there was a great deal of delay in having that Commission appointed.

One of the reasons was that although in theory the Commission had to be appointed by the Minister responsible for Amerindian Affairs, when once the agreement was reached that the British Government would provide a Chairman, it turned out that the application had to be made through the Ministry of Economic Affairs. Months passed. In spite of my probing continually we could not get anything done.

I went to Canada in 1966 and, without the authority of Government, I visited the Canadian Foreign Office in Ottawa. There I got agreement from them to provide a Canadian Amerindian to be a member of the Amerindian Land Commission. When I returned here, I met at a party an officer of a certain High Commission who told me that the man whom the British Government had selected as Chairman was available and cooling his seat in London waiting to be called. I did everything humanly possible to get action because the Ministry responsible for Amerindian affairs could not initiate the action to get this man. It had to be done through the Ministry of Economic Affairs and nothing was done until a year after but by that time the intended chairman had taken another job. That was in February, 1967. It was too late. We wanted a man of some stature to head this Commission. I am not prepared to go into more details. Finally, the Commission did come together and started its work in September, 1967 and every effort was made to urge it to push ahead in view of the fact that so much depended on its report.

[Interruption]

The hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Jack) has just said that this party, referring to the Minister of Local Government at that time, did nothing. I can tell you this. In view of what has been said I must refer to one or two things which will not sound very pleasant. Take for instance, the Kumaka-Quebana road. That was begun by the Interior Department. The

department had been asking for a machine to go there to assist in the work on the road. Eventually a machine was sent there and it worked for two or three days and after that it broke down. Despite repeated requests no one was sent to repair it. I would not be surprised if the machine is still there being cannibalised. A driver from some other Department was sent there and he wasted time for months.

If the Interior Department wanted a man stationed say, at Mabaruma, to look after agriculture, the application had to go through the Ministry of Agriculture. Interior had to make requests and wait until several months had passed. If the Interior Department spoke to a foreign aid group like the Canadians who were willing to offer a man, it had to be initiated by the Ministry of Agriculture and so round and round these things went.

So far as pure water supply is concerned, it must be noted that although the thirty-three Amerindian villages which have got pure water supply have got it through the application being made in the same roundabout way, the sinking of the wells in those villages was done on the initiative of the Department of the Interior.

Take Mabaruma. I can tell you this. The people there wanted Local Government – Amerindians and others. Week after week and month and month we were told the receipts had not been made out; they would be prepared and they would get titles to their lands. The people did not get titles that nor the next year nor up to now. When I went there on a certain occasion, the people approached me, so I decided something must be done. I made every effort, yet nothing was done. For a brief while I acted as Minister of Housing then a man was sent to examine the situation and see what could be done. That is all that was done.

To this day the receipts are not in order. There is the utmost confusion. There is nobody in the Ministry of Housing who know what is the situation at Bartica Housing Scheme and at Mabaruma. The people believe that the Government is anxious to give them titles that their documents are in order and they will get titles for their land. Excuse after excuse is being made

and nothing up to now has been done. I believe that somewhere in the distant future when they decide to reconstruct their records, something will be done.

Then there was the time when I got a caressing from the kabaura flies in the rainy season. I do not know if you know what that means. A certain Government wanted to assist us in the eradication of the kabaura fly. An officer came to me and tried to get some action taken in getting this man here to work on the eradication of this. For months nothing could be done. On one occasion when I met him he called the name of the doctor who was available and wanted to come. He asked, "What is your Government doing?" I spoke to the Minister concerned. I did not stop there. I wrote the Minister concerned. I also wrote a letter to the particular officer in the High Commission and I sent a copy of that letter to the Minister. Nothing at all has been done and up to now nothing is done. More than a year has passed and the expert I am sure is no longer available.

That is the kind of co-operation that the predecessor of the present Minister received when he was in office. I only trust now that they have got one of their own, there will be more co-operation at that level. I would refer to the airstrip at Kumaka where a bulldozer was sent by some Ministry or the other as a result of our persistent asking. An airstrip is an urgent necessity there. After several months of waiting to get his answer, I decided to fly over the area and see whether it could be used under group direction. The people did voluntary work but they received no food aid.

2.50 p.m.

Eventually a bull dozer was sent up there and the Amerindian Captain told me that it worked for two hours and then broke down. These are things which have happened and were never reported; they were never recorded. These things breed dissatisfaction. I understand that that bull dozer is also still there and I do not know how far the construction of the airstrip has gone.

The Leader of this Party, after he saw what was happening, gave \$10,000 to the Government to assist with certain projects in the Amerindian areas. These projects were mixed up with those of the Government and it was difficult to tell which were the ones financed by D.I.H. [Mr. Jordon: “What is D.I.H.?”] There were eight projects in all. I refer to these things because it is being believed that this party did not do anything for the Amerindians.

I can refer, sir, to the efforts which were made to get Amerindians to receive old age pension. [An hon. Member (Government): “Merriman did that.”] During the regime of the PPP there was one person receiving old age pension in the Rupununi and that individual was a member of their party. [Interruption] Requests and letters came. We decided that this should be rectified. But in spite of that, there was not much progress or improvement. I brought up the matter several times. I spoke to my then colleagues. I suggested to him that when he was establishing the new Social Assistance Boards in Amerindian areas, that Amerindian Captains should be appointed as members to the Board; not as Chairmen, because you just cannot pick up someone who knows nothing of the conduct of meetings, and make him a Chairman. We all understand that. But even that was not done. If it was done eventually towards the end of last year I do not know. Probably there are one or two Amerindians who receive old age pension now.

The fact that the Interior Department is now under the control of the Prime Minister is an indication of the seriousness with which it is being regarded; and I believe and trust that something definite will be done for those people now.

There are always regular complaints coming in. Of course this happens all over the world – people always complain to those who they believe are representing them. Complaints are made about their lands being taken away from them. They complain that pork-knockers were entering their houses and stealing their diamonds. There were complaints from Wyaka where the Amerindians were settled on the shore of the lake with their schools and houses and so on and the Government - I say the Coalition Government – [Laughter] – at the time, the minority

section of the Coalition knew nothing about it. It was hidden from us when they stole the land, although it was supposed to know. [Dr. Reid: “You were sleeping.”] *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Order, Order. Let the hon. Member proceed.

Mr. Cheeks: The Officer-in-Charge there, on the instructions of his Minister, had taken away the lands from the Amerindians and shifted them further to various parts of the forests. Some departments of the Government wanted to put up in its Youth Camp. The Captain said he eventually had to agree to remove his school and structures further down. I know it would be said that since the Amerindians had agreed to this, we should not complain. But the fact remains that these people were forced to agree; they are not pleased with the whole idea.

I was not surprised when I saw a picture of the very Amerindian Captain in a P.N.C. publication: “Why I support the P.N.C.” *[Interruption]*

At Yupukari in the Northern Savannahs a certain Amerindian much favoured by the P.N.C. was allowed to fence in a portion of land which had already been leased to a rancher. He was made a Community Development Officer eventually, and was also a two-way receiving set which is kept in his house. *[Interruption]* [Mr. Reid: “He is a Captain, nothing is wrong with that.”] Yes. He is a Captain. I mentioned these things because they show the extent to which the P.N.C. has gone to divide and win over people.

In another part of the Northern Savannahs a piece of land which was already the subject of lease, a certain favoured person – not a Captain this time – was allowed to tear down land fences and utilise that land. If these persons had legal leases in existence it does not matter how favoured they were, they should not be allowed to take away other people’s lands. These are things which breed dissatisfaction and which many people in Guyana do not know.

11.3.69

National Assembly

2.50–3.00 p.m.

I should like to mention too, the situation which has developed, say, at St. Francis Mission and St. Cuthbert's Mission where these Amerindians cut their logs and sell them. People whom they call outsiders, go there and see them cutting these logs. The outsiders check on the areas where the best timbers are found, and then they go down to Georgetown and apply for lease. The record in Georgetown does not show those lands as occupied by the Amerindians.

3 p.m.

On paper it would appear that nobody occupies the land, so leases are issued to the applicants. These lessees then go into the areas and begin to work. First of all they drive out the Amerindians. There was one hard case where the Amerindians had cut dozens of logs and were getting them dragged out, when the man to whom the lease was issued, moved in, stopped them and threatened to get them locked up. All that I could do on that occasion was to draw the fact to the attention of the relevant authority and that is what I did.

The same thing happened on the Pomeroun at a place called Dredge Creek where the land had been occupied by Amerindians for over 40 years. Suddenly other people went and claimed the land and began to push Amerindians off. They came to me and I advised them to apply to the Government for leases. They approached the Minister concerned who, at first, was very sympathetic and offered to give all the necessary help. In the end nothing was done and the Amerindians are still without the land which they should have at Dredge Creek.

I have tried to get the settlement at Orinduik moved to Chiung or Cato. One has to go there to understand how necessary this is. I must confess that the Prime Minister was very sympathetic to the idea but nothing was done.

So far as the building of the Amerindian hostel is concerned, everybody knows that the Georgetown Hostel has been an eyesore for several years. I had meetings at my Ministry every week. Every week the officers had to report to me the progress which was made. Of course,

officers were changed regularly. Sometimes something had to be done by an officer in another Ministry and action was held up for a long time. It also took a long time for funds to be released. We were told there was only one architect who was engaged on very important work. After a considerable time a start was made and I think the work is going ahead now.

I must say a few words about Local Government here. The Minister on page 55 of the Budget Speech says –

“At the local government level the community development budget is expended only on approved community development projects.”

But this is most interesting to see words used on page 56 to the effect that –

“Community Development is an integral part of local government.”

I wonder if the Government has discovered this now that a P.N.C. Minister has taken charge of Local Government. Every effort that I made to produce results met with obstacles. Community Development was kept from local government. I wonder if the Prime Minister himself has stopped to think that local government really has been established for the local communities. It is the community which has got together to improve itself. When it is organised in that legal way it is called a Local Authority. Community Development should not be kept as something separate and apart. [**The Prime Minister:** “Did you raise this in the Cabinet?”]

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that we do not wish to hear Cabinet secrets at this stage.

Mr. Checks: In any case I would think that the present Minister will make real progress now that it has been accepted that community development is the very heart and soul of local government. Once that is accepted and the two Departments can move together there should be

real progress. I will tell hon. Members, however, that the Minister in question has been very successful in helping the Government to win elections.

Mr. Speaker: Time!

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

Mr. Feilden Singh: *Seconded.*

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Checks: As I was saying, if the Minister succeeds in holding elections and in establishing one single Marshall area – I do not mean the Wismar/Christianburg/Mackenzie area as that already has a legal entity – in addition to what he has done for his party, he should earn a place in the firmament.

I want to refer to some of the problems which are glossed over in the Budget Speech. I should like to see the Minister include an extra nuclear area in a Marshall area. I should like to see him bring local government to large organised areas. For six and seven years the Housing Estate Act has been on the bookshelves of the Law Officers. The land in the extra nuclear areas belongs to the sugar estates and the expense of maintaining the lots is the expense of the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund Committee. The people in those areas hold leases from the estates. I should like to see how the Minister is going to unravel that problem in view of the opposition of M.P.C.A. which receives many benefits and now insists that some of the benefits received through the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund is part of the workers' income. The M.P.C.A. argues that if its members are put in a category where they have to pay rates it would mean a reduction in their incomes and, therefore, they would have to get increased wages from the sugar industry.

Then there is the registration list which is the preliminary list for Local Government elections. I would prefer to say no more on that question other than that the Minister has to keep his eyes on the phantom votes.

3.10 p.m.

Then there is also the question of adult suffrage. The Minister himself is not quite so sanguine that adult suffrage is the best thing the villagers. The people who own the lands and the houses, who stand to lose if rates are not paid, who keep their yards and houses clean, feel that they have a stake in the villages. They regard those who do not own any lands or buildings in the areas as just birds of passage travelling around and they contend that they should not be vested with the rights to vote there in Local Government elections.

Then there is the problem of the Valuation Bill. All three Bills are already complete. The Municipal and District Councils Bill which makes provision for extensive Local Government reform has been published. Local Authorities (Elections) Bill has been published, public comments have been invited and have been received. There is also the Valuation Bill which has already been drafted and is in its final stage. But the Minister is going to discover that there are certain powers – and you cannot see them, I could not see them – which, somehow or the other, were able to hold back the Bills. The Minister will discover that those clauses in the Bill which involve the valuation and rating of all those multi-million dollar concerns, such as the properties and the DEMBA lease and the land which factories owned by Bookers will not have an easy passage. The lands which accommodate the factories where sugar is manufactured and the lands which are subject to lease are all under modern conditions and are subject to a local tax, but the Minister will find out, as I found out, that, somehow or the other, hidden somewhere, there is a hand which holds back action when action is to be taken to tax those people. [**The Prime Minister:** “What about the hand that held back the shrimp tax? Tell us about that? Be careful.”]

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no threats in the House. The hon. Member may speak freely.

Mr. Cheeks: I am grateful to Your Honour.

It is necessary, at this time, to say a few words on education. [The Prime Minister: “We will tax D.I.H.”] I am not concerned with D.I.H. There is a philosophy on education clearly stated not only by means of pronouncements from Government Ministers and others authorised to make them, but we have it here clearly documented in the White Paper on Education. There is no doubt, in fact we have all accepted it, that education is the handmaiden to development. The words used here on page 58 of the Budget Speech are:

“A proper system of education, we all know, is a *sine qua non* of economic development;”

That much is agreed. It is also agreed that education must be decolonised.

Now we have inherited a system from England which was embodied in the Hadow Report providing three streams – the grammar school, the technical school and the secondary modern school. The report was about twenty years earlier, 1944, but the implementation began during the last war. Now we could not possibly have secondary modern schools at that time because we could not afford them. We had some grammar schools and we hastily built a technical institute. Then that tripartite system gave way, of course, in several parts of England, to the comprehensive school.

We are faithful copyists of the British system. We do not have the resources at our disposal as they had but we tried to say, under the P.P.P. regime, that comprehensive schools are “it” and we must have them. Of course at the same time they were building comprehensive schools there, they were also building schools which they called multilateral schools. By all means build multilateral schools for they can be orientated to the needs of the country, as you say in your philosophy on education, but what are you doing? You propose to build multilateral schools to cater for the weaker 70 per cent who will not enter the formal grammar school. If you

enrol children in your multilateral schools, are you still going to admit them on the Common Entrance tests? That is what I understand the Government intends to do. If they do so, they will be at once excluding from the multilateral schools the children who stand most in need of that type of education.

I remember drawing attention to the fact that, in a certain area of Guyana, young fellows who had reached the age of twenty years and who had left school in second and third standard were able to get academic instructions and instructions in one or two trades to enable them to make a living. There are thousands of lads of that sort, our educational system has ensured that. They leave school at an early age knowing little or nothing. They can make little or no contribution to the country unless, when they reach the comparatively advanced ages of twenty and twenty –two, there are means by which they can attend schools and learn not only academic work but something to do with their hands to make a living. That is one of the crying needs in this country.

Multilateral schools are necessary, but are you going to put all of them along the coast? If you have the Interior at heart, are you not going to have at least one or more of these schools in the Interior areas? If the multilateral schools are to serve their purpose, are you going to insist on admission on a Common Entrance test only, where children from the remote areas as well as from slums are at a decided advantage? In other words, the Common Entrance Examination is culturally loaded against the poor child. It is necessary, therefore, for Government to do some rethinking with respect to the use it intends to make of these multilateral schools.

There are other obstacles or drawbacks in the present system which I know from experience are difficult to overcome. One problem is the problem of teachers in the schools concentrating mainly or almost exclusively on the children writing the Common Entrance and charging high fees – charging fees at all – to train those children. What happens is that the teachers in these schools pay attention only to those children from whom they are receiving private fees.

The rest of the school is neglected. The schools have got to be organised to put an end to that. When at the end of the year, both the Government secondary schools and the Government aided secondary schools – I exclude, Queen's College and the other two schools – give their annual promotional tests, if 90 per cent of the children fail, the scrap that test. These are things the public should know; the Education Department should know and they should adopt means to prevent them. All schools which are supposed to have their curriculum at a certain level should write one uniform test. They should not be allowed to set their own tests.

If 90 per cent of the children fail some headmasters set another one. If they get 75 per cent failures, they scrap that one and set another one, and so on until they get a result which looks fair enough for them to send in to the Education Department. I am not blaming the Department for that. These are some of the drawbacks in the system which should be removed.

Mr. Speaker: Time.

Mr. F. Singh: I move that the hon. Member be given 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mrs. DaSilva: *Seconded.*

Mr. Checks: I have drawn attention to some of the drawbacks and obstacles in the Local Government system, in the interior and in education. There is one thing more I should like to refer to and that is, the Teachers' Pension Bill. I remember 11 years ago I sat on a committee where that Bill was studied and promises were made by that Government and by every Government after that, but the Teachers' Pension Bill has still not qualified for mention in the Budget Speech.

I should like before I take my seat to make one point about the measures used here to raise the necessary funds that are required. I would only point out to the Government that the 3 per cent Bill of Entry Tax, which is necessary perhaps, because the money must be got, will

cause a rise in the cost of living, but Government must not fool itself that the cost of living will rise by a mere 3 or 4 per cent. It must know the economic forces which will operate. It must know that the banks which finance this business have to lend more. They have to be paid more interest and the total cost of importing goods is going to be increased. There is going to be a spiralling of increases so that the consumer will have to pay much more than 3 per cent.

These figures about increases in the gross domestic product and in the national income are statistics that mean nothing to the man who has not got an increase in pay for the last four years and has to pay very much more for every item except flour and sugar when he goes to the shop.

Mr. Y. Ally: The meaning of a budget is the shouldering of the financial strains of the country by each and every inhabitant of our country. It is important that whatever we may say or do should have some sincerity but when we reflect on the mutterings made by our Governor-General when he said in the Throne Speech, “the small man becomes a real man; where injustice is eradicated,” this budget is open to suspicion.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member wishes to make reference to anything the Governor-General said, he must do so in a proper manner. The Governor-General did not matter. He read the Speech very clearly.

Mr. Y. Ally: I apologise. These are very good words and very good phrases but there is no sincerity of purpose. When we reflect on the ulterior motives throughout the entire speech of the Minister of Finance, we find it is to fool the people that there is a threat of invasion by Venezuela, and hiding under the smoke-screen whilst carrying on vicious pressure on the backs of the poor people. It is a case of easing the rich and pressing the poor. It is the case where the rich is getting richer and the poor is getting poorer.

We had a very good recommendation in the Seven-Year Development Plan by the Coalition Government. I should like to quote, with your permission, paragraph 21, page 16 of that Programme:

“Accordingly, the Guyana Development Corporation is charged with starting a number of new large-scale industries, agricultural and manufacturing, and has been allocated \$20,000,000 for investments of a pioneering nature. This is a relatively small sum; there is no prospect of the government raising any but a small fraction of the total capital required.”

But, sir, these are very good words to put in a book but when we come to realities, the moment the Government took office, this entire programme somersaulted. This entire programme was thrown aside and what do we find in the Budget Speech? It is sadly lacking in proposals for small trades and industries. Even the rehabilitation of the displaced persons, whom any honest Government would help, is ignored. There is nothing set aside to help them.

3.30 p.m.

All we hear, is about threats by Venezuela, threats here and there, and the Government is in fact planning more and more threats upon the people by increasing the tax year after year. I should like to quote from the 1969 Budget. Page 5, paragraph 3 states:

“Guyana, as a young, under-developed country striving to bring employment and economic prosperity to its people, must now defend its territorial integrity as well. It is certainly a sad reflection of the times in which we live that poor countries must devote what must be an important share of their national production and revenue to defence. But these are the realities of our situation. We must now forgo excessive consumption, reduce our development effort and limit some of our immediate expectation for a better life, so that we may continue in existence as a nation.”

These are very good words and phrases but sad to say they are without any meaning.

We have heard that Guyana is a participant of Carifta; the Chamber of Commerce has representatives. We have seen trade missions going abroad specifically to help bring Carifta into existence and at Hon. Member there is no propaganda. All we are hearing is the Prime Minister providing special dinners; and he had to charter a special plane to go into the Rupununi to get Labba. That is the only significant thing we can hear about Carifta. What do Guyanese stand to benefit from this?

I wish now to examine the PNC manifesto, *the New Road*. I quote from page 22 and it states:

“In establishing and encouraging the establishment of industries our policy is clear.

In small industries and those composed of small units, we shall encourage private ownership – individual and co-operative – as far as possible by local investors and entrepreneurs. We will offer credit, technical assistance in training, management and marketing, and tariff protection where and how long necessary. Our purpose is to develop entrepreneurial and managerial capacity and to encourage these enterprises.”

Further, on page 23 we find this:

“We refuse to sell our souls or mortgage our future.”

These things have just come to light.

The trade mission went to Jamaica and came back with very good sounds but it has failed to tell us that we have an industry right here in our country – a young enterprising industry – which is a Textile Dyeing Plant and the only one in the Caribbean. This Government is not looking after the interest of the Guyanese people. Jamaica still accepts dyed products, which is against the rules of Carifta. The people who are in this Government are only looking for personal gains. When it comes to a big show or squandering of the Guyanese money, this Government gets all the credit in that respect. This is not good enough.

Another point I wish to bring to the attention of this honourable House is the fact that in Trinidad and Barbados there are regulations which prohibit the importation of paint from other territories outside Carifta. But this is not done in our country. This is a part of neo-colonialism and nepotism.

Let us take a look at the 1968 Budget and see what the hon. Minister of Finance said – fortunately he was Minister of Finance in 1968 ... [**The Prime Minister:** “At that time you were in the back Bench.”] I should like to quote from page 15. It states:

“Accordingly, price increases would be closely watched with a view to control, and the Government would wish to encourage traders to switch their sources of supply to areas where prices are more advantageous.”

This is only to fool people.

3.40 p.m.

The Minister of Finance said that the Government was going to gaol the sharks, but he is fooling the people since nothing has happened. The record will show that in 1968 there were over 100 strikes. A worker does not strike because he likes to strike but because he is aggrieved and a strike is the only weapon to let people know there is something grieving workers.

We find that this Government is callous with the wishes of the people. The cost of transportation is going up; the price of foodstuff and everything else is going up. Even unemployment is increasing and is backed by racial discrimination which is practised by this corrupt Government. The Government is fooling the people that there is an invasion and advising them to tighten their belts and to try to be efficient so that we can arm ourselves against the invasion.

There is a letter here dated 17th January from the Amerindian Association of Guyana. [Mr. Hoyte: “Addressed to whom?”] I should like to quote it with your permission, sir. I read:

“Several reports have reached us that as a result of the recent disorders in the Rupununi large numbers of Amerindians have been displaced and are missing from their homes and that there is great suffering among the people.”

What is this Government doing? We hear of these disturbing things but this Government sits quietly and invite a few people to come to Georgetown to have a big “jump-up” with a masquerade band and to drink a lot of rum. This is to fool them, but we must face reality. We must be serious; we must realise that a Government is not for one section of the people; it is for the entire country and whatever it does should be in the interest of the entire population.

We find that there was discrimination in religion. The Roman Catholic and other Christian missionaries were doing a wonderful job of helping the poor people in the interior. Today this Government is bent on refusing the missionaries admission so that they could help these unfortunate people. It leads one to wonder what is the real motive in the refusal.

I am informed that the real reason why Government is prohibiting these missionaries from entering the Runpununi is that the priests lived close to the people; they were with them every day and knew the entire family structure, father, mother, children and every one so that at any time these priests make enquires as to where such and such a person is and this comes to light the Government would be under suspicion. This is the reason why the Government refuses to allow priests who were there before to return to the Rupununi.

We have heard that a priest by the name of Rose has now gone to the district. He is an absolute stranger to the people of the Rupununi. Why not send people who are accustomed to caring for the unfortunate people. This Government should not discriminate. It tries to fool the people by saying, “Look, we have no objection; we have no discrimination against religion”, but clearly it leads one to wonder what is the motive behind the Government’s action.

We are told in the Budget of a three per cent tax proposal. Let this Government tell us who will pay for this, in the final analysis. The merchants will most surely pass on the tax to the shopkeepers. Then the shopkeepers will pass it on to the consumers who comprise the masses of our population, the poor workers, regardless of race, colour or religion.

I urge this Government to remember that wilful waste brings woeful want. The majority of our people are in want. I have no objection to the Government framing a Budget. It has the prerogative to do so, but it should take into consideration that the Budget that it frames should be in the interest of the people of our country.

As I said before, the majority of our people are in want. The best defence against any invasion by Venezuela – it seems that the Prime Minister does not know this – or by any other power, is that the wants of the people should be looked after and this bluff about an invasion should be called off.

The members of the Government should remember that this is not a case of easing the rich and pressing the poor. The squander mania practised by this Government should stop. I urge the members of the Government to unite for some useful purpose. The purpose and criterion of an honest Government is “Vox populi, vox dei,” the voice of the people is the voice of God.

I crave your indulgence, sir, to bring to the notice of this House the proposals on page 38 of the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Do not forget that we will be in Committee of Supply when we will deal with the Estimates page by page.

Mr. M.Y. Ally: This might have some bearing on the Government. My complaint every year we sit here is that the Government should yield to the wishes of the people. It is its

prerogative to govern but it should be very careful. We find the Government has budgeted on page 38 for overseas allowance while it is trying to tax our people.

3.50 p.m.

We find that under the item Overseas Allowances the sum of \$229,656 is allowed; under Overseas Subordinate Staff the sum of \$310,000 is allowed; and under Entertainment Allowance the sum of \$123,000 is allocated. I think the Government should stop this type of rascality. How can a poor country like this afford to spend \$123,000 on Entertainment Allowance? To entertainment whom? I think it is time that the members of this Government realise that if they want the people of this country to co-operate and subscribe to the Budget, they in turn must be careful with this squandering that is going on. In 1968, the approved estimate with respect to Entertainment Allowance was \$65,700 but this Government has increased it by 100 per cent. The sum of \$15,600 is provided for Outfit Allowance and \$26,400 is provided for Domestic Staff.

Coming back to the Budget Speech, I should like to quote from page 73 ... *[Interruption]*
I am craving indulgence, Mr. Speaker, please let me have a hearing.

Mr. Speaker: I am listening to the hon. Member most attentively.

Mr. Y. Ally: I quote from page 73:

“... diplomatic representation must be strengthened to meet the challenge of external aggression. Guyana can boast of the most hard working and devoted representatives overseas. Even though Government cannot meet more than the basic needs of our representatives, we dare not fall below this level especially at this time when our diplomatic corps has become part of our defence corps.”

No fairer statement could be made by a corrupt Government. It is this same overseas staff that was responsible for the rigging of the overseas votes. A total number of 66,000 bogus votes were

prepared by these people. The Government is trying to give them payment, “You have done your part, we are doing our part. We will try to help you.”

I understand that there are many priests and parsons siding with this Government but, as a religionist, I should like each one of them to come out of his shell and ask himself whether the Government is doing the correct thing. At least these priests and parsons should have the honour and conviction of their faith to tell the Government that it doing the wrong thing. They should condemn the Government.

We heard the Minister of Health say that the Government is not fully responsible for the health of the Guyanese nation. She even cited where parents will have to put clean milk in clean bottles to feed their children. Clean milk is essential to good health. While the Minister of Health is saying this, this callous Government tries its best to increase the price of milk which the children are using. The price of milk is to be raised by two cents per half pint. I saw an advertisement in today’s and Friday’s newspapers to the effect that the price of milk is to be raised from 10 cents to 12 cents per half pint. This is black marketing of the highest nature. The persons who should be charged are the Members over there. This Government is buying milk from the farmers at 56 and 64 cents per gallon and selling it at \$1.92 per gallon.

Mr. Speaker: The time is up for the hon. Member but, as there are still a few minutes more for tea, would the House agree to have him continue?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Burnham): Yes.

Mr. Yacoob Ally: This Government is not concerned about the rising cost of living. The price of milk has gone up 200 per cent. No wonder the Prime Minister is trying to fool the people that they would not go hungry, that at least they would get milk and cassava. Let us look at the prices of milk and cassava. You have to pay a lot if you want them. I urge the Government to

rethink in the interest of the nation. Let us go over each of these items and see how best we can build a strong nation so that each and every one would be able to survive.

Before I take my seat, I should like to tell a little story about honest leadership.

Mr. Speaker: Quiet in the Public Gallery!

Mr. Yacoob Ally: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would share the views of the Caliph of Omar.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker does not have to share anybody's views, he listens; so try not to bring the Speaker in.

Mr. Yacoob Ally: This is an Islamic affair.

Mr. Speaker: It matters not.

Mr. Yacoob Ally: I am trying to make the point that an honest Government should look after the welfare of its people. I should like to tell a story of the Caliph Omar. When the Caliph took over the reins of Government, one of the first things he did was to call his Minister and ask them to make a check to see what was the average income of every person in his dominion. When this information was given, he requested that the allowance for his home should be similar to that of an ordinary peasant in the country. Now it happened that his wife wanted an extra allowance for making sweets and other things for her children, who were his children also, but after asking him for an extra allowance, he replied to her – I should like the Government to hear these words because the Prime Minister is always telling the people that he would like to become a Muslim, but that is only loose talk – and I quote: “Until every man in my dominion can afford such a luxury, then and only then the House of Omar would collect this extra allowance.”

11.3.69

National Assembly

3.50–4.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, please be up standing. This sitting is suspended for half an hour.

Sitting suspended at 4 p.m.

4.35 p.m.

On resumption --

Mr. Stoby: This budget which is presently under heavy criticism by the Opposition needs careful consideration. The manner in which it has been compiled reflects the policies that this Government intends to pursue. It appears that the main problems that our country is faced with have not exactly been projected in this Budget Speech. Many of our real problems have been just put aside. Problems which do not exactly affect the Guyanese people have been given priority.

We all know about the Rupununi uprising. In my opinion it is the handiwork of the imperialists. Many members from all the parties cannot understand how the imperialists operate. This uprising was at the sacrifice of five policemen. The security forces knew what was going on in the Rupununi. It is not something that was secret. There are policemen and security agents at all important points in Guyana and they were fully aware of all the things that were going on.

I got that impression when I was in the Rupununi last year February, when I was standing in a yard near the premises of the District Commissioner. I was speaking to a certain friend and we saw a plane coming down. My friend told me, "Look, you see that plane. It is coming for whisky." Smuggling goods from other territories! Going outside, right away I saw a motor cycle being started up and the rider was one of the very security policemen who have been killed. My friend said, "In a little while, the two-seater plane will take off again", and in no time the plane took off. The security forces knew what was going on, but no doubt, there was bribery.

This is the policy that this Government has adopted and intends to continue in the future. Bribery and corruption! They have nominated themselves to office. There is a lot of money this Government intends to raise for defence purposes. The answer is not defence by arms. I should recall that in the same Rupununi, when the Brazilians wanted to take part of the country, the same McTurks, McDonalds and Davises, protested and they are the ones now implicated.

They have defended our territory. It does not need so many soldiers. They would not help us with our problems. What we want as the greatest aim of the Government is to unite the people of Guyana and we would all stand up and defend our rights. So long as this Government intends to take on these policies of sectionalism and divide and rule, there will hardly be any progress for Guyana. I know we have passed the stage of colonialism. The Amerindians, left under British control, now are being transformed into a new estate. The Prime Minister, I understand, when he addressed the Conference of Amerindians, said that a new day has dawned for the Amerindians.

4.45 p.m.

A new day for slavery and the continuation of slavery for the Amerindians in Guyana. [**Mr. Hoyte:** “You, for example.”] The Prime Minister has fed the Captains well. The Government brought down a number of them from the Interior. I met some of these Captains and one man said to me: “Comrade, I had a very good time. I drink plenty and I eat plenty. I had a good feast at the Prime Minister’s house; but if he believes he is fooling us, we know, and we are watching all that is going on.

The plans of this Government are a million times worse than in the days of Columbus and Morgan who came to our shores and bribed the Amerindians taking all their wealth in exchange for beads and cotton cloth. Things are surely going to be worse than what took place some four hundred years ago. I feel that legislation will be brought in sooner or later and even if Members of the Opposition vote against any such legislation, eventually it will be passed. This Government is going to introduce slavery again in this country. This is a terrible Government. Its

intentions are not good. Take for example the Chiefs in Nigeria and Rhodesia who are well protected and bribed, and who are wealthy. So too, this Government is pursuing the same course of inducing the Captains of the Amerindian settlements. [**The Prime Minister:** “Are you a Captain? You are a son of a Captain.”] This Government wants political support. I am sorry for these Amerindians who cannot understand the tactics of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some more reference about the recent disturbances in the Rupununi. I wish to give an explanation regarding the people who were arrested, brought down at gun point and who are now in prison. I am from the North West District. The settlement at Toka was established by Mr. Davis whose son was one of the persons brought down – he has been released and sent back. Mr. Davis built a school and church. He has big sons and grandchildren and there are people who sing hymns and so on – [**The Prime Minister:** “Cheddie, what do you think about him?”] – I cannot understand how they were involved in the disturbances. The other day when I was coming down to Georgetown, in the plane there were soldiers on board and what did I see? I saw a white man with his transmitting set, probably some C.I.A. Agent – [*Interruption*] – because the pilot has his set already, he could not have been a pilot. This was very suspicious. He was looking all around the plane and it seemed as if he was transmitting to headquarters in Washington. [*Laughter*] These are the things that are going on.

If the Government is going to carry on in this manner, I do not know what will become of us. The Government is going at full gear now, there is no one to be blamed, the U.F. is no longer the humbug. One would have thought that things might have changed. I feel that some day we are going to have a revolution in our country because things are getting unbearable. Who do you think, Mr. Speaker, will be able to survive with the increased taxation which is to be implemented? The cost of living has been going up especially since this Government came into power. [**The Prime Minister:** “Not before?”] The prices for consumer goods have increased.

I wish now to make a few suggestions with regard to the problem of the Amerindians. The idea of having the Amerindians integrated into the Guyanese society as such is a very

technical one. I wonder if the Government knows what is going on in these areas where they have sent soldiers? Let me, sir, tell you about this ill behaviour of those who are supposed to defend us. The soldiers are giving alcohol to the women and doing all sorts of things. I receive many complaints and it makes me sick when I hear them. It is sad to say that there is no morality in the Defence Force and it is very bad that I have to make remarks such as this against our Defence Force.

4.55 p.m.

These things are serious and I trust that the Government will try its best to do something about them. We know what the plan is. The Government is now taking people from the coastlands. What will happen? The same kind of choke and rob which is going on in the city and on the coast will be exported to the Rupununi and to the North West District.

Let us look at the record. How many people are in gaols in the Rupununi and North West District? How many people are charged with crimes in those districts? We should bear in mind that there will come about a different attitude among our Amerindian population.

In the field of social services, there are no regular medical services in the riverain areas especially in the North West and Pomeroon districts. Since last year the motor launch in the North West has been out of commission and people who live in the river head cannot benefit from its services. Typhoid cases in the Pomeroon cannot have the use of the launch. This applies even to supporters of the Government. I do not know why the informers of the Government - it has paid informers – do not tell the Government specialist what is going on.

Look at the position at the Suddie Hospital. People travel from the Waini and from Moruka to the Suddie Hospital. There were two cases of snake bites and there was no serum there at all. These are serious problems and Government should take action to solve them.

When one goes to the Suddie Hospital one cannot get quick attention. I should like to give an example of an old man from Moruka who had gangrene and was sent by the dispenser to Suddie. He spent about four days there and was told that nothing could be done, he would die. The advice given to his family was to take him back home. This man was taken back to Moruka; he spent a week there and did not die. The family subscribed money and managed to bring him to a private hospital in Georgetown. One of his legs was amputated and today the man is well and sound.

This is what I am worried about and I want the Government to do something about it. An investigation must be made into the conditions at Suddie Hospital. Recently a woman was injured in an accident and I understand that two days later the blood stains had not been wiped off her mouth. These are things to think about.

We have problems. Our copra industry is at a standstill and it is interfering with business. People in the Pomeroon district want the Government Marketing Corporation to buy their copra. They want money to go to the shops, but the Corporation is not purchasing copra at the moment because of over-production. Why did the Government not do something about it? Why did the Government not buy it and store it? People want money. I know a gentleman who has over 600 bags of copra; he has many employees and a lot of people are depending on him. I believe that these are problems which need quick action, but this Government is only bent on doing things that would let people believe that it is a right Government. Look at how much money the Government plans to spend! The supporters of the Government at Matthews Ridge have received so much. The Government is fraudulent; the Manganese Company made arrangements with it.

We have been hearing about communism for a long time. The P.P.P. was attached for communism but who are the communists? [**Hon. Members:** "Tell us."] You will find out. The members of the Government are wrecking the whole economy of our country.

I should like to deal now with the Amerindian Lands Commission. I think that the areas that are now reservations should remain as reservations. The Government should send officers from the Lands and Mines Department to survey these people's territories and then give them such lands as an Independence gift. The Government should make legal arrangements so that the land, when given, cannot be taken away from the Amerindians.

In Canada today and in America, reservations are protected, but this Government has no intention of protecting Amerindians. The Government is only making a lot of statements which are published in the newspapers under big headlines, but the Amerindians will be in the same place and will continue to live in poverty.

The P.N.C. is alone in Government now and there is nothing to worry the party any more. It is alone in charge and we want to see it do something to improve our country and to better the conditions of the people, especially those who really need assistance.

5.05 p.m.

For instance, there are people in several areas in the Rupununi who do not know about old age pensions. This is something that we discovered. It would seem foolish for me to say so. People attended a meeting that was held and we listened to them to find out their problems and grievances. A schoolmaster got up – and he is not a supporter of the P.P.P. – and he was honest enough to say that he has been in the area for 15 years and nobody ever received old age pension. Now there are people in this country who have coconut and coffee plantations, who are receiving incomes, and still are getting old age pension. This could never be right.

Let us assist those who need assistance. Let us search for them. The Government could very well afford to send officers in various parts of the country to try to solve the problems of those right down at the bottom, and after that it could assist gradually until it reaches those at the

top. But our Government has the reverse policy of helping the very wealthy classes first. For instance, I have the Government's report for 1965 and I have seen...

Mr. Speaker: For what Department?

Mr. Stoby: The Report of the Commissioner of the Interior for the year 1965. Running through this Report I discovered that, in relation to the North West – all the figures are there giving the square miles, the population and everything, so there is no point in repeating them – the amount provided for loans in respect of the year 1965 was \$15,000. I know that one man in Essequibo got \$100,000, but in relation to a big area like the North West, only \$15,000 was provided.

Mention was made about lending money to the Credit Corporation. There is no Credit Corporation in the Rupununi. The people in the North West need assistance but the Government is planning to assist its supporters only. Those people who are opposed to the Government get a hard time, they cannot get small loans. These are the things that I am interested in. Yet in his speech the Minister of Finance talks about helping the small man. Whom does the Government call the small man – a man with a big factory producing hundreds of bags of padi and rice or a man with a big estate?

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mr. Ram Karran: I beg to move that the hon. Member be given an extension of 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Hamid: *Seconded.*

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Stoby: I come now to deal with what we call “Amerindian politics”. I read this Report to give me a little idea and I should like to express myself a little. Many people felt that they were responsible for the formation of the Amerindian Association. I heard a statement by the Prime Minister that he has created a record by bringing down these captains from the area, but my records show that, in 1952, I made an attempt to form an Amerindian Association but, because of my political and philosophical beliefs, I was discouraged by the church.

I think it is fair that I should give the true picture. I was trying to explain the problems to the people and a few people started to listen to me. I have a copy of the letter that I wrote to the Commissioner. The plan was to get the Amerindian leaders to discuss common problems, not to take action against the Government, because this took place during the days of the Interim Government, just before the days of the P.P.P. Government. [**An hon. Member:** “It was not in 1952.”] The Interim Government started in 1953. It was before 1953, you got support as long as you decided to toe the line. Well my plan failed. At the first meeting I got a very good gathering but I was told that my Association was undermined.

A few years later there was a lot of fighting for power in that Association. Mr. Campbell – God rest his soul – Mr. Duncan, Mr. Kenneth Muir and a lot of other people wanted to use the Amerindian Association as a means of political games. The point I want to make is this: I hope that it is not because of the influence of the church against my organisation that the Prime Minister is now debarring certain priests from going back into the Rupununi.

5.15 p.m.

Many of us are wondering why certain Roman Catholic priests are not entitled to go to the Rupununi. When I was there the same Reverend attended a meeting of the ranchers’ and farmers’ association of which Mrs. Hart was the secretary. We wondered what was the reason because he knew what was taking place there. I have my own idea about the whole affair of the Rupununi and if one should think clearly about it, one would find out and get the answer.

How is it that I cannot go back to the Rupununi? How is it that the security forces allowed arms and ammunition to go into our territory, when 10,000 rounds were found on certain premises? That makes me believe that the whole plot is an imperialist plot. Many people are trying to accuse Venezuela but we must understand that both Guyana and Venezuela among other countries of the world today are dominated by the United States of America and therefore for us to try to raise over \$7 million for defence does not make any sense. Our country could be very well protected by the ordinary police and security forces that we have trained. They would surely defend us and the civilians would give a hand.

Some people are accusing the United Force. I am accusing the imperialists and not the United Force, because the P.N.C. and the U.F. both of them are a part of imperialism. One is saying, "Is it I?" and the other is saying, "Is it you?" and so on. Those people in the P.P.P. who are studying and reading and who have vision, know exactly what happened in the 2nd January uprising. We have now seen where the Government has appointed a person, who actually owns the whole of the Mazaruni, as the chairman of the Interior Development Corporation. We feel that those people who have been appointed by this Government to be members of that Corporation – the two persons who represent the Amerindians – really do not know what they are about.

I was glad to see that the Government appointed an Amerindian recently to the Amerindian Lands Commission. It should have been done long ago but this chairman of the Interior Development Corporation, this tyrant, this big exploiter, will continue the same old story of robbing the people of their wealth. I wonder what action the Government will take in relation to the drinking at Tumereng and other places which are controlled by the Correias. One bottle of rum costs \$10. I was glad when I heard the announcement of a development committee for Amerindians but I know there will be hardly any development among the Amerindians. We need men of ability to project the Amerindian's views. We do not want a yes-man, who will just put up his hand. We do not want a man who will have to take orders from his party.

11.3.69

National Assembly

5.15–5.25 p.m.

I welcome the plan by the Government to develop our interior but all these plans are only to assist the P.N.C. in making strongholds in the interior. We know what is going on. Presently, there are reports coming to me – up to today. At the Amerindian hostel, people are hungry. They want jobs, they cannot obtain work.

5.25 p.m.

The Amerindians have been by-passed.

Mr. Speaker: Time.

Mr. Hamid: I beg to move that the hon. Member be given a further 15 minutes to complete his speech.

Mr. Lall: *Seconded.*

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Stoby: I wish now to deal with the question of unemployment and how it would affect the people in the Interior. Companies are introducing machine to fell trees – to cross cut – and as a result of this many people are put out of jobs. There are a number of Amerindians who are unemployed at the moment. There was large scale retrenchment at C.D.C. and Toolsie Persaud because of the increase in mechanisation. This is a serious state of affairs and I urge this Government to do something about the situation. [*Interruption by an hon. Member.*] Mr. Speaker, this man is just raising my nerves! [*Laughter*] When the PPP adopted the same co-operative spirit, these same people were saying bad things and discouraging people from ...

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member is referring to hon. Members of the House do not say “these people”.

Mr. Stoby: We have serious problems facing us today. I feel that the Government should do something to remedy the situation, this terrible situation of unemployment, otherwise things will certainly get worst.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what goes on at the Hostel when Amerindians come down from other areas for medical treatment at the Georgetown Hospital. I make reference to a particular case where a girl was starved because she did not consent herself to ... *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Let the hon. Member proceed.

Mr. Stoby: I feel that the policies and plans that are in this Budget will only bring further hardship and disaster to all the Guyanese people, including the Amerindians. It is my wish that the hon. Minister should seriously reconsider the proposals in this Budget in the interest of all Guyanese. *[Applause]*

The Parliamentary Secretary, Minister of Local Government (Mr. Duncan): Mr. Speaker, for the first time we are free from domination of colonialists. When I say so, I mean that during the past four years, we had been dominated by colonialists who now call themselves “the independent opposition”. Honourable Members might say that this was a P.N.C. Government. It would not be right to describe the last Government as such. The fact is that it was a P.N.C. led Government.

When I say that we had colonialists during the past four years, I mean that the United Force believes and supported the “white supremacy.” That party felt that it could have always kept the Amerindians under that belief – the belief that there must be white supremacy in Guyana. It is rather unfortunate that we do not have all the United Force Members of Parliament present today. It is a well known fact that that party has no practical intention of having the Amerindians integrated into the Guyanese society as such. This is why there is not an Amerindian Member of Parliament sitting on the United Force Benches. It is surprising to know

that, now-a-days, we seem to have additional Amerindian representatives in the Opposition. Some of them are “certified” Amerindians. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Duncan: On this side of House, we will always have natural Amerindian representatives. [**Hon. Members (Government):**“Hear, hear.”] We will not cry out for certificates in order to be qualified as Amerindians. *[Interruption]* On this side of the House, there is multi-racial representation and the P.N.C. believes in practical integration of the Amerindians into the Guyanese society. *[Cheers]* We have already started practical consultative democracy among the Amerindians. The PNC believes in practical consultative democracy and it would not be right for the hon. Member Mr. Stoby to state that the recent Conference of Amerindian Chiefs was not the first time they came together. [**Mr. Ram Karran:** “You are talking about the circus at Queen’s College?”] He has referred to his attempt in getting these Amerindians to come together, but he was not successful.

The recent gathering of Amerindian leaders showed that they have confidence in the socialist Government. [**Hon. Members (Government):**“Hear! Hear!”]

If I may I refer to some of the things suggested by the hon. Member Mr. Sutton for the development of the Amerindians. He suggested that these Amerindians must first be educated before they are brought into practical integration into the Guyanese society. As I said, we are practical men in this side of the House. [**Mr. Ram Karran:** “Not all.”] [**Mr. Hamid:** “The ladies are included too?”] *[Laughter]*

Already, there are Amerindian scholarships. There are Amerindian nurses and orderlies. We have Amerindians as Agriculturalists. At the recent Conference of Amerindian Chiefs, Mr. Maurice Bennett was chosen by the leaders as their representative on the Lands Commission. *[Cheers]*

Some time ago it was said by one hon. Member of the Opposition that I never spoke in this House. This was a lie because I have spoken here on two occasions. [**Hon. Members:** “But we did not hear you.”] But, as I said, on this side of the House we do not believe in talking; we do not speak for the sake of speaking. [**Hon. Members (Government):** “Hear, hear.”] What has become the practice among members of the Opposition is that they talk for the sake of talking; they make no constructive criticism and give no practical suggestions as to how the Government should solve these problems.

The revolt in the Rupununi has been referred to by hon. Members of the Opposition many times. There was an allegation that Amerindians had been slaughtered. There is no truth in this. As representatives of the people in this House they have taught not only Amerindians but other people in Georgetown and on the coastlands to lie. In the streets one will hear how many Amerindians have been slaughtered during the revolt in the Rupununi. We find on that side of the House people who are liars and who are creating more liars outside of this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: May I just explain to the hon. Member that we do not in the House refer to another hon. Member as a liar or as having told a lie. There might be misrepresentation, but not a lie. The same meaning is covered in Parliament by speaking of a terminological inexactitude. The hon. Member may continue now.

Mr. Duncan: I should say that they are strangers to the truth. [*Applause*]

The question of land ownership of the Amerindians has been referred to by the members of the Opposition. I have already stated that there is now an Amerindian representative on the Amerindian Land Commission. In the past the Amerindians seemed to believe that the Commission was not representing Amerindians. Since we came into office we have built confidence in the Amerindian that this Government will serve the interest of all Guyanese. [**Hon. Members (Government):** “Hear, hear.”]

I wish also to refer to the expression of incompetence by the ex-Minister, the hon. Member Mr. Cheeks. He referred to the many things he could not do during the regime of the last Government and he stated that he would be speaking in the interest of Amerindians. I wish to say that some of us in the last Government suffered from limited freedom of movement and limited freedom of speech because of the presence of his party, the United Force. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Order! order!

Mr. Duncan: It is not a strange thing to find that when someone is in business with a partner there must be quarrels.

I do not wish to be long, but I wish to say that this P.N.C. Government is only two and a half months old and we have already started practical work to integrate the Guyanese to one people. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Member make his speech.

Mr. Duncan: I am saying that the last Government cannot be accused of doing nothing for Amerindians during the last four years, but Amerindians and hon. Members must now learn that this Government will do everything in its power to let them enjoy all the amenities that have been afforded to the people on the coastlands. They will no longer be strangers to the Government.

We have as one of our priorities that Amerindians are to form part of our civilisation, but it would not be right for this Government to develop Amerindians alone. We say it would be right for us to develop the interior as a whole without referring to any racial group in the interior. I do not think it will be proper for us to continue to describe them as Amerindians, certified or uncertified – *[Laughter]* - because this kind of name forms a barrier between other Guyanese and the Amerindians themselves.

I wish to make my last point about guaranteed titles to land for Amerindians. There will be legislation to guarantee to them the lands to which they are entitled. [**Hon. Members:** “Hear, hear!”]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Teekah.

Mr. Teekah: Mr. Speaker, my contribution to this debate will take the form, first of all, of analysing the proposed taxes and then I shall deal specifically with the field of education with respect to this Budget that has been presented to this House. In the course of my contribution I also wish to make some very constructive criticism which, I sincerely hope, will be of some benefit to the Government.

First of all, in analysing the Budget Speech I have observed that the sum of \$15.14 million will be raised by way of taxation. I have also observed that this is going to be a tremendous burden on a very poor populace.

In the Development Programme 1966 – 1972 the Government had indicated that it only intended to raise, by way of taxation, the sum of \$10 million which was necessary for that Development Programme. If this Budget is passed and if the new taxation measures are all approved, it will mean that the sum of \$58.3 million would have been raised by way of taxation instead of the \$10 million which, in 1966, the then P.N.C. – U.F. Government said it intended to raise from 1966 – 1972.

5.45 p.m.

Since 1966, the Government has raised, by way of taxation, the sum of \$58.3 million from the people of Guyana. I want to draw this to the attention of the people of Guyana. This is 583 per cent above what was originally intended to be raised. It is indeed an alarming burden on the shoulders and backs of the working people of this country. Is this not fiscal madness? Is this

not craziness on the part of a Government that hopes to get its support from the ordinary people, the masses of this country?

Let us see how the taxes are to be raised. I would imagine that, when the hon. Minister of Finance was thinking of taxation, his eyes were all over the place searching for persons on whom and commodities, etc. on which he could put taxes, because this is very much revealing of the Budget which has been presented to this House.

Let me deal, first of all, with the 3 per cent Bill of Entry Tax which is referred to in the Budget Speech as the defence levy. The Government says that the reason why this tax has to be imposed is because there is a threat of Venezuela invasion. I would not deal here with the pros and cons of this threat. My hon. Colleagues who spoke before me made mention of this and I am sure those from this side of the Opposition who will speak after me will also deal very capably with this matter.

However, I would have thought that this Government, which has some degree of support from the working people of this country, would not have looked towards these people for the \$7 million which it hopes to raise. All right, let us assume that the Venezuelans' threat becomes a reality. The Government wants to raise \$7 million. Is this the correct way to do it? [**An hon. Member** (Government): "Tell us how."] I will tell you how.

I know for a fact that if Venezuela invades Guyana it will be the ordinary people and not the wealthy, who will be called upon to defend this country, and the people of this country. The masses are not wealthy and I know you will have to call upon them to shed their sweat, their flesh, their blood, to defend our nation. Why give them additional burden?

The Minister states – and I quote from page 72 of the Budget Speech:

“The tax has been levied in this way so that everyone will make a contribution.”

Why must the masses make a financial contribution? Why has the tax not been put on the expatriate funds which would not lend physical support to defend Guyana? Why do we not have division of labour? This is our country, our nation to defend. If this country is really invaded, the ordinary people will lend their strength, their support; they will give all they can, they will give that which they have to give. But what they do not have is money, financial support.

Why does the Government not get down to the task of dividing the burden? This is absentee ownership in many places in this country. There are people who would not lift a finger to defend this country, because they are not here, in the first instance. Where will you find Sir Jock Campbell? Where will you find Mr. Bookers, if he is alive? Where will you find Mr. Sandbach Parker? Who is Mr. Reynolds, or Mr. Demba? They are not here. You will find people who are in the Public Gallery. You will find the masses who voted for the P.P.P. and the P.N.C. Why do we not ask the masses to give physical support which they actually have – strength, energy, courage, valour and heroism? Why do we not ask those who would not be here on the firing-line to give what they can afford to give, to give money? They send millions of dollars out of this country. Let us take the \$7 million from the expatriate companies in this country.

That is why I feel that this Government lacks intellectual ability and also the nimbleness of intellect that it accuses us of not having. I should like the hon. Minister of Finance to take my remarks into consideration when he is going to give his honourable reply. I am very much concerned because I talk to the ordinary people of this country every day. I know that they are poor, naked and hungry and, therefore, let us not ask them to give what they do not have, let us ask them to give what they have.

Let me move on to the consumption taxes that have been proposed. In the Budget Speech the Minister spoke about unfair competition in certain industries, and this exists especially or particularly in cases where goods that are produced in Guyana are being sent here from other CARIFTA member countries, from those enterprises that enjoy certain tax concessions – import duty concessions. I agree that there ought not to be unfair competition and that local

11.3.69

National Assembly

5.45–5.55 p.m.

manufacturers must not suffer as a result of CARIFTA but, although I agree that the manufacturers must not be the ones to suffer, I will staunchly be against and would oppose vigorously any proposal that would cause the consumers to suffer. If the consumption taxes are passed – probably they will be passed if the Minister does not make an alteration – it means that what this P.N.C. Government is trying to do is to raise from the consumers the \$2 million which it was formerly receiving from the manufacturers in this country.

5.55 p.m.

On page 74 the hon. Minister said:

“In order to recover the revenue lost by this concession, appropriate consumption taxes will be levied on the final product consumed in the country.”

I ask the question: Does this Government sincerely believe this will assist those persons who support it? All right. The Government does not want to lose the \$2 million revenue so it will take off the \$2 million from the manufacturer and extract the \$2 million from the ordinary working people. I wonder how the hon. Minister of Labour felt when it was brought to his attention for approval.

What should have been done, what it should have been is,

“the Government has promised that, where an industry faces competition from a similar industry in another Carifta country, it will match duty-free concessions on raw materials given in that country”.

Full stop. Yes, it should have stopped right here. It should not proceed to extract \$2 million from the consumer. When we say that the Government is pro-capitalist, we are justified because if it is going to raise the \$2 million from the workers which it was raising from the manufacturers, now certainly the policy is to ease the capitalist, tax the consumers, tax the workers. I should sincerely

like a reply from the hon. Minister of Finance and see how he can reconcile that with his effort to woo the working people.

I shall deal with the additional import duties on luxury and semi-luxury goods. One of the Members on this side of the House did mention something about these additional duties that have been proposed on certain imported goods but there is a funny thing about this whole matter, which made me laugh when I read it on page 75. I quote:

“I consider that certain luxury and semi-luxury items could well bear some additional taxation.”

When I read that, I checked the supplement of the *Official Gazette* of Friday, 28th February, 1969, and on page 18 I observed that among the commodities to taxed were spoons n forks, electric tools and appliances. Mr. Speaker, since when these things like tools are luxury or semi-luxury commodities? Is it not very funny? Not in the sense that it is strange, but it is hilarious that tools are luxuries. It is most humorous.

Knives and forks are found in almost every non-Indian Hon. Member. The poorest Afro-Guyanese in his Hon. Member you will find knives and forks because the use of these things has become a part of the civilisation, it is part of the culture, and therefore one would have thought they were necessities. I was born at Parika where Indo-Guyanese would eat with their fingers but the Afro-Guyanese would eat with knives and forks. They are necessities where these people are concerned and you can never regard them as luxuries.

Another thing – portable electric tools. I heard the hon. Minister of Finance talking about doing homework. Well, what I would like to ask, are we regressing or are we progressing? These are the days of technology and science, and portable electric tools are used by workers show a development, an acknowledgement, a forward step, and we do not want to go back to the days when one would take a saw and blow out so many ounces of water from his body. It is a tiring

exercise. Portable electric tools have become something which this nation is proud of. The Government says it wants to promote industry. We want to go forward. We want to increase productivity. That is why I am alarmed at finding such things in the supplement.

Another tax that worries me a little bit is the professional tax. I am a teacher and teachers are not included here. I have observed with very great concern that a man's profession today has become to him what his dog is. A man's profession is being taxed. If you have a dog you have to have a licence. If you have a profession, which should be encouraged, you have to have a licence to practise it. In reading from the Budget Speech we have noted that the Minister was very much concerned about those professionals who dodge tax. They do not send correct returns therefore they are able to evade the proper amount of income tax they should actually pay.

What is necessary and what would solve the problem is to work out a fool-proof system where these people could not indulge in improper returns of income, because the penalty of licence gives these professional an excuse to transmit the cost of this licence to their clients. This means the Government would not be getting anywhere. It is not the professional the Government would be getting money from, but the persons who will be going to the professionals. What the Government would be doing in the long run would be taxing the ordinary workers where it fails to extract that sum of money from the professionals.

6.05 p.m.

The other loophole in this proposal is that the Minister is very vague in his proposal. He did not say how much the licence would be. He said during the course of the debate he will give the amount. That shows clearly that it has been done in haste. The second point is that the entire proposal is very unequal is so far as all professionals are concerned –

- (a) What about those professionals, doctors, especially, who work with the Government and who practise part time. Will they have to pay this licence fee?

(b) What about those people who are advanced in age?

There are quite a few of them. I remember when I was at Sibley Hall, the Government sent a dentist. One could have seen that the man was in the evening of his years/ take for instance a man like him. [Mr. Green: “You sure it was not Cheddi?”] [Laughter] Such a man – [Mr. Jordon: “He is dead.”] – would be called upon to pay the same sum in so far as a licence is concerned as that of another person who works all the time, and who has all the vigour to work for more money? I think this is a very awkward position; and a scale ought to be properly worked out. And when properly worked out, this scale should cover all the special categories of persons.

Then you have also to take into consideration the fact that not all professionals could be tagged together. You cannot generalise or lump everybody in on basket. One has got to be very careful so that the idea will not be unequalled. It would not be properly accepted by the people. This is not the way to tackle the problem. The proper way, I reiterate, is to work out a foolproof system so that those persons who are dodging income tax will be called upon to pay justly the sums required.

There is another offensive tax called “Exit Tax”. I observed that this tax will bring a return of \$0.4 million. It means that exit certificates or what is commonly known as Airport Tax, will increase from \$2 to \$3. I think that the Government is really taking advantage of the population. I will also tell you why. I have travelled in some advanced countries, for example, Britain and Switzerland. In those advanced countries, one does not pay such large sums for exit. Even in the Caribbean, we do not pay so much. And in these countries, the standard of living is much higher and the earning power is also higher. It means that the people in those countries can afford to pay more because of the higher standard of living and higher earning power.

In Guyana, we have such a comparatively low standard where the earning power of the working class is very weak and there has been a wage freeze since 1965, such heavy tax should

not be imposed. And even if this tax is raised to \$10 and an individual wishes to leave the country he has got to either take one or reject the other. This is really taking advantage, and I mean every single tenet of the meaning of the word. This will affect students very much, because they will have to leave, and this Government will only be squeezing them just because of the necessity to do so. What a shame on this Government!

Mr. Speaker: Time.

Mr. Chandisingh: I beg to move that the hon. Member be given 15 minutes to complete his speech.

Mr. Remmington: *Seconded.*

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Teekah: It means, Mr. Speaker, that \$15.14 million will be raised in this budget, when passed, from the ordinary people of this country. What bothers me most is that regardless of the logic of the arguments, the Government will still go ahead with it. Further, the sum of \$15.14 million will be raised in tax and let us examine how this money and other sums will be spent in so far as this Government has been budgeting.

Let me deal with the field of education. Firstly, I have noted that the sum of \$21.4 million will be spent on education. This sum seems large; but when one compares it with the other divisions in the Estimates and when one compares it with the increases therein, the alarm is raised.

In her last contribution to this House during the debate on the Thorne Speech, the hon. Minister of Education spoke very glibly about priorities and I was expecting to hear how very high “education” was placed among those of the priorities of the Government.

One would have thought that education would have received the highest priority. What deserves to be given higher priority than education? Perhaps only industrial or agricultural development.

I have also noted that the Government spoke about Efficiency Campaign. With the Efficiency Campaign, of course, there will be the off-shoot, greater productivity. If workers are not being provided for in so far as a sound education is concerned, then it means that efficiency and productivity will be affected. If there is to be greater efficiency and greater productivity then education must be given far and wide and very deeply.

The sum of \$21.4 million is to be spent on current and capital estimates. This is only a 4 per cent increase on last year's approved Estimated. Last year the sum of \$20.5 million was voted. It was approved and this year the sum is \$21.4 million. When we compare this with what is being spent in the Ministry of Information we see the great disparity on emphasis. For example, last year the sum of \$0.5 million was approved for the Ministry of Information. This year the sum of \$1.2 million is being proposed. If this is passed, the vote will be 140 per cent more than last year's for the Ministry of Information while the Government has only given a 4 per cent increase in education. That is why I should have like to have spoken earlier this afternoon while the students were there in the gallery. *[Interruption]*

What does the Ministry of Information do? Every day at 1 o'clock there is a programme on the Government radio station GBS called "World Tomorrow". The announcer speaks only about America, divorce cases, military intervention and such nonsense, things that have no relevance to Guyana. But he occupies half an hour of radio time from 1 o'clock every day. What else does one hear? Things that are completely irrelevant and very dishonest and untrue are being peddled over the air, over GBS. For example, one night I was listening to a programme and a parson was speaking. In the opening sentence he said, "We want peace in the world. Yes, there should be peace; that was a desirable thing being sought by people. Everyone wants peace but recently we were shocked that the latest peace letter by President Johnson has been returned by President Ho-Chi-Minh of Vietnam and the war in Vietnam continues". What utterly false

11.3.69

National Assembly

6.15 – 6.25 p.m.

propaganda is this! Every intelligent Guyanese who understands what is happening in this world knows that Vietnam has been affected, not America. Therefore the ware aggressors are not in Vietnam they are in America. Yet our radio station propagandises this in order to fool the Guyanese nation and to brain-wash the people into something which is completely untrue and completely false. Yet this year we will vote \$1.4 million for the Ministry of Information that is responsible for this.

Another very alarming thing is to see the sum of money to be voted for Division V, Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Again there is an alarming increase. Last year's total in the Approved Estimates was \$3.9 million. This year the total is going to be \$7.4 million. This is an increase of 89 per cent over last year's Approved Estimate for the Office of the Prime Minister where there is so much travelling and entertainment and many outriders all over the place. We are to spend ... and 140 per cent more on the Ministry of Information 89 per cent more this year on the Office of the Prime Minister but we can only squeeze out a 4 per cent increase for the Ministry of Education. Yet the Minister of Education (Mrs. Patterson) said that education was high on the ladder of priorities. What does she mean by priorities?

I now move to another observation of mine that was very disturbing. I checked to see what the Government is going to do about In-Service Training of teachers. During the course of the debate on the Throne Speech I had cause to mention the fact that In-Service Training of teachers is severely harnessed in this country. I mentioned that in 1964 there were 9 in-service training centres for teachers and 7 were closed down by the Coalition Government.

The Larby Report spoke about trying to get at least 50 per cent of the 70 per cent untrained teachers trained by 1970. If one looks back at what the P.P.P. Government was doing one would clearly see that it was very concerned about teacher-training and that is why it established 9 In-Service Training Centres to reduce the number of untrained teachers from 70 per cent to 20 per cent in 1970.

11.3.69

National Assembly

6.15 – 6.25 p.m.

I read with extreme astonishment in the *Sunday Graphic* of March 9, 1969, what the Minister of Education said at the graduation ceremony for the 1966 – 1968 batches of teachers at Queen's College. I quote:

“The Minister observed that one half of the nation's teachers remain untrained. In primary schools there was about one trained teacher to every 106 students; and in the secondary school one trained teacher to every 112 children.

What is worse for the future of our country is that of these trained teachers the greater number is in Georgetown ... 479 trained teachers in Georgetown; 338 on the East Coast Demerara; 43 in the Rupununi area and 20 in the North West District.”

6.25 p.m.

She went on to say – and I quote:

“You must have heard of the slogan used in the past and in other countries ‘each one teach one’.”

She exhorted them to teach their colleagues. If this is the way the Minister of Education hopes to have the teachers trained in this country, it certainly shows that she is poorly conversant with teacher training, and I learnt from her that she has been a teacher in her earlier years.

It is shocking to know that that is how the Government is going to train people. Every teacher knows that the instructions carried out in a school can only extend as far as end of year examinations are concerned – the First year, Second year, Third year and Fourth year. There are no facilities to train teachers. Headmasters, deputy headmasters, etc. could only instruct for the examinations mentioned.

That is not the alternative to the Training College. It is impossible for one to conceive that this is going to be the alternative. Really, this is very poor foresight. It shows lack of understanding in the field of teacher training and reflects very poorly on the Minister of

Education and her Ministry as a whole. That is why I would proceed to show the reflection here in the Estimates. In 1968 the sum of \$156,000 was voted for In-Service Teacher Training and the amount to be voted this year is \$113,911. There is a decrease in the amount to be voted. How concerned is the Government with In-Service Teacher Training if it is going to vote a smaller sum this year than last year, if it is going to have more than the two in-service centres in operation – the one in Georgetown and the one in New Amsterdam? And still the Government is extremely concerned about the people who are not trained! One indeed has to be a simpleton, an ignoramus, or possibly a nincompoop to believe that.

I wish to tackle the question of higher education. When one studies what is happening with higher education in this country, it is indeed shocking to know that this is how the Government is looking after education. I have made a study of what is going to be the position of the University of Guyana this year. I have noticed that the sum of \$2,452,000 will be committed to the University of Guyana for 1969. I have also noticed that an amount of \$360,000 will be contributed to the University of the West Indies. If one really understands what is happening here, it would cause tremendous amazement. Why? There are less than four scores of students at the University of the West Indies and approximately 800 students at the University of Guyana. If one breaks this down, one would see clearly that about £1,000 - \$4,800 G – per year is being spent on each Guyanese student at the University of the West Indies, an institution that does not belong to Guyana.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this is a good point at which we could suspend then. This sitting is suspended until 8 p.m.

Sitting suspended at 6.30 p.m.

On resumption --

Mr. Speaker: At the time of the suspension the time voted for the hon. Member Mr. Teekah was up. If he wishes to continue, he will need another extension.

Mr. Ram Karran: I beg to move that the hon. Member be given an extension of 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Balchand Persaud: *Seconded.*

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Teekah: When the Adjournment was taken I was comparing the amount being contributed to the University of the West Indies with the amount being spent on the University of Guyana. I was making the point that the sum being spent on each student at the U.W.I. is something like \$4,800 as against \$2,313 on each student at the University of Guyana. I have noted that the sum of \$2,452,000 has been allocated to the University of Guyana for this year but \$1,601,000 is specifically for the construction of the University building at Turkeyen. Therefore, the actually sum being spent on the students is \$1,851,000, and if there are 800 students it works out to \$2,313 per student.

Where is the intelligence that makes it imperative for so much money to be contributed to the University of the West Indies every year? For example, in 1963 the sum was \$1.8 million. We withdrew from the University of the West Indies that year, and the following year, 1964 with the University of Guyana set up, the sum voted was \$489,600. Following the same vein in 1965, the P.N.C./U.F. Government brought the amount down to \$192,800 and then in 1966 to the very low sum of \$124,800.

This is good because while we are trying to expand our own University, more and more students would be able to have higher education right here in Guyana and fewer and fewer students will be required to attend the U.W.I. It was rather surprising that, in 1967, there was a

steep increase in the contribution to the U.W.I. In 1967 the amount contributed was \$302,400. In 1968 the amount contributed was \$360,000 which is the same amount to be contributed this year. The students at the U.W.I. have to pay very high fees and I cannot see the logic in contributing so much money to the U.W.I. when we can spend the same money here and develop the University of Guyana which is much cheaper in so far as fees are concerned.

8.15 p.m.

It is no sense – I hope that the hon. Minister in her reply will say – saying that the West Indies institution is just like the Guyana institution. If the Government wants a regional institution of higher learning, then close down the U.G. and have the U.W.I. If that is the policy, come to the House straight and just say it, but do not have this half-way method. Come to the Parliament and to the nation and explain to them what the Government has in mind. I think this may seem to be some commonsense on the Government. There is no need to allocate \$1.6 million for the construction of a building at Turkeyen. The Government is constructing a building to house that University and yet it wastes money on the U.W.I.

What I do not understand is the fact that a Guyanese Professor, Dr. Walter Rodney, was driven out of that University and the country where it is situated not too long ago. When others tried to attach him to the U.G., when the Academic Board made this recommendation, the Board of Governors was so callous as to reject it. Of course, he has to go to Africa where he can offer his services and this is very much in contradiction to the Government's pronouncements about wanting specialists and intellectuals home. Has he no place in Guyana?

If they say they have no money, \$360,000 can take care of a Professor.

There is need for a Professor of his quality at the U.G. There are many things that are short there and there are many things to be done. For example, you have no Faculty of Medicine, no Faculty of Engineering or of Agriculture. A Faculty which the P.P.P. had wanted to set up

there at the U.G. was the Faculty of Afro-Oriental Studies. One would have thought it very much relevant to the P.N.C.'s philosophy of the support of black power. This Government speaks a lot of black power and, therefore, one would have thought that it would have accommodated such a faculty at the U.G. This is not honest of the part of the P.N.C. because it has no intention of having a Faculty of Afro-Oriental Studies at the U.G. and it has shown nothing that it is interested.

Another very important department I would urge Government to set up at the U.G. is a National Institute of Scientific Research. There is nothing in this country to co-ordinate scientific research. Why cannot the money be used to set up such an Institute which could be of benefit to scientific studies in this country? This would contribute to the development of Guyana. I am amazed to know that the Minister, or the Ministry of Education, of the Government, cannot find it possible or convenient to have such an Institute. There is nothing to conduct any form of scientific research in this country. This thing is very much needed at the U.G. All the students there would tell you that this is extremely essential but still, the Government would say: We have to give priorities and give a free hand to the Board of Governors, and so we cannot give you a National Institute of Research.

I come to the very callous piece of literature which has been sent out by the Ministry of Education to all Masters and Mistresses. It was written on 29th January, 1969 and it is headed "Guyana Week Celebrations 1969."

"The Theme for the 1969 Observance of Guyana Week 'Love Your Country' is taken from the opening Broadcasts to Schools programme on 10th January, 1969, delivered by the Acting Minister of Education, Hon. Martin Carter.

In this choice of theme we wish to draw the attention of Headmasters and teachers to the previous themes, 'Know Your Country' of 1967 and 'Serve Your Country' of 1966. The definition of the word 'Love' which we wish to emphasise in the theme will be found in the Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary where it is described as

'a feeling of strong personal attachment induced by sympathetic understanding.'

It therefore includes the sense of being faithful and loyal to the Government, and the theme may be emphasised in the following ways...”

And it goes down to say, I quote:

“In addition, arrangements are being made to supply every Headmaster with an official statement on the Rupununi uprising and the Beria plot as instances to be explained to children what is meant by the term ‘Loyal to the Government.’”

They were talking here about love you country which I have absolutely no quarrel with but then this circular – the author is Mr. Basil deRusche, Secretary, National History and Arts Council – went out of its way to speak of loyalty to the Government. This is irrelevant. To love your country is good. But you do not expect to rig the elections, you do not expect to have a fraudulent and illegal regime which the people will love and be loyal to. There is a distinction between defending Guyana and defending the Government of Guyana, a qualitative difference between defending the people of Guyana and defending the Government of Guyana. Who will defend that illegal and unjust Government who is now in control of the reins of administration?

It is the inalienable right of the citizen to overthrow, to get rid of, any Government that is unjust and illegal. I think that is why you have general elections so that people can pass judgement upon the Government and especially if a Government is illegally elected, more than ever, the people are willing and anxious, in a hurry, to get rid of that Government.

Mr. Speaker: Time.

Mr. Teekah: I need just five minutes more.

8.25 p.m.

So, therefore, it is really irrelevant and lacks profundity that the Government would expect people to extend loyalty to it. I can understand a person loving his country; that is necessary. But

not the Government.

Probably, the most offensive paragraph in the entire circular is the one which states, and I re-quote:

“In addition, arrangements are being made to supply every Headmaster with an official statement on the Rupununi uprising and the Beria plot as instances to be explained to children what is meant by the term ‘loyalty to the Government.’”

Mr. Speaker, since when the Ministry of Education has become the private property of the P.N.C.? This Ministry is being used to attack and demolish the Government’s political opponents and brain wash the children of this country – our sons and daughters. Imagine the Ministry of Education doing this type of thing. The Ministry of Education, as I understand it, is to administer in the interest of the nation but no to be used in this underhand manner. Why has this Government not found it necessary to talk about the 200 detonators which were found in a certain individual’s yard? *[Interruption]* Why has the Government not found it necessary to talk about the chasing out of certain people from Wismar? This is a piece of villainy, steeped in bigotry and characteristic of the diabolical winds of those who unjustly and illegally govern this country. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let the hon. Member proceed.

Mr. Teekah: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that education has drifted down the channel very far and something ought to be done to out the Ministry of Education in better shape so that the motto: “We mould the Nation” – of the teachers may be fully implemented. I have sympathy with the person who is now Minister of Education because she is such a wonderful person. **[Hon. Members (Government):** “Hear! Hear!”]

I wish to warn the more progressive elements of the Government like my good friend the hon. Member Mr. Haynes and the hon. Minister of Education (Mrs. Patterson) to take heed of the

writing on the wall because the masses are a very invincible force and when that force starts to sweep all and sundry will be affected and I recall at this moment the poet Carter who wrote: all are involved, all are consumed. I want to sound a note of warning because all of you are involved and all will be consumed. *[Applause]*

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

The Minister of Education (Mrs. Patterson): Mr. Speaker, at this moment I am a little sad. I really ought not to be. Perhaps, I was hoping for too much. When the hon. Member Mr. Teekah began his contribution to this debate, I hoped for great things because he promised us some constructive criticisms. I remember, and correct me, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong, that at the beginning of his intervention he expressed that the Public Gallery was not as full as he had hoped and therefore, I think I can excuse the last part of his contribution as being an attempt to appeal to a section outside of this honourable House.

However, we have a serious job ahead. The serious problem is what to do in our country as regards education. I would like to start with higher education because the hon. Member spent some time on this. He made high sounding recommendations as regards what our priorities ought to be. Unfortunately, he is on the wrong side of the House to effect that priority and an opportunity will never come into being. But what is slightly amusing, if it were not serious is that there was an opportunity to make these sounding achievements which opportunity was not taken advantage of.

The University of Guyana came into effect during the regime of the PPP at the end of 1964. At that time we were dealing with an institution that had enrolled in the last term of 1964, 240 students. Mr. Speaker, you might be interested to know that, in the last academic year, there were 771 students enrolled. This is not of in itself greatest importance to the University now. What is more important is the type of courses being offered at the University.

11.3.69

National Assembly

8.25 – 8.35 p.m.

The hon. Member Mr. Teekah tried to compare our contribution to the University of the West Indies with what we are spending on the University of Guyana. He deliberately cancelled the fact that the courses at UWI are precisely the expensive ones – Medicine, Agriculture, Architecture, etc. In fact, the University of Guyana is doing courses which to some extent have reflected the disorientation that was left in 1964; but to a great extent has been remedied since 1964. In addition to the normal kind of degrees, the University is now offering Diploma Courses and Certificate Courses for senior civil servants and medical technologists.

In the new academic year which begins in 1969, the Department of Technological Studies will be opened at our new campus at Turkeyen. This is the first time in the history of our country that our University will have diploma courses in higher technology. By this, we are endeavouring to train the type of Guyanese who would be first-class technicians to assist our professional engineers in our development programme.

8.35 p.m.

This is, indeed, a new departure within our University. It is the kind of direction in which we are going with intensity. In addition – and this is particularly related to our situation in education and in teacher training – the University has begun a Faculty of Education. Already this Faculty has made an impact on the community in terms of the research it has been doing, in terms of the co-operation that has proved possible between the Ministry of Education and the Faculty of Education and in terms of the Development at the University of the Teacher Diploma course which endeavours to train our graduates who now teach, to give them teacher training so that in the secondary schools there will be person academically qualified as well as teacher trained. In the immediate future the University of Guyana has very concrete plans for playing an even more important role in the training of secondary school teachers. These are some of the things the University of Guyana is doing.

The hon. Member Mr. Teekah has used a lot of figures. I do not know quite how he arrived at some of his figures. I wonder, in fact, whether we are using the same book of Estimates. It is either that he misread them accidentally, or perhaps he has been guilty of what he himself describes as intellectual manoeuvring. Perhaps he does not feel it is important. We are this this year spending on the University of Guyana \$3 million. I need not remind hon. Members that in 1964 when we took over this institution the previous Government had been spending less than half a million dollars on the same University. Nevertheless the hon. Members on the other side of the House now come with big plans and proposed suggestions precisely because the challenge does not fall to them.

It will be necessary – and the Government faces the situation – to continue having some of our professionals trained outside of Guyana until we can replace this system by some other way and it will take a long time, precisely because of the question of priorities. Therefore our doctors will continue to be trained outside of Guyana and we will continue to have to pay for the training.

Post-graduate work is already being done at the University of the West Indies and we are attempting to do this at the University of Guyana. It will be some time before we can take over completely by the provision of facilities to make it possible for scholars to do post-graduate work, but as I have said the University of Guyana has made rapid strides since 1964 and the University of Guyana is now recognised throughout the world. [**Hon. Members:** “Hear, hear!”] The external examiners have, in fact, recently commended very highly the type of student that we have been producing.

The place of the University of Guyana in our society is directly connected with the other area of educational activity that seems to have attracted the attention of the hon. Member Mr. Teekah and that is the field of teacher training. I noticed with interest that the hon. Member confined his remarks to in-service training. I think this was deliberately done.

Now, I concede very readily that in 1964 there were eight training centres established for in-service training. There are now two. Six had to be closed down and I would like to tell this honourable House why. I am sure the hon. Members have heard it before but I will tell them again. A system had been introduced called In-Service Teacher Training. The idea was a good one to have training of teachers who were already in the field, but the plans as executed left much to be desired. Teachers who had managed to get a College of Preceptors Certificate were accepted for training in In-Service Training Courses. Teachers manage to get into this In-Service training course with a maximum of three ordinary level subjects. This led to a fantastic situation because the teachers had not the academic content in their training to enable them to benefit from the in-service training as then devised precisely for them.

The In-Service Training Courses were, therefore, not fulfilling as usefully as they could have done the functions which they were designed to fulfil because we found that teachers went in without the necessary high academic background. They could not benefit from the two years course of training that was offered and they left the In-Service Training having done two years of training on paper. This was fine but they were still not competent to teach many of the classes they were called upon to teach.

Therefore, when this Government took over we decided that we would ask for a minimum qualification of four G.C.E. (Ordinary Level) subjects. Having done this we found that in six of these centres we could not find in-service teachers with this kind of qualification to make it worth the while to keep all the centres in operation because of the overhead costs. When we decided to close down the centre at Anna Regina there were four teacher applicants for the in-service programme.

It was not therefore worthwhile to do this kind of exercise at six centres and we adopted what in fact was a reasonable solution to this problem. We sent teachers into those areas which needed teachers and those teachers who could benefit from in-service training we transferred to a school near the centre in New Amsterdam or in Georgetown and trained them. At the end of two

years they will return to their areas as fully qualified teachers, who have the academic content as well as the teacher training to cope with the demands of what used to be called all-age schools in which they are asked to teach. As I see it, the in-service training programme will continue to perform a useful function.

An hon. Member quoted from a speech which I made a few nights ago which illustrated in stark terms what great a need there existed, and still exists, in our schools for trained teachers. I need not make the point that between 1964 and 1968 we have doubled our amount of trained teachers. This is by the way, but the point is that although the In-Service Teacher Training Programme will be continued it will continue to provide training for people who have the academic qualification to benefit from it.

Our emphasis, however, has been on pre-service training. I have already brought to the attention of the House our plans for the erection at Turkeyen of a new Teacher Training College which will have an output of about 300 teachers a year. This will keep up with our annual demand for trained teachers within our schools. It means that there are left about 2,000 teachers now in our schools who will have to be trained in one way or another. Some of these will continue to benefit from in-service training.

8.45 p.m.

At the moment, in-service training produces about 100 teachers per year in Georgetown and about half that number in New Amsterdam. The Government has designed a series of courses which are reflected in our Estimates, and which the hon. Member completely overlooked, for precisely this kind of specific training to teachers who might not benefit from in-service training in specific areas: Mathematics, Science, and other relevant areas.

I was a little surprised at the interpretation given by my hon. Friend of the exhortation I made to teachers "Each one teach one". I was completely amazed that he should regard this as a

substitute for training. I am sure that the teachers to who I spoke have been completely flabbergasted by his interpretation. I find it a little difficult to understand the attitude of my socialist friends because I am aware that this particular motto “Each one teach one” was used quite effectively by one of the heroes – I assume he was a hero – of my colleagues on the other side. It was precisely with this motto that he managed to inspire within Cuba a kind of revolutionary zeal towards education that allowed Cuba to make a take-off. *[Interruptions]*

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mrs. Patterson: In addition to this, this precise watchword was used in a country which I understand is greatly admired by my friends on the other side. I refer to India. In India they found this particularly important in dealing with the problems in education.

I should like to look at our won situation and to see what are the kind of needs we have. I am surprised to find that my socialist friends could regard the acquisition or knowledge as a sort of property right to be kept to oneself. It seems to me that the very essence of socialism in this field would suggest that one should share one’s knowledge not only in this area of training but in any kind of training or education that one has acquired. We live in a country that is moving very rapidly from the state of chaos left in 1964 and, indeed, we have to recondition our attitudes and things like that. It is precisely this point I was trying to make when I spoke about attitudes at my last intervention during the debate on the Throne Speech. This to me is the basic problem that education faces in this country. We need to revise our attitudes.

At that time I remember one of my hon. Friends on the other side was a little alarmed by the fact that it was suggested that a student should be encouraged to become a farmer. It is this kind of attitude that would make us develop an educated elite. Most of us -indeed all of us, for we have had compulsory primary education since the nineteenth century – have been educated to a greater extent at the expenditure of our country. It is, therefore, our duty to share what we have acquired in this way with others around us, and if we have among us the tops of our primary

school education, it is our duty, especially when we proclaim ourselves socialists, to come out and to share this with other people in the country.

I have said that teacher training is a very important priority in our country at this time and, in fact, the hon. Member's interpretation of the estimate is reflected in the figures provided him. I was a little at a loss to know where he quoted his figures from. But looking at our provisions under Head 14, it can be discovered that \$210,000 has been set aside for courses for teachers. He will notice that our allocation for in-service has gone up rather than down, or perhaps he has private sources of information to which I have no access and which completely misinformed him. I think, since we are using these Estimates before the House, hon. Members should stick to the figures shown here.

There is really only one other area in education that I should like to look at. This starts with the multilateral school. I am sorry that the hon. Member Mr. Cheeks is not here because I think it was he who raised this point and in so doing demonstrated a complete lack of understanding what the multilateral programme was about, in addition to which I was a little pained to see that he again spent some time discussing the suitability of the Common Entrance Examination when, unless I was mistaken, at my last intervention of the House, I dealt with this and took the House into my confidence and told Members that this was an examination which the Government was thinking of replacing, but now I reflect I think the hon. Gentleman was not in his seat at that time. Unfortunately, he is not in his seat at this time.

I should like to say that I think it is wrong if we in this House start now to regard the multilateral project as catering for what he calls the lesser qualified student. It is not this at all. As a matter of fact, I think education would have done its task without our country if a child who comes top in whatever examination we have prescribed, chooses to go to a multilateral school because that is the kind of education that is suited to that child, and rejects a schools like Bishops' High School or Queen's College because it does not cater for what the child is

particularly interested in. The multilateral school is not conceived of a second-class school at all. It is designed to give the child the kind of exposure that is needed without our country now.

Perhaps I could do a great service to the House by looking in a little detail at what the multilateral schools are going to attempt to do. Now, in the first phase of this project, the Government intends to have seven multilateral schools, and these will be set up by 1974. I might mention that the first multilateral school will be in Anna Regina where the Government secondary school will be extended. There are two secondary schools which are now being built in Georgetown but existing schools are also going to be extended and converted to complement multilateral schools. The first multilateral school will be in Anna Regina and it will cater for primary schools around that area. It will be a senior school to be serviced by schools around the area and, in addition to this, it is proposed that we build a hostel to accommodate 300 children so that some of the students would be able to come from as far away as Pomeroy. We have already started on a project of teacher housing which is essential for schools in this area, if one is to maintain teachers in this area.

A child will go into a multilateral school at around the age of 11 plus and for three years that pupil will follow a general course. All pupils will be exposed to this course for the first three years. It is a broadly based course which will include English, English Literature, Mathematics, General Science, Social Studies, Spanish, Handicraft, Arts, and also musical and physical education. While the child is going there, teachers trained in guidance will follow that child from primary school to the end of this three-year course and will guide the child into the particular stream for which the child is suited and has inclination. The streams will include Arts, Science, technical studies – one for technicians, one for craftsmen – agricultural, Hon. Member Management, and commercial subjects.

8.55 p.m.

Now a child who is put into one of these streams will not be exposed only to the subject

matter of that stream. Let us assume he is going to do a course in agriculture. This is not the only subject he is doing but he will be exposed to other areas. He will do other subjects that are considered necessary to the formation of his character and relevant to the area from which he comes and what he is going to do, this is the kind of exposure that is necessary in this school but as I suggested, this project must be regarded as part of the whole system of secondary education. This is one type of secondary education and the other schools that now exist will have to be adapted so as to be complementary to those schools.

There are and will be several opportunities for children to enter those schools. Mr. Cheeks seems to believe that a child enters a multilateral school as a result of the Common Entrance examination. In a school like Charlestown Secondary, you have students entering at 14 plus years and 16 plus years. There are feeder schools and the pupils from there are put in secondary schools. This is the pattern followed in many country areas which we have provided in secondary schools. In addition to this, the Government has decided that students from private secondary schools are eligible now to enter Government secondary schools on the basis of the Preliminary Certificate of Education and the College of Preceptors Examination. Already we are in our Ministry engaged in absorbing these students who have passed these examinations.

I do not think it is useful at this stage to try to cover the whole gamut of what we are doing in education. Very briefly, I should like to make a point, that at the present rate of building we expect by 1975 to have solved a situation in primary schools where there is still some overcrowding and where we have come out of a situation where there were many bottom house schools. In the last four years, we have shown a lot of improvement in the quality of the schools. We have been able to meet the demands for primary education and to a large extent in secondary education by the method of Government aid and self-help. We have in fact launched a tremendous programme of school building. We aim to provide 1,000 places per year in primary schools. We have extended our institutions and by 1975 the situation will be better, provided things continue as they are.

I think there will be a further opportunity for us to look at what we are doing in education even in detail and I should like in closing to thank the hon. Members of the Opposition for their contribution in so far as they reflected an attempt to be instructive, and to repeat that I was a little sad to notice that they very often departed from their noble intentions and tried to indulge in political gimmicks.

Mr. M.F. Singh: The speech which we had on the 28th February, 1969 was perhaps the longest Budget Speech in the history of this country. A very long speech but what is very disappointing is that there is such a lack of real thinking in the speech. I hope I will be able to comment on the hon. Minister's speech in a short while as I did read it and I hope I will be able to convince him. To the extent that we expected this speech, as any well conceived Budget Speech, to redistribute income, it did not do so. In the final analysis, what it really did was to place the tax proposals firmly on the shoulders of the masses in the country.

Whereas we were looking forward to some kind of reform in the fiscal system, we note there was none. The tax structure remains the same out of date tax structure we have had. Until the committee to review fiscal policy is set up, apparently we will be left with the same out of date proposals. I hope that when this committee reports, its report will not be treated like the Dobson Report on income tax which has not seen the light of day. I understand that it dared to make proposals to criticise the Government, therefore, the Government decided not to let it see the light of day.

In spite of the Budget Speech, it really flatters, as will be seen and in a short while I will show this House what I mean when I say we do not know what to believe in spite of the Budget Speech. Before I proceed, let us look at what some people have had to say about it, people who are supporters, certainly, of the Government, perhaps even supporters of the party, because I think it is important that the hon. Minister has the views of people not only inside this House but outside this House. I feel there will be need to urge him to change some of the proposals which he has in the Budget Speech. This House must be acquainted with what people outside think

11.3.69

National Assembly

8.55 – 9.05 p.m.

because we are here to make laws for the good of the country as a whole. We must take cognisance of what is said inside and outside the House.

9.05 p.m.

If I may read what the columnist Mr. Carl Blackman said in the *Guyana Graphic* of Sunday 2nd March, 1969. In the 4th paragraph it stated:

“The plain, blunt Ptolemy, spoke from three till sundown and at the end of it all none of us knows for sure whether the axe has fallen on our fingers or on our necks. Of course, he mentioned a three per cent defence levy, a consumers’ tax, a licence to put lawyers, doctors and architects in the same category as cars, radios and dogs and a warning that none shall escape paying his taxes fairly and promptly.

What we have not got yet is an explanation of the Budget in bread and butter terms.”

So much for Mr. Blackman.

I would also like to quote the comments made by a learned gentleman in Guyana in the person of Mr. Maurice Odle, acting Head of the Department of Economics, University of Guyana. I now quote from the *Guyana Graphic* of Friday March 7, 1960, and this is what Mr. Odle said:

“The Budget Speech of 1969 is one of the longest on record. The length of its preamble gave the impression that the Minister of Finance was attempting to put his audience in the frame of mind for something really radical. In the end, however, his taxation proposals fell like a damp squib and one got the feeling of an anti-climax (in this a post-election budget). What we got was another dose of the same old measures.”

It is important that the Minister should take cognisance of these facts. I shall now quote from the *Sunday Chronicle* of March, 1969 under the caption: “No new thing about the Budget”. It states:

“The Budget of a nation should paint in broad outline the road the Government has marked out and the means of traversing that road. The picture of the road is clear and in strong colour, but the revenue measures do not really provide a modern vehicle by which the road can be traversed. The old chariot is there, the same tired horses used; the well-used reins are in evidence. There is really no new thinking.

The measures may bring into the Government’s coffers the required revenue, but even this is not certain. In 1968 revenue fell short of the projected estimates. But even if the revenue projections are realised, it would do so by affecting once again the prices of commodities in common usage.”

Mr. Speaker, let us turn to this monumental document called the Budget Speech. Let us expose some of the inaccuracies or perhaps the hon. Minister would prefer me to say the inexactitudes of this Government. Let us look at page 18 of this document. It is stated:

“Firm statistics indicate that in 1964 the G.D.P. had increased by 3 per cent over what it was for 1963.”

I do not really know where these figures were picked up from because if we were to look at the *Economic Survey of Guyana 1966* issued by the Ministry of Economic Development, on page 8 it states: G.D.P. for the year 1963 was \$275.4 million; and for the year 1964, \$302.9 million showing a profit of 10 per cent and not 3 per cent. One wonders where the hon. Minister got those figures. *[Interruption]*

Again on page 19 of this document it is stated:

“Between 1964 and 1967, income per head of the population increased by as much as 12 per cent.”

Why is it that the figures for the previous year have not been given at all? This budget speech is supposed to review the previous year. The previous year was 1968. The G.D.P. has not been given for 1968. Why? Other figures are given for 1968. Do not tell us that the figures are not available because on page 18 G.D.P. figures are given; on page 21 – private consumption; on page 22 – export of goods and services. Why then have we not been supplied with these figures?

What is the reason for the omission? Is it because people are in fact worst off in 1968 than they were during the early days of the Government? [Mr. Green: “It is because you left the Government”.] There was no contradiction on my part.

Let us look at the 1967 Budget. This is what is stated: “National income per head of population rose from \$400 in 1964 to \$470 in 1966 – and increase of 18%” if from 1964 to 1966 the increase was 18 per cent as stated in the budget of the hon. Minister and if the increase in the budget for 1967 was 12 per cent, then obviously there must have been a terrific drop for the year 1968. Between 1964 and 1967 there was a decrease from 18 per cent to 12 per cent. What has really happened? Has the additional year been added on?

The Budget speech in 1967 was delivered on the 16th January, 1967. This Budget Speech for 1969 was delivered on the 28th February, 1969. That one gives the per capita income for the previous year 1966; this one does not give the per capita income for the previous year 1968. Is it not reasonable for us to assume that just like 1968 there has been a further drop in the per capita income for 1967?

9.15 p.m.

I submit that this is now the position. The question arises: Why is this so? What happened in 1967? Obviously things have got worst. The previous Minister of Finance resigned in 1967 and confidence in the Government’s economic policy was rudely shattered. The tide of investments and of money entering the country was stemmed. Instead there was a reversal; there was a flight of people and of capital to Canada and to other countries. There was no confidence in the Government of that time; there was no development in the public sector. People, in fact, were afraid to invest their money because of the partisan attitude of the Government which was governing for one section of the community alone.

For example, people were afraid because of the policy being pursued by the Government in respect of jobs. The fact is that the majority party in the coalition controlled the Employment Exchange and jobs went to the boys. Fear was generated in people as a result of the resignation of the former Minister of Finance and there was a lessening of confidence generally in development. Add to this the rising cost of living, more unemployment, the increase in the choke and rob industry – probably one of the few industries which developed – and you will realise that the picture is really clear.

Let us look at page 21 of this Budget, paragraph 4, and I will further elucidate what I mean. It states here:

“Private investment declined from \$80.0 M. in 1967 to \$67.0 M. in 1968. The decline was of the magnitude of 16 per cent.”

It declined for the reasons I have given and not, as suggested here, because of the completion of the bauxite expansion programme. The reason was that there was no longer any impetus for development. The situation got worst.

Let us look, for example, at the method being used in the introduction of the P.A.Y.E. system for companies. When P.A.Y.E. was introduced for persons there was one year's remission of taxes. There is to be no remission of taxes in the case of companies. We can understand the reason for this, namely that the Government cannot afford to do this. I agree with the reason, but in trying to speed up this collection of two years taxes in one year the method proposed imposes, in my opinion, a sharp financial burden on the private sector. Unless collection of this tax is carried out with restraint and unless it is spread over a much longer period there will be a severe squeeze which will prevent these companies, through lack of cash resources, from expanding and developing. It may even be that they may be prevented from maintaining their actual revenue-producing machinery and equipment.

Again, what will be the position of new companies which do not enjoy tax concessions? If they know –and they would know – that in the years between now and 1974 they will not, in fact, be able to make much profit and they will have to pay more taxes in one year than they would normally have to pay, is it not reasonable to suppose that they will hold back from going into business? They will wait until 1974 when P.A.Y.E. is introduced for companies. Let us remember that companies are made up of individuals and an individual will not invest his money if there is not a reasonable chance of making a fair profit. So that if a person knows that his business will be more heavily taxed between now and 1974 he will perhaps decide to put his money into the bank and merely get interest on it rather than invest in a new company.

For this Government to be able to encourage development, it must ensure that there is adequate provision to protect companies from having to pay taxes perhaps even before profits are earned. Let us remember that there are a lot of businesses which make their money in the latter months of the year so that a new business will have to expend every penny of its money to push its products on the market. We must be careful of not killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

Let us remember that if these companies find ready cash to pay the Government they will probably have to resort to overdrafts from the banks. When they do this, the financing charges go up, costs go up and profit is lessened. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that they will think twice before they expand or continue in business for that matter.

Let us look at page 27 of the Budget Speech. It states here:

“For the private sector it is estimated that the level of investment would be almost at what it was in 1968, that is, at \$99 M.”

9.25 p.m.

It says here that the level of investment would be almost what it was in 1968, \$99 million. This is, in fact, nonsense because if we look back at the bottom of page 21 we will see that it is stated:

“Private investment declined from \$80.0 M. in 1967 to \$67.0 M. in 1968.”

What are we to believe?

What is the position? They are referring to the same things and they have two different figures. We must form our own conclusions from this, and I am sure we in this House are capable of forming our own conclusions.

If I may, I should like to proceed to the most important aspect of the proposals for 1969. These proposals are embodied on pages 72 and 73 of the Budget Speech. The first proposal appears on page 72. I quote from the second paragraph:

“But, however much we may save by good husbandry of our resources, we need fresh funds to preserve our borders because, unless we can resist greedy claims on our territory, we shall have nothing left to practise good husbandry on.”

We of the United Force whole-heartedly endorse this. We say that every effort must be made to see that our territorial integrity is maintained. I continue to quote:

“This, then, should be our greatest endeavour and to this task we must bend the efforts of all our people. The Government has therefore decided to impose a defence levy in the form of a 3 per cent bill of entry tax on all imports.”

The Government intends to impose a 3 per cent Bill of Entry Tax on all imports as a defence levy. But let us examine how much of this defence levy will really be spent on defence. Let us look at page 41; this will help us arrive at that conclusion. On page 41 is listed current expenditure and I am going to pick out what the Government says falls within the ambit and the category of defence: Defence Force (\$0.4 M.); Police (\$1.1 M.); External Affairs (\$0.5 M.). This makes a total of \$2 million and if we turn to page 45 we would see that defence and police account for \$1.0 million, making a total of \$1.9 million. This makes a total of \$2 million plus \$1.9 million - \$3.9 million. Who is fooling whom?

We need fresh funds to preserve our borders. We are told that we are to pay a defence levy in the form of this Bill of Entry Tax. This will realise about \$7 million but, by extracting the figures given by the hon. Minister, we arrive at \$3.9 million for defence and, even accepting that the figure is in fact \$3.9 million – and this includes external affairs, by no means do we accept in the entirety that external affairs comes under the category of defence – how could the realisation from the levy be \$7 million?

I wonder whether what is written on page 44 can shed any light. I am hazarding a guess. On page 44 of the Budget Speech it is stated:

“We have projected \$4.0 M. From this source for 1969...”

-“this source” meaning issue of debentures. In 1968 an issue of debentures was made the Bank of Guyana. Is it that, if the Bank of Guyana does not do a repeat performance in 1969, the shortfall will be made up from this extra amount under the levy for defence? Is this the position? If this is so, you must tell us so. Do not throw dust in our eyes. Let us know what the true position is. We are really playing here on people’s sentiments and emotions to raise money but, in truth and in fact, we are playing with the people’s bread and butter.

There will be a general rise in the cost of living. Let us realise that the gross increase may well be more than 3 per cent because to pay the 3 per cent defence levy you will have to find cash money. There will be no borrowing, so there may well be financing charges for increased overdraft, obviously, the cost must go up and it may well be that the increase which they will be tempted to put on will be over and above 3 per cent. In fact, it will have to be over and above 3 per cent because they must find ready cash to pay 3 per cent levy.

In the final analysis, who will in fact suffer? The working class will suffer. It is all well and good for us to scream about price control, but what is the history of price control in practise?

We all know very well that when Guyana devalued by 14 per cent, prices rose in certain cases above 14 per cent. We know also – this everyday occurrence – that the price of cabbage is controlled, yet, if you find cabbage, it is sold over and above the controlled price. Price Control is a farce. We all know...

Mr. Speaker: Time!

Mrs. DaSilva: I beg to move that the hon. Member be given an extension of 15 minutes to continue his speech.

Mr. Ram Karran: *Seconded.*

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. M.F. Singh: We all know what happened during the war. Merchants had a field day of profits because of price control. A commodity like flour made tremendous profits during the war. The fact of the matter is that price control has very serious problems. Usually, you may be able to fix the prices for the small shopkeeper and, when you fix the prices for the small shopkeeper, you will find that this is more than adequate for the big supermarket because it is a known fact that, in the big populated areas where there are a lot of people, a lot of competition, a bigger turnover, the supermarket can all have a lower price than can obtain in the less populated area with a small shopkeeper.

Normally, sufficient supply can breed good competition where the position can be stabilised, but how often have we been able to maintain a sufficient supply? The headlines in today's *Evening Post* state that there is now a flour shortage because of the hoarding of flour as a result of inadequate supplies and, moreover, because of the 3 per cent levy. So there you are, problems. In my humble submission, price control can be effective only if it is policed 100 per

cent, and if you do that you may well realise from the 3 per cent defence levy is all used up in policing this price control.

We are not objecting to the levying of taxes, what we are objecting to is rather the manner in which it has been done. It has been done in such a way that the full impact of the taxes will be passed on to the shoulders of the consumer, the ordinary, common man. If we add to the 7 per cent defence levy the 2 per cent consumption tax representing increase in the CARIFTA goods, we would get 9 per cent, then we realise the enormity of the burden which will fall on the shoulders of the common man. But, sad to say, the burden does not even end here.

Let us look at one of the other tax proposals by the hon. Minister. We find that tax has been imposed on luxury and semi-luxury goods. In an Extraordinary issue of the *Gazette*, reference is made to made-up curtains, draperies, and made-up household articles of textile materials which include made-up articles of cotton and of cotton chief component. In this enlightened age, can we really call cotton goods, made-up cotton household goods, luxury materials? Of course not!

9.35 p.m.

We cannot call them luxury goods. The majority of housewives would buy ready-made clothes in the shops rather than buy materials.

Then we go on to the professional tax. This is absolutely the wrong way to go about this. In the first place, the licence is a deductible expenditure. The licence fee will be deducted before you arrive at your chargeable income so the income on which you are charged is less by licence fee you have to pay. You will have to pay less income tax. In all probability, the tax will be passed on to the user of the service. It would appear as though the Government is legalising income tax evasion.

What about the other categories of people whose earnings may fall in the category of being invisible? People like commission agents. People like merchants, university professors. What about the professionals who are employed in the Government Service, will they pay the tax or are they going to get away with the tax? A very apt comment was made on the 2nd March, 1969 in the *Sunday Chronicle*, I quote from the third paragraph of the editorial on page 4:

“There can be no quarrel either with the Minister’s contention that there are certain professional men, the ‘ascertainment of whose precise income not infrequently presents some difficulty.’ That euphemism, no doubt covers the Minister’s belief, which we heartily share, that many professional men – and we would add, many self-employed commission agents and merchants – have been getting away with murder. What may present difficulty of acceptance is the implied suggestion that, on payment of a fee to practise a profession, some inaccuracy in income tax returns will be acceptable. What is the position of the professional man who has for years been making a scrupulously honest return and tax payment? Can he now, to set off his fee payment, cut back on his income tax returns? Or is honesty to remain unrewarded?”

Very nicely summarised! The Government must not take the easy way out which, instead of preventing income tax evasion, will actually encourage it. If the Government is really doing this, it is creating a separate class, and making an imposition, a penal expropriation, but there is nothing in the Constitution which can justify this, which can justify penalising the people or in fact, dividing them because the rationale for this is really the penalty. I should further submit that the professional man must be dealt with professionally, not as a trade or business, because he deals on a personal basis. He can never expand. He cannot earn precariously. He can only work twenty-four hours a day. He is different from a factory or business.

This is what is attempted to put on a trading licence. To professional is put in a category to which he does not belong. Commission agents, property agents, they all pay a tax for running a business, for running what is in fact a money making business. They can make millions. A professional man must keep a standard of ethics, particularly moral. He has a vital role to play in the making up of the modern democratic society. A fee should not be attached to the practise of a profession.

In the United Kingdom, solicitors pay a fee but their fee is paid to Law Society as a practice fee. It is not a revenue earning measure, not put in the revenue coffers of the country. When the Government puts this revenue yielding measure, it is in fact denying him the right to work. Is the Government going to put a licence on someone so that he cannot practice his skill without taking out the licence? What about the young professional? Let us take the case of a young lawyer. He comes out just recently qualified. He has to pay \$240 to be admitted to the Courts of this country. He has to set up an office. He has got to have a car to run the country courts if he is to survive. He has to employ a clerk. Is the Government going to tax him further?

The normal family man, if he makes \$5,000 a year, will pay \$500 a month in income tax. Let us open the magistracy at \$5,000 a year to the professional and we will see that we are swamped with applicants from the lawyers of this country for the job. How can this tax be a justifiable measure against the young practitioner? In the final analysis, what proposals in the Budget Speech, what incentives are there for development purposes? No attempt has really been made for the mobilisation of local savings for domestic development. Here is indirect taxation falling on everyone and I would like to remind the hon. Minister of Finance of his responsibilities. I quote from the *Sunday Chronicle* of 2nd March, 1969.

“This is already a very heavily taxed country and there is a limit to what can be milked from any cow. The danger now is that increased taxation will bring, instead of increased revenue, a strangulation of enterprise, and that this will result in a lessening of spending and a consequent diminution of revenue returns from those estimated. While there can be no quarrel with the need to defend the country against outside aggression, it would be folly to overlook the danger involved in adding this to the country’s expenditure, while still maintaining other spending.”

I do hope that the fun raised by this budget will be utilised effectively and in this respect, I welcome the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Works and Hydraulics (Mr. Green) that every dollar in his Ministry will be well spent. In his speech, the Minister attempted to cast aspersions on a previous Minister. The Minister could well be me.

It is all well and good to sit down in the security of this House and make remarks, but I say, Mr. Speaker, I will always welcome any job done by me being the subject of an impartial non-political investigation. *[Interruption]* I would also welcome any remarks repeated outside in **Brickdam before witnesses so that they could be put before the courts of this country.** *[Interruption]*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. M.F. Singh: On page 25 ...

Mr. Speaker: Time.

Mr. M.F. Singh: Just five minutes more.

Mr. Speaker: All right five minutes more.

Mr. M.F. Singh: On page 25 of the Budget Speech, we note that the Government painted a rosy picture of work advancement in 1968: sugar, rice, and bauxite. The fact is that this is all in the private sector; therefore commendation must go to the industries concerned and not to the Government particularly.

Let us look at page 61 of the Budget Speech because we must get on with the job. It is stated in respect of hydro-electricity that the report was made available in August 1968 and I quote what was further stated. Page 61:

“The engineers advised that the project would not be financially viable if it relied only on the normal growth in the national demand for electricity. What Shawiningan had in mind, of course, was the establishment of a smelter in Guyana for the production of aluminium.”

If in fact a small man is to become a real man then the Government must tell us what they have done to make a reality. Has the Government approached the Demerara Bauxite Company as regards the setting up of a smelter? We must know. Is the Government proceeding and not leaving it in the air of the Budget Speech as it has been left? [**Dr. Jagan:** “Castle in the air.”]

What about the new hospital which is so badly needed in our country? What about the M.M.A. Scheme which will benefit the people of this country? What about the Canje project? These are things which the Government should pursue. Let us in the public sector get down to real advancement with impartiality. Let us make a determined effort to make the small man a real man and not pay lip service to this slogan. Let us go forward and build the nation of one people, one nation, one destiny. [*Applause*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Bholá Persaud.

Mr. Bholá Persaud: Mr. Speaker, before and after the elections, the people were looking forward to this great Budget – incidentally, this great budget is one of the worst budgets in the history of this country. Let me draw the attention of this House to come of the promises and speeches made during the elections period. There were promises like: free distribution of cassava bread and milk; no one will go to bed hungry; each married couple will have a new Hon. Member. All these speeches we have been hearing. *The New Road* which we all know is the PNC manifesto – since 1964 there has not been another manifesto – paragraph 1, page 8 states:

“An independent Guyana will no longer be the private estate of a few expatriate giant firms.”

Some of these like Bookers have for generations profitably exploited our people and our resources.”

What about the agricultural sector of this country? I would like to read from the Budget Speech. We will now take a look at the Rice Marketing Board and it is associated with the Rice Development Company. I quote from page 69:

“This Board has been able last year to make a reasonable profit of \$3.0 million, a welcome reversal of the trend of substantial losses which has been the Board’s experience in the past.”

I wish to refer to the *RPA Rice Review*, page 9. This very individual Mr. Kennard...

Mr. Speaker: Please let us have the month and date of the publication.

Mr. Bhola Persaud: It is the July/September 1968 issue. I quote:

“According to Mr. Kennard the Rice Marketing Board made a profit of \$3½ million in one year as follows:”

Incidentally, the hon. Minister, in his statement, mentioned \$3 million and Mr. Kennard has quote here \$3½ million. Let us check how the profit figure was arrived at.

9.55 p.m.

Again I quote:

“\$2.5 million as a result of higher prices from the West Indian and World Markets.
\$1.0 million from efficiency by Management and Staff.

Examine the facts closely:

Purchase prices were reduced by over \$2.00 per bag in 1966 while cost of production increased by 20 per cent. West Indian prices increased by 5 per cent, and World Market prices by over 60 per cent.

On the basis of purchasing 1.4 million bags of rice at \$2.0 per bag less profit \$2.8 million.

Increased prices from W.I. and World Markets – Profit \$2.5 million

The profit, therefore, should have been - \$5.3 million, but the profit realised is only \$3.5 million.”

We are comparing this with Mr. Kennard's report. What is responsible for the difference of \$1.8 million? I should like the hon. Minister in his reply to inform the House whether he is correct or whether Mr. Kennard's report is correct.

Never before in the history of this country has there been so much confusion and misery in the local rice industry. Although the Government tried to do its best we have noted with great pain the amount of money which is thrown down the drain in connection with the rice industry. I shall quote from page 8 of the R.P.A. publication. *The Government and the Rice Industry*. This is for the period 1964 -1968. It gives a list of some of the experts who came here; some have done some good and some have wasted their time here. The first on the list is –

- “1965 The Connel Rice and Sugar company from New Jersey, U.S.A. which was retained to sell surplus rice on the World Market and to train local personnel in marketing, shipping, etc.
- We have retained this company at a fee of \$258,000 with a commission of one per cent. Along with this company we had in
- 1965 Caffey and Efferson, two U.S. Rice Specialists, who carried out an appraisal of rice production and marketing problems.
- 1965 Connel and Hall, two Specialists from the British Ministry of Overseas Development, who investigated the storage and infestation problems of the rice industry.”

These were the people imported by the P.N.C. – United Force Coalition. I read again:

- “1966 Urwick Orr and Partners, U.K. Management Consultants, conducted a survey of the Rice Marketing Board and the Rice Development Company.
- 1966 Fredrick Johnson, a U.S. Consultant, considered the priority to re-establishing the rice industry on a sound basis.
- 1966 Forte Committee (local) carried out a survey on all aspects of the rice industry.

11.3.69

National Assembly

9.55 – 10 p.m.

- 1967 The Mc-Millan Advertising Company of Jamaica carried out a marketing survey in Jamaica for the Rice Board.
- 1967 Caffey and Efferson appraised the feasibility of establishing an adequate tropical coastal agricultural research facility in Guyana.
- 1967 Maynard and Company, Management Consultants of the U.S. carried out an analysis of rice handling operations, methods and procedures at the Rice Marketing Board.
- 1967/8 Rodes/Chekki, U.S. Specialists, reported on the storage to market segment of the industry.”

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps this is a good point for us to suspend the sitting, if you have finished quoting. We will resume tomorrow at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

Adjourned accordingly at 10 p.m.
