

# SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

Wednesday, 18th January, 1961

The Council met at 2 p.m.

## PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary Hon. D. M. Hedges

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

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

} *ex officio*

The Honourable Dr. C. B. Jagan	— Member for Eastern Berbice (Minister of Trade and Industry)
" " B. H. Benn	— Member for Essequibo River (Minister of Natural Resources)
" " Janet Jagan	— Member for Western Essequibo (Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)
" " Ram Karrao	— Member for Demerara-Essequibo (Minister of Communications and Works)
" " B. S. Rai	— Member for Central Demerara (Minister of Community Development and Education).
Mr. R. B. Gajraj	— Nominated Member
" W. R. Kendall	— Member for New Amsterdam
" R. C. Tello	— Nominated Member
" F. Bowman	— Member for Demerara River
" S. Campbell	— Member for North Western District
" A. L. Jackson	— Member for Georgetown North
" E. B. Beharry	— Member for Eastern Demerara
" S. M. Saffee	— Member for Western Berbice
" Ajodha Singh	— Member for Berbice River
" Jai Narine Singh	— Member for Georgetown South
" R. E. Davis	— Nominated Member
" A. M. Fredericks	— Nominated Member
" H. J. M. Hubbard	— Nominated Member
" A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.	— Nominated Member

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

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

## ABSENT :

Mr. L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C. — Member for Georgetown Central — indisposed.  
The Clerk read prayers

## MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 12th January, 1961, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

MR. A. G. TASKER WELCOMED

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members, I am sure we are glad to see, again in his seat the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, who was away for a long time on leave.

## PAPER LAID

**The Chief Secretary** (Mr. Hedges): I beg to lay on the Table

The British Guiana (Electoral Provisions) Order in Council, 1960, made on the 21st day of December, 1960, at the Court at Buckingham Palace by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

## ORAL ASKING AND ANSWERING OF QUESTIONS

## EMPLOYMENT OF NON-GUIANESE BY B.G. AIRWAYS (GOVT.)

**Mr. Tello:** Sir, I beg to ask Question No. 6 standing in my name on the Order Paper: Is Government aware—(i) that when B.G Airways (Govt.) was under the management of a British West Indian Airways representative, he trained a number of non-Guianese for service with B.G. Airways (Govt.) when, in fact, there were suitable Guianese available for such training? (ii) that an unemployed third class airways engineer from a neighbouring colony has been offered an appointment with B.G. Airways (Govt.) as a first class engineer?

**The Minister of Communications and Works:** (i) I am informed that the only non-Guianese employed with B.G. Airways Govt. who were sent on training courses within recent years are two engineers. The individuals in question were selected because they were the most senior and the most qualified and suitable of the employees in that category.

With reference to (ii), I am informed that no offer of appointment with B.G. Airways (Govt.) as a first class airways engineer has been made to an unemployed third class engineer from a neighbouring colony.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILL

**The Chief Secretary:** I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of the

Electoral Provisions (Registration) Bill, 1961.

## ORDER OF THE DAY

## BILL—FIRST READING

The following Bill was read the First time:

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to provide for the registration of Electors for the purpose of Elections to the Legislative Assembly."

## PROPOSED SALE OF HAM AND BACON FACTORY, &amp;c.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Motion in the name of the hon. Member for Demerara River reads thus:

"Whereas the Director of Audit's Reports for the years 1957 and 1958 have shown that the Central Produce Depot, the Ham and Bacon Factory, the Processing Factory, the Milk Pasteurisation Plant and the Fish Market together operated at a loss of \$785,678.71 during the two years:

And Whereas it is felt that Government is incapable of operating these enterprises efficiently and economically:

Be it resolved that this Council recommends to Government—

(a) that the Ham and Bacon Factory and the Milk Pasteurisation Plant be sold to private individuals or group of individuals; and

(b) that the buildings which house the Central Produce Depots in Georgetown and New Amsterdam and the Fish Market be rented to the respective producers to be converted into Producers Co-

**Mr. Bowman :** Sir, the Motion we are about to discuss stems from the fact that the Government has been losing a considerable sum of the taxpayers' money on these enterprises which time has proved that it is incapable of running efficiently and economically.

I am no economist but I have been urged to move this Motion because of the commonsense way in which I view the whole affair, and the way in which I think these Departments could and should be run. The argument may be adduced that these industries are being subsidized by Government for the benefit of the populations as a whole, but to my mind such an argument would be superficial. These losses have been going on for a long time, as the Director of Audit's Reports will prove. With your permission, Sir, I would like to read some extracts from the Director of Audit's Report for 1958 concerning the Ministry of Natural Resources.

The Consolidated Account with respect to the Ham & Bacon Factory, New Amsterdam, Georgetown and Produce Depots, Processing Factory, shows a total loss of \$338,987.52 in 1958. The Milk Pasteurisation Plant shows a loss of \$163,160.83, and the Fish Market \$57,827.21. Paragraph 100 of the Director of Audit's Report states:

"100. *Central Produce Depot—Loss \$321,459.79*—The majority of the excess expenditure of \$312,303 over the estimate of \$66,661 is attributable to the purchase of a glut of cassava and plantains at a guaranteed fixed price which could not be disposed of economically. Sales much below cost, free distribution, and considerable deterioration of produce resulted. Control over purchases and disposal was in the circumstances, lax."

In paragraph 101 the Director of Audit states:

"101. *Produce Depot—New Amsterdam—irregularities*—Local inspection revealed a large number of book-keeping and accounting errors and irregularities, and further information is awaited."

Paragraph 102 states:

"102. *Milk Pasteurisation Plant—Loss \$163,160.83*—Gross profit on operation (\$2,956.39), and other income (\$3,747.40) for the year totalled \$6,703.79, but administrative and other expenses amounted to \$169,864.62, resulting in a net loss of \$163,160.83. Of this loss \$69,040 was due to the appropriation of interest and replacement charges. The operational losses resulted in an unauthorised bank overdraft of \$14,000, which was cleared by the issue of \$35,769.08 under the authority of Advance Warrant No. 3/1958. Total advances at the 31st December, 1958, were \$80,000.00. Supplies of raw milk continued to be in excess of demand, which necessitated disposal by free issues or at reduced prices."

Paragraph 103 of the Report states:

"103. *Fish Market—Creditors—working Capital advances*—This Department was informed that the Fish Marketing organisation owed a private company \$12,000 for supplies. Further investigation revealed that the organisation had exhausted its funds. These were subsequently refreshed by a working capital advance of \$50,000.00 under the authority of Warrant No. 5 of 1958. There seems little hope of these advances (\$75,000.00) and those to the other organisations being recoverable; and it has been suggested that consideration should be given to charging them to expenditure above the line."

That is the record of the Marketing Division under the Ministry of Agriculture. The consolidated account for 1957 shows a total loss of \$225,703.15, which rose to \$559,975.56 in 1958. The figures for 1959 have not yet been supplied to members of the Public Accounts Committee, but I have no doubt that losses have continued.

One of the reasons I brought this Motion is because Government indicated, not only this year but last year, its intention to embark on new industrial enterprises, and I feel that having proved itself incapable of running efficiently and economically enterprises already established, it would be stupidity on the part of Government to embark upon new enterprises of any kind. I feel that the existing enterprises should be sold to private individuals or groups of individuals — anybody who

[MR. BOWMAN]

wishes to purchase them. I think it would be wise if Government took my advice, because what is happening now is that Government is only digging one hole to fill another hole.

This country is in need of industrial development, but Government should stick to those services which are necessary for a government to undertake. In the big democratic countries Government does not compete with private enterprise but confines its activities to public utility services, but in the Communist countries the Government commandeers everything; nobody owns anything. The very lives of the people are controlled by the State, even their thoughts. There are very clear indications that this Government is determined to take over all industrial concerns and to attempt to develop new ones. It wants to have everything under its control.

This country is crying out for development. In the Progress Report on the Development Programme up to June last year I read that \$1 million was allocated for industrial loans, but up to June not a cent had been loaned to anybody for industrial purposes. In this year's Development Estimates we find another \$1 million has been allocated to the same purpose. It was stated in the Governor's Speech and also in the Financial Secretary's Budget Speech that Government proposes to embark on further industrial development if it sees the feasibility of doing so. It is true that industrial development is proceeding at a slow pace as compared with the development of the rice industry, but if Government embarks on more industrial enterprises it will only mean further loss of money. That is why I am urging Government to dispose of the industrial concerns which it now operates, but those who run the Government do not intend to give way to anything.

I remarked last week that during the 3½ years we have been here, this Government has refused to listen to rea-

son. It has not agreed with one single Motion put forward here by anybody else. The reason is that it wants to get all the praise. The members of the Government want to prove that they are the only ones who have the people's interests at heart. But they are only masquerading. These people have been crying to high heavens that they want the Venn Report implemented. Eleven years have passed. We have been advocating that, but it was merely words and more words. I am responsible, too, but I had to remark the other night that when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. I intend to save my soul, now. Everybody can see that I have turned away. [Laughter.]

Let us look at the Transport and Harbours Department. I realize that this is one of the enterprises on which Government is losing money, but it is known as a public utility. Although it has been losing money for years, I am one who would not agree that it should be scrapped. I am a working man, and know that scrapping this department would mean greater unemployment; but it is well to refer to its losses in 1959, which appear in the Auditor's Report relating to the Transport and Harbours Department, page 5, paragraph 32:

"The net deficiency for the year (\$1,706,846.73) showed a decrease of \$66,785.46 when compared with 1958 (\$1,773,632.19), and gross receipts (\$2,489,176.87) were down \$8,039.25 on those for the same period (\$2,497,216.12)."

This means that the losses are increasing. I have quoted this to show where it is stupid for the Government to embark on other enterprises.

Only a few weeks ago I urged the Government to increase the tax concessions to bring them on par with the islands of the West Indies, hoping it would have had the commonsense to do so. Children are leaving school at the rate of 6,000 a year. It should consider this. I thought the

Government would have had the common-sense to accept the Motion, because I believe it would be a greater incentive to would-be investors; but this Government that supposedly represents the ordinary man —

I am one of those who have been saying that the working class is the class of today and tomorrow; the capitalist class is opposed to the working class, and we must fight the capitalist class. I have proved, conclusively, within my own mind, that the members of the Government are only masquerading — [*Interruption.*] — not me.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would you confine your attention to the Motion?

**Mr. Bowman :** I realize, today, that the fuss some of them were making, they were just masquerading to get here. The Majority Party has broken practically all of its promises, and I am really ashamed. I have been a sugar worker, and one of the promises I made to my fellow workers was that I would see that the Venn Commission's Report was implemented. I made an appeal to the Minister and she made a stupid excuse. Up to now, not one thing has been done. Three-and-a-half years have passed. If this Government was really interested in the establishment of new industries, as it claims, why has it not published the Government Industrial Advisory Committee's Report? I have not seen it. That is the Committee which was set up in 1957. I am sure it has submitted its report. Why Government has not published it? If people were to see the report and what has been recommended, they may invest. This is something of concern to us.

Mr. Speaker, I said just now that \$1 million was allocated for industrial loans last year and up to the end of June not one cent had been given to anybody, according to Government's report. I also see that the Fisheries Department is allocated \$58,857. These allocations for loans should not be necessary, and, even if they were necessary, I think they should be

given to private individuals because I am sure that the losses that are constantly sustained by the Fisheries Department and other Government departments would not be sustained by private individuals. Let Government name me any firm in Water Street, or in the Colony as a whole, that is running at such great losses. Yet it is thinking in terms of embarking on new industries.

One of the worse errors that the Government of British Guiana has committed in the past was when it took over the decrepit Transport and Harbours Department from a private company. Today, the Government has to pay an annuity of \$84,373. These perpetual losses which I have quoted are quite enough to convince this Government — if it can be convinced — of the necessity to hand these enterprises over to private firms or individuals who are able and willing to buy them, because it would stop this great drain; it would ease the burdens and headaches which this Government suffers year by year.

I am commending this Motion to this Council, hoping the Members of the Government would take shame out of their faces and accept it, in spite of the fact that it has not come from them. They are incapable. I am sure if I were in charge of any of the Ministries run by my former friends, I would run it better than anyone of them. I challenge them. I will take my seat.

**Mr. Beharry:** Sir, I beg to second the Motion, and reserve the right to speak on it at a later stage.

**Mr. Tasker:** As a member of the Public Accounts Committee, I share the anxiety of the hon. Member for Demerara River over these mounting losses. As he knows, we have been considering this matter for a number of years, arising out of the Annual Reports of the Director of Audit, and we have on several occasions argued with the departmental heads re-

(MR. TASKER)

sponsible for these projects. But while I sympathize with the hon. Member's anxiety, I do not believe that this Motion, if accepted, would necessarily lead to the solution that we want to see.

This is because we are dealing with two problems which will always be within the purview, and properly so, of any Government. Government is faced, on the one hand, with the problem of the extent to which it will support the agricultural community by means of guaranteed prices for farm products and, on the other, with the related problem of the extent to which it will endeavour to cushion the effect of high prices for essential foods on the consuming public. This is recognized in all countries as an essential responsibility of Government, and I do not see how, when we are dealing with essential foodstuffs and agricultural products, we can ignore it.

We all know, as the hon. Member has said, of the periods of glut and shortage. These things will happen in tropical agriculture, or in agriculture in more temperate climates, whether in a Government-run marketing organization or in a free enterprise one. This problem is going to continue. We know that attempts are being made by private enterprise to develop new secondary industries in order to process some of these products and find markets for them both at home and abroad. This is obviously highly desirable, but we are still left with the problem of surplus versus shortage which is going to bedevil us for a long time to come. My anxiety is not that these existing organizations should be handed over or sold to private enterprise, rather than be run by Government, but that they should be run more efficiently.

I have been out of the country for some time, and I do not know whether an announcement has yet been made, but I asked some months ago in this Council when we were to get a Director of Marketing. One has been promised for some time.

The need for a Director of Marketing was accepted by the Government, and this officer was expected to take a grip on these various activities and to bring some order into the present chaos.

The Director of Agriculture has commented on several occasions that this is not a job for the Department of Agriculture. This is a matter for people with practical experience in the business of moving products from the producer to the consumer. And what I submit is desperately needed is to clarify the present unhappy situation whereby these Departments, even if they are run efficiently—which they are not—must still make a loss, because it is Government's policy to subsidize prices either to the farmer or to the consumer.

The time is long overdue for these Departments to be put on an accounting basis whereby they are run as properly constituted economic units, and they should be able to show a profit. If Government then elects, for political reasons, to provide subsidies which cancel out those profits, that seems to me to be a perfectly reasonable thing for Government to do. What is not reasonable is to continue a system which must inevitably break down the morale of people endeavouring to run a marketing organization efficiently by preventing them from doing so.

I am not by any means convinced that, if the system were changed today, these Departments would make a profit. But if the system were changed, they would at least be given an incentive to operate in a businesslike manner, and everybody would see the true relationship between efficient marketing and Government subsidies. This is the line we should be pursuing, and I hope very much that we shall hear something from the members of the Government when they reply to this Motion.

I do not feel able, for the reasons I have given, to vote in support of this Motion, but I strongly urge Government to improve the present unsatisfactory situation.

**Mr. Beharry:** Sir, the basic purpose of this Motion is to prevent the annual recurring losses sustained by the various Government-run Marketing Organizations. I say that the answer does not really lie in getting rid of these Organizations. I agree with the hon. Member in his argument that the Government lacks the initiative and foresight to run these Organizations properly. When these various Marketing Organizations were originally set up the intention was good—Government desired to guarantee prices and increase production in agriculture, livestock and other sectors.

The Rice Marketing Board was established to guarantee a particular price for rice. I say that the Government Produce Department has been established in order to create an incentive for our local farmers to produce much more than they were producing at guaranteed prices for their products. These Organizations were set up as incentive Organizations to local production. I feel that they have served their purposes very effectively, because we have seen increased production in the field of ground provisions and related agricultural crops.

We have the Milk Pasteurisation Plant, and I have seen an increased production of milk in the country. But where the initiative is lacking in this Government is that it has failed to create conditions whereby the processing of excess raw material, agricultural as well as livestock, can be carried out. That is where the whole purpose of setting up the Marketing Organization has fallen to the ground. I give a simple example. We have seen within two years, as a result of the heifer scheme and the guaranteed price for milk, how our milk production has risen. Processing is the answer to over-production. Jamaica and Trinidad have established condenseries for the processing of their excess milk. We must suffer loss in our Marketing Organization because we do not have facilities for the processing and marketing of our surplus raw materials

when production rises. We need a condensery in this country to avoid having to throw our surplus milk down the drain. This Government has failed to create the necessary atmosphere to induce private enterprise to establish industries to process our surplus raw materials.

Another example is the Government Produce Depot where in time of glut vegetables and fruit have to be given away or remain to rot. There is no cannery where fruit juices can be manufactured from our surplus fruits. The necessary atmosphere which Government should create is lacking in this country, and that is why several of our products go to waste and we have to subsidize our farmers who are encouraged to produce more, otherwise they would become disgruntled and produce less, a situation which would be worse than our present plight. There are times when there is an abundance of plantains which either have to be given away or thrown away.

I do not blame the Minister of Natural Resources for encouraging increased production in our country. That is his job and he is doing a good job, but I lay the blame on the Minister of Trade and Industry for failing to create the necessary atmosphere for private enterprise to set up processing factories. We should have a plant to make plantain chips to be introduced to foreign markets, but as a result of the losses incurred by Government in trying to run certain enterprises it has failed to create the necessary atmosphere to induce private enterprise to set up processing factories. That is where I say the blame lies. We use large quantities of edible starches in this country but it is all imported. We can produce our own starch from cassava, but it is not being done. Private enterprise should be encouraged to do these things, but would private enterprise migrate here?

When industrial concerns in places like Cuba are taken over by the Government the leader of that Government is described as a liberator. The purpose of

[MR. BEHARRY]

every one of these organizations was a good one — to increase production and protect the increased production — but this Government has failed to create conditions whereby surplus products could be processed and stored for use in times of shortage. Our farmers should be complimented for their increased production, but there is no protection for them except by Government subsidies.

We shall continue to suffer these losses at these Government enterprises unless there is a change of Government in this country, or unless there is a change of outlook and attitude on the part of the Government.

**The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn):** I had been hoping that I would have had the benefit of the views of more Members on the other side of the Table, if indeed they intended to speak, in order that when I started to speak I would be able to reply to all the criticisms that could be made, or might have been made of the Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture. I am happy that this matter has been brought before the Council by my friend, because what I hope to say, and what the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, said a few moments ago, should go a far way to enlighten the taxpayers as to the reasons for these organizations and the reasons for what the hon. Member and the Director of Audit described as losses.

I am quite certain that if the hon. Member had not mentioned in his Motion the years 1957 and 1958 we would have had a more vigorous attack on the Government by the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara (Mr. Beharry), but he was still able at the end of his speech to squeeze out some attempt at an attack on the Government on some aspects of its marketing scheme.

The policy of the Government is to encourage production of local foodstuffs so as to reduce imports of foodstuffs into this

country. If that is to be done more land has to be given out to farmers, the staffs of the Ministry and the Department of Agriculture have to be increased, and such proposals as progressive farming schemes, revolving heifer schemes, and the development of areas like Ebini and certain parts of the Rupununi must be carried out. These things are done with a view to keeping in this country the large amount of money which we now send outside to purchase foodstuffs.

The hon. Member for Demerara River has referred to the large army of unemployed people of British Guiana. I agree that there is a large army of unemployed people, but are we going to get rid of that large army by selling the Milk Pasteurisation Plant to private concerns, by selling our Ham and Bacon Factory and our Fish Marketing Centre to private persons? That would help to increase unemployment, because no private person or capitalist who has a marketing organization will buy what he cannot sell. Because of our minimum guaranteed prices to the producers we are today purchasing large quantities of milk and having on our hands every day between 800 and 900 gallons of milk which we cannot sell. A private person or capitalist would tell the farmers to bathe in their surplus milk.

What would happen to those who produce large quantities of cassava and plantains? The Government Produce Depot purchases large stocks of plantains, cassava and other ground provisions at guaranteed prices; on many occasions they have to be sold at greatly reduced prices, and at other times they have to be given away. If these supplies of cassava and plantains are not bought, what would become of the farmers who produce them, and what would be the effect on the cost of living in this country? These are things which I would like the hon. Member to consider. In fact they are the things which he should have considered before he tabled his Motion.

The hon. Member referred to these subsidies as losses. They are not losses. More than 75 per cent. of this money is

in the form of a subsidy to the producers. The hon. Member says that if he had the reins of Government he would run it more efficiently than any one here, but I think that if he had to run the Milk Pasteurisation Plant he would do one of two things. If he could sell 7 million gallons of milk per day he would buy 7 million gallons, and the producers could bathe in the surplus. Therefore, the Government's policy is aimed directly at increasing production and finding employment for the large number of people who, the hon. Member suggests, have not been getting employment.

The Government Marketing Division, the Processing Factory, the Ham and Bacon Factory, the Depot in New Amsterdam and the Milk Pasteurisation Plant, have all been running at what the hon. Member describes as a loss. They are subsidized. It is fortunate that the years which he mentions in the preamble of his Motion were 1957 and 1958. Perhaps, it was because of that, as I said before, that the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara (Mr. Beharry) was so restrained in his speech this afternoon. But the policy to guarantee prices and the purchase of farm products is a natural effort. It is a direct policy of this Government, and aims at keeping the cost of living down and providing employment.

The hon. Member refers to the unemployment in the United States of America and England, but many like that hon. Member have been doing this.

**Mr. Beharry:** To a point of correction. I never said anything about the unemployment in the United Kingdom and the United States. I referred to the extensive use of potato chips in the United States and the United Kingdom. I also said how you can get rid of the excess plantains.

**Mr. Benn:** I did not refer to the hon. Member's speech. One hon. Member referred to unemployment in the United States and England. But, perhaps, we can

put the record straight. In the United States of America, the unemployment figure is just over 5 million. In the B.B.C.'s newscast last Friday, it was disclosed that the unemployment figure has gone up by half a million; and the United States, Britain and Canada, where the unemployment figure is either 5 million or half a million, are highly industrialized countries. And whilst we cannot take comfort in the fact that there is unemployment in other parts of the world—and why should we—the hon. Member should not construct a false basic cause of this unemployment. If we were to follow the policy which the hon. Member is trying to get this country to follow, now, British Guiana will be, as a man in a prison cell, condemned to a period or future where there will always be large numbers of unemployed. I should like him to think about this.

The hon. Member has suggested that all those industries have failed. It is not true that all those industries have failed. For instance, the Depot and the Ham and Bacon Factory have been running commercially. That is for several reasons, one being that ham lasts a long time and is not spoilt as easily as milk. To collect milk from the Abary, Mahaicony and Mahaica rivers and bring it down to Georgetown for processing in a hot country like this, would certainly lead to some losses. Similarly, cassava: Cassava lasts only 36 hours; therefore, if a man reaped his cassava yesterday and brings it down to town today, there is only one more day that cassava has to last, unless somebody is continually throwing water on it. My predecessor in office had made efforts to get cassava and plantain—I believed he succeeded in getting plantain—sold outside the country, but cassava and milk spoil very quickly. Many of the products which the Government is purchasing at the Plants, here, deteriorate, and on some occasions we have to give them away or sell them at what is described as 'give-away' prices. This policy of guaranteed prices is not a policy that is followed by the Government of British Guiana alone.

[MR. BENN]

The hon. Member for Demerara River, if he has not forgotten what he has learnt, should remember the soil bank scheme in the United States of America where large quantities of potatoes, eggs and various farm products were purchased by the Government and buried or thrown away in order to keep prices stable. This Government has not been doing this. Perhaps, I should draw the hon. Member's attention to a published statement on the potato situation in the United States of America where it has been found that the United States of America had spent \$25 million to produce large quantities of potato and buried them in order to keep the price stable.

Well, the policy of the British Guiana Government is not to purchase cassava or any other produce and bury it. We have been distributing free milk to schools. The Palms, orphanages and various centres. On many occasions it has been found necessary to share out plantains and cassava; and what the hon. Member should do is to congratulate the Government for its policy of providing the farmers with a good steady price and, at the same time, trying to keep the cost of living down.

I referred to the United States of America. With your permission, Sir, I wish to quote from the *Annual Review and Determination of Guarantees, 1960, of the British Government*. This White Paper was laid in the House of Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in March, 1960. It shows what large amounts of money are being spent by the British Government in subsidizing eggs, milk, fat cattle, fat pigs, cereals, potato, wool and fat sheep. I shall quote from page 4, paragraph 8, on the question of the cost of agricultural support:

"There has been an increase in the cost to the Exchequer of support for the industry. The total for 1959-60 is estimated at about £259 million, compared with £241 million last year..." meaning 1958.

"This increase is mainly due to greater expenditure on the production grants, but there has also been a net increase in the cost of price guarantees."

They have even increased their guaranteed prices and paid large amounts on wool, cereals, sheep and a variety of other things. So, to suggest that all that is being done at this section of the Department is "a lot of waste", is not to understand the policy of Government and not to know what is going on under the hon. Member's own nose.

I have an illuminated report on the cost of production—a study of milk—from the economic section of the Agriculture Department. The average cost is 65.2 cents per gallon. The Department is purchasing milk at 80 cents per gallon in Georgetown—a guaranteed price for the milk producer. If this guaranteed price were not given, then there would be no purpose of having artificial insemination involving a beifer scheme and other things.

Another point on the determination of prices: A large quantity of milk is coming into this country cheaply. The milk which is coming into this country is really wreaking havoc on the milk industry here. This country has been importing large quantities of milk from countries which are subsidizing their milk producers. Perhaps, it will be a good thing, Sir, with your permission, if I quoted some of the importations of milk into this country in 1959 since the position for 1960 has not been finalized. The imports in 1959, the quantities in pounds, were:

	Imports 1959	
	Quantity (Lb)	Value
Whole Milk Powder	1,261,889	\$ 597,768
Skimmed Milk Powder	810,341	299,220
Evaporated Milk	5,998,769	1,419,730
Condensed Milk (Sweet)	3,459,239	883,629
Milk and Cream	1,542	676
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	11,531,780	\$3,201,023

What does this mean? It means that the industry in British Guiana has severe competition from countries where evaporated as well as other milk is subsidized.

[Mr. Beharry: "Protective tariffs".] The milk comes from Holland, the United States and other countries. While we do not wish to stop people from buying foreign milk, Government is considering what should be done about the control of imports, the running of the Milk Pasteurisation Plant, and other Departments which market Government products.

An hon. Member suggests that the answer lies in the processing of the product. We have information that many of the countries the hon. Member mentioned so glibly are now processing milk and butter. In British Guiana there is not such a regular surplus of milk to justify the establishment of a condensery, as the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara has been mentioning since he was a Minister in this Government. These things were very carefully examined not only by the Government, but by a local company—either Bookers or Garnetts considered the matter and decided that the establishment of a condensery would not be a commercial proposition. [Mr. Beharry: "Nestles".] The hon. Member says Nestles.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am asking hon. Members not to interject these things because that will only prolong the debate. If an hon. Member wishes to speak he has the right to stand up and do so, but I deplore this practice of interrupting the Member who is speaking—the Member is not always inclined to ignore such remarks.

**Mr. Benn:** I have already mentioned during the debate on another Appropriation Bill that Government had decided to set up a Sterilization Milk Plant as the first step in the processing and keeping of this raw material for a long period of time. I have been advised that sterilized milk can last for a year in bottles.

The hon. Member also mentioned something about a cannery and the making of plantain flour. The hon. Member evidently does not read the newspapers. The Ministry of Trade and Industry has

already sent away large stocks of plantain flour to the outside market. The increase in the production of marketable produce has been considerable. As one hon. Member says: this is due entirely to the policy of the Government in encouraging increased production.

The hon. Member, who said that he could run the Milk Pasteurisation Plant efficiently, seems to forget that the Minister does not run the Plant; it is run by a Manager and, incidentally, it has always been argued that it should be run by people with commercial experience. Both the Milk Pasteurisation Plant and the Marketing Division are run by people who have been engaged in private enterprise many years ago. Mr. Mittelholzer, the head of the Marketing Division in Lombard Street, was, I believe, the Manager of the Demerara Meat Company in this country. Mr. Riley, who runs the Milk Marketing Plant, was employed by private enterprise, so it is not a question of inefficiency; it is a question of Government's policy.

There is no doubt that, like other Departments, some money may be over-spent or withdrawn from the Bank without permission. That happens in every Department, and it is the duty of the hon. Financial Secretary and the hon. Chief Secretary to see that these Departments put themselves in order. The competence of the person who is the head of the Department has to be looked at very carefully when one considers what is Government's direct policy in relation to these things.

It has been said that commercial men can run the Plant more efficiently, but when we tell them that they must purchase all of the milk produced at a fixed price, it is very difficult for them to refuse to purchase the milk. If they refused, Government would receive complaints every day. People in the Mahaicony area and, so on would say that they refused to purchase the milk contrary to law. The Manager has to seek markets in shops and

[MR. BENN]

private homes, and that is what the people at the Plant have been doing. Several girls have been employed in this Department. A few days ago five vans were purchased to assist in the distribution of milk. During the Christmas Season it was necessary to reduce the price of milk at the Milk Pasteurisation Plant in order to get rid of it. That assisted in the reduction of the cost of living and in the efficient running of the Plant.

I repeat that this matter must be looked at in the light of Government's policy. I am sorry I have to disappoint the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tasker, who asked whether a Director of Marketing had been appointed. A few days ago I was informed, by that section of the Government which deals with the employment and salaries of officers, that applications for the post had been considered but nobody was appointed. We have spent seven months advertising and looking around for an officer to fill this post. I do not employ the people who work at the Marketing Division—that is done by the Public Service Commission. I am afraid that the Director of Agriculture will have to assist in running the Department until the P.S.C. or Chief Secretary's Office can find a suitable officer to appoint.

**Mr. Speaker :** Time.

**Mr. Benn:** I will not be very long, Sir. There are no more criticisms to which I should reply. What I have done is to give a rough idea of Government's policy in relation to this Department, and to indicate why Government cannot see its way to accept the Motion.

**Mr. Davis:** Like the Government, I am unable to accept this Motion in its present form as tabled by the hon. Member for Demerara River. Unfortunately, in my view, he made the mistake of mixing the processing factory with the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. This discussion has

brought out some very useful points, and I am very glad to hear that Government has a policy in this matter—I should have said a rough policy, nevertheless, a policy.

**Mr. Benn:** I did not say a rough policy. I said that I had given hon. Members a rough idea of Government's policy.

**Mr. Davis :** I am sorry if I have misinterpreted the remarks of the Minister. I propose to speak for a few minutes on the question of milk. With regard to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant and milk in this country, I think the Government has inherited a Plant which is unsuited for the quantity of milk it now receives and processes. I am one of those who think that milk, like rice, is a highly political substance. The moment the Government decided to purchase the milk at the price now offered, I realized that it was bound to run into trouble at some stage.

As the hon. Minister has pointed out, the milk has to be purchased by the Plant at a price fixed by statute. He said that every "quart", but it is my view that every "pint" of milk produced, except what is used at home, is supposed to be purchased by Government. However, Government does not put into full effect the provision of the Ordinance, and it has rebounded like the bad stone. I do not know whether Government or the Police is responsible, but people are allowed to run up and down the coast selling milk. In times of shortage all is well, but today when milk is produced in such a large quantity, these people who usually sell milk along the coast do not sell it now to their own customers—they expect the agents of the Marketing Division to purchase the milk from them for shipment to Georgetown.

The Minister spoke of telegrams and complaints. Had the Government insisted that every pint of milk produced should be

delivered to the Government Marketing Division, this situation would not have occurred. The Minister spoke of the importation of milk products—condensed milk, etc. This is true, but I am sorry he left out the large quantity of powdered milk from U.N.I.C.E.F. which comes into the country and is distributed free of cost, for it is my view that some of that powdered milk finds its way into areas where Government should be able to sell pasteurised milk. It is my view also that Government does not take sufficient care in the free distribution of the powdered milk. Government should also limit the quantity of powdered milk imported into the country for sale in such places like the Brown Betty. It may be an unpalatable decision to take, but Government has to face up to it and take such decisions in the interest of the farmers and the country.

Each succeeding Minister of Natural Resources has gone up and down the country advising and urging the farmers to improve their stock and pay more attention to their dairy cattle, and it is a reasonable expectation of the farmers that Government should give them an assurance that every pint of milk produced would be bought. That is a normal function of a Government. The Minister and officers of the Department of Agriculture have urged the farmers to improve their stocks so as to increase their production of milk, and it would therefore be a breach of faith on the part of Government if it was not prepared to buy all the milk produced, and further, it would spell ruin to very many farmers.

Government has also to examine the question of what can be done in times of over production of milk which the Minister speaks of. I agree with the hon. Mover of the Motion when he says that there should be processing of our surplus milk. It is my view that

when the Minister said that it was found that a condensery was not an economic project it was at a period when the production of milk in this country had just started to decline, but today we have to deal with between 900 and 1,000 gallons per day, which I think throws a different complexion on the picture, and I would urge a reconsideration of the matter.

The Minister also spoke of sterilization of milk, but those countries which practise sterilization of milk have experienced that milk which is sterilized loses most of its nutritional qualities. As I see it, our problem is not one of over-production of milk but under-consumption at the moment, and the solution is to sell the milk to the ordinary man-in-the-street, from house to house, but there again we run into a snag. Among the complaints I have heard is that some of the people who deliver milk in the vans to shops adopt an attitude of "take it or leave it." I repeat that this is simply a question of under-consumption of milk, and Government has to adopt ways and means to step up consumption in order to relieve the Milk Pasteurisation Plant of the burden it carries in the form of apparent losses.

The solution to the problem is not to sell these plants to private persons. In doing so Government would have to remove the controlled price of milk because, to be fair to a private individual, when he suffers loss in times of over-production he would have to charge a higher price for the milk in times of shortage. It is for this reason that I find myself unable to support the Motion.

But the hon. Member's criticisms in respect of the Ham & Bacon Factory and the Fish Marketing Centre are not on the same basis. Not very long ago in Finance Committee we were asked to vote a sum of money to make good a

[MR. DAVIS]

deficiency at the Fish Marketing Centre, and the explanatory note stated that it was the result of a glut of fish.

With regard to the processing of ham, there again we run into the problem that we have to provide some of guaranteed protection for the farmer. The great difference between the protection given to milk producers and the policy of Government with respect to pig-rearers is that while, by law, the milk producer has to sell his milk to Government at a fixed price, if the Marketing Centre does not take a farmer's pork he has to sell it as best he can—often at reduced

With regard to the marketing of local produce it is my opinion that more attention should be given to the subject and to some form of protection given to the commodities manufactured by the processing factories. I think that had the Motion been divided into two parts it might have received better support than it now appears to have in its present form.

**Mr. Jackson:** Neither I nor my other colleague present in this Council this afternoon will give support to this Motion. The establishment of the Milk Pasteurization Plant and the Government Produce Depot has not been an act of the present Government, and that is something which should be placed on record as a reminder to some people.

I well recall that in 1950 or thereabout, when there was just the Georgetown Milk Depot which bought milk in the same way it is being bought now, there was the dumping of milk; and there may be many persons who may recall that another organization to which I belong got knowledge of that fact and had photographers take pictures of the milk as it was being dumped at that time. I know that other members of

that organization and I made very strong protests against the way in which the milk was being disposed of when it was possible for that milk to be distributed to many of the children whose parents could not have afforded to give them milk. I remember that, as a result that, we did suggest the need for processing milk so as to avoid throwing it away.

Before the present Government took office, a previous Government offered a subsidy to the farmers; and I have, on more than one occasion, said that it would have been a very good thing if the Government had indicated that what is being done is something in the nature of a subsidy, so that no one can come, at any one time, and say that there was a loss at either the Government Produce Depot or the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. If we were to cast our minds back to the days before these organizations were established, we would remember that the farmers and producers faced rather precarious conditions. Those fields of agriculture were suffering considerably and would have gone out of existence if steps were not taken to offer the farmer the protection which was necessary.

It is a modern concept which is practised by all States which are interested in the agricultural production of a community, that since agricultural produce is not as lasting or durable as the manufactured article, steps should be taken to protect the farmer or producer in every field or in every respect. So we are supporting the fact that a subsidy to agriculture in these respects is an important and necessary factor for the running of a Government which is interested in maintaining the standard of living not of the people who consume alone but, also, of the people who produce.

I do not know whether it is better in these days, only, to offer the surplus milk to institutions. I have said in this Council, on more than one occasion be-

fore, that milk is being distributed to certain institutions. I also said, not so long ago, that in spite of this, there are still large quantities of milk which cannot be absorbed by these institutions, and it has become still necessary for milk to be thrown away. I know the Minister of Natural Resources will not deny it, for he has said on a previous occasion that the milk has been spoilt and that is why it is dumped. I disagree with him, because I know that a good deal of the milk which is thrown away is not milk which is spoilt.

I want to be fair to everybody in this matter. While I say that milk is spoilt by the time it gets to the Plant in Georgetown, there is still milk which can be used. The situation is not due to the present Government, but since it is in power and has been encouraging the increase of milk production, which is being realized by all concerned, perhaps, it can examine the possibility of taking the Plant, or building another plant either similar in size or quality, nearer the points of production.

Let us assume that milk from the Mahaicony and Abary Creeks is given away, it may be a good thing if it can be considered that, instead of transferring the milk from those areas along rough road to the City, a similar Plant be erected somewhere in the region so as to take care of the milk produced in those areas.

I do not have the figures on the volume of purchases of milk at the Milk Pasteurisation Plant, but I do know that the volume of purchases exceeds, by far, the volume of sales. The consumption of milk is not as it ought to be. What is wrong? I have, on more than one occasion, said that there has not been enough propaganda or publicity to encourage people to stop the consumption of condensed, evaporated and powdered milk, and consume the locally pasteurised milk.

There has not been, I repeat, enough propaganda or encouragement. Steps have been made to advertise and do some propaganda work, but they have not been made in as wide a field as they ought to have been done. Some people forget that the taste of pasteurised milk is different from that of evaporated or the other kinds of milk. The Minister said that the question of subsidy is, indeed, an attempt to keep the cost of living down. That would have been true, in this respect, if the surplus of milk were finding its way into every home in our country. If we get a surplus supply of any commodity and that surplus does not reach every home, then it cannot be disputed, successfully, that the distribution of that commodity, whether it is milk, plantain or cassava, has not had the effect of reducing the cost of living to a general point.

It is true that the cost of producing pasturised milk is 14c. over the cost of other brands of milk. I wonder whether Government has ever given consideration to the question of reducing the cost? Perhaps, if Government were to examine the matter, it may be found that it could be produced at a lower figure. I do not want to deny the farmers of their right to a good standard of living, but we may find ourselves forced to examine the possibility of producing milk at a lower cost.

It is also true that we are importing a good quantity of milk. The Minister has given figures as to the volume and cost to this country. He has indicated that it is Government's intention to reduce, as far as possible, the importation of certain items. It is a good thing to build up the economy of a country until it is self-supporting; it is good to reduce imports to a very large extent but, in my opinion, it is possible to take such action to a point where it can destroy our own economy.

[MR. JACKSON]

Although I am not a businessman, I believe that trade is reciprocal. If you want to sell your commodities to a man who is producing certain other commodities, you are also expected to buy your required supply from him. Therefore, in our attempt to be self-contained, we have to be very careful that we do not destroy our economy in any form. I would ask that this point be given due consideration.

I have been wondering, since this debate started, whether the Minister of Natural Resources has ever given consideration to the possibility of securing the services of an officer from the I.C.A. to advise us on the defects in our Marketing Division. Everybody in this Council knows that provision has been made for the appointment of a Director of Marketing. It appears to me that this Department should be examined carefully by an expert from the I.C.A. The sooner that is done, the quicker we will be able to build up our marketing system to a point where it can take care of itself and be run efficiently.

I am not for one moment agreeing with the Minister that the present officer in charge of the Milk Pasteurisation Plant has any business ability whatsoever. He has knowledge of pasteurising milk. If that is his only qualification, then he has not been able to fulfil the other requirement: how to manage economically, or in a businesslike manner, the plant over which he has charge. That is one of the errors which have been made in the Milk Pasteurisation Plant. I repeat that the officer in charge has knowledge of pasteurising milk, and that he has no knowledge of managing an organization of this type. Perhaps the Minister, through one of his colleagues, will say whether my statement is true or untrue.

I observed the Minister nodding his head when I referred to the question of getting the I.C.A. to examine market-

ing in general in this country, and I assume that he agrees with me that it is essential. If that had been done, I assume that Government would have told us about it already. If we know what the experts say, we may be able to find a suitable officer to fill the post of Director of Marketing.

Perhaps the salary we are offering is one of the reasons why we are unable to secure the services of a suitable officer. We do not know the facts, so we are entitled to speculate as to the reason for the difficulty in securing a suitable officer. Several Members on this side of the Table have made observations already on this matter. Government should offer the right salary in order to get the right type of officer to do the job. If the salary is too low to attract a suitable officer, then Government should take steps to offer a more attractive salary. If we are to increase production and sell what we produce, it will be necessary to have this Department running efficiently.

The marketing of the Colony's agricultural production must be considered as a very huge task, and it is likely to run into millions of dollars per year. Therefore any officer who has the ability to fill the post of Director of Marketing can visualize that he will be dealing with a large sum of money and that his responsibility will be great. In the circumstances, the officer will expect a proper salary to compensate for the responsibility he will have to shoulder.

The Minister mentioned that not so long ago the Agricultural Department purchased five vans for the purpose of collecting and distributing milk—perhaps the vans will be used for marketing in general. I am happy to find that the Minister has admitted that it was necessary to get more vans to do the work.

I think it was in 1958 when I was appointed as a member of a Committee to advise the Agricultural Department on marketing and the way things should be done. The Committee recommended the purchase of additional vans for the transportation of milk and so on, but the Government did not pay any attention to the advice submitted by that Committee. The trouble with the Plant at Kingston is that they do not have sufficient vehicles to distribute the milk. I was informed that one of the old lorries had broken down. I suggested to the Director of Agriculture that he should order a lorry and let the hon. Financial Secretary and the hon. Chief Secretary ratify the action at a later date. Of course, the Director of Agriculture did not take my advice, and he had to wait two years to get the required number of vans. I would advise Government to act promptly when recommendations are submitted by Committees.

It is clear that if these vehicles had been bought years ago, Government would have saved some money. I am sure the Minister will agree that Government would have saved money if the vans had been purchased three years ago. I feel sure that the complaints made regarding lack of transportation will be considerably reduced in the future.

With respect to ham, bacon and fish, all sorts of things have been mentioned in the debate. I have been aware for a long time that the system of refrigeration needed expansion, for the volume of fish brought into the Marketing Division was greater than the capacity of the Plant. At one time fish which was bought in large quantities was distributed between the Plant at the Marketing Division and the Ice Depot. I do not know whether steps have been taken to increase the space for keeping fish in cold storage. If nothing has been done in this direction, I would advise Government to do something about the matter.

On more than one occasion complaints have been made that while an officer may be able to run a small business, he may not be able to take charge of a business which does a large amount of curing items like ham and bacon. On more than one occasion I have observed that bacon and ham have been sent on the market for sale without being properly cured. Several people have been forced to return ham and bacon to the Department because of improper curing.

I hope that steps will be taken to improve in every way possible our system of marketing; the system of curing bacon and ham so that when we are encouraged to change our eating habits by using a local article as an alternative to the imported one, we shall not find ourselves eating something of inferior quality to that to which we have been accustomed for a long time.

I also wish to make the point that when we ask our people to give up buying an imported article we must make sure that the locally produced article is as good in quality as the one imported. We must also make sure that the prices are almost the same, and that if there is any difference in price it should be very small. For if we do not make sure of exchanging quality for quality and price for price we will find ourselves unable to get our people to consume what is locally produced. It is no use saying that because we are Guianese we must be patriotic and buy what is produced locally. We are Guianese and we must be patriotic and buy what is produced locally, but those who are producing what we are to buy must also guarantee that they are giving us quality. I wish that Government would take much more care in dealing with its marketing possibilities and give the public better consideration.

**Mr. Bowman** (*replying*): It seems to me that the gist of my argument has been misunderstood both by the Minister of Natural Resources and the hon.

(MR. BOWMAN)

Member for Georgetown North. In their arguments they have tried to create the impression that I am opposed to subsidization of the farmers. That is not the position at all. I am not opposed to farmers being subsidized. I am a working man; I know that the peasants and the workers depend upon each other. My argument is supported by the Director of Audit's Report, in which he states with reference to the Milk Pasteurisation Plant:

"Gross profit on operation (\$2,956.39), and other income (\$3,747.40) for the year totalled \$6,703.79, but administrative and other expenses amounted to \$169,864.62, resulting in a net loss of \$163,160.83.... Supplies of raw milk continued to be in excess of demand which necessitated disposal by free issues or at reduced prices."

That is the gist of my argument. Where the Government has failed is that it has neglected to take care of the marketing and also the processing of milk. The Minister gave us some very fantastic figures with regard to milk and milk products imported into British Guiana. I think it is a shame and a condemnation of the Government.

I am aware that the question of a seasonal surplus of milk is not confined to British Guiana; it is something that happens in every country in the world, but what happens in other parts of the world? When there is a surplus of milk it is manufactured into condensed milk. I know that this Government has been discussing the question of the establishment of a condensery, but I am reliably informed that when Nestles offered to put up a condensery in this country the Minister of Trade and Industry said it was an imperialist concern and should not be encouraged in British Guiana.

Mr. Benn: I would like to correct that statement. I did say in my speech that the Company refused to carry out the proposal to set up a condensery be-

cause it found that it was an uneconomic proposition. It did not go to the Minister at all.

Mr. Bowman: I did not say it was the Minister of Natural Resources. I referred to the Minister of Trade and Industry as having made that statement. I have been so informed.

Mr. Benn: That is not true.

Mr. Bowman: I have been told that the Minister described Nestles as an international combine, an imperialist concern, which should not be encouraged in British Guiana. It is for that reason that a condensery has not been set up in British Guiana.

Mr. Benn: I should like again to correct the hon. Member's statement.

Mr. Speaker: You have said that already. I would like to know what is the fact.

Mr. Bowman: Nestles went to Trinidad, why? Because the Government of Trinidad thinks differently from the Government of British Guiana. Dr. Eric Williams does not scare the imperialists away. In fact he gives them encouragement, and that is why over 350 new industries have gone to Trinidad.

Mr. Speaker: You say you have heard what you have said concerning the Minister of Trade and Industry. I do not know whether you have verified it.

Mr. Bowman: I said that I have been reliably informed. Another thing is that I am aware that there is something called farm support, a scheme which operates in the U.S.A., England and Germany. I am not opposed to the Government supporting farmers here. Perhaps the Government would like to create that impression deliberately. After all this is election year. What I am

saying is that the Milk Pasteurisation Plant is being run at a terrific loss, and that if Government had the foresight it would have encouraged or at least established a condensery here. There are condenseries of various sizes. A small condensery could have been set up to absorb our surplus milk. There are also times when there is a shortage of fresh milk. I say that in times of shortage we could use powdered milk to make condensed milk.

Another point concerning fish marketing. Every housewife will tell you that before the Government took over the fish marketing, fish had cost less. The price of fish today is almost fantastic. There is no competition now because the prices are fixed. Government should sell the building of the Fish Marketing Centre and allow those engaged in fishing to organize a co-operative marketing organization. It would ease the burden and the headaches of the Government. If Government decides to hand over the Marketing Division to the people in the fishing industry and they do not have the money to purchase the concern, Government should by all means lend them the money.

The sum of \$58,000 has been allocated for expenditure this year with respect to the Fish Marketing Centre, and I am certain that there will be a big loss again because there are frequent gluts of fish. But in spite of these gluts we see no reduction in the prices of fish. When fish was sold by fishermen in the open market, housewives were able to buy cheap fish in times of glut. It is not so today with fixed prices. I consider that a very great disadvantage to the public.

**Mr. Benn:** The Government is under no obligation to purchase all the fish caught, and does not purchase all the fish that is produced.

**Mr. Bowman:** Sir, whether the Government is obligated to purchase all the fish or otherwise, I am saying that

the building which houses the Fish Market should be rented to those who produced the fish because I feel, as a result of that, the cost of living would be reduced considerably.

One last point I would like to make. It was only last year that the Minister of Trade and Industry opened a Cassava Plant at Plaisance. The Members of the Government claim that cassava farine and casareep can be exported. Government could have done the same as the man who established this plant, but it is incapable of doing it. The same things which it should have undertaken years ago, it is now encouraging others to do.

**The Minister of Communications and Works (Mr. Ram Karran):** It, who?

**Mr. Bowman :** The Government! It is because of the inefficiency of the members of the Government and the uneconomic way in which they do things that they are asking others outside to do them; and that is why I am suggesting in this Motion that these concerns should be sold to private individuals. Let Government put these concerns up for sale and see if those producers would not buy them. Why have they encouraged that man at Plaisance? Because they know they cannot run such a factory.

The hon. Member for Georgetown North said that this Government is not responsible for putting up the factories, but it is responsible for the losses over the last 3½ years. I agree that the farmers should be subsidized by all means. Farmers in the United States of America are being subsidized, but Government can devise other means to subsidize farmers other than bringing their produce to the depots. Let the producers take over the running of these concerns themselves; and I am quite sure if they are given the chance to run the Milk Pasteurization Plant, they will do so success-

MR. BOWMAN

fully, efficiently and economically. These "numb-skulls" cannot do it. [*Laughter.*] You laugh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members. the Question is:

That this Council recommends to Government

- (a) that the Ham and Bacon Factory and the Milk Pasteurization Plant be sold to private individuals or group of individuals; and
- (b) that the buildings which house the Central Produce Depots in Georgetown and New Amsterdam and the Fish Market be

rented to the respective producers to be converted into Producers Co-operatives."

Question put; Motion negatived.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know if there is any point beginning the debate on a new Motion now. There are only seven minutes left.

**The Chief Secretary (Mr. Hedges):** beg to move that Council adjourns to two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

**Mr. Speaker:** Council is adjourned to two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.