

# Guiana Graphic

## BIG DIFFERENCE

**WE** HAVE SOME doubt about the news release which was published yesterday and which carried the statement that "vocational training would be an advantage if information of the requirements of jobs that would be available was given children about to leave schools."

**S**UITING what material is available to requirements can be only an expedient. It may lead to the insertion of many a square peg in a round hole.

**O**NE may be pardoned, therefore, for looking askance at the theory that **vocational training would be an advantage** if information of the requirements of jobs that would be available was given children about to leave schools.

**WE** would be more inclined to agree with the proposition that information of the requirements of jobs that would be available would be useful to children about to leave school.

**I**N such a case the information of requirements of jobs would enable children about to leave school to determine whether any of those jobs appealed to their imagination and inclination. That would be paving the way for a good start.

**A**ND it is only when such a start is made that one can expect to get workers who are really interested in their jobs and who will have a natural pride in what they do — the twins that signify **SUCCESS**.

**I**F he is not to be just another drifter on the ocean of Life a man's work must be a vocation for him. To discover this vocation his aptitudes must be recognised and developed. The requirements of the job must be more related to his ability and choice than the other way about.

A country cannot progress with mediocrity at a pre-

# The Suez Canal Issue

Dear Sir,

Two main issues — control and nationalization — seem to be involved in the Suez Canal crisis.

On the question of control, it seems that Britain has reversed her former position. The truth is that for a long time Britain refused to ratify the Convention of 1888 because it feared that the Convention might lead to international control.

At the 1919 Peace Conference, the British Government opposed the internationalization of the Canal. A Foreign Affairs Memorandum to the British representative at the Conference stated: — "Other Powers . . . wished to substitute international for British control . . . the British Government would agree to no form of international control likely to stand in the way of its lending its independent support to Egypt, if the security of the Canal required it. Its policy was to leave to the territorial powers and in the first place to the Egyptian Government the supervision and enforcement of the regulations."

In other words, so long as Britain imposed on Egypt a puppet government and an army of occupation following the defeat of the Egyptian forces at Alexandria in 1882, it wanted no international control, but firm control in its own hands. But now that Egypt, without a foreign army of occupation, is pursuing a vehement anti-colonialist policy, Britain and the West want international control.

What must be remembered in this period of heat and excitement is that President Nasser has undertaken to maintain the same freedom of transit as existed before nationalization, has not abrogated the Suez Canal Convention of 1888, which safeguards the use of the canal by all nations.

If internationalisation of a major waterway is good in principle, then the same should apply to other such important waterways — the Panama Canal, which is owned and controlled exclusively by the U.S.A.; the Kiel Canal in Germany, the Straits of Gibraltar, the Dardanelles, etc.

The Suez Canal Company is an Egyptian Company, governed by Egyptian law and therefore as Prime Minister Nehru argued, nationalization is within the

province of the Egyptian Government.

President Nasser has promised to pay compensation to the former shareholders. It should not be forgotten that nationalisation has merely antedated the time by 12 years when the waterway would under the 99 year agreement of 1856, automatically pass over to Egypt.

The Egyptian Government's share of total profits of the Company is relatively small. For 1955, in direct and indirect revenues it obtained only £3,400,000 as compared with the total profit (dividend and reserve) of £16,500,000. If Egyptian taxes were as high as Britain's, Egypt would have got at least £6 million more.

For 1955 alone, Britain's share in dividends would be about £2,900,000 after deducting Egyptian taxes for 353,404 shares (out of a total 800,000 shares) which were purchased for £3,976,582 in 1875. Already by 1928, the British Government had been paid back eight times over.

Additionally, the Company has huge reserves, estimated at end of 1954 at £40 million.

Yours sincerely,  
Cheddi Jagan.  
199 Charlotte St.,  
Georgetown.

### OPINION

PRAYER FOR TODAY