

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORTS

[Volume 10]

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE THIRD SESSION (1983) OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FOURTH PARLIAMENT OF GUYANA UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA

16th Sitting

14:00 hrs

Friday, 1983-10-28

With the Deputy Speaker in the Chair

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (71)

Speaker (1)

*Cde. Sase Narain, O.R., J.P., M.P., (Absent)
Speaker of the National Assembly

Members of the Government – People’s National Congress (58)

Prime Minister (1)

Cde. Dr. P.A. Reid, O.E., M.P.,
Prime Minister

Other Vice-Presidents (4)

Cde. H.D. Hoyte, S.C., M.P.,
Vice-President, Production

Cde. H. Green, M.P.,
Vice-President, Social Infrastructure

Cde. B. Ramsaroop, M.P.,
Vice-President, Party and State Matters

*Cde. Dr. M. Shahabuddeen, O.R., S.C., M.P.,
Vice-President and Attorney General

Senior Ministers (6)

Cde. R. Chandisingh, M.P., (Absent)
Minister of Education and Social Development and Culture

Cde. R.H.O. Corbin, M.P.,
Minister of National Mobilisation

*Cde. R.E. Jackson, M.P.,
Minister of Foreign Affairs

*Non-elected Member

*Cde. J.R. Thomas, M.P.,

Minister of Home Affairs

*Cde. H. Rashid, M.P.,

(Absent – on leave)

Minister of Energy and Mines

*Cde C.B. Greenidge, M.P.,

(Absent)

Minister of Finance and Economic Planning

Ministers (7)

Cde. U. E. Johnson, M.P.,

Minister in the Office of the Prime Minister

Cde. Sallahuddin, M.P.,

Minister within the Ministry of Agriculture

Cde. R.C. Fredericks, A.A., M.P.,

Minister of Youth and Sports within the Ministry of Education,

Social Development and Culture

Cde. S. Prashad, M.P.

Minister of Transport within the Vice-Presidency
of Social Infrastructure

*Cde. Y.V. Harewood-Benn, M.P.,

Minister of Information and Public Service

*Cde. Dr. R.A. Van West-Charles, M.P.,

(Absent)

Minister of Health and Public Welfare

*Cde. K.W.E. Denny, M.P.,

Minister of Manpower and Co-operatives

Ministers of State (2)

Cde. M. Corrica, M.P.,

Minister of State within the Ministry of Internal Trade

and Consumer Protection

Cde. H.L.B. Singh, M.S., M.P.,

Minister of State within the Ministry of

Regional Development

Parliamentary Secretaries (4)

Cde. A.W. Bend-Kirton-Holder, M.P.,

Parliamentary Secretary, Housing, within the

Ministry of Health and Public Welfare

Cde. D.A.N. Ainsworth, M.P.,

Parliamentary Secretary within the Ministry of
Education, Social Development and Culture

*Non-elected Member

Cde. B. Bhaggan, M.P., (Absent – on leave)
Parliamentary Secretary in the Office of the
Prime Minister

Cde. J.B. Caldeira, M.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary within the Ministry
of Agriculture

Other Members (23)

Cde. M. Ally, M.P.

Cde. M. Armogan, M.S., J.P., M.P.

Cde. B. Beniprashad, M.P.

Cde. A.A. Chin, M.P.

Cde. J.P. Chowritmootoo, J.P., M.P. (Absent)

Cde. O.E. Clarke, M.P.

Cde. E. B. Davidson, M.P.

Cde. H. Doobay, M.P.

Cde. A.B. Felix, M.P.

Cde. E.H.A. Fowler, M.P.

Cde. P. Fredericks, M.P.

Cde. E.F. Gilbert, M.P. (Absent)

Cde. J. Gill-Mingo, M.P.

Cde. A. McRae, M.P.

Cde. E. Melville, M.P. (Absent)

Cde. J.M. Munroe, J.P., M.P.

Cde. R.N. Primo, M.P.

Cde. P.A. Rayman, M.P.

Cde. C.G. Sharma, J.P., M.P.

Cde. S.H. Sukhu, M.S., M.P.

Cde. B. Tiwari, M.P.

Cde. C. Vandenburg, M.P.

Cde. R.E. Williams, M.P.

Members from the National Congress of Local Democratic Organs (2)

Cde. R. Bishop, M.S., M.P.

Cde. B. Latchminarayan, M.P.

Members from the Regional Democratic Councils (9)

Cde. K.N. Jones, M.P. (Region No. 1 – Barima/Waini)

Cde. K.V. Jairam, M.P. (Region No. 2 – Pomeroon/Supenaam) (Absent)

Cde. C.A. Singh, M.P. (Region No. 3 – Essequibo Islands/West Demerara)

Cde. W. Bipat, J.P., M.P. (Region No. 4 – Demerara/Mahaica)

Cde. H.I. London, M.S., M.P. (Region No. 5 – Mahaica/Berbice)

Cde. I. Chowritmootoo, M.P. (Region No. 6 – East Berbice/Corentyne)

Cde. N.R. Charles, M.P. (Region No. 7 – Cuyuni/Mazaruni) (Absent)

Cde. D. Abraham, M.P. (Region No. 8 – Potaro/Siparuni) (Absent)

Cde. D. Hinds, M.P. (Region No. 10 – Upper Demerara/Berbice)

Members of the Minority (12)

(i) People's Progressive Party (10)

Minority Leader (1)

Cde. Dr. C. Jagan, M.P.,
Minority Leader

Deputy Speaker (1)

Cde. Ram Karran, M.P.,
Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly

Other Members (8)

Cde. J. Jagan, M.P.

Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud, J.P., M.P., (Absent – on leave)
Minority Chief Whip

Cde. N. Persaud, M.P.

Cde. C.C. Collymore, M.P.

Cde. S.F. Mohamed, M.P.

Cde. I. Basir, M.P.

Cde. C.C. Belgrave, M.P.

Cde. H. Nokta, M.P.

(ii) United Force (2)

Mr. M.F. Singh, C.C.H., J.P., M.P. (Absent – on leave)

Mr. M.A. Abraham, M.P. (Absent)

OFFICERS

Clerk of the National Assembly - Cde. F.A. Narain, A.A.

Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly – Cde. M.B. Henry

PRAYERS

1983-10-28

14:00 – 14:10 hrs

14:00 hrs

/The Deputy Speaker in the Chair/

OATHS

The Deputy Speaker: Comrades, I have been advised that consequent on recent Cabinet changes, Cde. Dr. Mohamed Shahabuddeen who was not an elected Member of the National Assembly, ceased to be Minister of Justice when he was appointed a Vice-President. He is, however, again a Minister and a member of the Cabinet by virtue of his holding the Office of Vice-President. He ceased to be a Member of the National Assembly when he ceased to be Minister of Justice but again became a Member of the National Assembly on his appointment as a Vice-President. He therefore has to take a fresh oath as a Member of the National Assembly. As Cde. Dr. Shahabuddeen is present, the oath will now be administered to him.

The Oath of Office was administered to and made and subscribed by Cde. Dr. Mohamed Shahabuddeen.

The Deputy Speaker: In the recent changes, Cde. Carl B. Greenidge is appointed as Minister. Although Cde. Greenidge is not an elected Member of the National Assembly he has, by virtue of holding the Office of Minister, become a Member of Assembly. It is therefore necessary for him to make and subscribe the oath as a Member of the Assembly. This will, however, have to be done on another occasion as Cde. Greenidge is presently out of Guyana.

Following the resignation of Cde. Dalchand as a Member of the National Assembly, and a call upon the representative of the list from which Cde. Dalchand's name was extracted, the name of Cde. Harripersaud Nokta was further extracted from the list and Cde. Nokta was on 13th September, 1983, declared to be elected a Member of the Assembly to fill the vacancy. As Cde. Nokta is present, the oath will now be administered to him.

The Oath of Office was administered to and made and subscribed by Cde. Harripersaud Nokta.

1983-10-28

14:00 – 14:10 hrs

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Resignation of Cde. S.S. Naraine, A.A.

The Deputy Speaker: Comrades, a letter dated 14th October, 1983, was received from Cde. S.S. Naraine, who was Vice-President, Social Infrastructure, tendering his resignation as a Member of the National Assembly. In his letter Cde. Naraine expressed his thanks to the Speaker and to the other Members of the Assembly and also to the Clerk and other staff of the Assembly for the co-operation given to him in the discharge of his functions.

With Cde. Naraine's resignation, a seat in the Assembly became vacant. The representative of the list of candidates from which Cde. Naraine's name was extracted was therefore called upon, in accordance with section 99A of the Representation of the People Act, Chapter 1:03, to further extract from the said list the name of another person to fill the vacancy.

It is understood that Cde. Naraine has been appointed Guyana's High Commissioner in India. I am sure that hon. Members would like to congratulate him on his appointment.

/Applause/

New Appointments and Changes

The Deputy Speaker: I would also like to state, for the record, the changes which were recently announced, in so far as they affect the membership of the National Assembly.

These are as follows:

- (i) With effect from 15th October, 1983.
Cde. S.S. Naraine ceased to be a Vice-President and vacated his seat in the Assembly.
- (ii) With effect from 17th October, 1983:
 - (a) Cde. H. D. Hoyte, who was Vice-President, Administration, has been assigned other responsibilities, and has been re-designated Vice-President, Production.
 - (b) Cde. Hamilton Green, who was Vice-President, Production, has been assigned other responsibilities, and has been re-designated Vice-President, Social Infrastructure.
 - (c) Cde. Dr. M. Shahabuddeen, who was Attorney General and Minister of Justice, has been appointed a Vice-President, and has been re-designated Vice-President and Attorney General.

14:00 hrs

The Deputy Speaker: Cde. C.B. Greenidge, has been appointed a Senior Minister and has been designated Minister of Finance and Economic Planning. Cde. S. Prashad, an elected member of the National Assembly, has been appointed a Minister, and has been designated Minister of Transport within the Vice-Presidency of Social Infrastructure.

Cde. H.L.B. Singh, who was Minister of State within the Ministry of Finance, has been assigned other responsibilities, and has been re-designated Minister of State within the Ministry of Regional Development.

Cde. B. Bhaggan, who was a Parliamentary Secretary within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has been given other functions, and has been re-designated Parliamentary Secretary in the Office of the Prime Minister.

Welcome and Congratulations

The Deputy Speaker: On behalf of the Members I would like to welcome I would also like to back to the Assembly Cdes. Shahabuddeen and Nokta. congratulate Cde. Shahabuddeen on his new further appointment as a Vice-President and Cde. Nokta on his election as a Member of the Assembly. [Applause]

I would also like to congratulate and extend best wishes to Cdes. Naraine, Hoyte, Green, Prashad, Singh and Bhaggan on their respective new appointments and assignments. [Applause]

Leave

The Deputy Speaker: The Speaker is not available to be present at this Sitting and leave has been granted to Cde. Rashid and to Mr. M.F. Singh for today's Sitting, and to Cde. Bhaggan from today until the middle of next month.

Broadcasting of Proceedings

The Deputy Speaker: Permission has been granted for the installation of a public address system for today's proceedings and also for the Guyana Broadcasting Corporation and the Colombia Broadcasting Service of North America to be present to record the proceedings.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

The following papers and reports were presented:

- (1) (a) Annual Report of the Ministry of Works for the year 1982.
- (b) Annual Report of the Plant Maintenance and Hire Division for the year 1982.
- (c) Annual Report of the Ministry of Housing for the year 1982. /The Vice-President, Social Infrastructure./
- (2) Annual Report of the Ministry of Co-operatives for the year 1982. /Minister of Manpower and Co-operatives./
- (3) Annual Report of the Ministry of Transport for the year 1982. /The Minister of Transport./

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS - FIRST READING

The following Bills were introduced and read the First time:

- (1) Acquisition of Lands (not beneficially occupied) Bill 1983 – Bill No. 20/1983. /The Vice-President, Production, on behalf of the Government./
- (2) Public Corporations (Amendment) Bill 1983 – Bill No. 21/1983. /The Vice-President, Party and State Matters, informed the Assembly that Government would not proceed to introduce this Bill./
- (3) Factories (Amendment) Bill 1983 – Bill No. 22/1983.
- (4) Employment of Young Persons and Children (Amendment) Bill 1983 – Bill No. 23/1983. /The Minister of Manpower and Co-operatives, on behalf of the Government./

1983-10-28

PUBLIC BUSINESS

MOTION

INVASION OF GRENADA

Whereas, at dawn on October 25, 1983 the armed forces of the USA, in collaboration with units of the armed forces of six Caricom countries, invaded Grenada;

And Whereas the invading forces were resisted by the armed forces and people of Grenada and are still being so resisted;

And Whereas this invasion constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in internal affairs, respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of states, in particular, and of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law in general

And Whereas the attack on Grenada can be a prelude to further military interventions in the Caribbean and Central America in Nicaragua in particular;

And Whereas it is the sovereign and inalienable right to each State freely to choose its own political, economic and social system and to develop its international relations without outside interference, subversion, coercion or intervention;

And Whereas in accordance with Article 2 (4) of the Charter of the United Nations, all States are enjoined to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations:

And Whereas the invasion has been widely condemned throughout the international community:

Be it resolved that this National Assembly strongly condemns the armed intervention in Grenada by the United States of America, regrettably supported by some Caribbean countries, which has resulted in the death of and injury to many persons, including unarmed civilians from indiscriminate bombardment, shelling and other military activity by the aggressors;

And be it further resolved that this National Assembly calls for an immediate end to external intervention in Grenada, the prompt withdrawal of foreign troops from her territory, and full respect for her sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

/The Prime Minister./

1983-10-28

14:10 – 14:20 hrs

National Assembly

14:10 hrs.

(Cde. Dr. Reid continues)

The Prime Minister: Cde. Speaker, Members of this House Assembly would no doubt have followed closely the very sad events which have recently occurred in Grenada, our sister state within the Caribbean Community. Admittedly, the reports which were issued on these chaotic developments were far from clear, and on many aspects were often very confusing. The rapidity with which the tragic drama unfolded moreover did not allow for a full appreciation of the agony in which Grenada had become seized. By now however, as further events have taken place and as the tragedy has been revealed in all its starkness evidence as we all know, of the grave peril faced not only by the people of Grenada, but indeed, by all small and defenseless nations of the world. Cde. Speaker, in his observation over the past few days, the President of this country has sought to give Guyana's understanding of the reaction to the Caribbean crisis. I think at this time I would wish to express appreciation for the work done by our President hour by hour during this crucial time. Details put forward in his disclosure, in his discourse, only last evening, provide us with opportunities to penetrate the darkness and remove the veil of ignorance from our very eyes. He has lamented the mad and untimely death of the former Prime Minister of Grenada, Cde. Maurice Bishop, some members of his Cabinet, and other close political allies. It was only last month, to be exact, 18th of September, I had close and private conversation with the late Cde Bishop when I visited St. Kitts, Nevis, where he too had attended the Independence celebrations of that New State.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

14:20 hrs.

(Cde. Dr. Reid continues)

The President has regretted the circumstances which resulted in these startling killings. We must look to the people of Grenada pursue their own salvation to heal their internal wounds and restore the spirit of unity which led to the successful pursuit of their revolution. Most importantly, however, he stand against any foreign intervention in that island's internal affairs which would seek to deny the sovereignty and independence and instead to impose upon them solutions which were inimical to the best interest of the people of Grenada and even our region and far beyond. However, despite this warning and despite every effort made by the government of Guyana to rouse awareness of the dangers of such intervention, the forces of neo-imperialism have invaded Grenada and thus violated all the principles, norm and rules of international law.

At an emergency meeting of twelve Caribbean heads of governments which were held in Port-of Spain last weekend President Burnham made a last appeal to promote good sense and better reason so that the independence and integrity of the Caribbean Community Members might be safe-guarded and preserved. But all to no avail. Some members of the very community saw it fit to ally themselves with the aggressors and in breach of the good faith which inspired their O.E.C.S. Treaty, conspire against the freedom and safety of Grenada. As true extent and significance of this dastardly action has impacted upon world opinion a great outcry has arisen against callous and mistaken power, and of which U.S.A. has been clearly identified as the primary aggressors. Even the United States' closest ally admit to embarrassment and perplexity resulting from this ill-conceived and irresponsible adventure. Other principled governments including Mexico, Dominican Republic, France and Sweden, to name a few, have spoken out against the perpetration of this criminal act. All has been in vain. Yet there is no justification for recourse to invasion. Nations have consequently refuted the poor pretext which the Reagan administration has advanced to support the invasion. Guyana is therefore not alone in its condemnation of this great wrong which has been committed; and I dare say that as the full potent of this disaster dawns upon humanity there will be many more who will roundly condemn this vile deed which has been done in the name of power, prestige and profits.

You should know that the Security Council of the United Nations of which Guyana has the honour to be a member, has been convened to examine the implications of the raw military aggression against Grenada. Within this body, we have taken the initiative of moving the resolution, the aim of which is not only to secure universal condemnation and armed intervention in Grenada but also to be urged the speedy termination by the withdrawal of all foreign troops. We firmly expect that the world organisation will deal effectively with the threat to peace and security which has now been presented and it will act in unison to restore integrity and stability to victimized Grenada.

Our permanent representative, Cde. Noel Sinclair had among other things this say: "The claim has been advanced that this intervention is in pursuit of peace and democracy. But, is it not the true test of democracy in international relations the ability to tolerate those who do not follow our every whim and fancy or the whims and fancies of our partners. If the international system cannot find it democratic and just that the small, the poor, the weak be protected from the fit and powerful then I fear that far from being democratic we are instead submitting to our Hobbesian system which recognises only the powerful and fittest and only their interests. Democracy has thus been poorly served in Grenada today."

Cde. Speaker, already the President of the General Assembly has deemed the use of force as regrettable and has urged the situation be resolved within the context of respect for self determination and territorial integrity and the principles of the United Nations Charter.

In presenting this motion for a Resolution our consideration on Grenada by the National Assembly we are committed by the same desire to have the people of Guyana speak forth from their forum of representatives in the courts of civilized people everywhere. The language which has inspired us is dictated by our deep concern and respect of the basic principles which are intended to guide the behavior of international society and without which the world will be returned to a primitive state of disorder and complete lawlessness. Its main thrust has therefore been to carry the false excuses which have been used to deviate from the sanctity of these principles and the fundamental rights of humanity. We are convinced that if these basic rules are flouted then anarchy will prevail and enmity and recourse to violence will become a thing of practice. Let us therefore not hesitate to voice our indignation at the outrage that has been committed on Grenada and to formally express the resolve which it merits.

1983-10-28

14:20 – 14:30 hrs

As the Cde. President said, "today the bells toll for Grenada, tomorrow it could be for our own country," this dear land of Guyana. We ourselves have not in the past entirely escaped the wrath and vengeance of those who would have us follow a different path from the one which we have chosen for our political, economic and social well being. Onerously, we attempt to harness our efforts and to attract finances for a project which we felt would be a great boon to our economy, namely the M.M.A. Project, we soon felt the heavy hand of the United States government raised against our application and denying us access to these much-needed resources.

1983-10-28

14:30 – 14:40 hrs

National Assembly

14:30 hrs.

(The Prime Minister continues)

Cde. Speaker, why that has happened? Meanwhile, it is interesting to note the investment that the United States has in South Africa. I need not say more about South Africa but just to quote from this document, a foreign report published by the Economist Newspaper Limited, 25 St. James Street, London, October 13, 1983. I quote:

"American Investment in South Africa. American Investment in South Africa is flourishing. More than 300 American Companies with subsidiaries and affiliates in South Africa account for about a fifth of total foreign investment there. More than 5,000 American companies did business worth 5.5 billion dollars with South Africa in 1982. According to a confidential State Department cable from Johannesburg," American financial involvement in South Africa is much greater than it had previously believed." "The latest estimate is that Americans have about \$15 billion in direct investments bank lending and portfolio investment, particularly in gold mining in South Africa. The previously accepted figure for American investments, by the commerce department of \$2.6 billion, covered only direct investment by American firms in South African subsidiaries. The State Department cable reports that many American investments in South Africa are handled by subsidiaries of American firms based in Europe, particularly in Britain." We are willing to believe that the real statistics for direct and indirect investment by American firms in South Africa could be double that recorded," it adds. The State Department also found that South African borrowings from the American banks last year totalled at least \$3.6 billion. Two-thirds of the loans were made by the top nine American banks. Most were bank-to-bank loans, maturities of one year or less. Americans have invested about \$8.1 billion in shares on Johannesburg stock exchange, mainly in gold mines, platinum mines and two big companies, De Beers and Americans account for nearly two-thirds of all foreign stockholdings. According to the cable, American investors own 25.3 percent of the platinum mines, 11 percent of the De Beers and have a stage of 7.7 percent I gold mining companies."

Therefore, Cde. Speaker, action by the United States in our application was nothing short of economic aggression meted out for no other reason than to frustrate our aspirations as a developing nation. We have resisted, we shall continue to resist this type of political blackmail and will press on with our campaign on self-reliance and self-sufficiency.

/Applause/ However, in the light of the tragedy which has now befallen Grenada, we cannot be blind to the fact that these new imperialist forces will stop at nothing to achieve their evil purposes. The Co-operative Republic of Guyana, however, will not be intimidated nor deterred from its goal of a more just and equitable social order, not only for its own people but for all of humanity.

As a member of the Caribbean Community, as a member of the Commonwealth, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and, indeed, of so many other international organisations, we are committed to working for the cause of the Third World and our One World so that all nations which still remain prey to poverty and alien exploitation might rid themselves of the millstone of mal-development. It cannot be that progress is the prerogative of a privileged few and that there is no opportunity for the poor and oppressed to escape from the prisoner squalor and deprivation. Natural law must hold the balances fairly and therefore any nation which either actively or passively denies this basic justice cannot meaningfully speak of democracy.

The United States, it would appear, is bent on having conflict within this hemisphere and more particularly in Central America and the Caribbean. These regions have entered into a strategic perception which drags them willy-nilly along to a wider East to West confrontation. In this distorted view of things, the plight of the countries in this area is not seen for what it really is, namely, cunning economic exploitation produced by outdated and unsuitable infrastructures, but rather for the utility and the power play between the super powers. The President of the United States, in speaking of the Grenadian situation, is reported to have said that at stake were not nutmegs, but rather his country's security. Accordingly, he was determined to pursue his own vision even if this meant, as events have shown, that small states in the region would be reduced by military force to colonies of the United States if they only dare pursue proper development of their own country. Let me, however, take this opportunity to remind the United States Government that human beings with the will to be free cannot be enslaved. /Applause./

Cde. Speaker, it is indeed a saddened experience in our world to identify leaders of nations who still believe that the prosperity and elevation of their countries would be best promoted by the impoverishment, depression, suppression and oppression of their neighbours. It is even more so when a powerful nation like the United States of America has a Government that cannot recognise the value of interdependence of nations and the value of mutual respect and collaboration between nations. The fate of Grenada must consequently serve as a warning for the future. If intervention is allowed to prosper then there would be more than ample reason to fear is repetition.

To the misguided who believe in power politics, it must seem to provide a passive solution for situations which are considered problematic. But I venture to say that such an attitude is shortsighted and incapable of truly resolving the issues at hand. It must be seen of course that change has been effected, but it cannot be said with any guarantee that it will last. For this very reason rash military action which has been taken against Grenada must be considered impulsive and precipitate. It will now be fair to say that it has created many more problems than it was intended to solve. Indeed a veritable door has been opened and it remains to be seen what further evils will emerge there from. In this case the cure is already proven that it is worse than the disease.

1983-10-28

14:40 – 14:50 hrs

National Assembly

14:40 hrs.

(The Prime Minister continues)

Cde. Speaker, even at this stage however, it is perhaps not too late for the truly peace loving peoples of this region and of the world to act co-operatively to close the link and further adventurism in the Caribbean. A wide and united appeal will hopefully stir the conscience of the aggressors into realizing that force accomplishes nothing. More particularly, it is to be hoped that those Caribbean nations which despite their horror at the last Heads of Government meeting in Trinidad and Tobago have served as conspirators to the invasion.

We again won the conviction that the attainment and maintenance of peace and security in the region are fraternal links to recognition of the principles of non-use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of states. Cde. Speaker, a foul and brutally enemy is riding roughshod over the Grenadian people. The brave Grenadian people are resisting beyond the expectations of the maddened aggressors. Whatever the results, a new freedom is striking through. History has seen the fate of those who represent out of date methods of oppression. We know that the Grenadian Armed Forces are much smaller than those of the enemy. Grenada is 133 square miles, with a population of 110,000 people. Grenada is an underdeveloped Caribbean territory endeavouring to carve out the development path for her people. It is therefore, not an easy task for Grenada. Small weak countries can only depend on international law to support their just cause in this world. The Ediojian people's experiences in the struggle against the Italian fascists in 1935 to 1936 have shown that justice does not always prevail in our world. The world, however, sometimes must pay heavily for injustice in human lives and human insecurity. Many, many more may very well die on this new battle field created in Grenada by USA but can never end in Grenada. We therefore, as representatives of our Guyanese people must seek to learn deep-hypocrisy and machinations aimed at distorting any genuine development in the underdeveloped world.

Events like the destruction of Grenada should steal us to journey together on the road of self reliance and be so conscious of the psychological warfare now current in our own country that there would be total agreement to give guidance to all our people to be resolute in the use of our resources to the maximum for our betterment.

The resolution, therefore, before this House refers to these fundamental principles because they form a pre-requisite for the restoration of stability to the island of Grenada. Only when these corner stones are once again put in place can we expect to build a foundation for peace and a barrier against further intervention. There must also be, as the text urges, the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Grenadian territory. These are the minimum steps which need to be taken for a genuine return to normalcy. We must therefore, lay them down as essential to the peace process which must now be found. At a public rally only last night, people who attended gave direction and this is the way we should go.

Cde. Speaker, I should also say that in preparing this motion, the Government side has ensured and benefited from consultations with Party Leaders represented in this House. The debate on this motion dealing with the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of a state cannot be for Guyana a partisan exercise competitions are usually readily proclaimed and pursued but I do believe that this Assembly is of one mind in the aggression against Grenada. I therefore, now formally table the resolution in the expectation that its passing will demonstrate Guyana's full representation of our law makers and its own belief that all conflicts need to be resolved by peaceful means. I move the motion in my name.

Question proposed.

The Deputy Speaker: The list of speakers I have before me is as follows: Dr. Jagan, Cde. Clinton Collymore, Cde. Shahabuddeen, Cde. Janet Jagan and Cde. Jackson in that order.

Cde. Dr. Jagan.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

The Minority Leader: (Cde. Dr. Jagan): Cde. Speaker, as one who represents a Party which was subject to imperialist aggression both directly in the 1950s and indirectly in the 1960s. I wish to register our strongest condemnation for the brutal, dastardly, despicable act of intervention by US imperialism and its lackeys in the Caribbean. This is a case of a vulture-eagle descending on a peaceful dove in a calculated move to snuff out its life. It is a case of a bully using superior force to crush a small heroic people.

What is even more distasteful is the connivance and complicity of the Regional hawks with the fiendish eagle. It is a dark and shameful day in the history of the Caribbean people. The treacherous position taken by Jamaica, Barbados, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Dominica, and Antigua, is reminiscent of the sordid role played by the Caribbean political leadership in 1953 when British, imperialism acting through the Churchill Government, landed troops, suspended the constitution and forcibly removed the P.P.P. from the Government. The sordid role of the Caribbean Leaders gave the hawks in Washington the pretext for their criminal gunboat action. These puppets in the Caribbean are looking for crumbs from Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative. Right now Washington is going through the Caribbean carrying out bilateral discussions, hoping to get these puppets one by one to sell their souls for a mess of pottage. This is what is happening right now. They want to be designated as the Uncle Toms of the Caribbean – Uncle Toms – tied to Uncle Sam. What a disgrace!

The fascist-minded in the Pentagon and their minions in the Caribbean prattle about democracy and the rule of law while they flagrantly violate international law and the Charter of the United Nations and President Reagan has used the thread, bare excuse of moving in to protect the lives of Americans in Grenada.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

14:50 hrs.

(Cde. Dr. Jagan continues)

Crocodile tears are also shed about Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and some of his colleagues. What utter hypocrisy! We all remember it was not too long ago when Reagan and his warriors in Washington were aiming missiles at Maurice Bishop and his colleagues. They insulted him. When Maurice Bishop went recently to Washington, Reagan refused to have talks with him and now he is shedding crocodile tears. Since when are the hawks in Washington concerned with human lives? Since when? From the days of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, and more particularly from the Roosevelt Corollary of 1904, the U.S. ruling class has resorted to plunder, destruction, rape and murder all around the globe. What we are seeing is nothing new. Have we forgotten the Mai Lais and napalm and the saturation bombing of Vietnam and Cambodia. And who it was but the C.I.A. and its minion Pinochet who slaughtered the great Chilean patriot, Salvador Allende.

When President Ford was asked, "Under what international law do we have a right to attempt to destabilize a constitutionally elected Government of another county?" he replied, "I am not going to pass judgment on whether it is permitted or authorised under international law. It is a recognised fact that historically as well as presently such actions are taken in the best interest of the countries involved." Sheer hypocrisy then to talk about democracy and freedom, and that they are moving to Grenada to protect lives and the rule of law. These criminals! "Best interest" under the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 meant "securing America for Americans." That was the quotation used then. The Americans posing as defenders of the countries of the South against armed intervention from the outside, Europe particularly, and preparing the way for Future U.S. expansionism. That was declaration of intent to keep our hemisphere as their preserve, as their backyard, as their lakes.

More recently the Truman doctrine of 1947 and the Caracas Declaration of 1954, gave the Monroe Doctrine a new content, from an extra-hemispheric power in Europe, threatening our hemisphere to a foreign ideology of Marxism/Leninism. In his crusade against communism and national and social liberation, President Truman stated that Governments which conducted planned economies and controlled foreign trade were dangers to freedom; that freedom of speech and worship were dependent on the free

1983-10-28

14:50 – 15:00 hrs

enterprise system; that controlled economies were both not the American way and not the way to peace. He argued that the whole world should adopt the American system and that the American system could survive in America only if it became a world system.

1983-10-28

14:50 – 15:00 hrs

And so the Americans set about on a warpath to sell their criminal imperialist system to make it a world system, and anybody who did not go along must come under their "big stick." The Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt "big stick" were resurrected all over again. The Caracas Declaration of 1954 provided the political justification for the U.S. sharks swallowing the Central America sardine, Guatemala, for the C.I.A. overthrowing the democratically-elected Arbenz Government.

They are, talking about elections and democracy. They threw it out – the Arbenz Government with C.I.A. intervention and the training of Guatemalan "worms" in the jungles of Nicaragua under the butcher Somoza, and then getting them to invade Guatemala. Just before the invasion, the imperialist gathered their lackeys in Caracas, then in the O.A.S. and got them to pass a declaration and this is what it stated:

"The domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by an international communist movement extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extra-continental power would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

By "existing treaties," they meant bilateral treaties under the Rio Treaty in the case of our hemisphere, which together with NATO, the Baghdad Pact later called CENTO, and SEATO were intended to create an iron ring of military bases all over the world to contain not only communism but national and social liberation. That was the mission. All the puppets decreed to brand the Arbenz Government as communist, as the British Churchill Government had branded the P.P.P. Government in 1953, and therefore to justify intervention, whether direct or indirect. Yes, "best interest" meant direct and indirect attacks to protect the interest of Booker's and the ALCAN/ALCOA monopolies in Guyana and the United Fruit monopoly in Guatemala.

The Prime Minister told us about U.S. interests in South Africa, but they are also very big in this hemisphere. "Best interest" also meant the C.I.A. engineered invasion of Cuba in 1961 to protect U.S. investments. Cuba was the pearl of the Antilles so far as the U.S. imperialists were concerned.

1983-10-28

14:50 – 15:00 hrs

In 1965, like Reagan, President Johnson had sent troops to the Dominican Republic ostensibly, to quote from what he told the Congress, "to save the lives of our citizens and to save the lives of all people." But, again, imperialist interests were at the root of a massive invasion with 42,000 troops. The doctrine of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Oliver Lyttleton, in the case of the 1953 use of force in Guyana, which stated that Her Majesty's Government "is not willing to allow a communist state to be organised within the British Commonwealth" became the basis of the Johnson doctrine which stated:

"The American nations cannot, must not and will not permit the establishment of another Communist Government in the Western hemisphere."

This was the basis, too, for the C.I.A. intervention in Guyana in the 1960s. There should be no more Cubas in this hemisphere.

1983-10-28

15:00 – 15:10 hrs

National Assembly

15:00 hrs.

(The Jagan continues)

We are glad to see that the Guyana Government has taken a very firm position on this issue. Let us hope they will remain consistent. Had they spoken in the same strong way that they are speaking today perhaps we would not have had a Grenada. They were a little silent when the C.I.A. invaded Cuba, and they justified the massive intervention of the Dominican Republic. When the President, the then Prime Minister, visited President Johnson in the U.S.A. in 1968 and went horse-riding with him in Texas, he declared that he now understood why the Americans had intervened in Dominica. Anyway, let us hope that those days are gone. But we will just put that in for the record.

The "best interest" of the United States under President Ford became the "vital interest" under President Carter. These vital interests were spelt out by Abelardo Valdez, the then USAID Assistant Administrator. In a speech in 1979 to the United States House Foreign Affairs Committee, he said that Caribbean and Latin American countries were purchasing \$20 billion (U.S.) worth of export, that United States investment in this area exceeded \$27 billion or represented 82 percent of all their investment worldwide, and they were making a profit of \$4 billion per year on those investments. This does not include many other things which come up to nearly \$20 billion per year. That is their stake. And President Reagan, when he addressed the O.A.S. last year, said the Caribbean Region is a vital, strategic and commercial artery for the United States. Nearly half the U.S. trade, two-thirds of her imported oil and over half of her imported strategic mineral pass through the Panama Canal and the Gulf of Mexico.

Then there is bauxite. Caribbean bauxite, provides nearly three-quarters of the raw material for the American aluminum industry, but the region gets only a fraction of the total income of this integrated industry. Yes, this is how they plunder our resources and they hypocritically talk about freedom and democracy. I had to tell somebody the other day these facts when they were saying: let the "white man" come back, let the imperialists come back.

1983-10-28

15:00 – 15:10 hrs

I told them that when I was Minister of Trade, I had summoned Reynolds Bauxite Mines and asked them (they held 1/4 million acres of land which they were getting for exploration through annual Exploration Licenses) to better talk “turkey” or they were not going to get any more licences. For ten years they had operated in Guyana without paying one cent in tax. I said: which company in the world would operate in a country for ten years, consistently losing money and still staying there? They were cooking the books. They were selling to themselves cheap and buying from themselves dear as the imperialist always do. They bought four tons of bauxite from us for \$60 to make one ton of aluminum and we bought it back from them for \$1,500. This is imperialism and I hope that those on the other side, the Government, will take heed of all these facts and take a firm position along with this side of the Assembly. I do not mean the little side at the back (The United Force). They are not here and I can understand why they are not here conveniently. The Government must take a firm position because this is a time for decisions, this is a time to say which side you are on.

With the fall of the butcher Somoza of Nicaragua, the lunatic dictator, Garry of Grenada and the Shah of Iran, then the second largest exporter of oil, along with Afghanistan, the Kampuchean Pol Pot regime and the African Portuguese colonies, there was a decisive shift of the balance of forces against imperialism. And in their own backyard, with the Liberation of Grenada and Nicaragua, they became hysterical and began to move.

President Carter in the last period of his four-year rule reactivated the cold war and created the rapid deployment forces. A Caribbean Joint Task Force was stationed at Key West, Florida in the United States, and military exercises surveillance and intelligence activities were stepped up to cope with the volatile Caribbean, deemed by the United States Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, as the world's fourth trouble spot. The attentive "big brother" policies with smiles, tri-lateralist aid, reformism had more subtle methods of control, gave way to "gunboat diplomacy."

The People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada was subjected to pressure even by Carter. Former U.S. Secretary Frank Ortiz told Prime Minister Maurice Bishop that the United States would view with displeasure any tendency on the part of Grenada to develop closer ties with Cuba.

1983-10-28

15:00 – 15:10 hrs

The USA was daring to dictate to a sovereign Government, a sovereign territory, what their foreign policy must be, who must be their friends and who must not be their friends.

Various attempts were then made to intimidate, isolate and harass Grenada, and even to assassinate the principal leader of the People's Revolutionary Government. We remember the explosion which nearly killed Maurice Bishop and others. At one point President Carter said:

"Seriously considered blockading Grenada after the Government of Maurice Bishop began moving conspicuously closer to Cuba."

That quotation is from a Magazine called South, an English magazine dealing with the "Third World." It was written by a West Indian named George Manning. Dr. Richard Feinberg, State Department specialist on Latin American Affairs, visited Barbados in 1979 and declared that if United States vital interests were threatened, the use of military force would become an option. Why is it now threatened? Why has it become an option now? It has become an option now because of internal division. Whenever there are internal divisions, as in 1953 in Guyana and now in 1983 in Grenada, imperialism uses that as a stepping stone.

1983-10-28

15:10 – 15:20 hrs

National Assembly

15:10 hrs.

(Cde. Dr. Jagan continues)

More than that. The Caribbean is in a state of turmoil. The group of "wise men," whom they appointed recently to look into the economy, said something has got to be done.

Unemployment is around 30 percent and more in some places, and if nothing is done, we will soon find 40 and more percent of the young people roaming the streets without having anything to do. Why are these states in turmoil? Because of the neo-colonialist and colonialist policies they are pursuing, and the economic planning strategies dictated by imperialism – the Puerto Rican model, the partnership model, etc. Because of that, their countries can't solve the problems of the people. Meanwhile, Grenada under the P.R.G. was solving problems and becoming an inspiration to the people of the Caribbean. Therefore, snuff out that revolutionary outpost in the Caribbean so it will not be an inspiration, a guide, a hope for the long-suffering Caribbean peoples who have been betrayed by the puppet leaders for so long. This is why they have to move in, not to allow Grenada to become stabilized, not to allow it to become an example as Cuba has become to Latin America.

Cde. Deputy Speaker, the Reagan Administration deemed President Carter's policy soft, although Carter reactivated the cold war. It was said that he was too soft that he allowed the Panama Canal to go out of America's hand by the end of this century through the signing of the Carter Torrijos treaty; that he allowed Khomeini to get away with the Iran revolution and to humiliate America by taking American hostages. So Reagan said no more of this. Stop. We must now show our friends that we intend to stand by them and we intend to move to stamp out any more Cubas, any more Nicaraguas, any more Irans. So the bloody battle has started. They flex their muscles, build more weapons, MX missiles, neutron bombs, Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe. Now they threaten the whole world with another war, use Lebanon and Israel as a base to attack Middle East Arab countries, progressive revolutionary countries in the Middle East; use South Africa and some of their puppets in that region to hit at front-line states and other revolutionary democratic countries in Africa; and do the same thing in the Caribbean.

Well, this has now come to the point where it is quite clear what was the intention, a rightist offensive (military, economic, ideological, cultural and political), the main objective of which is to halt, if not reverse, as now in Grenada, the revolutionary process; to recolonise the region with Puerto Rican model and maintain the economies of the countries in a dependent status to the U.S.A.; to create a more congenial climate for the U.S. transnational corporations; and to propagate the American way of life. This is Reaganism.

As I said, it is a sad day for the Caribbean, not only because of the fascist like methods used by the Reagan administration but also because those who claim to stand and speak for the Caribbean peoples are selling out their birthright. They attacked Grenada. They attacked Suriname. C.I.A. is moving in there. They are now threatening Nicaragua and butchering people in El Salvador and Guatemala. Over a hundred get killed every week by the right wing death squads. This is how they are teaching the people democracy in the Caribbean. But the American people, fortunately, American senators like Christopher Dodd and others are resisting the policy. The American people do not want any more Vietnams. What are the hawks therefore thinking? That they have to reverse the so-called Vietnam Syndrome. People say they do not want to go and die, get maimed and get killed in other countries. For what? Therefore, they are opposed to going, whether in El Salvador or Grenada. Anywhere. Consequently, the hawks in Washington want to give the American people another message. We do not have to die. We do not have to lose. We will win. Therefore, go in quickly with massive force, score a victory. Then the American people will have the message – we do not have to lose like Vietnam, we can win. Thus the prelude for intervention in Nicaragua, intervention in Suriname, intervention in Cuba.

This is what is behind the mentality of the Reaganites. Change the Vietnam Syndrome, change the mentality of the American people.

It is in this context we have to see the tragedy in Grenada, a tragedy compounded by the so called leaders of the people. What then are our tasks? We have, first of all, to see that the gains which have been made by mankind from the very beginning when the Russian revolution was started in 1917, are preserved and that we do not have a thermo-nuclear war which will mean annihilation of mankind and of civilization as we know it. Therefore, we must make in Guyana the cause of world peace and disarmament our cause.

1983-10-28

15:10 – 15:20 hrs

We must come out and shout as millions of people in Europe and North America are shouting against the stationing of missiles in Europe. They are not being put there for defensive purposes. Grenada attacked Grenada. But Grenada is small fry. Their main enemy is the Soviet Union, the bastion of Socialist and they would like to have a first strike, first strike with Cruise and Pershing missiles stationed in Europe, which can hit and knock out the Soviet Union in six minutes, with the Soviet Union not being able to hit back at the U.S.A. with their intercontinental missiles which will take at least twenty minutes. This is the strategy of the hawks in Washington and their puppets in Europe, Thatcher and all of them who want to site the missiles in Europe. Therefore, let us remember that the battle in Europe, the battle to save world socialism is integrally related to the battle to save Grenada. World peace must be something we must be shouting about right here in Guyana. On that we have no difference. Let us have a chance to go on the radio, so far refused and talk about it.

1983-10-28

15:20 – 15:30 hrs

National Assembly

15:20 hrs.

(Cde. Dr. Jagan continues)

We must call for the withdrawal of all troops from Grenada. We are glad to see the vote in the United Nations where U.S. imperialism was isolated. Even their friends did not vote for them. This is a good sign. When Britain, Israel and France invaded Egypt in 1956, 62 nations in the United Nations got together and opposed the intervention. The Soviet Union came to the side of Egypt and the British had to withdraw and Anthony Eden was forced to resign as Prime Minister. Let us hope that world public opinion will be so aroused that that man in the White House will be removed because he is endangering not only the lives of the American people but the peoples all over the world. /Applause/

Those troops must be withdrawn and let us get the West Indian people to march as we are marching in this country, not only against the Americans but also against their own puppets so that we can have a new deal in the Caribbean. We must give every possible help not only to Grenada but to Nicaragua, El Salvador and Suriname, these are in the front line. We know what is happening in those countries. We must struggle for the transformation of the puppet OECS and Caricom into a genuine integration movement, at least as anti-imperialist as the Andean Pact which was started on the initiative of Salvador Allende and the revolutionary democratic Government of Peru under President Velasco Alvarado, and for the adoption of an independent position like the Contadora group made up of Venezuela, Colombia, Panama and Mexico. These people, so-called leaders in the Caribbean, have disgraced us.

Imagine Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico and Panama, standing up against U.S. imperialism in Central America and our puppets welcoming imperialism to attack Grenada. I am ashamed of these yard fowls. Why can't they behave like men, like the Contadora group? Those countries are not flaming radicals, they are not flaming revolutionaries. Yet, they are taking a sensible position, no to intervention. We cannot go about the world. Our head is low at the moment because of that behavior, we have to bring that to an end.

Here, at home, we must break with the imperialist I.M.F. We warned about the I.M.F. in 1978. They are still hovering around the corners. It is no use talking only of intervention with arms against Grenada.

Equally dangerous, and perhaps more dangerous, are the more subtle methods of penetration through the I.M.F., which wants the country to change course for the grant of a few dollars. We must break with the pro-imperialist I.M.F. We know that parallels are being drawn now in Guyana with Grenada. Imperialism is hitting Grenada because it was a socialist – oriented and Guyana because it is socialist: this is the claim of the P.N.C. But let us call a spade a spade. Let us deal with things scientifically, not in rhetoric. Reagan is applying pressure to Guyana but not for the same reason that pressure and military intervention took place in Grenada.

Nobody could doubt where the Bishop Government, the P.R.G., stood in domestic and foreign policy. There was no inconsistency about it. What was said and what was practiced was the same. Here we have rhetoric. What is said is not, however, what is put in practice, and so we would like to put the thing how we see it, how the Guyanese can see it, too, and judge. What is existing here and against which pressure is exerted is not socialism. It is state, bureaucratic, co-operative and parasitic capitalism, a form of capitalism which U.S. imperialism is opposed to. Why, because one-time strong friends of U.S. imperialism in every possible way have been displaced. I mean the United Force (U.F.) and all the business elements who were backing them. They were displaced politically, and were taken out of Government in 1968. But they were taken also out of their business positions, especially in trading in favour of the state-operated import/export trade, and state and P.N.C. dominated wholesale and retail trade under the highfalutin name of K.S.I., Knowledge Sharing Institute and some private new friends of the P.N.C. after those. So imperialism is angry. The P.N.C. was their second friend; the U.F. was their first friend. They are angry because firstly you displaced U.F. politically, economically. Secondly, your special brand of capitalism cannot provide them with the political stability that they need. You revised the Sophia Declaration under pressure and brought in the New Investment Code to allow the imperialist to come in. But the imperialists do not want to come into any country which is faced with political instability and riots around the corner as you yourself said when you pointed out that the new I.M.F. proposals were a recipe to riot. They do not want that. Therefore, they are pressuring you not because you are socialist but because your type of capitalism cannot "produce the goods." They are pressuring you to go to free enterprise, dependent capitalism, which is tied to the advanced capitalism of North America, which has a distorted under-developed base like Venezuela, as an example, with 85 percent of its

1983-10-28

15:20 – 15:30 hrs

income based on one product, oil and with oil employing only one percent of the total population – Venezuela which used to be a producer of its own food now having to import practically all its food, a classic example of dependency. Now in Venezuela, with the drop in the price of oil, they are in as much trouble as Guyana.

1983-10-28

15:30 – 15:40 hrs

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

15:30 hrs.

(Cde. Dr. Jagan continues)

Not only Venezuela but also Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Brazil, the most "developed" of these dependent capitalist Latin American countries, are in the most trouble. That is where the Reagan administration wants to push the P.N.C. Government. We are against that, the P.P.P. is against that because that road has no future. Look around in Latin America, look around in the Caribbean. It is that which cause guerilla warfare in Cuba under Batista, which caused guerilla warfare under Somoza, and which is now causing guerilla warfare in El Salvador and Guatemala.

That dependant capitalism is not the answer for Guyana. The answer for Guyana is socialist orientation, a socialist oriented path which Maurice Bishop and his Government was pursuing, for which they were attacked, for which they were slaughtered recently with the invasion. Therefore, we repeat, break with the IMF. Grapple seriously with the internal situation because if this continues to slide as it is sliding downwards, no matter what you say Guyana will drop into the lap of imperialism.

Therefore, find a political solution to the grave economic social and political crisis. We are not faced with a crisis only because of the world capitalist crisis, there is also the internal political situation with lack of democracy and so many other things. And at the same time, we must strengthen our relations – economic, political, cultural – with the socialist community, with the revolutionary democratic state.

This is the only way forward. Of course, there are risk in these things. But what is the other way? Submit on the basis of geographical fatalism that Uncle Sam is too strong; therefore, all of us have to bow. If we do that it is a dead end road. Latin American countries are facing us squarely in the face. There is no future in their dependency model. Political differences as I said in 1953 in British Guiana and similar differences in Grenada in 1983 opened the way for intervention by imperialism. Imperialism must not be allowed to meddle in our affairs. Down with US imperialism down with the puppets of imperialism. Forward ever, backward never!

1983-10-28

15:30 – 15:40 hrs

The Deputy Speaker: As it is not yet 4 o'clock, I suggest that Cde. Collymore speaks.

Cde. C. Collymore: Cde. Speaker, we on this side of the Assembly would like to associate ourselves with the remarks made by the Prime Minister when he introduced the motion. What has transpired in Grenada is unfortunate and has received worldwide condemnation.

I would like to state the achievements which have been made by the Bishop Government. At this point I wish to say that we are very much concerned over the untimely death of Maurice Bishop and we feel that those who are guilty should be brought to justice.

Cde. Speaker, much has been achieved in Grenada by the New Jewel administration since the dictator Eric Gairy was removed from office. It is because of these achievements, these dramatic achievements by the Bishop Government that the Americans have intervened. The fact is they were planning all along to intervene in Grenada but they had no opportunity. However, as soon as this internal wrangling in the NJM erupted into bloodshed they seized on the chance and they went in without any delay. As soon as Bishop was assassinated a high powered committee was set up in the White House and I knew that something was going to happen. They did not waste any time.

Now what are some of the facts about the Gairy years? There was massive unemployment reaching fifty per cent. There was a massive exodus of Grenadians outside of Grenada overseas. Statistics show that there are more Grenadians outside of Grenada than those who are living inside Grenada. Up to the last census there were 110,000 Grenadians living inside, on the island, while those who were living outside in various areas, North America, England and in the Caribbean areas mounted to 500,000 the statistics show that there are more Grenadians living in Trinidad than living in Grenada. This was caused by the activities or the measures undertaken by the vicious and corrupt Gairy regime.

Under Gairy, imperialist exploitation was rampant and ruthless, and the country was a ... state of the Americans. Illiteracy was growing by leaps and bounds. He statistics show that illiteracy in the period before the revolution took over ranged from 35 – 40% of the population and of course there were human rights violations willy nilly. Gairy had this notorious mongoose squad and he was beating up people and killing people, committing murders readily. There was also crime and rampant prostitution. In fact, Gairy even invited the American Mafia to come into his country and set up casinos. He is said to be one of the mafia dons.

Cde. Speaker, there was also poverty. Grenada was very poor. There are things which Bishop and his regime inherited. Now, what has happened since Bishop took over in 1979? The People's Revolutionary Government was moving towards economic independence. Not only flag and National Anthem but economic independence. Industrialization was also proceeding at a very rapid rate and this is one of the reasons for the American invasion.

During the Gairy regime, the state sector in Grenada accounted for only four percent of the Gross Domestic Product. Under Bishop's administration the state sector eventually accounted for 25 per cent of the GDP through Rapid industrialize development of the economy. These are some of the things which moved the Americans to desperate invasion. There has also been a big boost to agriculture. The figures issued by the PRG say that up to 1982 the PRG was spending fifty four times more money on agriculture than the Gairy regime and this figure is expected to rise. Thirty-three percent of the people in Grenada are all involved in agriculture.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

15:40 hrs.

(Cde. Collymore continues)

Socialist Orientation as an economic policy was rapidly gaining momentum in Grenada, and the New Jewel Movement was committed to Marxism/Leninism. This is another reason why the Americans intervened. Bishop was making such a very good thing running the country that even the World Bank praised his administration. The World Bank seldom praises anybody. It hardly ever praises the imperialists but it praised the Bishop Government. I have some quotations here from a World Bank memorandum. The World Bank issued an economic memorandum on Grenada in 1982, and aspects of this memorandum were quoted by the Deputy Prime Minister, Bernard Coard, at a press conference in St. George's on October 4th, 1982. I quote some of the things which the World Bank said in the memorandum.

"The Government which came into power in 1979 inherited a deteriorating economy and is now addressing the task of rehabilitation and laying the foundation for future growth."

It went on to say:

"The development of agro-industries offers promise. Fruit and vegetables which were often lost through spoilage can now be processed in a new agro-industry plant established by the Government. Agro-industries give incentives to many full-time and part-time farmers to produce more. The agro-industrial plant exported about 50 percent of its 1981 production and offers scope for expansion."

The World Bank report continued as follows:

"Grenada has been one of the very few countries in the Western hemisphere that continued to experience per capita growth during 1981."

Not a single country in the western hemisphere, including the United States of America, could have shown the statistics which Grenada showed. These dynamic aspects of the Revolution therefore generated envy in the Caribbean and in the North where the colossus exists.

What are some more of the economic achievements? This has to be seen against what transpired under Gairy. I have here some figures for the period 1970 to 1975. It is said that the economy under Gairy registered a negative growth of 25 percent aggregate G.D.P. So, between 1970 and 1975, under Gairy, the economy of Grenada went backwards by 25 percent. What has happened since Bishop took over?

1983-10-28

15:40 – 15:50 hrs

The G.D.P. was growing. It grew in real terms as follows: In 1979 by 2 percent; 1980 by 3.1 percent; 1981 by 2 percent; 1982 by 5.5 percent – almost the biggest in the world. No other country in this Caribbean area or in the western hemisphere showed this figure. This is why the World Bank praised the Grenada Government. For 1983 they were trying to achieve 8.5 percent real growth and since they knew what they were doing it is likely that they would have achieved this maximum. The minimum was 7.5 percent real growth.

What about domestic investments? Gairy was obviously not spending money. Four percent of the economy under his regime was in the state sector; he was not spending money! He was leaving the whole economy to be dominated by imperialists and the local sharks. The figures for domestic investment are in E.E.C. dollars. In 1978, under Gairy, it was \$8 million. In 1979, when Bishop took over, it was increased by 100 percent to \$16 million. These are investments in various areas of the national economy, particularly agriculture and industry. In 1980, it was \$39.9 million; in 1981 it was \$79.2 million and in 1982 the sum of \$109 million was invested in the domestic economy.

Unemployment, as a result, fell dramatically. These are some of the things which worried the "yard fowls" and "wood lice" in the Caribbean. In 1979, when the Revolution took power, unemployment was 50 percent of the labour force. That is, 23,000 Grenadians were jobless. By 1982 it had been reduced to 5,600; and up to June 1983, according to figures given by Phyllis Coard at a rally in Trinidad, unemployment in Grenada was 12 percent, equal to 4,560 persons. The Government had calculated that by 1983 it would have completely obliterated unemployment in Grenada. How were they going to do it? We have some statistics showing how it was to be done. In the next three years, which would be by 1985, new jobs were to be found as follows: In agriculture 2,500 jobs; at the new airport and in tourism 500 jobs, and in construction 2,000. That total comes up, in these three areas alone, to 5,000 jobs which is more than the 1983 June figure of 4,560 persons unemployed. It means, therefore, that Grenada would have solved its unemployment crisis. I don't see how the Americans could have sat there without doing something, rather than just talking, but they were waiting for an opportunity to go in to intervene and they got the opportunity when the two leaders split.

1983-10-28

15:40 – 15:50 hrs

There are some other achievements of the Grenadian Revolution. Maurice Bishop went to Trinidad in 1983 and he made a speech. Some of the things which he said were reproduced in a newspaper called "Courage" of the People's Popular Movement. I just want to quote to you some of the things that Maurice Bishop said about the achievements of his Government.

"In 1982"-

I am quoting

"out of every dollar spent by Government 37 cents were spent on education and health services. Secondary education in Grenada is free and University education is also free. Over 300 students are on scholarships overseas."

Before that period there were none on scholarships overseas.

"To date the poorest, 75 percent, of all primary school children have benefited from free school books, free uniforms and a free hot meal daily in schools."

That is socialism; that is socialist orientation. This thing was worrying the imperialists and the bourgeois riff-raff in the Caribbean.

"The doctor/patient ratio was 1:4,000 before the Revolution and there is now one doctor for every 2,057 persons. In 1979 the dentist population ratio was 1:30,000 and it is presently 1:18,450."

"In April this year a national insurance scheme, providing benefits for all workers between the ages of 16 and 60 years who are employed in the private and public sectors, has been established. Benefits payable include old age pensions and grants, sickness and invalidity benefits, maternity benefit, survivors' benefit and funeral grants. On a national scale, prior to the Revolution, there was no social security programme.

In 1980, a maternity leave law gave special protection to mothers during a reasonable period before and after childbirth. Three months maternity leave is guaranteed under the law. Also, a law giving equal pay for equal work for both men and women has been passed. Some 17,244 families, three out of every four families, have received benefits under a national house repair programme where loans, interest-free for a ten-year repayment period are provided to assist the poorest section of the population to repair their homes. The National Housing Authority constructed 31 low cost units in 1981 and 50 in 1982. A prefabricated house construction plant is now on line with an output capability of 500 houses per year."

1983-10-28

15:40 – 15:50 hrs

So they are saying here that they have set up a prefab. plant called the Sandino Plant and it is going to produce 500 units per year. It means, therefore, that Grenada under the Bishop Government was solving the housing crisis. That is another reason why the Caricom riff-raffs were worried. The newspaper goes on to say:

"Since 1979 30 percent of the lowest paid workers have been exempted from the payment of income tax. In 1981, the average wages and salaries increased by 17-1/2 percent and in 1982 by 10 percent. At the same time prices went up by 10-1/2 percent in 1981 and 7 percent in 1982. For two successive years, the real wages of Grenadian workers have been increased. Old age pensions increased 10 percent in 1982 and a further 12-1/2 percent in 1983."

1983-10-28

15:50 – 16:00 hrs

National Assembly

15:50 hrs

(Cde. Collymore continues)

They say further: milk is provided free through the milk feeding programme to a substantial section of the population. Seventy-three thousand pounds of milk reach 50,000 people monthly. In 1982, 32 state enterprises produced E.C. \$73 million, just under 1/4 percent of Grenada's G.D.P. The private sector and various co-operatives produced the remainder of the G.D.P. This is what Maurice Bishop said and is what was reported in the Progressive Newspaper. Now a very good way of gauging the development of a country, the improvements which the people made, is to look at its infant mortality rate. It would be shocking to realize that within the Caribbean, the highest infant mortality rate is registered by Guyana at 44 per thousand. Grenada has 15.4 per thousand. Cde. Speaker, these figures mean that in Grenada you have more nutrition, better housing, better medical facilities and so on available to others, plus better food and foodstuffs. These are the reasons why this figure pertaining to Grenada is 15.4 per thousand.

Inflation which is another issue plaguing the Caribbean was 30 percent when Bishop inherited the Government from Gairy. In 1982, it was 7 percent and in 1983 the Government intends to reduce it further. There is, therefore, very sound management in Grenada under the Bishop New Jewel Movement. Now we come to this conclusion – the State Sector made profits! Nearer home here we do not make profits. Last year Guyana had \$143 million in State Sector loses, while the Grenada Government made \$3 million in profits in the State Sector. The State Sector in Grenada also achieved 90 percent of its targets. The debt service ratio in 1982 was 3 percent of export earnings. This is a figure which does not obtain in any other part of the Caribbean, but those very inefficient people went in there to topple the NJM Government. In Guyana the debt service ratio figure is 14 percent for 1983. The surplus on the Current Account Budget of Grenada was \$6.5 million in 1982; so they are not having any deficits. They are operating on surpluses. The food imports, the importation on foodstuffs under Gairy in 1979 was 40 percent of the total importation Bill. Under Bishop this fell to 28 percent in 1982 and for 1983, they intended to reduce it further to 25 percent.

Cde. Speaker, in dealing with agro industrial output (the agricultural industrial sector) increased by 166 percent in 1982 over 1981, and there were plans for the cultivation of 10,000 acres of cocoa within eight years. These figures show that the NJM Government knew where it was going, was making rapid progress, and would very soon have made Grenada the paradise of the Caribbean. The production volume in 1983 is expected to triple that of the previous year – 1982. But all this does not mean that the private sector was being tormented and was not prospering. It was prospering. The private sector undertook 25 percent more projects in 1982 than the year before and their investments in the economy doubled in 1982 when compared to 1981.

Where it concerns freedom to travel, the Grenadians can take out of Grenada \$3,000 E.C. on every trip. \$3,000 E.C.! Here in Guyana we are lucky if we can take out 10 percent of that figure per trip abroad.

Cde. Speaker, I will now show you the hypocrisy of the American Government. When the Grenada revolution triumphed, the USA offered Bishop and his Government \$50,000 in aid. That cannot even buy a bull-dozer. \$50,000 was an insult; and now they are the people (as some people are saying) who are crying crocodile tears over the death of Bishop. They should be ashamed of themselves - \$50,000! He refused it categorically. One of those who went there, who sent troops, the Jamaican, P.M. Seaga, one would think that he would have hesitated to intervene there, because his Government is not running properly. I do not want to go into too many figures about Seaga's rickety Government and the mess he is making of the Jamaican economy, but in 1981 and 1983, the two years inclusive, the Jamaican G.D.P. went backward by 10 percent fall. There is great concern by Jamaicans about how Seaga is managing their affairs in respect of their dwindling foreign reserves and their battered economy. Activities in these two areas show that their debt service ratio is catastrophic. Cde. Speaker, in 1980 the Jamaican debt service ratio was at 52.2 percent. In 1982 it rose to 101 percent: of their export earnings and in 1983, 141 percent. This shows that the Jamaican people have to find 41 percent more money than what they are earning to pay their overseas debts. There is therefore reasonable ground for jealousy and envy, in Caricom, because of the progress Grenada has been making. Bishop had this to say when he was addressing the nation on New Year's Day, January 1983.

This is what Bishop said:

"Even our right wing detractors are today being forced to acknowledge the progress we have made. For them it is indeed difficult to dispute a World Bank Report which states that our poor struggling country with all its natural economic limitations, and in spite of the dismal legacy of economic backwardness, corruption and mismanagement from the Gairy dictatorship, and the well known list of imperialist attempts at economic sabotage achieved 9 percent accumulative growth in our economy for the first three years of the Revolution. Furthermore what can they say about the reduction of our unemployment from 49 percent in 1979 to 14.2 percent today."

This is what he said at the beginning of January. Subsequently, these figures changed with further developments in the year. Cde. Speaker, Grenada was pursuing a cultural revolution in its society. Bishop and his Government were also in favour of ending exploitation and liberating women. I have here a speech by Maurice Bishop made in 1980 on the first anniversary of the revolution. On page 9 he was talking about women and this is what he had to say:

"...or consider the case of the women of Grenada. The unemployment situation under hurricane Gairy was that over 50 percent of the national work force was unemployed and among women over 70 percent were unemployed and those few who did eventually manage to get a job. Many of them, in return for the job, had to sell this bodes before they could get the job. And with the ending once and for all in our country of the sexual exploitation and victimisation of our women we say a real democratic basis for the participation of our women has been laid."

He went on to talk on page 12 about the ending of exploitation and this is one of the things which imperialism obviously could not reconcile itself to. When a Government tries to end exploitation of man by man, it is hated by the exploiters.

I will quote from page 12 what he said:

"The right to exploit has been abolished when we made our first statement of a policy after 13th March. We made it perfectly clear that we were not interested in taking away rights that our concern instead was to add new rights." For example, "to give workers the right to form a Union, to return our farmers the right to run their own co-operative bodies to ensure that the women of our country through equal pay for equal work and through ending sexual exploitation are able to enjoy an equal place with their men folk in building our country. We made all of these proclamations and pronouncements and everything that has been done over the past year has been in furtherance of these principles. But the one right that we made clear that we were going to end once and for all and that right we have abolished, is the right to exploit."

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

16:00 hrs.

(Cde. C. Collymore continues)

"The right to exploit has been killed dead in Grenada. Therefore when we see elements willing to work hand in hand with external agencies and individuals to try to destabilise the revolution we can always be sure of the fact that these are people who are annoyed about the fact that the one right which is most precious to them, the right to exploit has been removed from them."

Cde. Speaker, to make a final point, I said before that envy was building up. I wish to quote what was written in the 'Thunder,' theoretical organ of the P.P.P. No. 3 of 1983 by me. The article is titled 'The Crisis in Caricom.' I foresaw what was going on, that they would have broken up. A former American ambassador to the Eastern Caribbean Sally Shelton, was addressing the American senate. She was talking about the attitude of U.S. President Ronald Reagan and his government towards Grenada and she said that "it is incongruous that the most powerful nation on earth should feel so disturbed and so threatened by a small island of 110,000 whose main export is nutmeg." Well, I went on to say that Mrs. Shelton was missing the point. "Nutmeg was not the issue. It is the socio-economic political system which is at stake in the Caribbean community. The system so loved by Reagan and so loathed by Bishop. Dependent capitalism."

"In Grenada the government is socialist-oriented and is laying the material and technical foundations for the construction of socialism. That is what is worrying Ronald Reagan and the jittery, trigger-happy collaborators. When Bishop succeeds Grenada will become the revolutionary power-pole in Caricom as Cuba has become to Latin America. Reagan is fighting socialism in reality not nutmeg politics or a small population. By this same token the Grenada revolution could be said dialectically to be a contributory factor to the deepening crisis in Caricom like a rose among thorns."

Cde. Speaker, that quotation ends and I wish therefore to throw out a warning to my friends on the opposite side who control this government. Now is the time to respond positively to our programme, our call for National Patriotic Front Government because they should not feel that Reagan is not looking here. We have been reading and monitoring their reports and statements and conclude that this government is under severe pressure from the Americans. If they think Reagan is not looking to see how he can penetrate here and get rid of them and bring about dominant free enterprise capitalism then they are wrong. We

1983-10-28

16:00 – 16:03 hrs

are calling on them to accede positively to our call for a National Patriotic Front Government. Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: It is now a convenient time for us to take the adjournment.

Sitting suspended at 4:03 p.m.

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

16:35 hrs.

On resumption --

The Deputy Speaker: The honourable Vice-President and Attorney General.

The Vice-President and Attorney General: (Cde. Dr. Shahabuddeen); Cde. Deputy Speaker, may I begin by taking the opportunity to thank you and the Assembly for so kindly welcoming me back in my new capacity. May I in turn say very sincerely that it is a pleasure for me to serve under your distinguished, experienced and courteous presidency of this Chamber.

Cde. Deputy Speaker, when we have reached in the region the sorry pass of witnessing the aberration of Caricom states grotesquely asserting a contractual right to invade a sister state, all subject to the Crown, I apprehend that this Honourable House may well expect some assistance from me as Attorney General in helping to place matters in perspective, in so far at any rate as this can be done within the limited time available.

Cde. Deputy Speaker, what can be the justification for the present war? Giving his reason for the attack, President Reagan said and here I quote:

"We have taken this decisive action for three reasons. First, and of overriding importance, to protect innocent lives, including up to 1,000 Americans whose personal safety is, of course, my paramount concern. Second, to forestall further chaos. And third, to assist in the restoration of conditions of law and order and of governmental institution to the island of Grenada..."

A fourth ground, which he added, was that the United States acted at the joint request of the six Caricom invading states. In passing, it may be observed that in the case of Jamaica and Barbados the ground is likewise that they acted at the request of the four invading OECS states.

A fifth ground, in the case of the four invading OECS states, is that they acted by way of a preemptive self-defensive strike against what they perceived to be a threat posed by the situation in Grenada to their own security.

1983-10-28

16:35 – 16:40 hrs

A just recently added allegation by President Reagan that the island was about to be occupied by Cuba may be summarily dismissed as an interesting but groundless afterthought.

Cde. Deputy Speaker, unscrambling the remaining grounds, it will be convenient to deal first with the alleged chaos and absence of effective government. The contention was factually inconsistent with the authority exercised at the time by the military government and evidenced by the stubborn and heroic resistance still being put up against overwhelming odds. However, even if there was chaos and lack of effective government, it is not clear who appointed the aggressors to judge that issue and to institute remedial measures.

16:40 hrs

(Cde. Dr. Shahabuddeen continues)

The mere fact, Cde. Speaker, of there having been a coup, even accompanied, as it was in this case by tragic loss of life, clearly did not ground external intervention. State practice testifies every day against the contrary proposition.

It used to be asserted in earlier times that there was a right to intervene on humanitarian grounds. The balance of opinion of international jurists is against the survival of that right in more modern times. In any event, the happenings in Grenada fell signally short of what would be required to justify the exercise of that now doubtful power. A further and sadder thought is that the casualties inflicted through the war exceed in number the casualties occasioned by the coup. Precious Caribbean lives have been lost. Already too many. The dismal arithmetic, when completed, will be difficult to reconcile with genuine humanitarian concern.

As to the safety of expatriates, it may be that there is a right to intervene for the purpose of rescuing one's nationals, but clearly this is a right of restricted compass. Its exercise was illustrated by the Franco-Belgian intervention in Kolwezi in May 1978 to save the lives of French and Belgian nationals who were reported being held as hostages by secessionist in the province of Shaba in Zaire. Not a tittle of evidence has been adduced to establish that a single hair of any national of any of the invading states was ever in real danger of being hurt in Grenada.

In any event, rescue operations of the Kolwezi kind are limited actions which could not justifiably extend to the destruction of the whole army of a country, to the protracted occupation of the country, to the removal of its government and to the installation of another.

In sum, except for limited rescue operations, which clearly do not include the instant action, armed interventions are illegal. The proposition is widely attested by international lawyers and firmly buttressed by United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2131 (XX) of December 21, 1965, which explicitly stated that "no state has the right to intervene directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of other states". The principle was reaffirmed by General Assembly Resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970 entitled "Declaration on the

Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations"; and, again and more recently, by the General Assembly's "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States" of December 1981.

As to the restoration of democratic institutions, the word "restoration" would seem to imply that democratic institutions existed in Grenada before the revolution^{of March 1979}. Do the aggressors seriously consider that this was so? What did exist prior to the revolution was a government which, despite its ugly shortcomings, was ideologically acceptable to Washington. Was it perhaps this aspect of things which it was desired to restore? Was the discontent with particular men, or with a particular system?

Ever since the Caricom Summit at Ocho Rios in November 1982 it was obvious that the very group of Caricom territories which was waging war in Grenada - for that, let it be clear, is the unworthy enterprise upon which they are engaged - had been intent on expelling Grenada from Caricom. It was equally clear that underlying this fixed determination was an implacable aversion to the ideological character of the Bishop regime in Grenada. It was accordingly also clear that their purpose was not to reinstitute the electoral system for the sake of its inherent virtues, but to employ it hopefully as a mechanism for sweeping away the P.R.G. and putting in its place a government more responsive and appreciative of the political philosophy associated with the magic of the market place. Initiatives taken to amend the organic document of Caricom with the transparent view of facilitating the attainment of this aim foundered in the legal misconceptions in which they had been hastily conceived. But such is the respect for law and order of those advocating the proposed changes that what legal ingenuity could not accomplish is now sought to be assured by force of arms. That a war for such a purpose is illegal is too clear for argument. And yet, looking at the various exculpatory statements offered, who can doubt that that purpose is the dominant note struck?

In effect, as all the world has been quick to recognise, the recent military take-over and the sad connected events constitute the occasion for, but not the cause of, the present war.

A number of asseverations have been put forward with a view to veiling this ugly connection. One of the most fascinating concerns the sudden canonization of the

1983-10-28

16:40 - 16:50 hrs

fallen Prime Minister by some of his erstwhile detractors. According to them, speaking as it were, ^{only} but yesterday, Bishop's regime was repressive and averse to holding elections for fear of an adverse result. Now we are told by the same critics that the Prime Minister was, after all, a responsible moderate, that he did have a popular base and was in fact moving latterly in the direction of holding elections. It is open to fair speculation whether, had he done so and won, the result would have been any more acceptable to the self-appointed custodians of regional morality than it was before.

As to the alleged threat to security, the original language employed by the invading OECS states was baldly framed in terms of a need to undertake an armed intervention in Grenada with the simple view of changing the government. Faced with the clear illegality of such a course, an alternative rationale has been deployed in terms of a right to undertake a pre-emptive self-defensive strike in order to protect OECS states which ostensibly considered their security threatened by the situation in Grenada. Except for the coup, no change had occurred in the military position in Grenada. Whatever else the regime did, there was no evidence to suggest that they uttered a single threat to any intervening state or embarked on a single action indicative of an intent directly or indirectly to project their military power beyond their own frontiers.

16:50 hrs.

(Cde. Dr. Shahabuddeen continues)

Much rhetoric has been spent on the size of the Grenada army. It was said that this was much larger than the force at the disposal of OECS states and that a strategic imbalance was involved. Two observations may be made. First, any kind of army in Grenada would be larger than the force at the disposal of a state such as Dominica, which, as her Prime Minister has proudly explained, had deliberately decided against having any army at all. And, secondly, however large may have been the Grenada army, the justification for its size had to be searched for not in any relativity as between Grenada and OECS states which deliberately chose either to have no army or to have a diminutive one, but in the threat to Grenada's security as assessed by its own competent authorities. Of greater relevance would have been any landing exercises carried out in the area by any extra-regional power unsympathetic to the regime. The baleful events which have since unfolded show that the magnitude of that threat which had to be guarded against was in fact so great as to prompt the reflection that, however large the Grenada army was in absolute terms, it was regrettably yet not large enough to fulfil its primary purpose of guaranteeing the safety of the state and the integrity of its territory.

The question whether the right of anticipatory self-defence survived the Charter of the United Nations has been much debated. It is perhaps the case that even writers who doubt or who deny the general availability of the right today do nevertheless tend to concede that there may be a casus omissus in the sense that there could be special circumstances in which a country does not have to wait to be actually struck before itself striking.

But the circumstances have to be very special indeed. By way

of illustration, it may help to refer to an excerpt from Louis Henkin's work on "How Nations Behave", 2nd ed., 1979, pp. 141-145, where he considers that an exception might be made in the case of nuclear war on the ground that the instant and total character of the destruction involved had not been foreseen by the framers of the United Nations Charter. Speaking on the subject, he writes:

"If there were clear evidence of an attack so imminent that there was no time for political action to prevent it, the only meaningful defense for the potential victim might indeed be the pre-emptive attack and - it may be argued - the scheme of Article 2(4) together with Article 51 (i.e., of the U.N. Charter) was not intended to bar such attack. But this argument would claim a small and special exception for the special case of the surprise nuclear attack; today, and one hopes for a time longer, it is meaningful and relevant principally only as between the Soviet Union and the United States and, fortunately, only for a most unlikely eventuality. But such a reading of the Charter, it should be clear, would not permit (and encourage) anticipatory self-defense in other, more likely situations between nations generally."

Viewed in so apocalyptic a context, it may perhaps be thought a trifle out of perspective, if not surrealistic, for mini-states within the region to be talking grandly of a right to make a pre-emptive self-defensive strike. One listens to it with disbelief.

Further, Cde. Speaker, it needs to be remarked that even if the states in question could bring themselves within the framework of the pre-Charter concept of anticipatory self-defence, the action which they undertake would need to bear a reasonable proportion to the threat sought to be abated. Nothing in any military threat which they professed to perceive - even making the most generous allowance for the hyper-sensitivity of the diminutive - could possibly justify an operation so large in scale and extended in time as to encompass the declared purpose of removing the regime in Grenada and of instituting arrangements for the establishment in its place of a parliamentary or

any other kind of government acceptable to the invaders.

Before leaving this aspect, Cde. Speaker, the House may wish to reflect on the fact that it was in reliance on the right of anticipatory self-defence that Nazi Germany sought to justify its invasion of the Soviet Union; that the United States sought to justify its action against Cuba during the missile crisis; and that Israel unleashed the 1967 war against the Arabs and destroyed the nuclear installations of Iraq in 1981. The defence drew controversy in each case. And yet in no case were the facts as unpromising for the exercise of the right as in the wholly meretricious one now before the House.

One further pretence about security must regrettably be suffered to trouble the intelligence of this Honourable House. The OECS states concerned, all else failing, have been forced to search for justification of the intemperate course upon which they have embarked by straining the provisions of article 8 of the 1981 Treaty establishing their organisation and to which Grenada is a party as a sovereign independent state. Because of my own unhappy inability to appreciate the importance sought to be placed on this article, I must ask the special indulgence of the House to read it into the record. It is as follows:

Article 8

Composition and Functions of the Defence and Security Committee

1. The Defence and Security Committee shall consist of the Ministers responsible for Defence and Security or other Ministers of Plenipotentiaries designated by Heads of Government of the Member States.
2. Only Member States possessing the necessary competence in respect of matters under consideration from time to time shall take part in the deliberations of the Defence and Security Committee.
3. The Defence and Security Committee shall be responsible to the

Authority. It shall take appropriate action on any matters referred to it by the Authority and shall have the power to make recommendations to the Authority. It shall advise the Authority on matters relating to external defence and on arrangements for collective security against external aggression including mercenary aggression, with or without the support of internal or national elements.

4. The Defence and Security Committee shall have responsibility for co-ordinating the efforts of Member States for collective defence and the preservation of peace and security against external aggression and for the development of close ties among the Member States of the Organisation in matters of external defence and security, including measures to combat the activities of mercenaries, operating with or without the support of internal or national elements, in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

17:00 hrs

5. The decisions and directives of the Defence and Security Committee shall be unanimous and shall be binding on all subordinate institutions of the Organisation unless otherwise determined by the Authority.
6. Subject to any directives that the Authority may give, the Defence and Security Committee shall meet as and when necessary. It shall determine its own procedure, including that for convening meetings, for the conduct of business thereat and at other times, and for the annual rotation of the Office of Chairman among its members in accordance with the principle of alphabetical order of the Member States.

The provision is to be read with article 3 (2) (q) of the Treaty under which member states undertook to -

"endeavour to coordinate, harmonise and pursue joint policies particularly in the fields of -

(q) mutual defence and security."

It is enough to consider the general thrust and character of these provisions, together with the expressions "external defence", "collective security", "external aggression", "mercenary aggression", "mutual defence and security", to appreciate that they never remotely visualised that a sovereign independent state which chose to sign the Treaty was thereby conferring a contractual competence on other member states to invade its territory invito domino. The necessity under article 8 (5) for decisions and directives of the Defence and Security Committee to be unanimous clearly excludes such unilateralism.

So altogether strange and momentous is the right claimed under the Treaty that, if indeed it exists, its existence might fairly be expected to be evidenced by clear and convincing language. By contrast, however microscopically one reads the provisions, however much or long one wrestles with them, it is wholly impossible by any combination or permutation of the words to extract from them the justification for which they have been prayed in aid. I do respectfully congratulate anyone who can succeed in imposing on the provisions a construction in favour of a contractual right on the part of some member states to wage war against another, without in the process convicting himself of sophistry to the point of absurdity.

As to acting at the request of the O.E.C.S., this defence has been advanced with such repetitiveness and emphasis as to suggest an intention to mesmerise by incantation where argument fails to convince. But the formula will not work, for

1983-10-28

17:00 - 17:10 hrs

it is a fundamental and universal principle of both law and logic that one cannot give to another more than one himself has, or, as it is said, nemo dat quod non habet. Hence, if, as argued, the O.E.C.S. states themselves did not have any ground for invading Grenada, it follows ineluctably that any invitation which they may have extended or been persuaded to extend to the United States, Jamaica and Barbados affords these latter no justification whatever for their own conduct.

It remains, Cde. Speaker, to mention the least graceful aspect of the matter. This concerns a belated reference to an invitation to intervene, allegedly issued by the Governor General before the invasion, which curiously never came to the notice either directly or indirectly of the British Government or the Queen, whose representative he was, although it is said to have come to the notice of others. So strange is the allegation that both the British Government and Her Majesty have been forced to deny knowledge. And it will accordingly surprise no one that not a word about the request was whispered even in the sanctum of the caucus of Caricom Heads held over the last weekend. And this of course is without entering into the question whether the Governor General in any event had the necessary legal or political mandate at the time to initiate action within the framework of that branch of international law relating to intervention by invitation.

So then, Cde. Speaker, we are left with this. There being not a scintilla of evidence to justify the action on the basis of self-defence, whether anticipatory or not, or on any other of the pleaded grounds, the action constitutes an armed intervention in another state. And that is clearly illegal, for, as has been recently said by the distinguished President of France, the only way that a country's armed forces can enter the territory of another with which it is not lawfully at war is by way of invitation. It is a wry reflection that the only invitation of which there was any credible evidence before the invasion was an invitation by those only recently emancipated from the political tutelage of a relatively modest metropolitan power for the restoration of colonialism and the return of imperialism at the astronomically elevated level of super power domination.

Measuring the consequences, the basic meaning of independence in the region has been lost, for it is essential to the subsistence of that delicate condition that there

1983-10-28

17:00 - 17:10 hrs

should be respect for the internal affairs of a sovereign independent country, and that such a country should in turn be entitled to go through its own growing pains and teething troubles without dictation or interference from without. Counsel, guidance and advice are another matter. It might, indeed, have been thought that assistance of this kind was well within the power of the aggressors to offer had they chosen to do so. By instead setting forth on the mistaken course on which they have embarked, they have committed an error from the consequences of which statesmanship of a higher order than that they have so far shown may yet be needed to save the region, including them.

Cde. Speaker, in all of this there is a certain irony which will not have escaped the House. Aspects of this have indeed been already noticed this afternoon by the Cde. Prime Minister and the Cde. Minority Leader. Grenada and its rulers have been much inveighed against for alleged disregard of basic norms of law and morality. The object of the exercise under way is professedly to enforce observance of such norms. Yet we have the sorry spectacle of even more vital norms relating to the international conduct of states being shamefully flouted, jettisoned and thrown overboard by the would-be exemplars and teachers of right conduct. It is difficult to reconcile such cynical international lawlessness with the right habitually assumed by those now without the law to deliver lectures on the rule of law.

In the sad result, Cde. Speaker, the patiently woven fabric of the region has been strained, if hopefully not rent, and we have on our hands the present war. I say the present war for the reason that it is not finished: it has long since exceeded the two hours sparingly allocated to it by the confident conquerors, and may yet last for some time.

1983-10-28

17:10 – 17:20 hrs

National Assembly

(Cde. Shahabuddeen continues)

17:10 hrs

Looking beyond, Cde. Speaker, even when the last shot has been fired, the flames will continue to burn in the hearts and minds of the brave patriots of the small Isle now gallantly locked in unequal combat. We respectfully salute them, bloodied but unbowed. And it is for these reasons, Cde. Speaker, that I respectfully commend to the House the motion so ably moved by the Cde. Prime Minister and so spiritedly supported by the Cde. Minority Leader. /Applause/

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member Ms. Janet Jagan.

Cde. Janet Jagan: Cde. Speaker, I would like to begin by first paying tribute to a very remarkable Caribbean Leader who died so unfortunately some few days ago. I think we in this Assembly should pay tribute to Maurice Bishop, a highly respected leader and to his colleagues, who have died. I am sure all of us feel sorrow in our hearts today. I would like to welcome the agreement to the proposal of the PPP that the National Assembly be called to discuss a vital matter that concerns the whole Caribbean and the whole world. I want to trace some of the early developments that brought us to the position that we are in today, where certain Caribbean Island Government have come forth with the preposterous decision of initiating the aggression that we all abhor. I can remember in the early days, in 1948 when Grantley Adams the then Prime Minister of Barbados defended colonialism at the United Nations meeting in Paris. It is good for us to reflect on these things and relate them to the present situation, and due to the despicability conduct of his son Tom Adams. A Nigerian newspaper, the West African Pilot, had this to say in 1948:

"When a group of black men join hands together in order to see to it that a new day dawns for all men of our colour, there is always a willing Negro to join forces of the enemy. Our readers should mark and digest the news published about the activities of one Mr. G. Adams of Barbados, in the UN sitting in France and judge for themselves, the type of African 'Leader' that Britain loves to advertise to the world. Mr. Adams by his irresponsible and inspired utterances has dealt a wicked blow to all suffering people. We can assure him that neither history nor African conscience will be kind to him, when at long last, the black men of the world come to their own."

1983-10-28

17:10 – 17:20 hrs

At that time Britain used such a man to "advertise" to the world, and now Reagan have used Tom Adams and Eugenia Charles to "advertise" the despicable act that took place.

In 1953, those of you who can remember the events of the suspension of the Constitution will remember too that aside from our own stooges who ran to England to complain and applaud the British for landing troops in Guyana, there were other Caribbean stooges too: Grantley Adams, Norman Manley and Alexander Bustamante applauded the British for removing the PPP Government in 1953. This showed the lack of development of these people in certain parts of the West India area.

In the history of our area of Latin America and the Caribbean, the United States is guilty of over 20 military interventions in this century beginning with the occupation of Puerto Rico in 1900, coming up to this year with the U.S. military training the Government army in El Salvador and the U.S. Militarisation of Honduras for the purpose of invading Nicaragua, and now the October 25 invasion of Grenada. The basis for the Grenada invasion was laid out in a secret report of the Santa Fe Committee to President Reagan during May 1980 in which military force was recommended against Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada.

On January 28, 1981 Secretary of State General Alexander Haig revealed the intentions of the U.S.A. to attack these countries under the guise of combating terrorism. Revelations were made of the CIA training mercenaries in camps in California, Florida and the Panama Canal Zone for subversion against Grenada and other regional states which Reagan had accused of "spreading the Marxist Virus."

In July 1982 the Central American Democratic Community was set up – a defence pact involving El Salvador, Guatemala, Costa Rica and Honduras. They were to be used as proxies for an undeclared war against Nicaragua, with Honduras as the jumping off base. The U.S.A. Declared that Nicaragua is a grave threat to all the countries of Central America.

1983-10-28

17:20 – 17:30 hrs

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

17:20 hrs

(Cde. J. Jagan continues)

The same language was repeated in November last when the United States and Great Britain engineered the formation of the Regional Security and Defence System involving Antigua, Dominica, St. Vincent, St. Lucia and Barbados and between 1981 and 1982 Anglo American imperialism supplied Barbados and OECS group with military hardware estimated at US\$40 million, and as well, United States trained troops from Dominica and Barbados.

The United States, in exploiting the ties between the OECS Defence System and the Northern Atlantic Treaty Organisation, brought its navy into Caribbean waters staging what they called Ocean Venture 81 and Ocean Venture 82 and operation Amber and Amberine. The warships held mock battles and manoeuvres in the Caribbean. I can remember at that time receiving a telephone call from Unison Whiteman in Grenada asking us to raise our voices with all those in the Caribbean against these operations known as Amber and Amberine, which they declared were specifically aimed at American troops into an invasion of Grenada and its small islands. So they had been given a warning that these were aimed at Grenada and we have seen from this operation that the preparations and training had already been carried out for the actual invasion which took place just a few days ago. It was also noted that Admiral Robert McKenzie and Admiral Lyons who were in command of the Ocean Venture manoeuvres said the U.S.A. navy would establish a permanent task force in the region. It was during this period that progressive voices in the Caribbean and Central America began to demand that the Caribbean be a zone of peace. These military and naval manoeuvres which were perceived to be laying the ground work for future attacks, probably against Nicaragua, Grenada, Cuba and possibly Suriname.

1983-10-28

17:20 – 17:30 hrs

On March 23, 1983 President Reagan said that Grenada was a threat to international commerce and military lines of communication which pass through the Caribbean and that Grenada's military potential is at odds with those of Eastern Caribbean states. As the last speaker said President Reagan has now come out to say that the Cuban presence in Grenada was for the take-over of that island. A preposterous suggestion when we know that the presence of Cubans in Grenada was to assist in the growth and development of that island. We know they specifically assisted in laying down the international airport which was to be the basis of a future tourist trade to enhance the economy of Grenada. We also know in Grenada, as in Guyana, there are many doctors assisting the nation. Right here we know that Cuban doctors have given us valuable service and in the same way doctors and teachers and technicians assisted in the development of Cuba. The fact that many Cubans have died defending the Grenadian people is, I think, of great significance and one which we should pay tribute to.

The Simms Amendment also lays the basis for the aggression that the United States has been involved in. In a document called the "Caribbean Basin as a Zone of Peace' Dr. Jagan said that Cuba was threatened with intervention. He referred to the Simms Amendment adopted by a 69 to 27 vote in the Republican Controlled Senate in mid 1982. Like the Johnson doctrine, the Simms Amendment urged implored the Reagan administration to resort to all means available, including the use of troops to oppose the alleged Cuban threat and to contain Marxist-Leninist subversion in the region. Earlier in May, 1981 former Secretary of State, Alexander Haig had stated that if Cuba continued "gun-running" activities in Latin America the U.S. had not ruled out a naval blockade of Cuba. The same Simms Amendment has now had its repercussion in this part of the world.

Yesterday, I wrote an editorial for the Mirror newspaper of which I am editor and I began it this way: I said if we were to take the tale of Rip Van Winkle, an American folk tale of a man who slept for a hundred years, and then woke up and saw all the changes in the world, and if we were to translate Rip Van Winkle to the present period, the tale would go like this: In shock and amazement he would see the massive United States of America, a country of 3.6 million square miles and 226 million people moving thousands of miles south to attack the small 133 square mile Grenada with a population of only 110,000 people. A

1983-10-28

17:20 – 17:30 hrs

preposterous and amazing situation. Yet we have seen it happen. We have seen as we have heard the yard-fowls of the Caribbean using their position in the Eastern Caribbean states to pretend to want assistance from United States to carry out the aggression. As a woman I felt the greatest shame when I heard that Eugenia Charles of Dominica had stood by President Reagan and given him the cues for the cover-up of the American aggression. I felt that she certainly had let down her sex, if nothing else. Eugenia Charles and Tom Adams and the whole pack of them who have given the U.S.A. the opportunity to carry out the territorial aggression in Grenada must be condemned by all of us in the Caribbean.

17:30 hrs

(Cde. J. Jagan continues)

They must be isolated and they must not be shown any consideration or respect.

The madness that has taken place in Grenada is something that we all deplore and

I heartily join ⁱⁿ this Motion before us saying that this National

Assembly calls for an immediate end to external intervention in Grenada, the

prompt withdrawal of foreign troops from her territory, and full respect for

her sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Applause

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs (Cde. Jackson): Cde. Speaker,

"I spent 33 years, most of my time, being a highclass muscle man for big business for Wall Street and the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism.

I helped to purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909 - 1912. I helped make Mexico and especially K.....

safe from American interest in 1914. I brought light to the Dominican Republic

for American sugar interest in 1916. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent

place for the national city boys to collect revenue in. I helped in the raid

of half a dozen Central American Republics for the benefit of Wall Street."

Those, Cde. Speaker, are the words of Brigadier General Smedley Butler who is the highest ranking officer in the Marine Corps of the United States Army in 1934 and those words I suggest describe the historical role of U.S. imperialism in this region. It was an imperialism that had as its clear, identifiable and unwavering objective making Central America, the Caribbean and Latin America safe for the promotion of United States interest, financial, economic, military and political. In those days it was relatively easy for American imperialism to run rampant throughout our region. The decision to send the marines was one taken very easily and gunboats were despatched. Those were the days of the big stick and this is the situation which the Minority Leader so brilliantly described and its extension beyond Latin America into the wider international community.

Today, however, we witness a somewhat changed world. There are new centres of power in international community. We have the rise of the European

Community, we have the rise of new financial centres of OPEC, we have the rise of developing countries. We have also, Cde. Speaker, the consolidation of a global socialist revolution led by the Soviet Union and we have a situation in which the results of the post-colonial revolution which sees Guyana as an independent member of the International Community making its mark on the decisions in the international community. These changes, some more dramatic than others, some more important than others, have nevertheless had an effect in that it has led to the evolution of international law to take account, at least partially, of these changes.

I think that in the statement of my distinguished colleague, Vice President Shahabuddeen, he did allude to many international legal documents which codified and which sanctified new norms of international law which one hopes would have a permanence in terms of guiding the relations between states. These changes as well have brought about the opportunity for a wider international solidarity, a wider solidarity between parties, a wider solidarity between workers' organisations and a wider solidarity between socialist organisations.

These are important inputs in the conduct of international relations and can help, if properly used, to guide the course of international relations. So that I would say today that, having regard to these changes and these evolutions one would have thought that the naked exercise of power as was the practice of imperialism in the 19th century, the early part, had been eternally proscribed. Be that as it may, the objectives of imperialism have not changed. The maxim remains do as I do, not as I say, and the search is ever present for attracting puppets and adherence to the wiles of imperialism. But I suggest that some of the strategies and the operational methods of imperialism have changed.

High on the list of imperialism's major weapons today are dis-information and destabilisation. In relation to destabilisation and dis-information I would like to quote two very important sections of the declaration and the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in internal affairs of states to which reference was made by Cde. Shahabuddeen:

"The duty of a state to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilise or to undermine the stability of another state or any of its institutions."

Equally, I would like to put on record this provision of that declaration:

"The duty of a state to refrain from the exploitation and the distortion of human rights issues as a means of interference in internal affairs of states, of exerting pressure on other states or creating distrust and disorder within and among states or . . . states. Destabilisation as one of the new weapons of imperialism for ensuring that the countries in this hemisphere and beyond are ordered to behave in a manner that would be liked by the United States."

I do not need to go over the examples. These have been dealt with very adequately in earlier presentations. But do permit me to recall a situation affecting Chile and do permit me to recall that destabilisation is not restricted only to Governments. It is a whole vast network starting from the subversion of Governments including the buying out of trade unions, the manipulation of multilateral financial institutions and to . . . These are all the techniques of imperialism today in seeking to control the direction of our political, economic and social development. Dis-information and dissemblance.

Sometimes, Cde. Speaker, even those who practise imperialism and their lackeys are caught by their ^{own} techniques. As we can see if we look a little closely at some of the statements that have been emanating over this dastard invasion of Grenada, we have the spectacle of the so-called Prime Minister of Jamaica speaking to his Parliament on the day of the invasion, confident of a quick victory saying, "I now report to Parliament and the nation that Grenada was this morning invaded by the United States marines backed by troops . . ." Yet, merely two days later, as a result of the heroic resistance of the valiant Grenadian people - Applause - Prime Minister of Dominica, cornered in the Security Council, could say she did not regard what had happened in Grenada as an invasion.

17:40 hrs.

(Cde. Jackson continues)

There is contradiction between them and we need to watch that they themselves can fall into trap of their own techniques. We can see as well if we look at the press conference given by the Secretary of State of the United States on the 25th October. A press conference, performance at which has been described in various terms, but none of them flattering, said "the initial decision to act was made jointly by the OECS states acting pursuant to the Treaty establishing that organisation at a meeting on October 21st," that is Friday and remember that the Cde. President received an invitation from the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago to attend a meeting in Port-of-Spain starting on the evening of the 22nd and going on to the 23rd.

Secretary of State Schultz said the decision was made on October 21st. He said he appealed to other countries. We do not know which others. Their appeal to other countries for assistance was made the same day Friday 21st October. Barbados and Jamaica to whom a similar request for assistance was also made immediately responded favourably. They had no choice says Secretary Schultz. We did so yesterday. See how the little boys jump first. Let them be coral and then they will succumb or they will answer to the whip lash of the master and President Reagan himself, who of course one gets the impression is not these days overtly concerned with the substance of his statements but more with their receptivity, indicated that the United States received the request on October 25th.

Again, be that as it may, Cde. Speaker, we need to take note that at this time the techniques of imperialism include destabilisation, dis-information including dissemblance. I think we need to look as well at the way how they combine these with the so-called campaign for human rights and democracy.

I have already quoted for you what the declaration says and

Cde. Speaker, it really pains me as a Guyanese, as a West Indian, as a Caricom citizen, as a man of the Third World and, more than that, as a socialist, we find that even among our own citizens we succumb to the blandishments of those who prattle these propositions having as their meaning our own destruction. They, for instance, Cde. Speaker, are always lecturing to us about the freedom of the press, but what did two hundred journalists tell President Reagan, "you would not let us go in and see what is going on because you want to cover up."

Cde. Speaker, the clear objective of the action that was undertaken on the morning of October 25 was to sanitize Grenada and to send a clear warning, an unmistakable signal to socialist and other progressive countries and forces in the Caribbean and in Central America. It is a clear signal because as the Cde. President has described to the nation, as he described to the people of Guyana at the rally, when the Caricom Leaders met in Port-of-Spain on the 22nd and 23rd of October, there was on the morning of the 23rd at 3.06 a.m. a concensus which should have provided a non-military alternative for dealing with the situation in Grenada on the basis of a Caricom and only a Caricom response. But it is not that the rest of the Caribbean did not want it. I think that is to see things in a distorted way. It is not that Jamaica and Barbados and the OECS did not want a non-military situation. It is the US imperialism that did not want a non-military situation and they were told so and therefore, imperialism Cde. Speaker has brought about a bifurcation within the Caribbean community.

Cde. Speaker, as I said enough has been said on this issue, but I think it is correct that I should attempt to indicate what action flowed from the analysis of the immediate events and those, the contextual framework, in which that analysis is undertaken. We naturally, Cde. Speaker, began to mobilise and internationalise and our response to the Minority Leader for having this debate is part

of our national mobilisation. Beyond the confines of our own boundary, we did join with Nicaragua, with the Security Council starting on October 25, a debate on the situation in Grenada and the resolution which was placed before that Council that very night was drafted and presented entirely by Guyana on behalf of a number of unexpressed supporters.

What did the draft resolution seek to achieve Cde. Speaker. It sought to recall and to re-affirm the validity of certain important legal laws and certain important practices of international laws. It sought for instance to recall the declaration and the inadmissibility of intervention, interference, internal affairs of states. It sought to reaffirm the sovereign and alien right of Grenada freely to determine its political, economic and social system and to develop its international relations without outside intervention, interference, subversion, coercion or threat in any form whatsoever. It expressed concern at the military intervention and ^{it} deeply deplored the armed intervention, deplored the deaths of innocent citizens, called for an immediate cessation of intervention, called on all states to show the strictest respect to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Grenada and requested the Secretary General of the United Nations to report on the implementation of the resolution within a period of forty-eight hours.

Cde. Speaker, I think this National Assembly will feel pleased to know that for the decision to conclude the debate last night, up to when we decided to conclude the debate last night, well over 70 countries had spoken in the Security Council and of those 70, only the invaders, the aggressors, supported their own action. Similarly, Cde. Speaker, we found that in the OAS there was a complete isolation of the aggressors and in the Non-Aligned Movement which was meeting today I am confident that there will be a similar expression of condemnation.

1983-10-28

17:50 – 18:00 hrs

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

17:50 hrs

(Cde. Jackson continues)

The nature of the international response needs no description. The Cde. Prime Minister has given an indication of this and the Cde. Minority Leader also dealt with this question, but I think we should take note that even within the United States itself, in the home of the principal aggressor, there is great unease, great questioning, and great condemnation. Today I understand the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Subcommittee adopted a Resolution of 32 votes in favour and two against calling for the withdrawal of American troops within a specified time. I think this is a good sign and I think we need, through all our contacts, both at the level of party and at the level of Government to try to mobilise groups within the United States to oppose these dastardly policies.

What does the future hold for us? What do the quizzlings want? The quizzlings want to impose a government of their own choice, a government which will be satisfactory to the United States. They mouth about all sorts of things but when you strip their arguments of their irrelevances you come down to the essential point – they want in Grenada a government of their own liking.

In the Motion before this House there has been no attempt to go outside the immediate focus of concern which is bringing an end to this aggression but, even so, I think it should be clear that the position that I believe all members of this Assembly share is that we want to see the Grenadian people left on their own freely to determine their own political, economic and social policies and I would suggest that even after we have adopted this Motion we would not rest until that right is fully restored to the Grenadian people.

/Applause/

In terms of internationalising, we are considering other ways of utilising the mechanisms of the United Nations for attracting wider support with a view perhaps to finding a role for the Secretary-General so that the United Nations which, despite its imperfections, remains the repository of hope for the majority of mankind for a peaceful world.

1983-10-28

17:50 – 18:00 hrs

We will see to utilise the United Nations as best we can but I think we must seek to restore respect for those international laws which have been so flagrantly trampled upon by the United States and its acolytes. I think there is more that we can do. The Leader of the Minority party in his presentation today made a number of suggestions. Without going into an exhaustive analysis I think we can say that there are many things here on which we can have general agreement but, for us to move forward, we must also have a clear perspective of the situation today that faces progressive forces in the Caribbean. With your permission, Cde. Speaker, I would like to read one analysis:

"In October, 1982, Barbados, St. Vincent, and the Grenadines, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Saint Lucia, created a pro-imperialist military government, a so-called "Regional Security Defence System" in which a joint coastguard is to play an active part. The United States is seeking to expand this bloc to include the other Caribbean countries – Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and Guyana. The imperialist aim is to circumscribe Cuba and Grenada and to use Guyana against the revolutionary democratic Suriname in the same way as Brazil and Venezuela were used to pressure Guyana. It is not improbable that Guyana can be persuaded to play this reactionary role."

No one of us can adhere to a view like this and hope to be credible in our support of the Grenadian people. I quote from the issue of the World Marxist Review of October 8, 1983, from an article entitled "Caribbean Danger Zone" by Cheddi Jagan, General Secretary of the People's Progressive Party.

I think we need as well to look at how we can intensify the role of the Non-Aligned Movement as a viable alternative to two things: first, a world that is divided between military blocs and, secondly, as a shield against imperialism. The opportunities may not be large but I have reason to believe in my own mind that we have not maximised the opportunities which exist.

Finally, I think we need to look at whether there is not need for internal cleansing, because there may be within our own midst in Guyana local puppets of American imperialism and unless we can deal with them we will be creating opportunities, sores, through which imperialism can come in through the back door.

I should like to conclude by saying that this fourth preambular paragraph is of special meaning. It reads:

"And Whereas the attack on Grenada can be a prelude to further military interventions in the Caribbean and Central America in Nicaragua in particular;"

I think this particular preambular paragraph needs very careful study because I think until our people recognise that we are under threat then what we have done here today will come to naught. /Applause/

The Deputy Speaker: Comrades, we have come to the end of the debate, all the listed speakers having spoken and the Cde. Minister of Foreign Affairs having wound up the debate. The debate has brought out very eloquently all the points including the part played by Adolph, Reagan and Eva Charles. I think that what ran through the debate also was the very strong feeling of admiration which Members have for those who are laying down their lives now in Grenada. Before taking the Division, I propose to ask comrades to observe one minute's silence for the heroic Grenadian soldiers and civilians who have so far laid down their lives in the glorious defence of their country against U.S. imperialism. Will comrades please stand.

/All Members stood in silence for one minute/

Question put.

The Vice-President, Party and State Matters (Cde. Ramsaroop): Division.

The Deputy Speaker: Cde. Clerk, please take the Division. The Vice-President wants to establish unanimity.

Cde. Ramsaroop: It seems that the vote was unanimous. I withdraw the call.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, "That this Assembly do now adjourn to a date to be fixed." /The Vice-President, Party and State Matters/

[Adjourned accordingly at 18 hrs.]