

**T H E**  
**P A R L I A M E N T A R Y   D E B A T E S**  
**O F F I C I A L   R E P O R T**

[VOLUME 6]

**PROCEEDING AND DEBATES OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE NATIONAL  
ASSEMBLY OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT OF GUYANA  
UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF GUYANA**

14th Sitting

2 p.m.

Thursday, 15<sup>th</sup> December, 1972

**MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY**

**Speaker**

Cde. Sase Narain, O.R., J.P., Speaker

**Members of the Government**

**People's National Congress**

**Elected Ministers**

Cde. L. F. S. Burnham, O.E., S.C.,  
Prime Minister

Cde. P. A. Reid,  
Deputy Prime Minister and  
Minister of National Development

Cde. M. Kasim, A.A.,  
Minister of State for Agriculture

Cde. H. D. Hoyte, S.C.,  
Minister of Works and Communication

Cde. W. G. Carrington  
Minister of Labour and Social Security

Cde. S. M. Field-Ridley,  
Minister of Information, Culture and Youth

Cde. B. Ramsaroop,  
Minister without portfolio and Leader of the House

Cde. D. A. Singh,  
Minister of Health

**(Absent - on leave)**

Cde. O. E. Clarke,  
Minister of Home Affairs

Cde. C. V. Mingo,  
Minister of States for the Public Service

Cde. W. Haynes,  
Minister of Co-operatives and Community Development

Cde. A. Salim,  
Minister of Local Government

### **Appointed Ministers**

Cde. S. S. Ramphal, S.C.,  
Minister of Foreign Affairs and Attorney General

Cde. H. Green,  
Minister of Public Affairs

Cde. H. O. Jack,  
Minister of Mines and Forests

Cde. C. L. Baird,  
Minister of Education

Cde. F. E. Hope,  
Minister of Finance and Trade

Cde. K. F. S. King,  
Minister of Economic Development

Cde. S. S. Naraine, A.A.,  
Minister of Housing and Reconstruction

## **Parliamentary Secretaries**

Cde. J. G. Joaquin, J.P.,  
Parliamentary Secretary,  
Minister of Finance and Trade

Cde. P. Duncan, J.P.,  
Parliamentary Secretary, Minister of  
National Development and Agriculture

Cde. J. R. Thomas,  
Parliamentary Secretary, Minister of  
Information, Culture and Youth

Cde. C. E. Wrights, J.P.,  
Parliamentary Secretary, Minister of  
Works and Communications

## **Other Members**

Cde. J. N. Aaron  
Cde. M. M. Ackman, Government Whip  
Cde. K. Bancroft  
Cde. N. J. Bissember  
Cde. J. Budhoo, J.P.  
Cde. L. I. Chan-A-Sue  
Cde. E. F. Correia  
Cde. M. Corrica  
Cde. E. H. A. Fowler  
Cde. R. J. Jordan  
Cde. S. M. Saffee  
Cde. R. C. Van Sluytman  
Cde. M. Zaheeruddeen, J.P.  
Cde. L. E. Willems

## **Members of the Opposition**

### **People's Progressive Party**

Cde. C. B. Jagan,  
Leader of the Opposition  
Cde. Ram Karran  
Cde. R. Chandishingh  
Cde. F. H. W. Ramsahoye, S.C.  
Cde. D. C. Jagan, J.P., Deputy Speaker

**(Absent)**

Cde. E. M. G. Wilson  
Cde.A. M. Hamid, J.P., Opposition Whip  
Cde. G. H. Lall, J.P.  
Cde. M. Y. Ally  
Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud, J.P.  
Cde. E. M. Stoby, J.P.  
Cde. R. Ally  
Cde. Balchand Persaud  
Cde. Bhola Persaud  
Cde.I. R. Reminton, J.P.  
Cde. L. A. Durant  
Cde. V. Teekah

(Absent - on leave)

### **United Force**

Cde. M. F. Singh  
Cde. E. DaSilva  
Cde. J. A. Sutton

### **Independent**

Cde. R. E. Cheeks  
Cde. E. L. Ambrose  
Cde. L. M. Branco

### **Officers**

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

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

*The National Assembly met at 2.00 p.m.*

*Prayers*

**PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS****PRIVATE BILL GUYANA MISSION BAPTIST CHURCH BILL**

**Miss Ackman:** On behalf of Dr. A, Carlyle Miller, of 167 Fifth Street, Cernpbellville, Georgetown, I present to the Assembly a Petition to have introduced a Private Bill to incorporate the Guyana Mission Baptist Church.

*The Clerk read the Petition, as follows:*

"GUYANA

**PETITION**

To The Honourable Members of  
the National Assembly of  
Guyana

THE HUMBLE PETITION of Allan Carlyle Miller, of 167 Fifth Street, Campbellville, Georgetown, respectfully sheweth as follows:

- (1) Your Petitioner is the Director of the Guyana Missionary Baptist Church;
- (2) The Church has been in existence in Guyana for 18 years and now has a membership of 569;
- (3) The Church has two places of worship in Guyana - one situated at Campbellville, Georgetown, and the other at Beterverwagting, East Coast.
- (4) The Guyana Missionary Baptist Church wishes to be incorporated so as to be able to acquire and dispose of property in Guyana;
- (5) Your Petitioner is the Promoter of a Bill which seeks to incorporate the Guyana Missionary Baptist Church and which seeks to repeal the Bible Protestant Congregational Church of British Guyana (Incorporation) Ordinance, 196\_;
- (6) Your Petitioner is desirous of having the said Bill introduced in the National Assembly an enacted by the Parliament of Guyana;

15.12.72

National Assembly

2 – 2.10 p.m.

WHEREFORE your Petitioner humbly prays that the Honourable Members of the National Assembly may be pleased to allow him to proceed.

AND your Petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray. Signed this 30th day of June, 1972.

Carlyle Miller  
Petitioner

167 Fifth St., C/Ville  
Address"

**Mr. Speaker:** In accordance with Standing Order 57(4) shall now put the question which is "that the promoters be allowed to proceed."

*Question put, and agreed to.*

## PUBLIC BUSINESS

### MOTION

#### APPROVAL OF ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE, 1973 BUDGET DEBATE

*Assembly resumed debate on the motion for the approval of the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year, 1973, totalling \$277,712,944.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon, Member Mr, Ram Karran.

**Mr. Ram Karran:** Sir, throughout the Budget Speech and in particular with respect to things having to do with the International Monetary Fund and the financial matters relating to the United States, the Minister was particularly vague of necessity. When you come down to reality if the Minister had attempted to do so he could have, if he wanted to be frank, as his name suggests, told us that the final answer rests with the United States of America. As is in the recent case of devaluation when, she was forced to devalue she imposed a 10 per cent surcharge and tried to get her friends, in the club to help her to solve her problems and the American problem is the most selfish and I say dog, in relation to the dog eat dog policy of the world today. It is like a drowning man who clutches at a straw. The Hon. Minister and the Government hang on people,

who would - - - as they say. I refer to page 46 when the best witness the Hon. Minister can produce is the World Bank. In relation to the public debt burden the World Bank supports the contention that it is not necessarily a strain on Guyana's economy. Where then does the Hon. Prime Minister stand when he said in 1952/53 that the policy of the World Bank - and I follow that time American institution were really interested in giving loans to underdeveloped and undeveloped countries so that the loan can be used to purchase American goods, That is why I take the risk to call on the Hon. Minister of Housing to tell us where did they stand all these years with respect to the drainage and irrigation scheme, Hutchinson - - - to buy pumps. The whole thing is cock-eyed. It is a shame and pity.

That is the whole philosophy of the World Bank. That is why we urge that this programme be amended to carry out a strained policy of helping Guyanese people. This allegedly used loan, some of it would probably materialise, a small part. This is the philosophy of a bankruptcy and the only solution is to dig a hole to fill a hole. They have to borrow money to pay interest and to pay loans; that is how we are living, and that is why the problems affecting the Guyanese working class continue to increase.

**2.10 p.m.**

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Trade says here in his speech that the repayment of the international loans is only an internal transfer to the inhabitants of Guyana, and that is how they come to tell us, both the Minister of Finance and Trade and the Minister of Economic Development, that the gross domestic output reveals a state of solvency but the solvency in terms of the gross domestic product is not solvency or the solving of the problems of the small man. The transfer that the Hon. Minister talks about, obviously, is a transfer from the pockets of the poor, who can hardly subsist, into the pockets of the very rich, the pockets of the people who are making the money. That brings us to the question of the social services.

The Hon. Member Mr. Teekah spoke on education. He made a very valuable suggestion with respect to the shift system to assist in providing secondary education to children who cannot obtain free secondary education. That makes the system of double shift relevant. When Mr. Nichol came here and the Government cried out that the cost of social service was beyond its

reach, the double shift system was suggested for primary schools, but the Hon. Prime Minister, who was then the spokesman on education for the People's Progressive Party, had this to say. It is an article written by Mr. Burnham, "Future of Guyana's Children Doomed". [*Interruption*]

That is the whole thing. How many years ago? If in 1952, the shift system of education was obnoxious, can you imagine in 1972, after Guyana became Independent, and became a Republic, now it has become a Co-operative Republic, that the things Mr. Burnham spoke against should be foisted on children of Guyana today? I should thank the Hon. Member for his observation. This is what he said:

"The Committee observes that we cannot afford this expenditure on education without curtailing expenditure on development. The future in their view is all the more grim and dark because they admit a fact the PPP has been stressing all the time - our economy is dependent on the prices of exports, particularly sugar. The Government's negligence in not recognising years ago the approach of this dilemma is hardly mentioned or stigmatised. There are some suggestions as to how the extra money required may be raised and with these I shall deal in the next issue of Thunder."

He did deal with that after. Then, he continued.

"Then there is to be a double shift experiment in 'selected areas' with a view to extending it wherever necessary. Before examining the system it is interesting to note that even though it may not be colony wide it will result in a different standard of educational proficiency in various parts of the country. In any case, as the Report admits, this is only a partial solution and the major problem, still remains.

In essence, the double shift system merely means that children will be taught for half day every school day. Though the teachers have as much teaching time to use this will be available to the students only one half the normal time. It is true that the double shift system is recommended only for those between 6 and 8 or 11 and 14 but the result is obvious. Any child who is the victim of such a system will have his education diluted and be thrown out into the world with even less than those who went before."

Sir, in 1952, the leader of the PNC said these words, and can you imagine that twenty years after, when all these things have been achieved, when we are free, when we are Independent, that the Government sits there, I do not want to repeat, draws fantastic salaries and tours the world - but we have already introduced the double shift system Mr. Burnham complained about in the year 1952. Is it not shocking?



The philosophy of the capitalist is completely exposed in the hon. Minister's proposal to grant tax holidays, a thing that we on this side of the House have always been opposed to, a barren system, because it staggers the imagination of any socialist to think that a Government that labels itself a socialist party should stoop to the level of granting tax holidays, up to fourteen years in the undeveloped areas of the region. In Puerto Rico, for example, capitalists come, they bring their capital, enjoy tax holidays besides fleecing the workers, and before the expiry of the tax holidays, they have already recouped all their capital costs, made tremendous profits, and they are ready to abandon everything and to go to another area to fleece the people.

This is not socialism, this is not development, this is playing into the hands of the same capitalists from the United Kingdom, from the United States of America, or Western Germany, or wherever they might come from, to fleece the Guyanese people. We are already seeing the things that have been banned, tinned peas, and yet if one goes into the super markets, one sees the same labels, but made in Jamaica, or made in Trinidad and Tobago. Let us examine the history of these things and we will find that the same monopolies they are supposed to be fighting against are the people who have come to Trinidad and to Jamaica, and have set up these small canning concerns, and the same American peas, the same American corn, the same American products are going down the gullets of the Guyanese people at fantastic prices.

Where is the socialism? Where is the development? Where is the interest in the working-class people which the Government talks so much about? We want to see Guyanese peas canned. We want to see Trinidadian peas, and Jamaican peas, then we will know that the Guyanese workers are getting work. Do not bring these things from Canada, fabricate them in tins which might themselves contain ptomaine poison, and foist them on the people.

**2.20 p.m.**

Another interesting feature in the Budget Speech is the General Review of the Economy. If we read through it, we will see that the Hon. Minister confirms that there has been a serious drop in production - he did not use the word 'serious' - in so far as sugar, rice and the exported commodities are concerned but the income from these sources remains as the Estimates

predicted last year. In other words, although we have a drop in production, we have the same amount of money to pay with for export.

We have also banned consumer goods. A lot of goods are banned but the customs revenue shows that the money remains the same as the Government had anticipated. Therefore, who lost and who gained in this transaction? In the case of the export of local goods, the producers have produced less. The sugar industry produced less; the sugar workers get less; God was against the Government. The members of the Government say it is due to the weather conditions. Next year they are going to find another excuse. The economy of the small people was affected.

In the rice industry the same thing occurred. There was lower production but the Government benefited. The Government collected the revenue it expected. It was the same thing as in the case of imports. Again, who benefited? The Government benefited and the consumers lost because they had to pay the same amount of money for a smaller quantity of goods. They admit that all has been due to devaluation. Devaluation operated in the interest of the Government's coffers, but against the pockets of the poor people.

It is for that reason that the Government is in a position, as the Estimates bear out, to provide an increase of \$1.5 million in the recurrent Estimates for the Guyana Defence Force, which, I understand, produces only peas and food for itself, and the Ministry of External Affairs, another non-productive Ministry, we are going to spend \$1.5 million extra for these elephants while the productive Ministries, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Interior Development and the Land Development section of the Ministry will be spending increases of \$94,833, that is, \$18,436 and \$93,307 respectively. Those are the increases over the last year, but the two Ministries, External Affairs and the Guyana Defence Force, which are under the Prime Minister's portfolio will have expenditure increased by \$1.5 million.

How are we assisting in the development of the country? Despite all bluster we have heard from the other side, I am convinced that nothing will happen during the year of Our Lord 1973. With all these big loans that are mentioned here as they have been in the past years - U.K. loan anticipated, U.S. loan anticipated - nothing will happen. We will hear nothing about them.

One of my friends across the Table said that for the first time the broad masses are going to benefit. If there had been, in truth and in fact, a workers' Government I would have thought that the broad masses would have been benefiting since eight years ago, or at least seven years ago, when this administration came into office. According to my friend across there, only now they are going to benefit.

This reminds me of the story of the king and his secretary who unfortunately was underpaid. The secretary was belly-aching to the king. He said the whole population was against the administration because the whole population was hungry. The king secretly gave him a massive increase on his stipend and gave him the impression that this increase had gone through the whole population. The secretary, within a few days, went back to the king and said that the whole population was eating milk and rice. In those days milk and rice was a delicacy. The whole population was happy because he was happy.

My friends across there who eat ham and eggs, who enjoy themselves, believe that what happens to them or their successes are enjoyed by the entire population. But let them go around, as we do, without policemen, without security and talk to the people. [**Mr. Hamid:** They will tear them to pieces.] The people are not so vicious. I will take them around. Enquire of the people how many of them have had a meal, how many meals they have missed during the week. Then you will know whether the broad masses are really enjoying anything but poverty and nakedness and hunger.

This ham and eggs Government, which can only think, like the secretary of the king, in terms of what they see in front of them, is oblivious of the real state in the country. Unfortunately we have arrived at a time when puppetry has been advanced to such a stage where none of the members of the Government can go up to their chief, the formidable Prime Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Development and Agriculture to say that things are really bad, do something about it. They are powerless; they cannot even speak. He waits for a whole week and hears one or two of them speak. We may have to recommend some sort of Ashton and Parsons powder for them to develop the power of speech and grow teeth and things like that.

15.12.72

National Assembly

2.20 – 2.30 p.m.

We note that the "Government is concerned about the very high cost of consumer goods in the markets. We make our philosophy quite clear. We support any measure to bring the cost of living down whether the prices relate to durable consumer goods or to market items, bhaji, shrimps and so on.

This Government must ensure that all the implements required for gardening - one of my comrades named them and the members of the Government were so confused that they thought they were talking about tractors. They were speaking of files, forks, cutlasses, hose and pitchforks. The prices of bhaji, tomatoes, cabbages and shrimps must bear relationship to the prices of these things that are imported.

2.30 p.m.

There is another important item. That is the cost of drainage and irrigation must also bear relation to the prices of these things which the Government seeks to control and not only that, the cost of sustenance for the people themselves must bear some relation. The members of the Government cannot say that they are worth \$840 a month, plus \$400 a month allowance for Ministers, plus \$120 a month for travelling, plus this, plus that, plus the other, and tell the people that they must live on \$15 a week.

I mention this particularly with reference to the prices of rice and milk over the past few years, when the prices of the imported items had gone up astronomically and the Government "break stick in its ears" as they say, and it was completely deaf to the demands and the appeals of the farmers in this respect. The members of this Government should not attempt to fix prices on these things without their bearing relation, to the cost of production.

Sir, I was amused, I nearly fell off my chair with laughter when the hon. Minister of Economic Development (Dr. King) boasted about the \$2 million, that the Rice Marketing Board will make as profits, it is recorded in the words of the hon. Minister of Finance. Are they not ashamed to talk about \$2 million, profit from the Rice Marketing Board? Would the Hon. Minister tell us how much profits the Government has made from the sugar marketing? Will the

Government tell us how much it made from, the timber marketing and from the marketing of bauxite from Reynolds? It has made nothing.

This is an invasion into the rights of the people. Why they have to make profits? If sugar can pay income tax and that is enough, then the taxes borne by the people in the form of income tax should be enough. But no, the Government must go further, take away, confiscate, members of the Government call other people totalitarian. Somebody is going to tell me that they provide drainage and irrigation. Let the farmers pay for drainage and irrigation. Let them pay for all the services and let the Government take a service charge for the disposing of their rice to the West Indies, but do not make a profit from it.

Sir, I want to deal very briefly with the public service pay which the Minister talks about. Unfortunately, we all knew the history of this. The Prime Minister was beating his big chest in 1969 to tell us about this job evaluation exercise. We have dealt with it. We have debated it in this House time and time again and this mention of it here today by the Hon. Minister of Finance has not yet brought a solution to it. We know that this is something that is insoluble in so far as the workers are concerned. What I want to observe is that during the imperialist days and during the time of past Governments every five years, at the most, there is a revision in salaries for the public servants, there is a revision in Government salaries to take care of the falling money and there is a revision in salary because Government leads the way so that industry will follow. It is no surprise to me that the Chamber of Commerce and somebody said the TUC too, have joined in their chorus of praise to the Government, Why is it the Chamber of Commerce shouting so loud in praise? It is because the delay in raising salaries and wages means a longer period for the Chamber and its comrades to continue to exploit the people. That is why more than ever it is necessary for the government to carry through the job evaluation exercise and to fix wages and salaries.

I want to deal briefly with the other point. I notice the Hon. Minister told us in the Budget that Government is moving towards the Installation of additional thermal plants in several parts of the country. I wish to make this observation that the Government should have followed the recommendations of PC&R, which we have repeatedly debate in this House, which said that in

15.12.72

National Assembly

2.30 – 2.40 p.m.

1971 if we did not move to hydroelectric we will have to put in additional thermal plants. We were in a position to begin to install hydroelectricity in this country in 1971. But because of the failure which the Government must admit - some of the members of the Government have not even read the PC&R Report - which failure has forced us into a position where we have to put additional thermal generation plants which, with the installation of hydroelectricity, become another white elephant. We have so many white elephants, including the Hon. Members on the other side.

Somewhere about, I heard that the Government proposes to look into the question of bottoms. What goods do we have to transport out of this country? Admitting that we have bauxite and sugar to transport, the Government cannot run what it has already. The "Ambrosia" was received as a gift. I note that the Hon. Minister is not in his seat. The vessel was re-engined and it was sent to Trinidad to be dry docked to find that the hull was no good and they may have to drop the engine in the Atlantic in bringing back the "Ambrosia". The people refused to do anything to it. The Government would not pay; it owes them a lot of money. The "Ambrosia" was not used when she was seaworthy to transport cement and so on. The Government has run into a mess but the incompetence and all the rigging that go on in the inner circles of the PNC, would not in any-way reduce the burden on the backs of the taxpayers. The "Ambrosia", the "R. H. Carr", thousands of dollars have been spent to rehabilitate these derelicts and now, we are being told that other ships would be built. Do not worry to build the other ships. At least, you have services that are providing these shipping facilities now. Build another Ferry for the Demerara River and for the Berbice River. You need them. Try to follow. The PNC has always followed in the footsteps of the PPP. This is the opportunity to follow, and build these facilities which the Guyana people want.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member Mr. Ambrose.

**Mr. Ambrose** *rose*

**Mr. Ram Karran:** That is not the arrangement.

**Mr. Speaker:** No, but that is the indication I got from the Hon. Member, Mr. Ambrose. [Interruption] Please proceed, Hon. Member.

**Mr. Ambrose:** Mr. Speaker, the 1973 Budget that is before this House today must be supported in its entirety. Since so much has been said relating to the Budget, I would like to make my contribution mainly related to the achievements in the rice industry. Page 18 of the Budget Speech had this to say about rice.

**2.40 p.m.**

"The Rice Industry faced similar unfortunate circumstances. Set to expand acreage and yields, the industry suffered from severe rainfall and floods. Output was therefore substantially diminished."

It is true that this year the yields in the rice industry have substantially fallen. The Government, according to the Budget, has clearly indicated some of the reasons that production has fallen so badly this year, but it is true to say that those are not the only reasons for the reduction. It was not wholly and solely that of severe rainfall. There were other problems that faced the rice industry which must be viewed as very important.

It is true we had extensive rainfall. It is true that to a considerable extent the rains were responsible for some of the setbacks, but it is also true that there are other problems that face the rice industry which must be corrected if the rice industry is to succeed and play a proper role in this country. I refer to things like land distribution. I refer to things like land tenure.

Land tenure, to my mind, is one of the great challenges that face the rice industry. Land tenure confines itself to landlord and tenant and today if one goes around the country, one would find that there are considerable problems that face the rice industry relating to land tenure. The system of land tenure is 100 years old if not more. The clash between landlord and tenant is a bugbear to productivity in the rice industry. This is one of important matters that any Government needs to look at.

A considerable amount of disadvantage has been in existence between the two sides, landlord and tenant. This is not the time for us to accept situations like those which exist. To my mind, the tenants of lands who are prevented in many ways from carrying on true and proper cultivation of their lands, because of the irregularities, because of the clashes, because of bad conditions that have been created by the landlords, their problem has been a growing concern of the rice industry.

It is true, as was referred to yesterday by the Hon. Member Mr. Reepu Daman Persaud, that one year ago in this House I spoke on behalf of the increased price of rice which itself is another of the problems that face the rice industry. The question of the income to rice farmers also must be viewed very seriously. This is true that in the past year the Government in no uncertain terms has raised the price three times. In the last year we have had three increases and some compliment should be given to the Government for this. But it must be borne in mind that even with the three increases that have been given over the past year, the price of rice is still not adequate to give sufficient impetus to the farmers.

It is true that the farmers receive the highest price ever paid to them but relate this to the cost of production, there is still much more to be done. As far as twelve years ago, a survey was carried out in the rice industry by Dr. O' Loughlin, who found that in that time it cost the farmers \$24.50 to produce one bag of rice, not to mention that cost of production and cost of living have risen much more than what existed twelve years ago.

I therefore would feel that the Government would look into the question of the price of rice very seriously, and as they have done in the past year, they would give a second view on this whole question because unless you can make the farms viable, unless you can make the industry sufficiently attractive, you will have the big problem that faces the country today, the question of the rural population flooding into Georgetown and its environs. You will continue to have this and as far as I am concerned, the challenge that faces the Government is not feeding, clothing and housing the people. That is a very simple matter.



The question of feeding, clothing and housing ourselves is not the big problem. That is a very simple matter in terms of the man who produces. The big problem that faces the Government is to contain the rural population which seems to be trekking away from the area of productivity. Hundreds and hundreds of people over the past four to five years have been trekking away from the country areas, from the farms where they produce and coming to the city to find jobs.

This seems to be a great challenge. Until the farms are made sufficiently viable and attractive, so long this problem will continue to be. Therefore, the areas of productivity will have less hands to operate there. As a result, the whole economic trends in the country will suffer. It must be made attractive. Not only must we contain our rural population, but we must try to increase that rural population. It is only when we increase the rural population that real progress will be made. If we are to feed ourselves we will want more farmers to remain on the land. We want more farmers to produce more. Unless we can contain the farmers there productivity will continue to fall and the economic trends in the country will continue to go backwards.

The farmers of our country are as important as other workers. The farmers of the country in many instances are more important than the other workers, On page 36 of the Budget Speech the hon. Minister is very clear when he says:

"It is now clear that the Job Evaluation study would reach an appropriate stage of completion during the early months of 1973 to permit of its use. The Government accordingly intends immediately after that to negotiate with the Public Service Unions new pay scales with the hope that those negotiations would be completed with expedition in order to ensure that the new agreed salary scales are implemented in 1973."

No sensible person would quarrel with the Government for doing this, but what must be clearly borne in mind is that the farmers of our country are just as important, if not more important, than even the civil servants or the public servants and when one compares the standard of living of the farmer with the civil servants one recognises the big gap there is. The gap is so vast that one can hardly measure the big difference there is.

15.12.72

National Assembly

2.50 – 3.00 p.m.

Compare the salary of a senior civil servant with the salary of a farmer who goes on the land to produce in the hot sun and in the rain. There can be no measurement because the Permanent Secretary, who is a senior civil servant, gets something within the vicinity of \$10,000 a year. A farmer with 20, 25 or 30 years experience on the soil earns very little over \$1,000 a year. How then can it be encouraging for people to go on the land? How can we contain our rural population who keep trekking to the city for a better life?

So long as the situation or the trend remains, so long will the problem that faces this Government - a problem that would face any Government - continue to worsen because no one understands the life of a farmer. No one who understands the problems that face the farmers of our country would dare doubt that farmers have been having a crucial time.

The farmer produces under the worst conditions that society can offer. He has no hours of work and hours of play. He works all the time; he works at night; he works in the rain and works in the sun and when one measures what he earns it is very shameful to know that the average farmer in this country is living at subsistence level. Therefore the agricultural sector - seems to be the sector that this or any Government must rely on - has not been performing well enough.

I remember that the Prime Minister in one of his speeches called on Guyanese not to look for white collar jobs but to go into the fields and produce. To be honest, the only person that would leave the city and leave a properly paid job to go on the land to produce is the man who is somewhat dishonest with himself. Conditions on the land are not all that profitable.

It is pulling no punches on the Government or anyone else to say that if agriculture is to succeed in this country the trend must be changed. It is not a question of fooling any one. Unless agriculture is made more profitable and more attractive no one will leave white collar jobs or office jobs and go into the country to produce.

3.00 p.m.

Land valuation is also another problem that faces not only the rice industry but the agriculture sector. Lands that produce agricultural crops - rice, provision, *etcetera* - are in the hands of a few people who are described as landlords. These landlords have held these lands for

many years, some as long as forty, fifty years. As the trend of things in the country changes agriculture becomes more important. For instance, they used these lands in the form of exploiting those who need lands. Could you imagine that one acre of rice land is sold for as much as \$1,000, in some cases \$1,200? There is no control. A man can sell an acre of rice land for what he pleases. Yet the product that is produced from that land is confined to certain fixed prices.

You cannot sell rice above that price or you will be charged, and this goes for other forms of crops.

There is no limit to what the landlord would charge. He bought these lands very many years ago at \$20 and \$25 per acre \$30 per acre and today he rents the minimum, say in the rice industry, for \$12 per acre, Therefore, the landlord continues to exploit the situation.

Let us take the life of a tenant rice farmer as an example. The tenant rice farmer pays his landlord according to the Ordinance, \$10 and \$12 per acre which is the minimum. Any improvement on the estate, on the dams and the trenches the tenant pays extra for that, the \$10 and \$12 per acre goes directly in the pockets of the landlords. Therefore, there are tenant farmers who occupy lands in this country for 50 and 60 years. I have been a tenant rice farmer for 32 years and I have been paying a rent for the lands that I occupy as a tenant. For the past 20 years I have been paying \$12 per acre this would give you a total of \$200, and for the next 12 years I have paid \$6 per acre, giving you a total of \$72.

**Mr. Speakers:** Hon. Member, you have three minutes more.

**Mr. Ambrose:** This brings the entire total to \$300 per acre. This is what would be paid by any farmer who occupies land as a tenant for 32 years; while the value of that particular acre of land happens to be ranging from between \$20 to \$30 per acre. You would therefore see clearly what has been the problem facing the ordinary tenant rice farmer. He has made \$300 for one acre of land as a tenant for 30 years, then after it continues to be the property of the landlord who owns this by transport. He would never stop paying no doubt for many years. Therefore the farmer who occupies the land continues to pay. These are some of the many difficulties which face the agriculture sector, and mainly the rice industry.

15.12.72

National Assembly

3.00 – 3.10 p.m.

The Government is making every attempt to solve these problems but it must be borne in mind that the problems are tremendous and they cannot be solved overnight. I would therefore, before taking my seat, call on the Government very strongly - if the agricultural sector is to perform as it is expected to - to implement things like land reform., bring an end to land tenure in this country which is too old for today's agriculture and, therefore, increase prices of farmers produce and in doing some of these things I have no doubt that the agricultural sector of our country would move forward as it is intended or expected to.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member Mr, Feilden Singh.

**Mr. M. F. Singh:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my Party both inside and outside of this House has always been to offer objective criticisms of the Government's policy and activities, and wherever possible, offer also praise for things well done and well conceived. I am very happy today, therefore, to be able to offer the Government a modicum of our humble praise, Because I should like to join with those taxpayers to give thanks for the cut though small that cut is to give thanks for the cut in the income tax.

**3.10 p.m.**

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare and refreshing experience indeed, for we have so very little to be thankful for otherwise. We feel like people marooned by stormy seas, who glimpse a very small ray of sunshine breaking momentarily through the heavy overcast of thunder clouds. The glimpse of sunshine may not be enough to dry our very wet and sodden clothes, but perhaps it is a kind of comfort to us, a comfort to the distress to know that somewhere in the great beyond there are happier people than ourselves whom the sunshine really gets at. So we give thanks to the Government for letting us feel even for a moment that we belong to that happy band of people, few though they are, who pay a few taxes and when they do pay them they get something in return.

Having paid this tribute to the skill with which our taxes have been trimmed, let me say at the risk of being accused of damning the Budget with slight praise, that the situation could well have been much worse. Let me say also, and go further still to say, that the situation could have

been a great deal better also. For one thing, the Budget could have carried with it a greater sense of realism, a realism, which has been long lacking not only in the Budget but in the whole conduct of Government. As I have pointed out elsewhere before, Mr. Speaker, the poor masses of our people have been treated with circuses and slogans for far too long and they have been denied the bread which traditionally is to go with them.

The Hon. Prime Minister in a very recent speech claimed a huge drop in unemployment. It is with diffidence that I contradict such an eminent personality, but with absolute confidence in the fact, I say that this is not so. I question whether the statement on unemployment, which has aroused the bitter laughter of well-informed people throughout the length and breadth of Guyana, can be backed with any authentic figures except perhaps figures which have been authenticated along the lines of the election results. But may I humbly submit that even if these figures were engraved in gold and issued wholesale by the Ministry of Information, along with free drinks, they would not and could not be accepted by toe thousands of ill-fed, half-clothed, unshod, hovel-housed, unemployed and underemployed, who I say would rise up in one voice and shout shame on the Government for trying to fool them in that way.

It is this approach to the problems of the country, not just that of unemployment alone, that we see reflected in this Budget. It is the policy of sloganeering reduced to columns of figures. It is the policy of shouting loudly to scare away 'baccoos' or perhaps whistling in the dark to chase away ghosts. It is a policy of make belief because is there any sign in this Budget of any practical attempt to grapple with the problem of unemployment? Even in the Government mouthpiece, Mr, Carl Blackman, writing on December 10, 1972, at page 8 of the Sunday Chronicle, in an article captioned, "Budget of Hope", says lower down in the article:

"What is needed are new industries and we have to keep our fingers crossed that oil will start gushing soon."

He starts out by making a very correct statement and he goes and he spoils it by talking about oil gushing from somewhere or the other soon. What is needed is new industries. He is perfectly correct and in this same vein I noticed also our young people are very alarmed at the situation. In an article on that same occasion in the Sunday Graphic on page 14, December 10,

15.12.72

National Assembly

3.10 – 3.20 p.m.

1972, "A view from the Classroom" an article entitled "Pitfalls of Job Hunting" written by a young student, 18-year old Daphne Lachman, Campbellville Commercial College, this paragraph struck me very forcibly because it shows that our young people - whom we say we are giving the right to vote at 18, even though framed in very ambiguous terms by the Hon. Prime Minister, we will make the majority age 18 this 18-year old is saying here in this article,

"the unemployed young people themselves are even more frustrated. This is aggravated by our leaders asking us to do all we can..."

Perhaps the Graphic needs some new printing material, because this is a bit smudged, and they cannot get it. Maybe we should enquire about this. I know the Mirror cannot get theirs.

"The unemployed young people themselves are even more frustrated. This is aggravated by our leaders asking us to do all we can to develop the nation. It is not that we do not want to play our part in nation building but what can we do when we are not offered employment and there are no honest avenues open for earning the most modest of wages. There are some girls I know who have fallen into the ways of the not so nice and in quite a few cases this starts when they are interviewed"

perhaps at Congress Place,

"by unscrupulous bosses."

Young people are very worried. They leave school as there are no jobs for them to go to. The jobs that there are parcelled out by Congress Place channelled perhaps through the Employment Exchange. Where are the new industries, as Mr. Carl Blackman asks, to absorb our unemployed? We are given assurances in the Budget. We are told that by the housing, clothing, feeding ourselves programme, a dream as yet far from realised, we will eventually provide many more jobs.

3.20 p.m.

After eight years in office everything is still comfortably in the future. Little or nothing is happening at the present time. "We will feed, clothe and house you after the next election in 1976." Young men and women are deprived of their jobs by our power-crazy cliques who seek to

take everything away from private enterprise and hand it over to ill-managed co-operatives and even less efficient Government corporations.

I am not talking about the monopolistic Government corporations, like the electricity corporation and the telecommunication corporation which charge consumers whatever they feel like charging and there is nothing to be done about it. Government is taking away business from private enterprise and setting up inefficient corporations, People seek here and therefore for the means to live.

The elderly, what about them? They beg humbly from passersby to get the small piece which would keep them from the last depth of degradation. What a shameful state of affairs! The poor cannot clothe themselves in columns of figures. They cannot feed on promises for the future. The poor demand action now, real action to bring jobs quickly. They do not care if their jobs fit in with the marxist theories of my friends on this side. [*Interruption*]

Theoretical debates do not affect the masses. Words will not still their hunger. What are the masses asking for? They are asking for bread; they are not asking for stones which are being fed to them by the present Government.

Many of the proposals in the Budget Speech would have the greatest support of my party if they were more likely to have immediate results. The concept of a mortgage bank has been accepted and put into operation in other parts of the world a long time ago. The same can be said of an agricultural development bank, which is mentioned in the Budget.

Although in these fields we have lagged far behind other countries which are less favourably endowed in respect of natural resources than we are, yet these things come better late than never. I must offer the Government praise for bringing them at long last even though they are long overdue. This step should have been taken early because the institution, by this time, might have been making some practical contribution to the welfare of our people. As it is, useful and, indeed, admirable as these institutions may be it will be some time before they can make any impact on the people or the employment situation in Guyana.

If I understand the intentions of the Hon. Minister correctly, I think he feels that at least one of these institutions will attract local capital. No doubt this will be the local capital that cannot afford the extra 10 per cent to clear out of the country.

The financing institution, the Government insurance company, is also not without some precedent. But such institutions have seldom worked where they have not confined themselves to purely governmental risks. Once they expand themselves into general insurance risks, if I may use an expression, the risk becomes even more risky.

There is, of course, one way in which the Government can make its insurance company really big. That is by driving everyone else out of the field and establishing for itself a monopoly. One wonders - indeed, we are wondering - whether this is not the ultimate intention of the Government when one bears in mind the various pronouncements that have been made from time to time by Government personnel. Perhaps I should have said "by Government lackeys".

In the last few years we have seen the miniaturisation of the foreign banks in favour of the Guyana National Co-operative Bank. It is very easy for us to be happy and think "Yes, this is a good thing." And it is very easy to think that knocking the heads off the foreign institutions and putting them in their places is a nice, fine, patriotic thing. It is easy to think in this way if you fail to look a little further and consider that this may have very serious and detrimental results on the population of the country and on the economy as a whole, as my colleague Mrs. DaSilva pointed out in one particular respect.

The hon. Minister has graciously acknowledged that even the paper programme of the Government will not begin to be possible without the help of the grants and loans from foreign sources. We have relied on these to a large extent in the past and it seems from the Budget Speech that we propose to rely on them to a great extent in the future also.

No doubt, now that we are busily making new friends, we may feel that we can reward some of our old friends by giving them a kick in the teeth, but let us remember that if we kick our old friends often enough they may decide that they are going to get the hell out of here and



then where will the Development Programme be? Where will we find all this money that we are talking about, the money that we will get from foreign sources?

If you kick them in the teeth, if you criticise them often enough, then we will find that we are unable to continue the policy of placing both ends against the middle. Then we will be at the mercy of every Johnny come lately.

This is one possibility, but I would urge the Government also to continue to consider the effect that the incursion into insurance will have on the private sector.

It appears that almost every time that a prominent member of the Government gives an impassioned assurance that there is a place in the economy of the country for the private sector, the Government promptly introduces some institution, some machinery, something of this nature, for nibbling the ground away from the private sector a little bit more.

### 3.30 p.m.

The Hon. Minister claims that because a number of foreign and local insurance companies have found it unprofitable to operate under the conditions created by the Government there is a lot of insurance business floating around the place, going to waste which the Government can capitalise on. I say that this seems to be a remarkable left-hand compliment to those insurance companies, including our own local insurance companies. It means that either the insurance companies are fast asleep - and this we know must be nonsense - or that the kind of insurance business that is certainly not profitable and for which the taxpayer may eventually have to pay, and if it creates any jobs at all it may be jobs for those people who will have to pay out money rather than receive money on behalf of the Government. But what seems more probable, I must admit, is that this new insurance company is a further move by our power crazy rulers to destroy private enterprise bit by bit so that in the final analysis all economic - power will be in the hands of the new elite.

I venture to make a prophecy: I would say that the achievement of total control and the destruction of the private- sector here will coincide very accurately with the total collapse of our economy in Guyana. You take over private enterprises completely, and then you will find that

you will be destroying your economy. Minister after Minister has said that the Government does not intend to undermine private enterprise. Yet the private sector is subjected to a mighty barrage of re-assurances to the extent that it has become less and less of itself and where it is going. Perhaps, the businessmen in this country will feel much more comfortable if they are given an honest barrage of threats, if they are told honestly and truthfully, "We threaten you with this, we threaten you with that and the other," instead, of making them a whole host of promises end. Immediately after enacting legislation, enacting institutions and doing such things that would whittle away the little ground that is left them at the present moment.

Mr. Speaker, many other points have been raised and answered and dealt with by my colleagues; I will not repeat these. But I should like to add a mere sentence or two on the two new taxes. It is proposed that these taxes would hit only the rich; it seems to be the contention that it is only the rich people who own motor cars and travel overseas. My contention is that if the figures are examined honestly and objectively and not in the way in which the PNC computed their election results figures, if these figures are really examined honestly it will be found that by far the greatest mass of expenditure is by people with the limited income, the salary earners, in industry, the civil service and by the professionals who are now starting to build themselves. For the very few rich people the 10 per cent cost to travel increase will be no particular disincentive but for the ordinary middle of the road, middle class people my contention is that it will create hardships. You may suggest that these people may make do without motorcars and without travelling. But I ask the Government a question: Will the Members of the Government make do without their Rovers and their Damliers? Because in the final analysis it is not they who are paying the 10 per cent, it is the ordinary taxpayer, the small man who pays for the Damliers and the Rovers and all the other extravagances which are being enjoyed by the Party hierarchy and even the ordinary people who themselves are indulging in self-help are merely helping themselves at the expense of the ordinary people.

I suggest that these new taxes will have three results. The first is that they would restrict the freedom of movement of the masses by covertly a restriction which apparently is indeed, I would say, clearly an integral part of the Government's policy. The second result is that it would raise the cost of living, since tax on any goods sooner or later spreads out itself and is added to

15.12.72

National Assembly

3.30 – 3.40 p.m.

real essentials such as foodstuffs and clothing. Finally, these taxes will be self defeating as far as taxation is concerned.

Since the people who will have to go without will not only have to go without but will cease to spend the little that they used to spend before so that the revenue that the Government used to get before without these taxations they will not get them now. No new taxes will be accruing at the old taxation levels on motor cars and travel but perhaps one of the most tragic aspects on the tax on travel is just that it is another drag on those poor people who have been denied a decent living in Guyana by the economic model under which we live. They are scraping and striving to find the means to get out of this country to find a better deal for themselves and children. No doubt, in time, if the Government does not - - - by this increase in taxation in respect of the 10 per cent travel tax, if this measure does not work to keep the people in Guyana the Government may well seek means to compulsorily stop people from emigrating and eventually make Guyana into a glorified concentration camp in spite of provisions of the Constitution under the fundamental right section which ensures freedom of movement in and out of the country.

We know that next year is an election year. Nevertheless, as I have said before we are thankful for 'small mercies'. We are thankful for the adjustments of the income tax bands but we say to the Government stop playing emotional politics.

**3.40 p.m.**

Perhaps we should say, not get on with the job but start the job of really making the small man a real man. Stop this sloganeering. It is all well and good for the Government to say we will feed, clothe, and house the nation by 1976, which is well past the date of the next election. They will do this in future, but how will this be done, even if it is in the future, if the people do not have the jobs to earn the money with which to feed, to house, and to clothe themselves, because it is money that does these things and without jobs you cannot have the money to do these things? Unless the Government intends to give a free for all handout and we know that poor Guyana cannot possibly afford that. How will the people buy their houses? They cannot even buy the Carifesta houses that are there lying down waiting there for them to buy.

I say to the Government, let us create the right atmosphere for investors, local and otherwise, to invest their money in Guyana with the prospect of a fair return for their investment so that we can provide the jobs for the Guyanese populace to feed, house, and clothe themselves, I want today to throw out a challenge to the Government.

This P.N.C. minority Government has said so often: we will control our natural resources. We must have at least 51 per cent in new industries. We must have majority control. Fair enough. Even if for the sake of argument we accept this, we will control our resources, we will have 51 per cent, we will have majority control of these new industries, what will the Government give to guarantee to the investor that if the Government mismanages he will get a fair return for his investment?

Let me put this suggestion to the Government. You insist on all these things 51 per cent participation, majority control, fair enough, but then you tell the investor who is putting his money in the business together with Government's money: what are you opening business for, in order to make a profit and also to provide jobs for our people? The investor is not a philanthropist, he wants a fair return for his money because if he puts his money in the bank, even in the co-op box, he puts it on fixed deposit, he will get a certain minimum interest.

Let the Government tell the investor that after such and such a period, which will be allowed to have the industry established on a sound footing, we will guarantee you that you will get "X" per cent dividend on your investment in the company, and if the company with our management does not pay that dividend, then we the Government will make sure that you will get it, we will pay the difference if the company pays no dividend at all, we will declare a dividend and pay it to you. This is fair, who can quarrel about that?

I am not stipulating what the return should be; you agree with the investor. You are saying we will manage it and we will have control. If you manage it and control it, you must give the man some guarantee whereby he will have some confidence in your control and management. If he is going to put his money in it, tell him that you would have had to do a feasibility study, you would have had to have a projection that after so many years or within such a time it will make so much profit, It is only on this basis that you will start the industry, so

having enticed an investor to put money into it, then you agree with him that if our projection does not bear fruit, if after "X" years we still cannot make a profit, you have put your money there, we have taken control of the industry, if you had put your money in the bank you would have got a return for it, we will pay you a dividend on your investment.

This is only fair. Is the Government prepared to do this? Is it prepared to tell the investor, that when he puts his money in an industry of which the Government will take 51 per cent shareholding, that he will have some guarantee that the Government will run it efficiently? I will await an answer of the hon. Minister or somebody on the Government benches in respect of this proposal which I throw out to the Government.

We hear all this talk of industries being established. Where? *In futuro*. We want them now. Children are leaving school every year. Are they to roam the streets? Choke and rob and end up getting shot? When you close down the private sector, the parents are out of work and children are out of work. The unemployment rate is going up in spite of all the pronouncements by the Prime Minister and anyone on the Government benches. Let them bring the figures and not election result figures. All you have to do is go in the streets.

I was in private enterprise not so long ago and you put an advertisement in the papers, and you say, "Secretary wanted", "Stores Clerk wanted", or anything along those lines, and you will get hundreds of applications coming through the mail. What a terrible state of affairs! I call upon the Government to stop sloganeering, get down to the job of providing jobs for our people so that we can house, feed and clothe ourselves some time in the future.

**The Minister of Housing and Reconstruction** [Mr. Naraine]: Your Honour, the programme submitted by the hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech in my opinion has found favour with everyone in this House and the people at large. It is an integrated programme, well co-ordinated. There seems to be some question in relation to the size of the programme and the ability to implement this programme. But the objectives of feeding, clothing, and housing the nation when taken totally are directed, and no one has so far said otherwise, to full employment as early as possible, rapid economic growth, better incomes with subsequential greater savings

15.12.72

National Assembly

3.40 – 3.50 p.m.

for further developmental effort, and it is wedded very strongly to the ability of the people, the individual, to provide for himself and to sustain an improving quality of life.

3.50 p.m.

Criticisms have been made and, in judgment, reference has been made to petty things. Statistics have been put forward to show, for instance, that the expenditure on health on a percentage basis has been declining. I would like to submit that this does not tell the story because if the developmental effort is to Feed, Clothe and House the Nation in a better manner, then it stands to reason that the need for that service on a percentage basis, not in absolute terms, ought to decline.

The methods which this Government has selected to undertake this programme involve the principle of self-reliance, self-help, co-operatives, owning and controlling resources-based industries. I would like to submit that a programme like this, as is reflected in the 1973 Estimates, ought to capture the imagination, dedication, ingenuity, unity and hard work of everyone who describes himself as a Guyanese.

We have heard in this House the questions from the Opposition: Is it better to take aid from the West? Is it better to take aid from the East? Should we import into our country ideologies which have no relevance to the Guyana situation? The Opposition has taken the opportunity to try to project, through a Guyanese Budget, the image of their masters overseas. I say that this is poor sense and this is idiocy in the context of Guyana. I feel that it is in the context of what I have said that we ought to look at the Development Plan and the 1973 Estimates.

It is true that Government will have to seek technical and financial assistance from overseas to undertake the programme. But we have said that it must be assistance, it must be aid, without strings. We are non-aligned and we are forming a situation in this country where development must continue principally out of the efforts of the people themselves in this country. If it is done in any other way, if it is done by introducing wildly, blindly, ideologies

from overseas without trying to relate those ideologies to the situation in used this country then we are doomed to failure.

It is in this light that the Government would wish to have its housing programme examined. But housing in Guyana evokes other conditions of tradition, family structure and affinity and economic constraints associated with the so common multiple family structure which we find in our society. For these reasons, the Government has set its programme in relation to housing its rather than houses.

The size of the programme, 65,000 housing units by 1976, has been determined by a sample survey which was done and by projections made from these surveys. The programme includes the construction of new units and rehabilitation of derelict houses and slums. These figures have been checked against previous surveys done. For instance, in 1954 Higgenbottom, an adviser on housing who came to this country, stated that the back-log of housing units at that time was 30,000 units. That back-log grew during the period 1954 to 1964 by another 11,500 units and by 1964 the back-log was then 41,500 units. During the period 1965 to 1971 housing units were constructed but the back-log remained at 41,500 units. It is estimated that additional units required for the period 1972 to 1976 will be 23,500 and so we arrive at a programme for 1972 to 1976 of 65,000 units.

I should say that, in order to get a more definitive programme on a district basis, the Government, through the Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction, is presently undertaking a survey on a district basis in relation to people who require house lots, or house lots and houses, for the following year. The 1973 Estimate is that 8,000 housing units will be constructed in that year.

I have said that the credibility of the Government's programme has been questioned in this House by the Opposition. I hope that, even though I may not be in a position to answer all the questions raised on the other side of the House, when I have finished with my address the credibility of the Government to undertake its programme will be firmly established and that although I may not be in a position to answer all the questions there will be need for no further questions.

15.12.72

National Assembly

3.50 – 4.00 p.m.

The housing programme, as projected by the Government, is intended to reach principally the middle income and low income bracket workers. I have said earlier that self-help on the public sector housing programme will be used to a maximum. Land owned by Government will be utilised to the greatest extent so that the necessity for buying land will be reduced to a minimum.

The estimated expenditure on the 4,000 housing units to be constructed by Government is \$15 million. It is estimated that, for the private sector to provide 4,000 housing units, which will include the rehabilitation of derelict units and old houses, it will cost \$20 million, the total being \$35 million.

**4 p.m.**

The purchase and development of land, providing streets, water, *etcetera*. will account for another \$6 million, making a total of \$41 million.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before you proceed to the next point, I think we can suspend the Sitting. The Sitting is suspended for thirty minutes.

*Sitting suspended at 4 p.m.*

**4.30 p.m.**

*Assembly resumed at 4.30 p.m.*

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to announce that it is agreed that we sit continuously until the debate is completed. The Hon. Minister of Housing and Reconstruction.

**Mr. Naraine:** Your Honour, before the suspension, I explained that the estimated cost of the programme for 1973 in respect of the 8,000 housing units was \$41 million. I wish now to explain how the financing of this programme is anticipated. Through the Insurance Companies, Building Societies and such bodies, a sum of \$10.5 million will be available by way of mortgages, from the Sugar Industry labour Welfare Fund - \$1 million, the New Widows and Orphans Fund - \$0.6 million, the Government Mortgage Finance Bank, which will start with an



Initial capital of \$2 million will get by private and other investments - \$4 million making a total of \$6 million. I should explain that a commitment of \$1.5 million in addition to the \$2 million by the Government has already been made. For other mortgage finance organisations, for example, the Guyana Mortgage Finance Company, it is anticipated that mortgages to the tune of \$7.2 million would be obtained, Houses to be constructed for sale by the Guyana Housing Development Company would be \$3 million. The Pensions Schemes, Thrift and Credit Unions, and Co-operatives the sum of \$3 million. Private savings, that is, advanced sums of money to be paid by purchasers on houses \$5.7 million. Private builders who will benefit from, tax concessions - \$2 million, Guybau's Thrift and Pension Scheme Funds - \$4 million. This means that \$43 million will be available for the financing of the programme and this is \$2 million more than what is required for the programme.

We may look at this in a slightly different way. It is estimated that the total income salary and wages of all persons working in Guyana in 1973 would be approximately \$320 million. It is not unrealistic to assume that a person will put approximately 25 per cent of his income towards the purchase or rental of a house. In this expenditure pattern this would mean that \$80 million can be available for housing. However, some of this money must be utilised in paying for services by way of taxes and rates, for maintenance of building, and for servicing existing debts. If, therefore, 50 per cent of this sum is taken for this purpose then a sum of \$40 million will be available for new investment or re-investment. Anyway this programme is looked at, its credibility is proven that it is a practical and realistic programme.

The 4,000 housing units to be provided to the nation by the Government will be done principally through the Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction. In this Ministry there is a housing fund of \$2.3 million at the end of 1972 and, if the House votes the amount of money requested for 1973, that is, \$1.8 million, at the beginning of 1973, there will be available \$4.1 million for construction purposes. It is proposed to pre-qualify purchasers of houses, and even in the case of self-help housing, a nominal advance on the house is required before construction, begins. It is therefore estimated that \$.3 million would, be had this way.

Then there are repayments on mortgages which the Government itself has given, over the years; it is anticipated that another \$0.4 million will be realised by this way. This means that a total of \$4.8 million will be available for building houses. It is projected that this sum will be turned over three times in the year. In addition, it would be possible to have another \$1 million in credit for the purchase of materials and other goods. The housing fund will be adequate therefore to do the construction required by the Government for 4,000 housing units in the year 1973.

The Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction is divided into three main divisions; the Administration Division, the Housing Division, and the Town and Country Planning Division. We accept and readily agree that there are staffing problems in terms of the adequacy of trained personnel. We would wish to have more of such staff provided in the Ministry. This, Sir, would assist us considerably implementing and accomplishing our targets. But the officers in my Ministry are equally dedicated and hard working. I feel that with their co-operation, even with a nominal addition to the staff, we would be able to accomplish this programme over the year.

But I do not feel the credibility has been completely proven until I give some additional information. Where are these houses to be constructed? Is the land available? Are the plans ready? Have we got layouts within regional planning areas? I am happy to report that present layouts provide for over 5,000 house lots. The Central Government, either on its own or in collaboration with local authorities and co-operatives, is pursuing the acquisition of 500 acres of land on the East Coast and a similar acreage on the East Bank for additional houses to be provided in the year 1974 and onwards.

In addition to this an inventory has been taken within the various village authorities and Municipalities on the availability, of existing lands that can be put immediately into use for house construction.

It is proposed for the squatting areas on the East Coast and East Bank, and in other places of the country to be regularised initially by completing layouts for these areas purchasing land on a co-operative basis and for the execution of infrastructure works on a self-help basis.

If the credibility of the Government programme is not yet proven, then I do not know what else is required. To my mind, the credibility has been proven beyond a doubt. Some members of the Opposition did raise, and I feel very properly the question of those very low-income workers who cannot afford to fit into the plans of even self-help housing, and must depend for a long, time on rental houses.

I wish to state that the Ministry of Housing presently has throughout the country 1,830 rental houses, and these are rented from \$8.40 per month to \$21.00 per month all over the country. The programme includes for many persons presently occupying rental houses, to either move into rental-purchase houses or into self-help houses. This would make the way clear for other persons to move into the vacant houses and enjoy the benefit of low-rental houses until such time as they themselves can own their own homes.

I should point out further that the people will also be moving from private rental houses into their own homes, provided by investments both by the public and private sectors and, therefore, even within the range of private dwelling houses, reasonable rental houses should be available for persons who would require that type of housing. But the role of the Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction does not stop merely with the construction of self-help housing, with the rental of houses presently in its possession, with the construction of rental-purchase houses, and with the sale of house lots. The Ministry of Housing will be arranging to make available, lands to potential builders, to persons who are willing to benefit from the tax incentives available in relation to constructing houses for sale or rental, and these lands will be provided at reasonable prices.

Our position is to have a complete co-ordination of the entire housing effort and thrust in the country and to promote both land development in terms of the sale of house lots, and housing development in terms of the rehabilitation of derelict houses and the construction of new houses for sale. We intend to use, we hope, effectively, the mortgage finance bank. We hope to, and we will, through the regulation of the Housing Ordinance, make provision where the very low-income people and those, who cannot afford, will be able to get 90 per cent mortgage on houses. At present, 75 per cent is about the maximum available. But what about the role of the private

sector? And I think it is useful that the private sector should understand what the Government is attempting to do.

The Government is attempting to make available, houses to those people who in the past could not get their own homes and had to depend on renting homes from the more fortunate persons. They should understand this because, if we are to go to countries that are better off than ourselves and say: "you are better off and you have more money and therefore we think that you are morally bound to assist, if you feel that people are people wherever they are, what colour they are, what circumstances under which they live, if we feel, that those people who are wealthier than us should give us aid so that we can develop ourselves", then we have to start right here at home.

Traditionally, mortgage companies and insurance companies, have been giving loans to those people who are better off. We feel that the time has come when the less better off should now start benefiting from such loans. I say this fortified with the position that to the best of my knowledge there is no scarcity of housing for the upper income and upper middle-income brackets, and the housing that may be needed by the process of growth over the years to come can be provided for by other saving devices, and other lending devices, that would be available within the economy.

I started out by saying the housing programme must be looked at totally with all the other developmental efforts, and obviously, the economy will not be properly enriched if we were just to import building materials from outside for the construction of our houses. It is proposed, therefore, to encourage the development and the greater utilisation of local raw materials in the manufacture of building materials to be used in housing construction in this country. Thus you will have numerous other industries created both for house building and house furnishing, and this will add to the employment opportunities available to the people of this country.

We feel, therefore, that although our targets may be high, this programme is practicable, it is rational, and it is a programme not only this Government should dedicate itself to, but this programme deserves the wholehearted support and dedication of every Guyanese.

I wish now to dwell for a short while on drainage and irrigation and water control schemes. I think that the members of the Opposition always make a fundamental error, the error of accepting without question what is put into their heads from overseas and trying to dictate to us, the ordinary people, what they wish us to do.

4.50 p.m.

[*Interruption*] I think that the judgment of what position I take or what job I do, must be my own and I hope that it is the last day I am hearing from the Opposition on this question.

On the question of drainage and irrigation, I myself must give credit to the work that Hutchison did. As a professional engineer, I probably should give him even more credit than many persons on the Opposition have been giving. But what we have to understand is that since Hutchison's proposals were submitted 20 years or more have passed by. We have to understand that when Hutchison made his proposals we were still under colonial rule. We have to understand that most projects authorised by our colonial masters, including the Tapakuma project, were not authorised on economic considerations but on social considerations. We have to understand that in the past we got money as charity. We had money as if we were their little urchins begging and thus, although engineering-wise a scheme might have been properly conceived in many details the scheme, if it had been constructed in that manner, would have left us the people in a state of servitude up to this day.

Drainage and irrigation *per se* cannot create increased production. Drainage and irrigation must be looked at in the cluster of activities required for productivity and greater production and this is the way we must look at drainage and irrigation today.

This Government is as committed as the Opposition to these big and wonderful schemes costing in the case of the Canje, at 1963/1964, prices \$220 million; Mahaica/Mahicony/Abary costing, at 1961 prices, \$80 million and at today's prices I wonder how much. Even then, these schemes would not have performed in the manner in which schemes must perform if we are to make the best use of the investment on drainage and irrigation.

For these reasons, the Government has taken a stand of consolidating its position and removing the constraints to production and productivity from existing development before undertaking any new development in drainage and irrigation. *[Applause]*

We stand idle; we grudge the sugar producers but while we were accepting schemes like the Hutchison scheme for gravity drainage, the sugar estates were putting in pumps so that they can control the water available and so that they could control their drainage 24 hours a day, that is whether the tide is high or low.

It does not need a technical man to understand that if a channel is working tidally it will work for only 10 hours of the day because it can only work when the koker is open. If you are pumping that same channel will work 24 hours each day. You do not need a technical man to tell you this. This is commonsense.

The Government feels, however, that in removing the constraints from existing drainage and irrigation schemes idle lands can be brought at low costs and into productive use; lands like those on the West Bank of Demerara and on the East Bank of Essequibo, where the main drainage and irrigation works were constructed as part of the Boerasirie extension project, but the subsidiary works were never completed.

These things are necessary. The Tapakuma scheme was constructed. It was a wonderful irrigation scheme but not one single thing was done to improve the drainage of that area.

Until these constraints are removed whereby we can move to make these lands more highly productive how are we to undertake new projects? What did Tapakuma scheme cost? \$14 million. The Black Bush Polder scheme? \$13 million. These were the schemes in which we were engaged in the past and the returns from these schemes were minimal because of these basic constraints. How in the name of God can any Government go with that background to borrow \$200 million for a new scheme? We have to show that the moneys we invest are put to efficient use, to productive use, in the interest of these people, before we can undertake these major schemes.

We have put \$2.5 million to start the conservancy dams on the Mahaica/Mahaicony/Abary and I feel that, although this is a modest start, it is a start. I am sure that in years to come \$2.5 million will multiply and in the process of time that scheme will join the band of the productive schemes of which I am speaking now.

It may be good for some to do schemes putting in only minimal services and giving people lands, where the land becomes a heavy yoke on their necks so that they will become servile to those who have done these schemes. But if we did that I am suggesting that we will be taking the place of our colonial masters whom we have cursed every minute of the day. All you will be doing will be removing that master from one place and introducing him to another place. This Government is committed to improving the lot of the small man and all our programmes, all our works, all our expenditures, are geared in this direction. [*Applause*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member Mr. Wilson.

**Mr. Wilson:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday both the hon. Members, Mr. Neville Bissember and Mr. Duncan, chided the P.P.P. for making reference to countries other than Guyana, when discussing matters concerning Guyana. I would have thought that every Government, whatever objectives it may have, must have a two-pronged policy or, it may be, two policies, that is, a foreign policy and a domestic policy, and that these two policies would be pursued in such a way, so integrated and related, as to serve the objectives of the Government whether those objectives are in the interest of the privileged few or in the interest of the masses, the workers, the working people, the farmers and peasants.

However, the hon. Member Mr. Bissember must be given the credit for not so long after he chided the P.P. P., making reference to other countries, he himself began to make reference to foreign countries. You will remember that we over here heckled him and asked him to come back to Guyana, that is to say, we reminded him that a few sentences before he criticised us for doing the same thing.

15.12.72

National Assembly

4.50 – 5.00 p.m.

With regard to the Hon. Member, Mr. Duncan, he and other Amerindians usually want to feel that they are the original inhabitants of Guyana. I suppose that is why he feels that being indigenous to Guyana he should only think of Guyana.

**5.00 p.m.**

But perhaps he should be reminded that he is a foreigner to Guyana. If he is to look at his physical appearance he will see that he looks like the Chinese, mongoloid, they ran very strait down the Pacific, and that is how he came here. Perhaps he should be reminded about the story of Robinson Crusoe, and he should be reminded also of the Spanish inquisition who rescued Friday. I do not know if he is one of the prodigies of Friday who came to Guyana and persecuted his ancestors. They are foreigners!

How can we extract ourselves from what is happening outside of Guyana? The world has been getting smaller for a long time, even before the renaissance, and in these days of satellite communications, and astronomical travels - going to the moon - the world has shrunk considerably. I am sure he would see from that how much related or connected we are, that we cannot at all extract ourselves from what is happening overseas.

What did his Foreign Minister say? I was not here at the time when he spoke but I saw an article in the newspaper giving an instalment of his address and I should read for the benefit of himself and the hon. Member, Mr. Bissember, for them to see how external factors influence Guyana. I am quoting from the Evening Post of Thursday, 14th December, 1972, page 2: The

Headline is: "Major Powers give cause for alarm."

"My colleague, the Minister of Finance in presenting the annual Budget has already drawn attention to our exposure to the chilled winds of recurring international monetary crises, crises for which we, in common with the rest of the developing world, have no responsibility but from whose effects we suffer on a recurring basis and often unpredictable ways."

This is the Foreign Minister of the P.N.C. puppet Government. Let us go to the Budget Speech, page 6:



"International Monetary Situation:

"Now Sir, before reviewing in some detail the internal and economic financial state of the Nation, it would perhaps be useful, if I bring to the attention of Honourable Members, recent developments in the international monetary situation in which Guyana functioned during the past year."

The Minister of Finance goes on to state at page 10;

"The vicissitudes of the dollar last year, Mr. Speaker, and yet once again on the £ Sterling this year, have pointed to the need to replace these reserve currencies with neutral reserve assets, which are not sensitive to particular national policies, and the supply of which, can be deliberately related to the need for international liquidity. In effect, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly desirable that the stability of the reserved assets of countries, particular small countries, should not be left to the vagaries of the balance of payments of the reserve currency countries."

Further down on the same page 10 it is stated:

"Consequently, Mr, Speaker, machinery has been established under the aegis of the International Monetary Fund, to find a solution to the persisting instability in the monetary system..."

I am laying the foundation for what I have to say from thereon. Page 16.

"...Great Britain's entry into the EEC has crucial Implications for Guyana and the CARIFTA region as a whole, because the future of such commodity exports as Sugar, Rum, Banana, and Citrus is at stake."

Page 21:

". . . our balance of payments on current account would by year end reflect a deficit that is larger than in the previous year."

Now, Mr, Speaker, I have read these excerpts from the Foreign Minister's Address and the Budget Speech to show the importance which the Ministers of the Government lay on international relationship. But I do not consider myself competent without assistance of more qualified people - [Hon. Members (Govt.): "Well, sit down."] - to give the answer to the technical aspects of the contradictions. So I shall resort to John... lecturer on economics, for some assistance.

15.12.72

National Assembly

5.10 – 5.20 p.m.

Page 2, *Morning Star*, Wednesday, 29th November 1972, William Rust House, 75 Farringdon Rd., London, this article is analysing what is happening with the monetary crisis and the various crises created by capitalism and imperialism, and I shall read a few excerpts from it.

"The post war domination of America with a vast outflow capital and dollar credits, stimulated capitalist expansion. But now the growth of capitalist rivalry has forced dollar off gold"

The Hon. Minister will learn from this, why all these headaches.

"The end of the dollar-controlled world capitalist monetary system means a continuing monetary crisis."

So it will come every year.

"With the monetary collapse and the other growing contradictions mentioned above, inflation threatens the collapse of the whole structure of inflated capital values and profits. It is almost out of control.

### **Class Strategy**

We are in a new stage of capitalist crisis. With its uneven rate of development as between countries and its basic contradictions. Monopoly capitalist rivalry becomes fiercer and fiercer - over trade, capital investment and money.

The U.S. with Nixon firmly in the saddle, aims to regain unchallenged world domination. Japan fights back. Europe strengthens its monopolistic bloc.

Ruling-class strategy in this crisis must involve the cutting back of real wages in relation to profits; dictatorial economic control; the crushing of weaker rival capitalist economies"

as they are trying to do with us,

"increased exploitation of the under-developed countries. Profit is to be boosted by class dictatorship and intensified exploitation.

Working—class strategy is to realise the only progressive solution to the crisis by developing the fight against monopoly capital at home and abroad, to the point where working-class power and Socialism are achieved. The time is ripe to put Socialism on the agenda."

This Government parrots a lot about socialism, co-operative socialist republic. It has brought forward a development programme commencing 1973 but we criticize this programme for not being socialist although the Government parrots about socialism. Socialist planning is integrated planning. Socialist planning should be comprehensive. In this planning, I am sure the Government will not be able to say, even though it can tell us, what is the population year after year, how many persons will be on the East Coast, how many will be on the West Coast Berbice. If you are planning along socialist lines, that is how you will have to do it, where the population will be situated and what action you will take to get them, if it is necessary for them to be there, if it will be in the interest of the people to be there.

The Hon. Minister of Housing and Reconstruction, in trying to answer certain questions posed by the hon. Member Mr. Chandisingh, told us how many units of houses, where they are going to be. But did the Minister of Works and Communications tell us if his plans are coordinated to provide transportation for the people, roads, public transport, co-operative transport? If you believe in socialism and you are planning in the interest of the masses, you are going to project all these things. *[Interruption]* You put the people to live anywhere. You have people living in the squatting areas. The hon. Minister said he is providing for them to be housed properly.

What are you doing to provide people with employment? Are they going to come to town to look for work? Where are the industrial areas adjacent to these places, your means of communication, telephones, water supply, and electricity? That is how you plan. You must not only co-ordinate your planning, recreational facilities, schools, markets and the like. Have you got all of these? If you say you have this plan and it is to start in 1973, how much have you involved the people of Guyana in this planning? Socialist planning is done from the grass roots. You bring your plan or ask the people for ideas, discuss matters with them. *[Interruption]* You did it with the trade union leaders who have no real connection with the workers, I am talking of the M.P.C.A, about leaders like "... Pollydore, that is why you have so much unofficial strikes.

15.12.72

National Assembly

5.10 – 5.20 p.m.

The hon. Minister of Local Government, did he go around with the local authorities to discuss with them this programme, to let them know what amenities are going to be put in their areas and to get their suggestions?

5.20 p.m.

The Minister spoke about Town and Country Planning. I did not know that there was a division by that name in his Ministry. I know that there should be one. Take the older villages like Beterverwagting, Buxton and Plaisance. Those villages were planned according to how the ex-slaves conceived the situation. They have very long lots and about ten houses are on one lot. Persons have to walk right through each other's lots. The inter-lot drains to bring out the water by gravity do not work. Engineers will tell you that after a certain distance the water cannot come down to the end.

My neighbour at the back of me wants me to provide drainage for him through the front. I tried to do it but when I dug my drain deeper I went deeper than the drainage in front. The water from the trench therefore came back into my drain and blocked it.

Is the Town and Country Planning Division working on these problems and has the Minister discussed with the people what is to be done? The hon. Minister, Mr. Mingo, will tell you that the people living in the back lots have to walk through mud and through narrow passage-ways to get to their land. They cannot drive up in a car to the entrance. These lots need to be cut and streets should be put to connect them.

I should like to know whether there is any intention to review the planning of these old villages so that everybody can get on the road as soon as he leaves his lot. I should like to know whether the Government is thinking about these things.

Let me get back to socialism. If this Government is really interested in socialist planning, if it is really interested in the welfare of the working-class people, it will be interested in peace because of the amount of money spent in war.

What is this Government doing in its foreign policy to condemn the United States for its war of aggression in Indo-China and Vietnam? I have said before that the foreign policy and domestic policy must be connected and if the members of the Government are interested in the working-class people they must be interested in working-class, international solidarity, in international proletarianism. Therefore they must be interested in peace.

It is only through peace that the workers can get true benefits. Therefore the Government must be sincere. It must have meaningful dialogue with socialist countries and it must send its technicians not only to capitalist countries, but to socialist countries like Russia, Cuba and the G.D.R. The Government is now establishing diplomatic relations with Cuba. I want to add that if it has diplomatic relations with West Germany, it should also have with the G.D.R.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member, Hr. Aaron.

**Mr. Aaron:** This afternoon I wish to speak with reference to the Nationalised Bauxite Industry, which is mentioned on page 22 of the Budget Speech. I should like to speak on what nationalisation of DEMBA has done for the small man, for its employees and for Guyana as a whole.

It is not necessary for me to repeat what my Hon. Friend, Mr. Bancroft, said earlier in this debate although I know that there are many leaders and politicians in this House who have had 25 years' experience and still need to learn a lot.

Let me get back to the days of DEMBA. DEMBA operated in this country for over 50 years. What can we say of DEMBA? We can say that when the PPP was in office and ran this country into bankruptcy, DEMBA came to its assistance by loaning some \$2.5 million.

What more can we say about DEMBA? Let us deal with the pension plan that DEMBA used to operate for its employees. Although these employees were pooling their money and putting it into the pension plan, that money could not be used in Guyana to develop Guyana, but it was possible to use it in Canada to develop Canada.

15.12.72

National Assembly

5.20 – 5.30 p.m.

I go further, to the welfare plan which DEMBA started in 1969. Although DEMBA started that plan in 1969, up to the time it left Guyana, DEMBA had not given one single cent to an employee. Although there were many applications for loans to improve houses and to build new houses, not one cent was given by DEMBA to its employees before it left the shores of Guyana.

Later I shall speak of what GUYBAU has done since it took over the operation of the bauxite industry in July last year. We can deal with sports during DEMBA's time. All we can say is that DEMBA controlled the monopoly of the sports complex. With the employees it built the sports complex in that area but DEMBA reserved the right to select the Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer of that complex. The membership had the right to select only the members of the Committee.

We can go further and look at education during DEMBA's time. What we can say of education during that time is that DEMBA built Echols High School which was named after the manager of DEMBA at that time and it gave scholarships here and there.

I would be failing if I did not congratulate DEMBA for exposing our local staff to the technical skill and training necessary to run its operation. Without this, nationalisation would never have been successful.

Let me now turn to GUYBAU. Mr. Speaker, you will remember that to April, 1971, three months before nationalisation, there was a strike at DEMBA. That was the first attempt by the Opposition to make sure that nationalisation failed.

**5.30 p.m.**

But this was not to be so, because of hard work by the Government and the Prime Minister of this country we were able to get the workers back to their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, you can remember also that there were pressures on these employees to take back their RILA money and their back pay. The Prime Minister of this country advised the workers not to take back their RILA money and to use their back pay in the best interest of the

community. He also told them that the Government does not want their money, if they want to take it back they can do so, but he advised them against the odds coming to them. It was not long after that advice, when they had taken back their RILA money - some of them - that the first death occurred. There was a crash on the highway, and after the first death at the plant no money could have been given to the family of the deceased. It was only then the employees realised the danger of taking back their money.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that after that strike we proceeded to nationalise DEMBA. I will now explain the Thrift and Welfare Plan. The Thrift and Welfare Plan generated \$0.86 million. It is geared to help the small man. First of all, it helps the employees to save through payroll deductions. The Company can deduct from his wages and salary \$1.60 a week to \$30 per month according to the man's ability to save. As a further incentive the Company puts in 80 ¢ per week for the employee. If an employee does not join the Plan, the Company still puts in that 80 ¢ in the name of the employee. It is used for housing development in the linden area, to pay down for new houses or to improve or extend an existing building. These amounts are loaned at a subsidized rate of interest. The employee only pays 3 per cent and the Company pays the difference bringing it to the commercial rate in force.

The two-fold benefit of the Plan is evident at this point since this is a form of co-operative savings scheme managed by the Company for the employees. In February this year 219 families have been housed through this Thrift and Welfare Plan. The total amount loaned to the 219 employees is \$771,000 which includes foremen and general foremen. This is not for the staff. 100 employees improved or extended their houses at a cost of \$290,000. DEMBA was operating this plan since 1959 and could not see it fit to give its employees 1¢ for improvement, but from the time we nationalised DEMBA we have loaned \$771,000 to its employees. Forty-nine employees were provided the down payment on new homes to the extent of \$94,000. 25 employees took mortgages amounting to \$177,000. Forty-four other employees who are Foremen and General Foremen received money to the tune of \$210,000. It is hoped that this plan will be more than doubled during 1973. It is already committed to financing the 175 housing units in the Amelias Ward in the self-help housing scheme which will cost \$1.03 million. The plan has helped employees on both banks of this River. It is interesting to know that as far as

15.12.72

National Assembly

5.30 – 5.40 p.m.

housing finance is concerned all of GUYBAU's employees would be adequately provided for as the company is now looking into the matter of the employees who do not wish to build their houses in that area and who wish to build elsewhere, outside of the Linden area. The company is not looking in matter of giving loans to them so that they can build their houses where they want to build them. This is a step in the right direction.

I can go further to explain about the farm. When DEMBA used to operate this farm only the staff and the CPR could have used this farm. Today the farm is being used by everyone in the Linden area. The company goes so far as to send out their produce twice per week both to the Wismar area and to the McKenzie end so that all can benefit from the produce.

I can go further on education. We had selected 12 young new cadets to go on training. These cadets have to be first trained for one year to develop their relationship with the workers on their aptitude for the job which they want to pursue. After, they would be selected to go to a higher school of learning to pursue engineering and other skills.

5.40 p.m.

Let me say, as time would not permit me to go through all the necessary details, in closing I would say this is a question of collective responsibility, and if there is any Government or any person to be singled out for this, it must be the People's National Congress Government, the Prime Minister of Guyana, Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham. If there is anyone or political parties to be singled out for attack it should be collectively shared by both Opposition parties in this House, the People's Progressive Party and The United Force, also the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Jagan.

As time would not allow me to indicate my proposal, I would, leave this note to the Opposition. So long as the People's National Congress Government is in office, our policy and programme to feed, to clothe, and to house this nation by 1976, will succeed. The reason whyour programme must succeed is because this Government is of the people, by the people, and for the people.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member, may I congratulate you on your maiden speech.



**The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan):** In this Budget we have been presented with some impressive figures, both for the Current and also for the Capital Budget. What is necessary at this time in the history of our country is to look very deeply into the figures which are presented. In fact, not only these figures but the general propositions which are put in the Budget.

On the first page, we read glowingly of a 7 per cent rate of growth, of the gross domestic product, but even by the Government's own admission, this is a deficit rate, for the cost of living alone, the Government has admitted to be 5 per cent. Then we have to add to that, population increase, which is also in the vicinity of 2.5 to 3 per cent.

If we examine the Budget itself, we have to try to see where all this money is coming from. I refer particularly to the Current Budget. Surely, production has not been increasing significantly in this country. The Hon. Minister himself admitted that this last year, the volume of production fell but the gross income was maintained because of increasing prices, but if we look at the figures over a long period, 1964 to the present time, we will find that there has not been significant increases in production in the sugar industry. In 1963, there was a total of 317,000 tons. This year, it is likely that the production will be about the same, perhaps a little more. Rice production in 1964 was 173,000 tons, in 1970 it was 134,000 tons. I give round figures, last year and this year, even less. Timber production 1964, 1,517 tons valued at \$2.5 million roughly; 1970, 852,000 tons nearly a 50 per cent decrease valued at \$2,407,000. I give these figures only to indicate.

In the field of bauxite, of course, production has gone up from 1.333 million to 3 million in 1970, alumina from 288,000 to 344,000 tons, not a significant increase. In the case of bauxite, this is a wasting asset and in true budgeting, perhaps, we should be setting aside a sum each year for this wasting asset, so one can say when it is all depleted we have that sum of money which we can use elsewhere, for on the Government's own admission it has not been able to generate surpluses from the current Budget for its own development. Very little. And this is a fundamental question especially when one is looking for income from a wasting asset like bauxite. One must think about it seriously.

15.12.72

National Assembly

5.40 – 5.50 p.m.

My main point is that the growth in revenue from 1964 to the present time has been quite significant from about the current Budget of \$70 million in 1964 to \$174 million.

5.50 p.m.

If this has not come basically from production then where has it come from? It has come, I submit, mainly from taxation. And this is why the Guyanese people are smarting under so many hardships today.

I do not think the Government can produce figures out of the air to show that production has sustained this large increase in the revenue. The revenue has increased in customs and excise from \$32 million to \$69 million, which is an increase of roughly 214 per cent. This is due to the cumulative taxation which was imposed in 1966 through to 1969. And from 1969, although we have been hearing about tax-free Budgets, outside of the Budget we have had increases in electricity charges, increases in telephone charges, increases in postage rates, increases recently in rum and other liquor taxes, increases in local authority rates and taxes and so on.

Normally, outside of the rates and taxes for local authorities, all of this, in the colonial times, came at Budget time. They were regarded as taxation but this Government wants to create a favourable position that there are no taxes, that the Budget is free of taxes. It bowls these googlies between the Budget Statements and comes along at Budget time to give us these figures. I submit that the masses of the people have had to pay taxes upon taxes which have largely accounted for these inflated Budgets.

What have they done with the money? This is the next question. I have already shown that very little surplus, generated from the current budget for the purposes of our development, has gone towards the Development Programme. This Development Programme speaks of a deficit in the consolidated account, of a deficit at the end of this year which will be nearly \$102 million as against a figure of \$6 million in 1964. That was the net deficit in the accumulated account. This, Sir, is the classic deficit financing which has led to the recurrent curse of inflation in Latin America and this is what the Guyanese people are feeling today.

Where does the money go? Let us note some of the heads. General Administration has increased from \$16 million in 1964 to \$62 million in 1973, a 388 per cent increase. The bureaucracy has grown by leaps and bounds. I see my friend Kit at the back there. That is how the money goes. He is part of the bureaucracy. [**Mr. Hoyte:** Like Jack Kelshall.] For one Jack Kelshall you have three or four. [**The Prime Ministers:** Better to pay him than pay Jack Kelshall.] That is what is shown up here. Police expenditure has gone up from \$4.5 million to \$9 million, that is, it has doubled. Prisons went up from \$6,68 million in 1964 to \$12 million, 180 per cent. Expenditure on the Army in 1966 was a little less than \$1.98 million. It went up to \$8.98 million. External Affairs, went up from \$500,000 in 1966 to \$4.2 million this year, an increase of 854 per cent. Information was \$118,935, less than a quarter million. It went to \$1.8 million in 1972; an increase of 1485 per cent.

Let us see, on the other hand, what has gone to the people. General Administration has increased by 388 per cent; Social Services have increased by 207 per cent; Social Assistance has had no increase at all from 1964 to now; Pensions and Gratuities have increased by 171 per cent.

These are the figures which tell the tale behind the Budget. The people have been taxed but the people are not getting value for money spent. The money is being squandered, wasted.

### **6 p.m.**

It is not going even for the development of our country, it is not going even to replenish an asset like bauxite which is being dug out of the ground. We do not say we must not have expenditure under different Heads such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs but what has to be seriously examined at this time of the Guyanese history is the question of priorities. First things must be done first, which means that we have to look after those people who are having a difficult time today to make two ends meet. Our public debt is becoming an increasing burden on the taxpayers. It has jumped from \$10 million in 1964 to \$35 million. This is 341 per cent increase. This is the position. Who pays for this? Who pays for the over bloated administration and the squandermania but the people through a cut in social services? The Minister of Economic Development will tell us talk in absolute figures, but absolute figures must be talked about in relation to where the money is coming from; it is coming from the people. That is why we chose

to deal in percentages. It is coming from the people; if the people are paying the taxes the people have a right. If not, to maintain percentages of the Budget to have increasing amounts of...

[*Interruption*]

Sir, where does the money go? Let us look at the Budget Statement. We see at the top of page 36:

"...increases in expenditure fall mainly in the following areas - Defence \$1.4 million, Foreign Affairs \$0.5 million, Land Development, \$0.5 million, Post Office \$0.3 million, Works and Communications \$0.7 million, Education \$2.3 million, Health \$0.4 million, Trade (subsidy) \$2.4 million, and Public Debt \$3.9 million."

From 20 per cent of the Budget last year the public debt has jumped this year to 21 per cent. Let us not live in the clouds. It is going to increase further because the Government has been given favourable considerations, 5-year and 10-year moratorium, and quite a large number of the loans which the Government has and the more they borrow the bigger the proportion in time it will have to pay. And thus we have this steadily climbing proportion of the Budget which goes to finance the huge debt burden. The Government gives us a big programme for development - \$145.2 million. It is clear that they have not either been able to spend this kind of money or to get this kind of money in the past. There is no doubt that what is being done is merely putting a figure. The same way we had it, in 1968 Guyanese people were told that over \$200 million will be spent on the Tiboku hydroelectric project. This is what is being done here - guesstimates. It was not that the PPP, as my friends are saying, was dealing in guesstimates. What they are referring to is the 1960/1964 programme for which we wanted \$200 million. There were estimates including the East Coast road which the British had paid large sums of money to have surveyed during the Interim Government period plus the whole electricity expansion scheme. Sir, Kenneth Beril gave the justification to the British Government for cutting down the programme from \$200 million to \$100 million on the ground that if we borrowed so extensively to finance such a big plan by the 70's Guyana, will be faced with a 31 per cent debt burden on the budget. This was the justification. But, Sir, where has the production gone in Guyana to justify... [Interruption] The Minister of Economic Development is arguing - which argument I use - that productivity and production can increase but where is the money going? Where did it go last

15.12.72

National Assembly

6.00 – 6.10 p.m.

year? Page 30 has shown what was done last year but when you look at these figures you will see - biggest expenditure sea and river defences, Rice Rehabilitation Programme, silos. They have not got the rice to put in the mills much less in the silos.

6.10 p.m.

This is how productivity and production are going up. This is how they are expending development money which they are borrowing 'harum scarum' all over the place.

The hon. Prime Minister says, we are getting it. Yes, you are going to get it, when you buy silos; you are going to get it, when you buy pumps; you will get it, when you buy fish trawlers; you will get it when you buy these products of packaged unemployment. You will get it because in the present situation of Anglo-American imperialism, they will give you these things. Of course, the Chinese will give you textile mills and other mills, in the same way that the other Socialist countries will be prepared to give you factories, to develop land schemes, and to take payment out of the products produced in this country.

I suppose the Chinese deal is based on that kind of proposition, but are we going to get the Yankee and the British and the Mexicans, and the Colombians, who sold us trawlers by remote arrangement, to buy Guyanese products? This is what we have been quarrelling about. Development does not only mean spending money. It is not only a question of quantum. It is a question of quality analysis of the total situation, planned proportional development as Socialist economists will say, integrating planned property development of the economy putting emphasis mainly on the proper sectors of industry and agriculture and integrating this with progressive foreign policy, which does not rely on playing the Nixon game.

Let us go back a bit. The \$300 million plan which was formulated in 1966 for seven years, was going to usher the millenium in Guyana, was going to solve all our problems in the same way it is now being shouted that we are going to feed and house and clothe ourselves by 1976. It is the same old story. The one before failed and all this will go the same way.

We heard the Hon. Minister of Housing and Reconstruction speaks about drainage and irrigation, agriculture and he told us that Hutchinson was a colonial with colonial concepts and

we must not borrow from foreigners. Will the Hon. Minister tell us whether he was not one of those who worked out a feasibility study for the Mahaicony-Abary scheme?

The Hon. Minister is trying to confuse the House. [*Interruption*] I know more about this than you do, although you sat in that Ministry for years. Hutchinson condemned the small scheme, Demerara East Coast conservancy. He condemned empoldering such as Black Bush Polder, because he said, particularly these two schemes contribute to the further inundation of surrounding areas. We know what happens every year with flooding in the Mahaica-Mahaicony area. Why did I do the Black Bush Polder? It was done by the Interim Government which had brought all the Mr. Browns and all the plans from the different schemes.

In the Hutchinson proposals, it was intended to completely condemn and abolish the East Coast Conservancy and to have timed drainage and irrigation from the Demerara River to the Berbice River, which would have tied in irrigation and drainage. The Hon. Minister tells us about pumps and drainage, and he compares the situation with the sugar estates, but what do the sugar estates do on the East Coast? They use the conservancy for irrigation water, but in times of flood, they release the four kokers at Lama and Maduni and flood out as far as the Abary.

The whole objective - and the Minister knows this - is that drainage on the coast is not only caused by rainfall in that particular area that is being cultivated, but water rushing down from the back, and the Hutchinson schemes were intended to control the back waters to prevent flooding in the front, and also in times of drought to have irrigation by gravity.

#### 6.20 p.m.

What have they done that is different from that? Let him tell the House and the country about the scheme which he worked out for the first phase when he was in charge of drainage and irrigation. [**Mr. S.S. Naraine:** I am telling you that is not Hutchinson's scheme.] Let us concede for a moment that it was not Hutchinson's scheme. I am saying that the principle enunciated by Hutchinson - these people cannot understand - was what the Minister worked out an engineering project for. He did it for \$32 million. I asked him after he worked it out how much it would cost, I said, "Go back and do some feasibility exercise. Let us know how we will be able to finance it,

where the income will come from". He was able to show, and he has the figures, that this scheme, based on direct and indirect income from increased production, increased acreage, will be self-financing in 17 years. [Mr. Green: Why did you not get money for the scheme?] Your masters in the Colonial Office said, No.

The Minister now tells us that we have to go into the economics of these schemes, that the Tapakuma scheme was not an economic scheme but, Sir, the economists also have to take into consideration a thing called "social costs". This is why people like d'Aguiar can succeed in running a beer factory and a soft drinks factory but when he comes to the Ministry of Finance as part of the Government, he fails.

There is a thing called "social costs". If you do not provide gainful employment to people or succeed in keeping them in the countryside what is going to happen? Not only do you have to find money to give social assistance, which we see from the Estimates stands still, but you have increasing crime. Your prison population goes up. That is happening now. They admit that the prison was built for 250. When I was in prison in 1953 they had about 25 remands. They now have to make a special jail at Timehri to take care of remands alone. Social costs have to be taken into consideration in calculating whether a scheme should be carried out or not.

Everyone knows that Essequibo is a depressed area. We heard a speech by the Hon. Member Mr. Ambrose. Obviously you can see that years of P.P.P. education have done him well, [Laughter] He made a very important point that if agriculture is to succeed in Guyana we must relate average income in various sectors of the economy, in industry, such as bauxite, such as sugar, such as urban versus rural incomes, standards of living and so on. It was a very important point.

All we are hearing "We are going to feed and house and clothe ourselves". Let us take the first. I was in Western Berbice on Wednesday last; they are trying to get the people to grow a second rice crop. They told me that for the last crop the average yield was roughly 7 per cent of what were the expectations. That was because of floods. They are encouraging them now to grow a second crop of rice. Now we hear talks about pumps. This is what was told to me. The pump is not going to help that. Where are they going to bring the water from? As the estates pull

out the water from the Abary for their irrigation the water gets salt in the front part where the rice farmers are operating. Therefore they cannot cultivate. How are pumps going to help them?

The Minister told us about a feasibility study. Was any economic feasibility study done on all these big road programmes in the MacKenzie Road Highway? We would like to see it. They do not make feasibility studies on a lot of the infrastructural schemes they are doing. A feasibility study caused them to build the \$35 million silos. [Mr. Wrights: What is wrong with silos?] First of all, you have to get the rice to put in them. You are the Governor of Leguan and you do not know what is going on in a rice area. They say they do not want 50 per cent of their salary deducted from their pay every fortnight. Drainage and Irrigation comes first. There must be priorities. The priorities will then help us to increase this production. That is one aspect of it.

The price structure in Guyana for rice, milk, or copra is such that it cannot encourage the farmers to produce. This is why we have been having a decline in agricultural production. You have not told us what has happened to the land settlement schemes such as Mara, and Brandwagt Sari, such as the one in Moco-Moco in the Rupununi, the big place that the Government built as a decanting centre at Annai. What has happened to all these things?

In the developed countries we know that in order to get agricultural production going, as in the United States, they have a two-priced system where they pay the farmers a high price even if they have to sell it at a low price in order to keep the people in the countryside and to keep agricultural products from going up but we may be asked: Where are we going to get the money to do this? We may be told that industrialised countries have a larger industrial sector.

### 6.30 p.m.

When we look in the Budget Speech we see that for the last year income tax from companies amounted to \$48 million, and \$43 million is estimated for this year. Why not nationalise these companies? Why not take money from this nationalisation so that you can subsidise the farmers, so that you can keep them in the country so that the income will be generated? This will have a



dynamic effect on the economy as a whole, [*Interruption by Mr. Hoyte*] I thought my friend was studying Marxism/Leninism. [*Interruption*]

For the benefit of this hon. Minister let me tell him for the first and last time. The PNC Opposition at the then time caused to be written in our Constitution a clause which read: "Prompt and adequate compensation if anything is nationalised." It was the Hon. Member Mrs. Willems with her defenders of freedom who were saying why this clause has been put in our Constitution. [**Mr. Hoyte:** "You were afraid." I was not afraid. You and your supporters generated an atmosphere of fear which permitted that clause to be put in the Constitution. Let me give you another practical example. [*Interruption*] Wait, just a minute. [**The Prime Minister:** We cannot wait too long.] The year 1963 when... [*Interruption*]

**Mr. Speakers:** The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is going in chronological order. [*Laughter*]

**Dr. Jagan:** - - - they were dancing in the streets with the CIA, a Cuban vessel answering our SOS sent a tanker with gasoline and kerosene. When it came here the question was where to store it. We knew that they were some tanks at Atkinson which, belonged to the Americans but which along with the whole property had been released to the Government of British Guiana. When I referred to this that we are going to store the gasoline and kerosene there the Americans said they would not allow it because this is Cuban oil and it cannot be stored in American property. I told the Governor that I am going to nationalise them, take them over. The Governor said if this is done it will endanger the relation between the United States and the United Kingdom, and as such being in charge of foreign affairs he would not allow it. We had the same problem with the immigration in the case of - - - the Prime Minister's pals. This is the explanation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are you coming to an explanation?

**Dr. Jagan:** A manifesto enunciates what the Government will do for a particular term of office and under the conditions of 1964, tell me, had the P.P.P. won, would the PNC support the PPP for nationalisation of anything? As late as 1970 at the 1968 Elections the PNC stated openly

15.12.72

National Assembly

6.30 – 6.40 p.m.

all over that they will not nationalise. At the election campaign... [**The Prime Minister:** "Is that in the manifesto?"] You had no manifesto. Sir, from 1968 they said they will not nationalise. As late as May 1970 the Prime Minister's Permanent Secretary no doubt taking the cue from the Prime Minister, because no civil servant today speaks on an issue like that without knowing what the Prime Minister's views are, Mr. Henry went to New Amsterdam on May 26, 1970, and spoke - the clipping is there, and their ideologist of the University was also involved in the debate. [**The Prime Minister:** Who?] Dr. Lutchman argued against it. They were only talking about meaningful participation now they are blowing the trumpet about nationalisation. I am saying that we could not nationalise, and I do not know if logic is beyond this Minister. [**Mr. Hoyte:** You are fooling the public.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying that he will not nationalise because of the circumstances.

**Dr. Jagan:** The PNC. will not support any Amendment of the Constitution as we did. [*Interruption by Prime Minister.*]

Sir, I come back to the point. In their manifesto they said in 1964 they will not nationalise the sugar industry. They are blowing the trumpet about nationalisation. They gave us how much income they made this year. What they did not tell us is the amount of money that DEMBA was paying in income tax.

**6.40 p.m.**

They did not tell us that. However, I leave that point because I am not going to argue against nationalisation.

I want to ask them why berate the fact that DEMBA was doing this and doing that. Go to Kwakwani and you will see a worse situation there. [*Interruption*] That is why I held up one quarter million acres of land and I refused to give them a lease. And you gave them the lease in 1965. You signed the secret agreement with them.

We heard incidentally, that the PPP was doing nothing against DEMBA. We wrote them and asked them about the land over on the west part of Demerara, which they were not using at all. It was then that they built a bridge across the Demerara River just to do a little bit to fool us that they were working all over the place but the Government must not blow hot and cold. On the one hand, they say we must own and control our resources. Castro said the same thing. Castro has put it into practice. Allende said the same thing; he has put it into practice.

This is the position and therefore they must not say that in one breath and then, in the other one, come along and say it is a question of pace. They have the records, we have nothing to hide, where it is shown that the P.P.P. was going to move on the lands on the west which were not being utilised, and to go ahead on our own. This is why the IDC was created and it said, "to facilitate and also undertake the establishment of industry. If a constitutional clause prevented the PPP from nationalisation, then the P.P.P. was going to resume and withhold, as we did with Reynolds, one quarter million acres of land and go in for our own development.

This was the PPP's strategy, but what excuse you have? A secret agreement with Reynolds in 1965! This is why you do not want to nationalise Reynolds. In order to circumvent the Constitution, that handicap which they put in - they allowed the Colonial Office to put in - it was necessary to adopt that kind of strategy. We are not apologising for our programme. What we are asking these people who say, ownership and control, is to be consistent and not to do as the Minister of Mines said: all we stand for is partnership, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs says: they must forget about DEMBA, DEMBA is a mental block, or words to that effect.

This Government is in the fortunate position of having an Opposition which will give it support for a radical programme which it is not doing and in order to hide its puppet status, to rationalise it, it talks about pace and tactics. The Government is aware that this crushing burden of taxation will continue to exert its debilitating effect on the human resources in Guyana, which in turn will affect the whole productive forces in our country.

Cost of living. The Government would like the Guyanese people to believe that it has no responsibility in this at all, that two things are responsible, one is, foreign prices increasing out of its control and local people trying to take advantage of the situation. To put the record straight,

15.12.72

National Assembly

6.40 – 6.50 p.m.

let us see what some of the factors which add to this heavy burden which the Guyanese people are carrying today. We had devaluation. We had taxation. We have failures in agriculture, industrial, and trade policies. I would like to refer to these.

Devaluation on two occasions 1967 and 1971, will the Government say that this did not contribute to the cost of living? Government admitted that it did the last one so as to help the situation in Guybau. What has it done with the windfall that has come to it directly and indirectly from the company by way of taxation? I have already said what the Government has done; expanded the State apparatus and the coercive apparatus of the State, financing the huge national debt which is growing the same with taxation which has increased by leaps and bounds. Apart from the taxes which I have mentioned which are done outside of the Budget, the Guyanese people cannot bear any more taxes, that is why the Government cannot come forward with any more taxes.

Agricultural policy and prices: The milk producers had to go on strike the other day before they increased the price which was lower than it was in 1964. From sixty cents a gallon in 1964, it was dropped by them to fifty-six cents. The price of copra remains today the same as it was in 1964. They import soya beans from the United States, nearly \$0.5 million. They import copra and coconut oil from the West Indies, \$0.5 million. Taxpayers have to foot that bill. West Indian producers of copra are getting 5 cents per pound more than they are getting here. This is the reason why the cost of living is killing people today. Production costs have gone up to the farmer. In addition, as my hon. Friend Mr. Durant reminded the House the other day, predial larceny in the countryside is rampant. As a result, cattle, sheep, goats are disappearing and people cannot go in for production, even of ground provisions. Apart from that, there are floods

6.50 p.m.

and droughts. This is a fact. When the statisticians begin to talk, as they are now trying to talk, about controlling prices they must take all the factors into consideration because their past policies have contributed to the present impasse both in agriculture and with respect to the cost of living for urban workers.

**Mr. Speakers:** Do you wish to continue until 9 o'clock?

**Dr. Jagan:** I do not mind, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** Neither do I except that reporters may not be able to carry on.

**Dr. Jagan:** On the question of Carifta and regional integration: What has Carifta brought? Branch plants, dearer and inferior goods. And what else? Consumption tax on the Guyanese people. Consumption tax has gone up, duty has been taken off from the goods which have come from outside but what I am saying is that in the process of the Government trying to recoup the money by consumption tax, people are also penalised because they have to pay higher prices for the branch plant products coming from the Carifta countries. The Government has its policy. What I am saying is that that policy has contributed to the increase in the cost of living. The Hon. Members do not want to admit it. That is their business but it is a fact.

The External Trade Bureau was established on the ground that it would reduce the cost of living. But apart from the question of principle there is the question of inefficiency and corruption. Why do they not let in some breath of fresh air into the place? Involve all who are interested to see what is going on. Controlled prices are good but it is no use fixing prices which are, first of all, uneconomic; which are so marginal that the merchants will not stock the goods and they go into black market; it is no use manning the thing so that you have dislocations in supply, you have shortages all the time and, as a result, the prices that you set mean nothing. People are forced to pay black market prices and no matter how much price control you have you are not going to succeed unless you run the thing properly.

I think, therefore, say, on this basic question which is plaguing the Guyanese people today, that the Government should embark... and nothing has been done in this Budget. Tell us what you will do about the cost of living. The Government gives some income tax relief, \$1.3 million but the defence levy alone, a 3 per cent tax on everything coming into the country, is nearly \$4.6 million. Why have they not abolished this? Either they must have subsidisation or they must cut out the defence levy. There must be one or the other. What happened to flour? You

put a tax on the people. In 1962 when we put a Budget, you all were shouting "Rum is a poor man's drink". [*Interruption*]

We demand for the people of this country a policy of subsidisation. This was done in the time of our colonial masters. They talk much about our colonial masters but the colonial masters used to subsidise essential commodities during the war and long after the war. [*Interruption*] In your manifesto there was a promise of free school books to children; university education was to be provided to all. Human resources are going to waste, 600 students apply with minimum qualifications, 500 pass the entrance test to boot. Less than 200 are taken. This is how the people are being helped.

We call for an end to the 10 per cent surcharge on goods coming from socialist countries. Why is it that these so-called "socialists" have put a surcharge of 10 per cent on goods originating in socialist countries? Where is their international solidarity? This is contributing to the cost of living.

When the PPP was in Government I was Minister of Trade at one time. The first thing I did was to abolish all quotas, liberalise trade, buy from anywhere. That is what the PPP did. We cut out all the rackets, the bribes and the corruption that was going on. Why do they not do that? This is what is going to help to bring down the cost of living. Liberalise trade or remove the consumption tax, shake up and reorganise the ETB. When the new manager, Mr. Low-A-Chee, was appointed we heard that there was going to be a big shake up but a strike was threatened on him. Congress Place must have said, "Boy, you better cool off, or cool down things", so nothing happened.

Pay economic prices to the farmers, prices which will not only take into consideration the costs of production but which will also take into consideration this factor which was referred to, that is, making life attractive to the people in the countryside so that they will not drift to the city, as is the general tendency in Third World countries.

Now, I will like to say something about the other evil which we have inherited from this Government. That is the unemployment situation. The Prime Minister said at a meeting the other

night that the figures dropped from 22.7 per cent to 15 per cent. Where did these figures come from? At one time we heard Kit Nascimento say that it was 15 per cent. Mr. Salim, the Minister of Local Government, said that it is at least 15 per cent.

**7 p.m.**

[*Interruption*] When the Minister of Economic Development attended the unemployment seminar called by the TUC, there were no figures so far as the rate of unemployment was concerned. The Prime Minister was there, what figures did he give? None. But now elections are approaching, we are manufacturing them and drawing them out like swallows in the air, and we let them fly, 15 per cent unemployment. The situation is very serious; we call on the PNC Government to provide unemployment relief immediately and also emergency works.

Under the devaluation the capitalist of Guyana, the foreign capitalist mainly secured the tremendous windfall. How is it that the Government cannot use this windfall for the purpose of giving some relief to those people who are having a hard time? The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Dr. Eric Williams, faced with a revolt in 1970, put on a special 5 per cent tax on the companies and got \$10 million so as to create work to give to the unemployed, in a short-term period.

We do not say that our whole programme should be based on relief works but there must be a short term approach to this question as well as a long term approach. There are many infrastructural works. I do not mean digging a hole and filling it up as they had to do in America after the depression. There are many local authorities in the countryside even in the City where necessary works are to be performed, but it is not done because there is not enough money. The Government tells us, "grow more things." I have bought plants until I am tired. I have a big yard space. I heard on the radio if you do not have land get pots. I have lands, I buy mango trees, I buy orange trees, pine apple plants. The plants grow up to a size and they stop growing. The water in my yard is always higher than the one in the trench. It cannot get out. Why does the Government not stop - it has the power - Bookers and the housing scheme next to Bookers from pumping the water into the Cummings Canal? When the pump to drain the GDF Compound was built why did they not integrate that with the whole area? One pump could have done the job.

15.12.72

National Assembly

7.00 – 7.10 p.m.

But, "Grow more food, let us feed ourselves", this time the mango tree is not growing. Nothing is growing. This is where they are only preaching...

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**Dr. Jagan:** I am winding up now. The time has come to do more than preaching. Even they are changing their tune. Long ago the parsons, the preachers for years were only exhorting people "Do good, behave well, do not steal." Even these people today, I have clippings here from the newspaper: "No communism dangers to Caribbean." This is the headline in the Graphic. Here is Archie's article commenting on the Church Meeting, I think it was in Barbados and this is necessary to be quoted. Guyana Graphic, 3rd December, 1972:

"The Committee said that it believes the Gospel of Christ must be proclaimed enabling our people to realise the full worth through the redemptive work of Christ. This must now manifest itself in the Caribbean situation.

We therefore call on the Caribbean people to rise up today to become in their own situation the instrument of radical and creative change and to take the risks involved in answering this call."

Sir, the Government is obviously not taking the crisis in our country today seriously. But one Minister had, perhaps without thinking about it, revealed the state of bankruptcy which faces this country today when he disclosed those alarming figures at the meeting of the Nurses Council from the Caribbean. Alarming, when out of 1,147 nurses who took the professional examination, only 267 passed.

**7.10 p.m.**

This is an alarming state. It cost taxpayers money to train those people. Go into the hospital and see! A messenger working in my office was knocked down by a Government vehicle, which did not stop at a major road. Through inadequate care, medical and nursing care, his leg became gangrenous and had to be amputated. Poor people are dying like flies. Two on one bed, even surgical cases coming out of the operation! Do you doubt this? Two maternity cases on one small bed. A lot of people, whose legs do not have to be amputated, could be saved. The country suffers in two ways, the cost to train these people who are failing, and the



inadequate services which the people are getting, and look at the other alarming side. While 267 passed in the five-year period, 323 left the service, gone like birds. Who are these people? Most of them are PNC supporters. Even its supporters are losing confidence in this Government. Why do you think they are putting the 10 per cent tax on airline tickets? This is not a revenue measure. This is a measure to prevent people from leaving. The brain drain is so terrible that they are using this as a device

Give us the statistics of how many people are leaving Guyana. We have the figures for passport fees. They have alarmingly increased. In the time of the PPP, it was very easy to go to England, anyone could have gone. Today, it is very difficult to go and they are going. The skilled people are going, those who have some capital are leaving, this is the reality. They are perturbed, but they do not want to admit it. *[Interruption]*

Parasites are leaving Cuba, but here your supporters have not got jobs or they see mounting inflation eating up their income. Mr. Semple in New Amsterdam, President of the Berbice Branch of the Public Service Association, says dual authority in the Public Service, being pushed around by hacks and incompetents who get their appointments through Congress Place or through the Prime Minister or through Hamilton Green.

No country can develop without the development of the resources and keeping those resources, human resources. In the whole educational system there is the same discrimination. Two weeks ago I was in Leguan. A young lady passed five subjects at GCE, cannot get a job, but somebody who has not got qualification - no G.C.E. - gets the job. It must show up in the indifference, and soon, in the whole educational system. Mr. Speaker, would you tell the Hon. Prime Minister not to misinform the House?

**Mr. Speaker:** When he gets up, he will properly inform the House. *[Interruption]* Hon. Members please allow the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to wind up.

**Dr. Jagan:** The Prime Minister deals with all these matters in a very jocular manner, but I think he should stand up and take note of the alarming state of the country at the moment and he should be serious to see that things are done to have, first of all, a correct strategy, correct

15.12.72

National Assembly

7.10 – 7.20 p.m.

domestic and foreign policies, an end to discrimination, and an end to corruption. Steps should be taken, and when these things are done, people will, have confidence, they will stay at home. Nothing is here to inspire them now. People will be prepared to earn less if they know they are making a contribution, if they are inspired, by the leadership. We, on our part, are always attacked for non co-operation. We have stated over and over that once the Government takes the right course it can depend on the support of the People's Progressive Party. [*Applause*]

**The Prime Minister** (Mr. Burnham): Mr. Speaker, it is but understandable and typical that the greater part of the remarks in this debate by the Opposition, including those of the Leader, were not relevant to the Budget Speech or in any way related to the subjects dealt with in the Speech, because though it might not have been written in Macaulian language, though it might not bear the stamp of a speech uttered by Demosthenes, it is a speech which indicates a carefully co-ordinated programme, a speech which shows the progress which has been made in Guyana. The progress which is being planned for, and at the same time realistically admits where there have been failures and where there has been disappointments.

7.20 p.m.

When the President's Address was the subject matter of debate it was pointed out that an opportunity would have been given to the House to discuss those aspects of the Government's policy which not only touched upon the lives of the people but also forecast movements in our economy. Alas, how little assistance, as has now become traditional, have we got from the Opposition?

I desire to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance who has shown us great a competence as a Minister as he showed as a senior civil servant. Before I deal with the highlights of the Budget Speech I would like to refer to a few fallacies and inconsistencies which have been mouthed by the Opposition.

We are told, for instance, that there has been no growth. Is it suggested that there is some inaccuracy or prevarication in a statement that there has been an annual growth rate of approximately 7 per cent. Is it denied, for instance, that the GNP in 1964 was \$302 million and

in 1972 \$513 million? Are the statistics referred to here and also in my remarks winding up the debate on the President's Address doubted that the average inflationary rate was about 2.5 per cent as against an average of about 9 per cent in other Commonwealth Caribbean countries?

Then we were regaled with the allegation that there were no surpluses from the Current to finance the Capital Budget and that in spite of the fact that the Hon. Minister of Finance, with his penchant for giving instructions to infants for he was once a teacher, carefully explained the contribution that was made to the Capital Budget through the Current and is hidden, so to speak. The Capital Budget is the budget which carries the loans, the receipts, and the Current Budget carries the repayment.

Secondly, the Current Budget also carries a number of services and personnel who are almost exclusively referable to the execution of capital works which form a part of the development plan, the development budget, the development estimates.

We hear also, for instance, that we have abandoned the Development Plan 1966/72. Now, when the Development Programme 1966/72 was introduced I remember participating in the debate and saying quite clearly that a development plan or programme is not intended to be a Bible. It is not supposed to be like the laws of the Medes and Persians and experience could well put a government in a position where it may decide to make important, significant and substantial variations.

That there have been variations from the 1966-1972 Development Programme is not a cause for apologies by this Government. In fact, if we were to show the foolish consistency of little minds the country would then have blamed us for our obtuseness, our backwardness and our PPP ignorance.

What is noteworthy, in so far as that 1966-1972 Programme is concerned, is that it forecasted an expenditure of approximately \$300 million in the public sector and the statistics referred to here in the Budget Speech show that we spent somewhat over \$320 million.

Let us refer to the last bits of paper which masqueraded as a development programme when my good and hoary friend was Premier of British Guiana. He asked for \$200 million on the

15.12.72

National Assembly

7.20 – 7.30 p.m.

advice of one of his masters from the United Kingdom, one Berrill, I think, from Cambridge. It was reduced to \$110 million and at the end of the 1964 period he had neither raised, been given or granted, nor was he capable of expending more than about \$50 million.

Let us now look at the other criticisms: that the increase in the Budget is due to taxation and not to production. It is admitted that there is an increase in production in the bauxite industry, but let us accept, argument for the sake of argument, the posit that the increase in revenue is due to the increase in taxation and not necessarily in production.

Now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has occupied that seat there for a long enough period to appreciate and understand the nature of the taxes which have been introduced by this Government. What have the taxes been on? There have not been increased taxes on personal income; there have been increased taxes on companies which now have to pay 51 per cent if they are manufacturing, and 61 per cent if they are trading. Where have the other taxes come from? From the insurance companies and the deposits which they have to pay as part of our policy of domestication of our financial institutions.

It is clear, even if you accept the fact that there has not been an increase in production - which of course I do not accept - that the taxes which contributed to the increased revenue have come from the places where they can be got. I remember this Absalom, who has now fallen, saying in his salad days when he was young and green in politics that the object of a tax system in a place like Guyana is to tax the rich, to tax the companies, to tax the corporations which can afford to pay. Tax them where they have been escaping, where they have not merely been evading, but also avoiding, the payment of income tax. That is what this Government has done. And even if we accept the proposition that increase in revenue is due to increased taxation, it is not the type of taxation which can be objected to by a *soi-disant* socialist.

Let us for a moment carry out an exercise in kindergarten education. Says the Hon. Leader of the Opposition "Consumption taxes have been introduced."

The Consumption Tax Bill which was introduced here clear was intended as substitute for import duties which had to be waived under Carifta and is part of the Carifta Agreement. [**Dr. Jagan:** Indirect taxes you mean?] The consumption tax is a substitution for import duties which were withdrawn. Therefore, the consumption tax does not represent new imposition. If, perchance, the argument had been that import duties should be lowered and therefore, *pari-passu*, consumption taxes should be lowered, there might have been some logic to the argument, otherwise, it must be dismissed with the contempt which it deserves.

Then we hear that the growth of expenditure is traceable to the expansion of the bureaucracy. [*Interruption by Dr. Jagan*] Answer not a fool according to the multitude of his folly.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Prime Minister, please do not have a private dialogue with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

**The Prime Minister:** I am sorry, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I was saying, before I was rudely interrupted, that we hear the allegation that there has been an increase in the size of the bureaucracy, that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has expanded. What proof do we have of that?

What does one expect if a country attains independence, has to carry out certain diplomatic activities and has to operate on certain levels on the international scene? Does one expect that the budget on foreign affairs in 1966 will be the same as the budget of 1972 or 1973? Does one expect when Guyana has increased the number of Missions abroad - and that increase is relevant not only to our foreign policy but to our economic interest?

When we have become one of the important members of the Non-Aligned Movement that the budget on foreign affairs for 1972 or 1973 should be of the same level as 1966? It is to suggest that the Leader of the Opposition's capacity to consume food is the same as his capacity when he was an infant in his mother's arms.

We hear for instance, the question asked: What has been done with the capital expenditure? There is none so blind as he who will not see. Says the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, "I was in West Coast Berbice last week Wednesday." We saw him here on

**15.12.72**

**National Assembly**

**7.30 – 7.40 p.m.**

Wednesday. In 1964 he could not have been in Georgetown and West Coast Berbice on the same day because there were no highways to take him to the latter area and back in time to do his piece here for which he is paid.

He talks about the Linden feasibility study. Part of that feasibility study began during his regime. Let us give Jack his jacket and the devil his due; it began during his short period of rule. Linden Highway from Soesdyke to Linden has been constructed. What has happened? There is easier communication between Georgetown and Linden; thanks to the expansion of the GAC services. There is also better means of communication between various parts of the country. Look at Festival City, where a certain politician like Nicodemus, entered by night. What has happened to capital expenditure? What has happened to the 470 miles of new road? What has happened to Kibilibiri? What has happened to Matthews Ridge? Am I to spend my time now explaining in detail? Therefore, I apologise for going into such details on some of the projects. Since his birthplace is the Corentyne I must remind him of the highway along which he can travel to go and see his dear mother.

One hears this question asked: What is being done about unemployment? Let us pause for a moment despite the remarks by the Opposition and say this: No one can deny and there has not been an attempt to deny that the level of unemployment in 1964 was 22.7 per cent. At the same time no one denies that, according to a Report published by the incumbent Government of 1957-1961, it was, in 1957, 17 per cent. So between 1957 and 1964 there was an increase from 17 per cent to 22.7 per cent. Between 1964 to 1972 there has been a reduction to 15 per cent. What do we hear from the old politicians? "We cannot believe."

**7.40 p.m.**

If you cannot believe, the statistics are there for you. The Reports of the Labour Department are laid before you month after month, year after year, extracts from those statistics show the true level of unemployment if you contend that that which is officially given is favourably low as against the fact. But it is the same gentleman who is reported as having said in Amsterdam that the level of unemployment in Guyana is 35 per, and even his infants yet unborn will not accept that fairytale.

It is asked also, what has been done with the windfall from devaluation. Let me again in explain, as I explained long ago. First of all, the windfall from devaluation *ex mero motu* automatically yielded at the then existing rate of taxation a greater income to the Government.

Secondly, it was immediately or very shortly after devaluation that the level of taxation on companies and corporations was raised. It used to be 45 per cent. In the case of trading companies, it went up to 61 per cent. In the case of manufacturing companies, it went up to 51 per cent, and also at the same time, the headquarters expenses allowances were reduced. But you know, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary sometimes to understand that you have to deal with people at the highest level of intelligence which you find amongst them. I thought this would have been recognized, but now that I notice it has not been recognized, I shall return to my pedagogical role of illustrating and teaching, point by point, and step by step, thought the Hon. Member Mr. Wilson would have done that task with respect to his leader and not left it to me.

We hear there is a crisis in Guyana. Indeed, there is a crisis! There is a crisis in the largest opposition party that cannot hold its members, and I would say that under this Westminster model which we have inherited and/or adopted, such a crisis in the main opposition party is a national crisis. I deal with this point at all merely because there appears from the observations of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that his is still an anti-national attitude. .

I was speaking with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, about why were so many thousands of people leaving Cuba. His analysis was that they were not prepared to accept the revolution! But ask him why do people leave Guyana? His answer is: because the Government is bad! Why do people leave the Soviet Union? Says he: "because they would not accept the revolution!" Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the hon. Leader of the Opposition? Must he always be so servile to those who finance his inter-international trips? What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

I do not deny that a number of people have left Guyana because they are not prepared to face the sacrifices which are the concomitant of the changes, the revolution, taking place here in Guyana. I do not have to do a special deal to airlift them, as some of my friends' friends do, and then stop the airlift, and then resume the airlift. I do not have to do that, because under the

Constitution there is freedom of movement. It is about time that the hon. Leader of the Opposition shows that he appreciates the fact that this country has not only given him his birth and infant nurture but continues to pay him.

For instance, in his enumeration of those sections of the bureaucracy which have grown, he could not mention the office of the Leader of the Opposition, or would not, because then there is no mathematical way of expressing the percentage increase. There is expended on the Hon. Leader of the Opposition \$20,000 per year. In 1964, the figure was nought. Those of us who have some familiarity with mathematics will tell you that you cannot express the percentage of \$20,000 increase as against nought.

That is part of the bureaucracy, and on second thought, I think, Mr. Speaker, when the time comes we ought to do some pruning, less free passages to various parts of the country, \$1,000 for his secretary, air conditioned office there with thick carpets, refrigerator, PABX, hot number, ex-directory number. All these things must be curtailed in the interest of the parsimony which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to see extant in Guyana.

Let us look at the Budget itself. What comment has there been on the Hon. Minister of Finance's treatment of international monetary scheme, of which Guyana is a part? This is a thing that has affected not only Guyana, not only countries in the West, but countries throughout the world. There is an advantage for certain types of societies where, by autocracy and direction, some of the effects will not be apparent but even in Poland you have the problem of Gomulka with the inflation. It is true, one may facetiously and lightly say that is why he was removed and replaced by Gierk, but Gierk is finding it no easier to keep down the rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I say this not to criticise one country or another, but this is the problem which is being faced by all countries which import. As long as you are importing, your economy can be affected by the inflation in one or other of the countries from which you are importing. It is as simple as that but it cannot be denied that, as a result of positive efforts on the part of this Government, not only in so far as finding cheaper sources is concerned but also in so far as the clamping on of controls, we have kept inflation in Guyana at a lower level than is to be found anywhere in the Caribbean.



There is the problem, but can it be denied that we have attempted to tackle the problem? It cannot. Then, can it be denied, as I asked the House to decide some time ago, that there has been increased production in all the important sectors though we have been dogged by problems arising from the weather in sugar and in rice?

They said, "You produced less rice in 1972 than in 1964." But Russia has produced less wheat in 1972 than she produced in 1970 and has been buying wheat from the USA. Unfavourable weather conditions must not be attributed to the Government. Is it to be suggested that the Government is accountable for unfavourable weather conditions? Is it to be suggested that we are more powerful than God?

We come now to consider the performance of the bauxite industry. The accounts we published; they are public property; the figures are available to the public.

We hear these snide remarks about bauxite. The figures having been made available I am to assume that the Opposition, like the PNC, has available to it people who can study, examine and question these figures but no, a blanket statement is made by the Opposition. That is not the quality of the Opposition that we are praying for. Why did we give the Leader of the Opposition \$1,000 a month and comfort to which he was not accustomed when Premier of Guyana

Then, again for the record, in 1964 when the PPP was convinced that it would win, or so it said, it wrote in its manifesto, printed by New Guyana Company Ltd. Page 30.

"It is not the party's policy to nationalise any industry, but if it becomes necessary in the national interest to do so, fair and adequate compensation will be paid."

Pause a moment: At the 1963 constitutional conference it was made clear that after the elections of 1964; Independence would be granted. The PPP expected to win and therefore the PPP expected to be in a position to write the Constitution. There was no question of any Constitution in 1961, allegedly written by Burnham. The only Constitution ever written in this country was the Constitution which was prepared by Dr. the Hon. Fenton Ramsahoye.

"The P.P.P. reaffirms." Now what is it to reaffirm? It means to affirm again.

15.12.72

National Assembly

7.50 – 8.00 p.m.

Therefore, what had been affirmed in 1961 is being affirmed again in 1964.

Let us accept the accuracy of the anecdote about my writing a Constitution for 1961. Now the PPP reaffirms that it will not nationalise the sugar and bauxite industry. This is in the context of moving to Independence. This is not in the context of having to ask Mr. Grey or ask Mr Sandys or ask Mr. Kennedy. This is in the context of moving to Independence. A manifesto is put forward for the last elections before Independence by a party that expected to win and it is reaffirming its undertaking.

It is the same undertaking referred to on the 28th March, 1962, in an address by the then Minister of Trade and Industry, Senator the Hon. H.J.M. Hubbard in his speech on that date. "To the company I say 'Go forward, in the certainty that pledges given will be kept.'" It was a pledge in 1961, reaffirmed in 1962, that the PPP would not nationalise the sugar and bauxite industries but it believed that these industries can make a greater contribution to the economy and the party would intensify its efforts to bring about this desirable objective. What is this but petty bourgeois politics? You will not nationalise but you hope to get a little more there while at the same time you do not get control of the vital extractive industries in this country.

**8 p.m.**

And yet the same infants are, saying "Nationalise this, nationalise that, nationalise everything."

Now Mr. Speaker, let us consider the programmes which Government has set up. Apart from the large expenditure of \$145 million proposed on the capital side, the capital expenditure proposed, item by item, supports the Government's thrust of feeding, clothing and housing the nation. In so far as agriculture is concerned it is pivotal. Out of the \$145million, the sum of \$45 million is allocated directly to agriculture apart from the subsidy for service ancillary to agriculture which you find under Education and other heads. We hear nothing constructive, not even destructive but merely noisy, about Government's proposal to set up a complex of co-operative financial institutions. We hear no comment be hear no comment on this important announcement. There is the Agricultural Credit Bank, one of the Institutions to be set up to provide credit, to give fillip and encouragement to the farmers.

There is a proposal in the Budget Speech, as to how that institution will be financed. First of all, Government intends to make a substantial contribution of \$2 million for a start, and then further proposes to attract other investments by making certain concessions. The same is true of the Mortgage Finance Institution. We have also discussed in the Budget Speech the establishment of a Co-operative Insurance Company which is another way of harnessing the savings and encouraging savings within the economy. I would have expected some level of discussion on this concept. From a man who is attempting to write a book on economic planning

There is this new step being taken and there will be four institutions now, the Guyana National Co-operative Bank, the Agricultural Credit Bank, the Mortgage Finance Bank and the Co-operative Insurance Company. Now let us hear some comment on that. Is this not an indication of the seriousness with which we pursue the objectives of our development programme? For agriculture, there is provision; for housing, there is provision; and both in the Budget Speech and in the Estimates there is provision for the setting up of a textile mill during 1973.

There were also references to the work that we have been doing in producing cotton once more in Guyana. When this concept of feeding, clothing and housing ourselves was first mooted, the point that was made was that when this programme was successful it would have provided the jobs or the employment opportunities in this country to wipe out unemployment.

Let us have a discussion. I have said over and over again that one of the most serious contributory factors to our unemployment is the disorientation of our people. There is a preference for the white-collar jobs, there is a preference for the pen-pushing job, and there is a preference to be employed rather than to employ oneself. If you agree do you propose we can do something for our people. These are the important matters so which we expected discussion.

The Hon. Member Mr. Teekah made some attempt in the field of education, but he limited himself to the question of how much is being spent in the Development Programme, or how much is not being spent, instead of giving us some assistance as is his duty, being paid by the taxpayers as to how we may set about task of re-orientation. In the absence of that, it is to be

15.12.72

National Assembly

8.00 – 8.10 p.m.

conceded, therefore, that the Government's point of view as to how the re-orientation should take place in education is the correct approach and the only approach in the circumstances.

The question is asked: Where will we get money from - for the 1973 portion of the programme? There is no State secret about it. Clearly, the sources are enumerated. The final one particularly referred to, which the Opposition ought to understand and appreciate, was manufacturers' credit. In the case of China, we have credit on a long-term basis. In the case of the United States of America, we have that type of credit for a shorter period.

We said it. There is no magic to it. [*Interruption by Mr. Ram Karran*] The magic, if magic there is, is only for the Opposition that they cannot see and cannot understand how a Government can contemplate in one year an expenditure that is 50 per cent higher than they contemplated in four years. That is what they cannot understand but the performance has been such that we are confined that we can do it. Have they forgotten? Do they fail to read? We have been able out of our resources to finance a programme of over \$300 million to the extent of over 45 per cent? Let them sit and listen let them understand. "Except ye become as a child, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom." That is the trouble.

8.10 p.m.

Tell the people about the blood and sweat and tears to build the Metro of Moscow. Tell the people about the blood and sweat and tears that every developing country has to go through, the price it has to pay, whether it is in the West with child labour, or it be to the last with a closed economy, with forced labour and controlled wages. Nowhere in the world have we seen or had the experience of a developing country getting on its feet without paying a price but what do we hear?

All we hear in Guyana from the Opposition is "nationalise". When the Government puts taxes on corporations, the Opposition says that the people are squeezed! [*Interruption*] Is it because we tax Gimpex, the personal property of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as admitted to me? That corporation does not pay its NIS levies, through it deducts its NIS contributions from its workers it does not pay over the contributions. You are being prosecuted soon. It is

15.12.72

National Assembly

8.10 – 8.15 p.m.

unfair to expose any more to the public, the misdemeanours, the felonies, the rascalities, and the inconsistencies of the Opposition.

This Government rests on this Budget statement, rests on the programme which has been outlined here, and is convinced as a result of the performance that there has been in the past, that there can be nothing but success attending our efforts during the period 1973, and success at all levels. [*Applause*]

### REPORT OF THE BUSINESS SUB-COMMITTEE

**Mr. Speakers:** Hon. Members, this concludes the general debate on the Motion for the approval of the Estimates of Expenditure for 1973. The Assembly will resolve itself into Committee of Supply to receive and consider the Report of the Business Sub-Committee.

*Assembly in Committee of Supply.*

**The Chairman:** Hon. Members, as Chairman of the Business Sub-Committee of the Committee-of Supply, I have to report in accordance with paragraph (2) of Standing Order No. 64, that the Business Sub-Committee met yesterday and passed a Resolution in terms of the matters set out in paragraph (1) of Standing Order No. 64, that is, on the allocation of time for the consideration of the Estimates of Expenditure in Committee of Supply. Copies of the Minutes of the proceedings of the Business Sub-Committee and the Resolution passed by the Sub-Committee were circulated to Members yesterday.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Trade, you may therefore now move the Motion concerning the Resolution of the Business Sub-Committee.

**The Minister of Finance and Trade (Mr. Hope):** Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of Supply agree with the Business Sub-Committee in its Resolution.

*Question put, and agreed to.*

*Motion carried.*

*Assembly resumed.*

15.12.72

National Assembly

8.10 – 8.15 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Resolved,** "That this Assembly do now adjourn until Monday, 18th December, 1972, at 2 p.m." [**The Minister without Portfolio and leader of the House.**]

*Adjourned accordingly at 8.15 p.m.*

\*\*\*\*\*