

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 6]

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

2nd Sitting

2.00 p.m.

Monday, 20th November, 1972

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Speaker

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

Members of the Government- People's National Congress (37)

Prime Minister (1)

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

(Absent)

Deputy Prime Minister (1)

Cde. P.A. Reid,
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture

(Absent- on leave)

Senior Ministers (10)

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

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

(Absent- on leave)

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

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

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

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

Cde. A. Salim,
Minister of Local Government

Ministers (7)

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

Cde. H. Greene,
Minister of Public Affairs

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

Cde. C.L. Baird,
Minister of Education

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

Cde. K.F.S. King,
Minister of Economic Development (Absent)

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

Parliamentary Secretaries (4)

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

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

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

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

Other Members (14)

Cde. J.N. Aaron

Cde. M.M. Ackman

Cde. K. Bancroft

Cde. N.J. Bissember

Cde. J. Budhoo, J.P.

Cde. L.I. Chan-a-Sue

Cde. E.F. Correia

Cde. M. Correia

Cde. E.H.A. Fowler

Cde. R.J. Jordan

Cde. S.M. Safee

Cde. R.C. Van Sluytman

Cde. M. Zaheeruddeen, J.P

Cde. L.E. Willems

(Absent)

Members of the Opposition (23)

People's Progressive Party (17)

Leader of the Opposition (1)

Cde. C.B. Jagan
Leader of the Opposition

Deputy Speaker (1)

Cde. D. C. Jagan, J.P.
Deputy Speaker

Other Members (15)

Cde. Ram Karran
Cde. R. Chandisingh
Cde. F.H.W. Ramsahoye, S.C. (Absent)
Cde. E.M.G Wilson (Absent – on leave)
Cde. A.M. Hamid, J.P. Opposition Chief Whip
Cde. G.H. Lall, J.P.
Cde. M.Y. Ally
Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud, J.P.
Cde. E.M. Stoby, J.P. (Absent)
Cde. R. Ally
Cde. Balchand Persaud
Cde. Bholu Persaud
Cde. I.R. Remington, J.P.
Cde. L.A Durant
Cde. V. Teekah

United Force (3)

Mr. M.F. Singh (Absent – on leave)
Mrs. E. DaSilva
Mr. J.A. Sutton

Independent (3)

Mr. R.E. Cheeks
Mr. E.L. Ambrose (Absent)
Mr. L.M. Branco

OFFICERS

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

PRAYERS**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER****Leave to Members**

The Speaker: Leave has been granted to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture and National Development, Dr. Reid, for 3 weeks with effect from today, the Hon. Minister of Works and Communications, Mr. Hoyte, and the Hon. Member Mr. F. Singh for today's sitting.

LETTER FROM THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION**RE MR. L.E. AMBROSE AND MRS. L.M. BRANCO**

The Clerk of the Assembly has received from the Leader of the Opposition a letter dated 14th November, 1972, informing him that Mr. E.L. Ambrose and Mrs. L.M. Branco are no longer members of the People's Progressive Party. These two members, Mr. Ambrose and Mrs. Branco, have advised the Office that they would be sitting as independent Members in the Assembly.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

The following Papers were laid:

- (1) Public Corporation (Broadcasting) Order 1972 (No. 76), made under section 34 of the Publics Corporations Ordinance 1962 (No. 23 of 1962), on the 27th of September, 1972, and published in the Gazette on the 30th of September, 1972. [*The Prime Minister*]

(2) (a) Guyana Water Authority Act 1972 (Commencement) Order 1972 (No. 73), made under section 1 of The Guyana Water Authority Act 1972 (No. 3 of 1972), on the 11th of September, 1972, and published in the Gazette on the 16th of September, 1972.

(b) Annual Report of the Transport and Harbours Department for the year 1970. [*The Minister without Portfolio and Leader of the House, on behalf of the Minister of Works and Communications*]

(3) Agreement dated 22nd February, 1972, between the Government of Guyana, Guyana State Corporation, Guyana Timbers Limited, and Commonwealth Development Corporation, providing for the acquisition by the Guyana State Corporation of Guyana Timbers Limited. [*The Minister without Portfolio and Leader of the House, on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Forests*]

(3) (a) Loan Agreement between the Government of Guyana and the United States of America for New Amsterdam Streets and Approaches and Canje River Bridge Project - A.I.D. Loan Number 504-L-011.

(b) Customs Duties (Exemption from Import Duties) (No. 3) Order 1972 (No. 72), made under section 8 of the Customs Ordinance, Chapter 309, on the 31st of August, 1972, and published in the Gazette on the 9th of September, 1972.

(c) Customs Duties (Exemption from Import Duties) (No. 2) Order 1972 (No. 7b), made under section 8 of the Customs Ordinance, Chapter 309, on the 8th of August, 1972, and published in the Gazette on the 23rd of September, 1972.

(d) Consumption Tax Order 1972 (No. 82), made under section 11 of the Consumption Tax Act 1969 (No. 13 of 1969), on the 20th of October, 1972, and published in the Gazette on the 21st of October, 1972.

(e) Consumption Tax (Amendment) Order, No. 2 of 1972 (No. 86), made under section 4 of the Consumption Tax Act, 1969 (Nov 13 of 1969), on the 3rd of November, 1972, and published in the Gazette on the 4th of November, 1972.

(f) Financial Paper Ho. 5/1972 Schedule of Supplementary Provision on the Current and Capital Estimates for the period ending 31st October, 1972, totalling \$7,188,422. [*The Minister of Finance and Trade*]

The Minister of Finance and Trade (Mr. Hope): I name Thursday, 23rd November as the date for consideration of the Financial Paper.

**REQUESTS FOR LEAVE TO MOVE THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE
ASSEMBLY ON DEFINITE MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan): Sir, I beg to move at the appropriate time the Adjournment of this House to permit me to discuss a matter which I have written to you about, that is the question of the issuing of licences for the importation of printing equipment, newsprint and other printing material for the New Guyana Company Limited. This matter also deals with the administrative acts of the Government which are resulting in difficulties. I hope that permission will be granted to debate this question.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition in a letter to me dated 18th November, 1972, which was received today, has submitted certain facts as a result of which he requests me to grant him leave at today's sitting of the Assembly to move the Adjournment of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

The matter which the Leader of the Opposition would like to have debated concerns the alleged delay in the granting of licences for the importation of newsprint and other printing supplies for the New Guyana Company Limited, publishers of the Mirror newspaper.

In relation to the application to the Ministry of Trade for licences for printing equipment and supplies which has not yet been determined by the Ministry, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has declared in his letter to me that the application was made since 3rd June, 1972, that is, over five months ago. This matter cannot, therefore, be now considered as urgent.

In respect of the newsprint, I have been informed by the Leader of the Opposition that the application has been granted. Therefore, that would not qualify as a matter of urgent public importance.

I am of the opinion that if the fundamental rights as enshrined in the Constitution are, in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition, being eroded or contravened, the proper forum for the ventilation of this grievance is in the courts which under the Constitution are vested with power to enforce the fundamental rights of the people of this country. Further, the plea of the hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is a matter of administrative delay, undoubtedly and clearly shows that a matter of this nature could never qualify as one of urgent public importance.

I am of the opinion that by reason of the delay in the granting of the licences applied for, the hon. leader of the Opposition may well be complaining against a fault in the administrative process. If this is so, then the Constitution by the establishment of the Office of the Ombudsman has provided machinery for the redress of the grievance complained of.

In the circumstances, I regret that I cannot accede to the request of the hon. Leader of the Opposition to grant leave for the entertainment of his Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS – FIRST READING

The following Bills were introduced and read the First time:

Public Corporations (Amendment) Bill 1972. [*The Prime Minister*]

20.11.72

National Assembly

2.00 - 2.10 p.m.

Sugar Industry Special Funds (Special Provisions) Bill 1972. [*The Minister of Finance and Trade*]

PUBLIC BUSINESS

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION

The Minister without Portfolio and Leader of the House (Mr. Ramsaroop): Your Honour, I wish to nominate the following Members to the Committee of Selection which Committee is under your respectful chairmanship:

The hon. Member Mr. J.R. Thomas, Parliamentary Secretary of Information, Culture and Youth

The hon. Member Miss M.M. Ackman, Government Whip

The hon. Member Mr. M. Zaheeruddeen, J.P.

The hon. Member Mr. A.M. Hamid, J.F.

The hon. Member Mr. Reepu Daman Persaud, J.P.

The hon. Member Mr. M.F. Singh, and myself.

Mr. Ram Karran: I beg to second the nominations.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that these Members be appointed to the Select Committee?
[*Hon. Members: "Yes"*]

MOTIONS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 23(3)

"Be it resolved that paragraph (3) of Standing Order No. 23 be suspended to enable the National Assembly to proceed, at its Sitting on Monday, the 20th of November, 1972, upon the motion, notice of which was published on the 16th of November, 1972, in Notice Paper No. 1, seeking approval of the Government's Policy adumbrated in the President's Address." [*The Minister without Portfolio and Leader of the House*]

Mr. Ramsaroop: This Motion standing in my name is essential, for under paragraph (3) of Standing Order 23 a Motion by a private Member cannot be legitimately entertained in this House unless fourteen days elapse from the time of the notice stated in the Notice Paper. Fourteen days have not elapsed since the Notice has been given for confirmation of the President's Address but since last Tuesday there has been reasonable time afforded the

2.10 p.m.

Opposition for Members to study it. It seems reasonable that this Motion is before the House. There is a custom in this House that a Private member should move the Motion for the confirmation of the Government's policy as outlined in the President's Address. I wish therefore to commend this Motion to the House and ask for its acceptance.

Question proposed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF GOVERNMENT'S POLICY ADUMBRATED IN THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

"Be it resolved that this National Assembly approves of the Government's Policy adumbrated in the President's Address for the present Session of Parliament which was made to the Assembly on Tuesday, the 14th of November, 1972. [*Mr. Corrica*]

Mr. Corrica: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on Tuesday, 14th November, 1972, His Excellency the President of Guyana held the rapt attention of hon. Members and other invited guests present here for that particular occasion, in spite of the competition he had from a few comedians who were on show. But they failed to distract any attention from the main item on the programme, the President's Address.

As the mover of this Motion, and being a small man, I am indeed very happy to be associated with what I must describe as a most practical, realistic, relevant, and essential document to be presented in this House. Though I do not intend to go into this Speech in detail, because there will be other speakers on this side who will be doing this, there are some significant points with which I would like to deal, the first being the emphasis placed on people. When we read through this speech, we will see in nearly every paragraph the emphasis that is being placed on people, and everyone knows, in a nation, the people are of very great importance.

2.20 p.m.

They are our human resources. This is not something accepted over-night. It has always been the principle of this P.N.C. Government to get the people involved as much as possible because without the participation of people nothing can be successful.

I quote a little paragraph from a speech made in Georgetown on 15th September, 1967 in this very Chamber. It is from the book, *A Destiny to Mould* and I quote it to show the consistency of the Government. At that time the Prime Minister was giving an address on efficiency. It is stated:

"Systems are on paper. These systems, however, have to be worked by people. People are not automatons and consequently it is an attitude of mind adjusted towards efficiency which we want to develop in the people, both in the private and public sector."

Mr. Jagan: Your Honour –

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, Mr. Jagan please proceed.

Mr. Jagan: The hon. Member was quoting from a text and he referred to a speech made by the hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister. I would be grateful if the hon. Member can give us the date when the speech was made, the page and so on.

Mr. Corrica: I have done that already. [*Pause*] That was the end of the quotation, Mr. Speaker.

The other point is that this Government in its wisdom sees it fit not to be isolated but to seek partnership with others so as to gather strength to fight the battle for economic emancipation regional-wise and in a wider scope internationally, and one remembers that the Non-aligned Conference which was held in Guyana recently was a most resounding success.

As I said before I would not go into every paragraph in detail but just touch on these little points so that hon. Members on the other side, if they did not have the time to read this Address, would be kept in line. This Government is so bent on involving the people that it seeks to educate them in every relevant manner so as to keep in the context of the Development Programme. We speak of "co-operative socialism" and no one in his right senses could doubt whether we are not really moving towards socialism co-operatively. Co-operativism is even now taught in schools. There will be a new college set up very soon to teach co-operativism.

In the fifth paragraph on the third page of that Address it is stated:

"The primary tasks of development are those to be performed at home, in our towns and our villages, in our fields, in our offices and our factories, in our coastal, our riverain and our hinterland areas - in all these sectors there is need for

national effort and for a contribution to nation building by every citizen of Guyana."

This speech has not dealt with anything Utopia. Everything can be pursued and achieved in a relatively short time as long as the people take up the challenge and join the revolution. The revolution is on. *[Interruption by an hon. Member]* Mr. Speaker, if I had my way I think I would christen the hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran "Mr. Ramgolie" because he is so much –

Mr. Speaker: You will not have your way hon. Member. *[Laughter]*

Mr. Corrica: As I was saying, there is the programme of feeding, clothing and housing ourselves by 1976. This should not be taken lightly, because by feeding ourselves we will depend more on our own markets. We would not have to depend only on overseas markets because the tradition is that when you export "X" you import "Y" and "Y" becomes more expensive. Therefore we have started a programme of diversification. That is already going on. At one time we could have boasted about rice and sugar only as our main agricultural crops; now we have corn, blackeye peas, sorghum, etc. Nuts are already being grown and sold locally.

2.30 p.m.

Therefore, the programme of diversification is taking root and making rapid progress.

On the fifth page, I think this would be the second paragraph, proposals will be made very shortly which will facilitate the small can. There again, we are thinking about the people because it states here:

"Also during this Session my Government hopes to present proposals for the reduction of the age for eligibility for benefits under the National Insurance Scheme. These will be based on actuarial studies now being carried out."

No one can doubt that this P.N.C. Government has not got the Guyanese people's problems at heart. In every section we help the small man to become a real man. Where we cannot find employment we give them land, and assistance to use it, education, to grow the proper crops, and one can go on for days relating the relevance to this speech.

Through the wisdom of this Government and its drive to create more regional co-operation, we have seen Carifesta '72. Carifesta '72, as we all know, has caused more unity, culturally, among the people of the Caribbean. Certain things which we did not know about one another, we learned during Carifesta. That, too, was a highly successful occasion. I read again from the third page, the last paragraphs

"My Government recognises that in this process of nation building we must not have our vision blurred by the traditional concepts of a passing, if not past, era. While we build on what may be good from the past, my Government is ready to embark with fearless imagination on new methods and to use new mechanisms which offer real prospects of development."

It means that we do not go around searching books written by Lenin, and by Nam, for our ideas of progress. We use our imagination fearlessly. Most of the time, a lot of people read but they do not understand and it becomes very difficult, more than if one does not know to read. It is because of this fearless imagination that we have had CARIFESTA, that we can talk about feeding, clothing, and housing ourselves by 1976, which I believe we can do before that time.

Once again, for the benefit of the small man, we see proposals on the fourth page, the third paragraph, where the Government intends again to assist the small man - since the members of the Opposition oft times complain that the majority of farmers in this country, however big they might look, are small men, so they cannot say we are doing anything for the big people because it is their own mouths that claim that all the farmers, 99 per cent, are small people.

I read:

"In this context this House will be asked very shortly to approve of legislation to remove import duty levies on agricultural machinery and equipment, and that for the establishment of an Agricultural Credit Bank."

We say that the small man must be a real man, and that is what we mean. It is going to educate him, we are going to finance him, and we are going to guide him along the way to become a real man, because we know that in the making of the small man into a real man, the economy of Guyana will be more balanced because his contribution will be more significant.

I have already dealt with the need for co-operativism---for developing nations and everything in this speech leads to progress. After reading this speech, can anyone say these are not the most important objectives which any capable and responsible Government should pursue? Can anyone with the slightest amount of authenticity say this P.N.C. Government is not aware of whatever problems the Guyanese people have and that it is not implementing ways and means of solving them? I am sure that the only way these problems will not be solved is if the people of Guyana do not take up the challenge, if the people do not recognise the revolution, if the people fail to grasp the opportunities offered them, that is the only way these progress will not be achieved from these implementations. Those who would like to see plans put into execution and bear fruit the said day should learn that progress is "the activity of today and the assurance of tomorrow." With that quotation I take my seat. *[Applause]*

2.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Zaheeruddeen.

Mr. Zaheeruddeen: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion to approve of the Government's policy adumbrated in the President's Address so competently and ably moved by my colleague and friend the hon. Member Mr. Malcolm Corrica. In examining the President's Address we find a consistent identity, the three outstanding and fundamental objectives which have neither been compromised nor diverted over the years but rather have played an important

part around which the entire policy of the Government revolved during the years. If we are going to examine these objectives carefully, Sir, we would find that they go back exactly ten years ago to a speech made on the 18th November, 1962 by the then Leader of the Opposition which is published in this book, *A Destiny to Mould*, page 85. He said among other things, Sir:

"...be sure, we do not want another colonial master. Be sure we want to proceed along a path chosen by us and in the interests of our country."

In a subsequent paragraph of this very Speech, the hon. L.F.S. Burnham had this to say:

"This country will never get on its feet if you try to toady to America. This country will never get on its feet, if you want to make it a satellite of Russia."

These words were uttered ten years ago by the then Leader of the Opposition who subsequently became Prime Minister and we can see that during the years he never diverted or compromised these policies. The policies which control these three outstanding objectives are an expanded agricultural market, a diversified agricultural economy with agro-based industry, a closer integration with our neighbours in the West Indies and promotion of peace and understanding among all the nations of the world. These objectives are not only interrelated but they go back to the central theme of that speech made exactly ten years ago when the Leader of this party said that we must follow our own path chosen by us in the best interest of the Guyanese people. The first objective which covers agriculture is a national objective. We intend to expand our agricultural and our fishery resources to the stage where, during the coming years, we would not have to import food. We intend to expand our resources where we no longer have to buy textile or fabric, where we no longer have to import components for construction work. From these efforts we expect eventually to feed, house and clothe ourselves.

In order to put these programmes into their proper places the Government realised that we have to undertake massive drainage and irrigation schemes, fair-weather access roads, adequate sea defences, land empolderment wherever we can find it possible. This Government,

during the past months, has changed the responsibilities of the various Ministers in order that strongest emphasis be placed on agriculture. I am happy to inform you that right now we are carrying out construction work like sea defence, access roads, drainage, irrigation and land empolderment. Yet we are being accused of squandermania and wasting the people's money.

We are accused of not paying rice farmers a sufficient amount for their rice. But we wish to ask: What is more profitable for the rice farmers? If, instead of spending millions of dollars on adequate sea defence, irrigation and drainage schemes, electric pumps, we mere to take that same money and pay it to the rice farmer then the increased prices would be meaningless without the benefits derived from those very things. That is the rice farmers' first consideration.

This Government has set itself the teak of improving the rice industry. For instance, this is a press release issued by the Chairman of the Rice Marketing Board, Mr. Gavin Kennard on the 18th October, 1972 when he outlined the various successes the Government had in rice. We also showed where in other times when we had bankruptcy, within a short time we were able to save the sum of \$3 million, we paid off our old debts, and an additional debt of \$5 million has been repaid and we are embarking on a practical means of assisting the farmers by subsidization of insecticides, weedicides and pure line seed padi, supply of fertilisers from rural depots subsidization of rice bags, production loans for purchase of inputs, service repairs of equipment, financial grants to communities for infrastructural work. The Chairman of the Board further went on to show where the Board has been spending more than \$3 million for additional machinery and machinery parts to help the farmers. That is not all, sir. This Government is trying in other directions to see how best it could utilize the products of our rice industry for other payable commodities. We were able to have an improved and modern packaging plant to meet the demands of our customers abroad and we were able to develop rice flour, and rice wine thereby increasing our total sales revenue.

It should be pointed out, and those of us who are consumers would appreciate, that although the price of rice was raised to satisfy as much as possible the rice farmers, the consumers had no cause to bear the extra cost of the increased price since the Board bears the cost itself. Not only Mr. Kennard's paper is a true and informative one dealing with the rice industry but in pursuing this objective of the Government, the emphasis on agriculture, we have been able to carry on certain experiments at Matthews Ridge, at Kibilibiri, and many other places, for the diversification of crops, and we are meeting with a great and a successful enterprise in whatever we try to do.

My good friend and colleague, the hon. Member Mr. Malcolm Corrica, talked about sorghum and peanuts, and that we understand, and we must understand further that it is high time that we should change our habits and we should learn to produce more and we must eat what we produce. I am happy to see that a member of the Opposition asked me to name them and I am going to name them. This shows split peas, Rahal Dhal. This is nothing imported. This is the Government's programme, the support of the Government is our business, to cultivate these things, and show them to the farmers, not to demonstrate them to the farmers like a type of demonstration we saw out there, but to go with a practical lesson to the farmers.

The point I am showing is that we have the type of soil, we have the type of knowledge, and we have the expertise from which we can develop our agricultural basis to produce more, and to consume whatever we produce. The whole philosophy of producing more, or to depend on ourselves for whatever we produce, does not really atop there. It goes to a link further. That link would carry us to the third objective, closer relations with our people in the West Indies.

Years ago, there was a West Indian Federation. In fact, at that time there were many federations all over the world, the West Indian Federation, the South Arabian Federation, the Malaysian Federation and the Nigerian Federation. All these Federations destroyed themselves and we were able to see that this federated system was imposed on these people by the colonial masters and when something is imposed, it cannot really grow. For something to grow, it must

grow from within and it cannot grow from within unless a necessity arises to compell its growth. That Federation had to fail but we who have studied the growth of that Federation have been able to analyse some of the reasons, and it is to those reasons we must address our minds, that in any closer relation with the West Indies we must try to avoid those pitfalls again.

In the first instance, you cannot really say; come and let us federate. Look at it closely. You must have something to sell, or you must want something to buy in return. And if you have nothing to sell and nothing to buy, then it is no use trying to federate. A common approach must be worked out because already we have seen, and CARIFESTA has fully demonstrated it, that there is a close relationship between those people in the West Indies and the Guyanese people. There is a mutual aspiration for the same ends in life, we have the same backgrounds, we have the same historical features, and if in this area we cannot come together to further our own interest and our own improvement, it is no use thinking of associating ourselves with anyone else.

We would recall that early in 1965, this Government took the initiative and moved to the West Indies for a period of hard and intensive bargaining. It is true we had to make some hard compromises, we had to lean backward, we had to have a spirit of give and take, but when we take all of that into account, it is better to have our trials and our errors so that we can proceed on a more realistic ground in the future, and we have successfully come forward, and from our successes we were able to bring forth CARIFESTA. We have gone further in the stage of the old West Indian Federation towards this process of integration. We still believe that out of necessity we can proceed further. Out of necessity again, we can develop CARIFTA into a Caribbean Common Market. No one can predict its ultimate success. We may still have our failures, we may still have to make compromises nevertheless to achieve ultimate success.

Earlier, as I quoted and I repeat the words again, be sure that we proceed on a path chosen by ourselves. What path then should we choose? It is true that we have quite a lot of friends and they are very profuse in their advice to us and, of course, this is a democratic society,

20.11.72

National Assembly

2.50- 3.00 p.m.

we allow everyone the freedom of expression and we listen to everyone willingly. Some say: why not keep to the Western capitalist countries. Some say: why not keep to the Eastern Bloc countries. But those who are wise among us say why not keep to our own path devised by our own people and in the interest of the Guyanese people.

A Chinese philosopher once said, and I read from *The Life and Times of Mao-Tse-Tung* by Stuart Schram:

"Each country has its own national spirit just as each person has its own personality. The culture of one cannot be transplanted in its entirety to another country. A country is an organic whole just as the human body is an organic whole. It is not like a machine which can be taken apart and put together again. If you take it apart then it dies."

3.00 p.m.

I would ask our friends who want us to follow the Western capitalist system if that system is the system that we had years ago when one western capitalist spoke openly of the principle of Lebensraum and who spoke openly of the superiority of the Harrenvolk. Is it the other capitalist country which we had, that for years plundered the wealth, culture and civilisation of the peoples of Africa or India? Is it the western capitalist country that is posturing all over the world talking about freedom and democracy and is bombing the poor and defenceless people of Vietnam? Sir, we should watch which of the countries we are following. We are advised to follow the Eastern Bloc countries. Which Eastern Bloc countries should we follow when at the moment they are competing along themselves in the purchase of millions of dollars of foodstuffs from the capitalist countries? They are borrowing capital from Japan, and technology from Italy to develop their mines and industries. Where is the self-sufficiency in these countries that we should follow as an example?

I know, for some, Marxism is an attraction, for some Marxism is also a convenience, and for some both attraction and a convenience. I want to know if it is a convenience or an attraction

still for the people of the Soviet Union in 1905, in 1917, and in 1972. We know that it was never an attraction for the masses of people in those countries. It was a system conveniently used for the personality cult. I may mention persons who were the idealists, those who were the intellectuals like Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Priobaszhenski. Millions of Russians had to be liquidated because of those who developed the personality cult, persons like Vladimir, Llyicht Uylanov, Joseph Dzugashvilli, Vassarionavich, Kruschev, Beria, etc.

It is believed that Lenin started the revolution, but if Lenin's brother Alexander, had not been openly hanged, this aristocrat who came from the landed Gentry might not have been encouraged. We know further, Sir, that Lenin never really followed Marx, the man who Lenin followed was never Marx. He was a man named Nechayev, the man who devised the 26 chapters of revolutionary catechism. This is the method of revolution that people all over the world followed whether it be Mao Tse-Tung, Castro, Che Guevara or Ho Chi Min. But Nechayev was not a Marxist, he was a Nehilist at a time when Nehilism was rampant in Russia, in Ireland, in Wales, in Spain and Italy right back to the Balkan countries until the War developed it in 1914 to a major world war. [**An hon. Member:** "Why don't you come to the point?"]

The point is this, as we are asked to come to the point, even if Marxism is still an attraction in this sophisticated world of the twentieth century we should be advised what breed of Marxism we should follow. We should be advised whether it should be the Russian brand, the Polish or Yugoslavian brand, whether we should follow the scientific marxism, the pure marxism the applied marxism, the primitive marxism. There are so many vintages so many vestiges, so many brands, so many bottles, so many labels and so many colours that in the final analysis it is better to go back to some sober rethinking and surely in the interest of Guyana it is better that we follow our own path chosen by us and in the best interest of our own people.

The third objective is on the international scene. The path we have chosen is a path of non-alignment. We were proud to welcome and host such a historical conference. For me it was a personal pleasure to meet men like Mr. Mbodenda, Mr. Swaran Singh and Mr. Raol Rao. It is a

personal gratification to me to see that there was a delegation from Viet Cong seated. It was really a proud moment for Guyana. We are no longer living in that obscure state in which we were living all the years. We have come to the forefront of a recognised and responsible nation of the world due to the will, due to the imagination and the careful guidance of those who fortunately now are heading the destiny of this country. Despite for all that we are doing we are still accused of squandermania. We are told we are throwing taxpayers money down the drain.

If we are to ask ourselves what motivated the Non-aligned Movement? What has it to offer us? Why Guyana's participation therein? The answer is not only pertinent, logical and timely, but the answer is also evident and enduring. Nehru once said that it is difficult to differentiate imperialist of the Past and the imperialists of the West. At that time Mao Tse-Tung could not have understood what Nehru was saying. He had started his great leap forward; he had looked forward to his paternal socialist neighbours, but when his paternal socialist neighbours wanted more than he could give them then he quite agreed that in the East there is also imperialism as there is also imperialism in the West. But we have to face the living reality that we have poor nations, rich nations, industrialised nations and under developed nations. We have to face the facts that industrialised nations control all the methods of industry.

3.10 p.m.

Not only do they control all the machinery, all the factories, but they control the bank, they control capital, they control shipping, they control insurance, they control communications, and because of these factors, they dictate to the producers of the raw materials, in their own countries, what prices they are going to be paid. They dictate again to those in the captive market what will be the cost of their manufactured goods, what will be the cost of services supplied to them, and in this process we can understand why some nations are getting rich and some nations are getting poorer.

It does not really end there. They not only dictate the standard of living, the cost of living in these captive countries, but they dictate at times their type of Government. We have seen in many places from Argentina right up to Mexico, where Governments fell not because of internal trouble but because of the presence of multinational companies. Here in this *Newsweek* magazine dated 20th November, at page 86, they talk about the operations of these multinational companies and there is one instance here, we already know about I.T. & T. in Chile, of Donald P. Kircher, head of the Singer Company, saying: "We regard the entire world as our area of operations, at least as far as we are able to do politically." This is the head of the Singer Company saying this, the fifty-third largest multinational company in the world. One can imagine if this company, fifty-third in size down the line, can say this, and it is operating in 108 political jurisdictions, then what about the first company, what about General Motors, what about Morgan's Bank, what about Mellon Bank, Rockefeller and Company, United Fruit Company?

That is to show that as underdeveloped countries, if we do not come together, if we do not show an identity of interest among the non-aligned countries, if we do not try to assist each other, then we are opening ourselves to be divided and ruled by these big countries, as they had been doing before, we will have to ask ourselves why have all these "summitries", all these rapprochements, all these ping-pong diplomacies, and ask ourselves what it portends for us. There is a saying that when rogues fall apart honest men come into their own. But we know it Sir, that rogues, despite their hue, despite their texture, and despite their field of operation, never really come apart; they remain together, and when they meet at "summitry" level, when they have their rapprochements, and when they have their ping-pong diplomacies, it portends no good for the small countries, the coming together of the sharks for the liquidation of the sardines. These are some of the things we will have to watch.

How do these sharks operate? In 1951 when Neguib overthrew King Farouk of Egypt, the Egyptians asked Stalin for arms and military equipment. Stalin refused. When Hungary was overrun by tanks in 1956, when Nagy asked for help from Nato countries, the Nato countries refused, and in 1962, Kennedy made one growl from the White House and Khamechev ran all

the way to Cuba to take out his missiles and carry them right back to Vladivostok. Why this refusal to assist, why this alacrity to obey orders from one power block against another power block?

Unknown to us all, at some time, there was a division in the world. Russia was given Eastern Europe all the way to the Pacific, the smaller European States were given Africa and the Middle East, and the balance of the world was left to America and Japan. That is why they did not want to assist the smaller countries that asked for their help. There was a secret consensus that overrode all the mouthings and all the sayings they are saying at the United Nations. We may say that the existence of empires is over, colonial possessions, protectorates, they are over. Thanks to Hitler, they are no longer around, but we would make a mistake and it would be a tragedy for us to really believe it, because we still have territorial expansion. No longer at the point of a sword but by the weight of the dollar, the sterling, and the rouble, and if there is still a cyclic evolution in the developed countries getting richer and richer, and if we are to remain poor, then there must be an economic awakening in these countries of ours that could provide an elementary basis for revolutionary legality.

Before the war there were empires, and after the war there were spheres of interest. And after that, there was the Cold War. Then that developed into what is known as the balance of power, but those champions of might have now reached dangerous proportions. We have to contend with the hard realities. These are the things that caused men like Nkrumah, Nasser, and Nehru, to see years before their time and come together and devise a third force that could stand up as an equal among the super powers and bargain for the protection and advancement of the smaller countries. Some may say, still it is best to keep to these Eastern bloc countries, but Nagy paid for it with his life, Rakassie of Romania paid for it with his life, Dubchek was thrown out, Czechoslovakia was overrun. There were some world leaders who felt it wise to play the game with both power blocs and in the end they got themselves played out and their countries truncated or divided, like Nigeria, like Congo, like Egypt, like Pakistan, like Vietnam, like

Korea. These are some of the pitfalls we must certainly try to avoid and, therefore, it was a proud moment to see Guyana a member of the non-aligned nations.

3.20 p.m.

We must warn ourselves that eternal vigilance should always be the light that guards our sovereignty. Yet, in this, we are also accused of squandermania. But we maintain that no price is high enough for us to pay for freedom and self-respect. No price is high enough for us to pay for closer integration with the people of the West Indies, and no price is high enough for us to pay for our programme to Feed, Clothe, and House ourselves. We have cut a wide path in international affairs. We have set out objectives, we have set out goals. We may not live to see our achievements, we can only hope that our children will give these objectives the continuity they deserve so that in the final analysis our country will emerge as the best country in the world.

Question proposed.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. Jagan: Sir, the very first paragraph of the President's Address congratulated you on the able manner in which you have guided the Session of this House over the past year, and noted with admiration the firm and impartial manner in which you have presided over and conducted the sittings. I deeply regret on this very first occasion to say how misplaced this statement seems to be. For when I sought today to discuss at the adjournment of the House a very important matter you referred to the Judiciary and you referred to the Ombudsman. The Parliament is the highest forum in this country. The Parliament is the forum which makes laws. The Parliament is the forum where one talks about all the matters concerning the people of this country, important matters bearing on the liberty and freedom of the people, and you denied me the opportunity to debate an important question.

Sir, I do not want to remind you of the ineffectiveness of the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman himself has on more than one occasion referred to the narrow limits under which he has to work. We know even matters which were referred to him, matters which he has dealt with have not been brought to this House, these matters have been shelved by the Government. Therefore, Sir, what use is it for you to tell this House that people whose liberties are denied by administrative measures should seek remedy by going to the Ombudsman. What is necessary is for the States and the nation to know not only the double talk but the chicanery that this Government is practising. And it seems to me that you are trying with your high office to shield the government to prevent this from being stated.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Leader of the Opposition, while I do not wish to interrupt you, your remarks must be relevant to the Standing rules and procedures which guide and govern this House. That does not mean that whatever you bring to this House must be debated. It is all well and good to make political speeches. Matters cannot be debated at the whims and fancy of Members of Parliament. Here we have rules and procedures which cannot be trampled by a Member of Parliament wanting to have his or her way. Certainly I must avert your attention to the scope provided under the Constitution.

Dr. Jagan: It is not a question of whims and fancies. On one occasion in this House the Prime Minister stated that opportunity will be given for the House to meet on Wednesdays when Motions by the Opposition will be discussed.

Mr. Speaker: Now you have digressed from the point to which I have drawn your attention.

Dr. Jagan: I will come to that. Those opportunities are never given. Opportunity is provided under the Rules to make Adjournment Motions and to be taken on the ground of relevance, urgency and so forth. Sir, could it be truly said that this is a matter which is to be treated in a manner which it has been treated by you today, that I am doing this mainly because

of fancy? Surely, the Speaker knows that a previous attempt was made for this matter to be debated in this House. The Speaker knows that the printing of one newspaper was suspended for three weeks. The Speaker knows that by a telephone conversation which I made today the Ministry of Trade had before it an application since June and on the 25th –

Mr. Speaker: That is in defeat of what you are saying. You said application was made since June and now five months after you bring the matter before the House saying that it is urgent. It is a question of administration.

Dr. Jagan: Surely, this House must debate all matters relevant to what is happening in the country whether it is administrative or not.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but not under that procedure.

Dr. Jagan: You say that the matter was raised since June that it is not urgent. This is not the question.

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Dr. Jagan: Application was made since June; in October the Ministry of Trade said they knew nothing about the application even though there were letters on the file pertaining to that application, even though there were interviews with the Ministry of Trade pertaining to that application. Because at that date the Ministry said it could not have found the application a copy of the old application was put.

3.30 p.m.

Contact with the Minister of Trade cannot be made. "He is a busy man", the Prime Minister says. Last Friday when I spoke to him, since the 25th October, after three weeks, he said the

application is approved.

Mr. Speaker: You are still having your say although I said what I said. *[Interruption]*

Dr. Jagan: Imagine the chicanery when the application having been approved has its stamp, the date, the 25th October: It is a disgrace that a civil servant now turned Minister has to resort to this kind of chicanery. Is it any wonder that the moral standards of the country are at such low ebb today, when Ministers, ex civil servants, are behaving in this manner? I hope, sir, in future, in keeping with this first paragraph, you will see the necessity for dealing impartially on matters when they come before you and not be influenced by the Government who does not want these matters to be debated.

Mr. Speaker: I must also ask you when you bring these matters, to read May's Parliamentary Practice ---

Dr. Jagan: Sir, I have read it over and over again.

Mr. Speaker: -- because it clearly states that 'actions shall be disallowed because the matters raised by them are no more than the administration of the matter. So if you were really reading this and remembering it, you would not attempt to belittle the Office of Speaker.

Dr. Jagan: Sir, when the Administration acts in a way as I have just pointed out, when it impinges on the fundamental rights of citizens, that is not for the Court, that is for the Parliament, and the Speaker is the guardian of the rights of the people of this country. Please do not look—I think I have said enough.

On the question of the Speech, we have heard a great deal from the hon. Mover and Seconder, but unfortunately we are no wiser than from the President's Address as to the matters which are seriously affecting the people of this country today. The question of unemployment,

the question of rising cost of living, the question of crime: We hear in this Address nothing about the Government's ten year development plan. The old plan which was debated in this House, which was supposed to have performed miracles, was scrapped since the end of 1969. From that time we were told year after year that a new plan was in the making. Up to now, we have not seen this plan even though we have so many experts now, even though we have so many technical people advising the Government, even though we have now a Minister of Economic Development and Planning.

What do we hear instead from thin report? We hear that there is to be an action programme for economic development, page 2, paragraph 4, which is to come out of the Non-Aligned Conference, Does this mean that we are going to wait until the Non-Aligned Conference works out an economic plan which this Government will then be guided by? We know that at the time when the non-Aligned Conference met, there was a committee sitting on the whole question of economic development and planning. That is public knowledge, and I assume that what is said here has reference to that body. Surely we cannot wait or necessarily take our cue from a broad-based body such as that, for we know that while the Non-Aligned conference has in it awe States which have a very positive position, there are others who do not want to take a firm anti imperialist position. There are countries such as Cuba, Chile, Algeria, Tanzania, on the one hand. There are other countries such as Trinidad and Guyana, on the other hand, there are other countries such as Malaysia and Indonesia, on the other hand – *[Interruption]* - what are we hoping to get?

The seconder of the Motion said, "let us forget all about the external forces, let us get to external forces, let us get to own path chosen by our own people." Surely, by now, so long experienced in ties Government, so many experts advising, so much experience in the international community, the Guyana Government should be in a position to make and place before this House a concrete plan, not, as every day I hear so many millions for this, so many millions for that, without a co-ordinated whole but something so that one can see the whole question of financing, the question of income generation, the question of employment

opportunities, in detail. All these things are within the capacity of planners today. If the Government does not have the expertise, surely, it can seek help from the United Nations. It gets technical experts; it gets other kinds of experts. It can certainly get experts in this field. I am not talking now of those who had advised in the past, like Mr. Davenport coming from the United States, or the Governor of the Bank of Guyana, coming from West Germany.

3.40 p.m.

I am talking about people who have had a great deal of experience in the West, in the Non-Aligned Countries, who, from their own experience would now be able to help this Government in formulating an overall plan which we could be debating. This is long overdue. I repeat, the Government has been taking a line which unfortunately matches up with even the most right of the rightest. The two super power lines which it has been propagating is the same line which Malaysia is also propagating. *[Interruption by the Minister of Foreign Affairs]* The Minister of Foreign Affairs said, "They walked out of the Conference, they did not like us."

Rao Raol from Cuba made a speech that the Non-Aligned Conference would become a museum piece unless it is prepared to take a firm position on questions such as colonialism, neo-colonialism, and imperialism. [**The Prime Minister:** "He did not walk out."] Raol does not talk nonsense like the Prime Minister about two super powers. [**The Prime Minister:** "Because none of them is feeding me."] He does not talk nonsense like the Foreign Minister whose line is the same. *[Interruption by the Prime Minister]* Raol did not say that. [**The Prime Minister:** "What he said in Spanish?"] Sir, Raol said further -- *[Interruption by the Prime Minister]* Do you want me to bring the speech that Fidel made last July which is the same content as Raol? You have a copy of the speech. The Cuban Government and the Cuban Foreign Minister do not double talk like this Government. They have a consistent position. They do not on the one hand talk about fighting against colonialism and neo-colonialism and at the same time talk about fighting the two super-power lines, because they know that it is inconsistent to take that position. You cannot

fight imperialism and at the same time try to isolate yourself from the Socialist world. This is an impossibility.

We just heard a long repetitious speech which did not get to the core of the problem. The Minister of Finance a few days ago warned and said that Guyana will not be able to go fast in keeping with the philosophy enunciated by the Prime Minister about ownership and control of our natural resources. Why? Because of external enemies, the enemy is strong. Cuba recognises this and starts out from the basis that the enemy is strong and ruthless. Therefore, Cuba does not take this opportunistic pro-imperialist line that this Government takes which is synonymous with the line taken by another pro-imperialist rightist regime like the one in Malaysia. *[Interruption by Mr. Ramphal]* My friend the Minister of Foreign Affairs says that they walked out from the Conference. The only difference between the Malaysians and this regime is that they are not so demagogic.

When Raol set the pace at the Conference and was followed by Tanzania, Algeria, Chile and others, the "stage Managers", the Guyana Government, was obviously caught with their pants down and they took a consensus. Why no vote? Consensus will give opportunity to the Guyana Government to be able to tell the Americans when it meets them, "You know we were with you, but the majority was against us", and when they meet the Vietnamese to say, "You know we are with you." This is how they behave. If they are not behaving that way, let them tell us how is it that they make nice speeches yet the Minister of Home Affairs denies the showing here of documentary films on Vietnam which were made in Hanoi. *[Interruption]* If you do not know the Minister of Home Affairs has seized the films. The Prime Minister does not know what he is talking about, he wants to deal with the law which he violates at every turn. But the fact of the matter is the Minister of Home Affairs, despite all their sympathy, seizes the films on Vietnam. This is this kind of double talk and the chicanery that has got this country in its present mess. This Government's inconsistencies have caused it to get into a "lock jam" and they do not know how to get out of it. To solve the problem of Guyana what is the basic problem? Unemployment, cost of living increasing, crime, prostitution and shooting up the people. To

20.11.72

National Assembly

3.40- 3.50 p.m.

solve these problems one must get down to a consistent position. [Mr. Jack: "In which country are all the problems solved?"] This Minister who is now talking tells us "We are going to take them over," but when he met the New York Times reporter he said "All we want is partnership".
[Interruption]

3.50 p.m.

Let me nail this lie for a moment. This falsehood of the Prime Minister. [The Prime Minister: "And you told Kennedy you will not take them over?"]

In 1963, when there was the blockade, when there was no gasoline in the country, when a tanker came from Cuba with gasoline, we attempted to take over three or four big tanks at the Base, right around by the police station, to put the gasoline into them. They were empty for years. The Americana aside "No, you cannot use them." We told the Governor "We are going to take them over." The Governor said that if we take them it will endanger the relationships between Great Britain and the United States; Go back a few years before that, when the Prime Minister then Leader of the Opposition was in London, when he said,; "No independence, P.R.", when they wrote into the Constitution of 1961; "prompt and adequate compensation", could we pay prompt and adequate compensation for nationalising sugar and bauxite when we could not even take over some tanks which were right here? This is the level at which they enter debates, to fool the simple minded, but time will tell.

To come to the basic fundamentals: First of all, if this country is to go forward, we must have a strategy of development. Number two. There must be confidence in what is going on in this country, Number three. There must be participation. These three things, if put together, one will then be able to see progress- if not immediately, at least in time to come. Let me deal with the first item of strategy. They know what is the right thing to say. They say that all over the World: Ownership and control of the resources. They say that. In the next breath they excuse themselves for not doing it by sayings "Oh, the enemies outside are powerful." Doesn't Cuba

know that the enemies are powerful. Doesn't Chile know that the enemies are powerful? What does Chile do? What does Cuba do?

The Cubans do not talk about two super powers. The Cubans develop the closest relation with the socialist world. They do not do as these, who try to work within the imperialist orbit of dividing and ruling the socialist world. They talk about relative strength. Compare Chile and compare Guyana. In Chile, the Government has no parliamentary majority. It has an opposition of the kind that the P.P.P. faced in the 1961 - 1964 period, irresponsible^o working closely with the C.I.A. In Chile the Government has no control over the administrative machine, the Civil Service, the Army, or the Police. What is the position here. They have got control of the administrative machinery. They have so manipulated the Police and the Army, that they have become not a national force but a P.N.C. force. Therefore, one can say they have control over it. They have a majority here, albeit by fraud. They have an opposition. It is no use telling us about internal force. They say they have no internal unity.

They have to worry about internal strength but the P.P.P. opposition today on these vital questions of ownership and control does not behave like the Opposition in the 1961 - 1964 period. The Prime Minister himself when he went to New York in 1962 was spreading falsehoods about 1,000 Cubans being in Guyana. His Government does not have that today. It was the P.P.P. which allowed an Amendment to the Constitution, the clause dealing with prompt and adequate compensation, so the Government could nationalise, so where is this talk that there is no internal unity or there is all this opposition internally? The P.P.P. has made its position quite clear, that the Government will be able to get the P.P.P. to take over the commanding heights of the economy. Chile can do it with less support than they have. Why is it that they are afraid? It is not that they are afraid. They have put up these imaginary blocks, self imposed, because it suits their basic fundamental position and that is to try to delude the people that socialism will oome to Guyana via the co-operative - thus, this fraud of co-operative socialism.

20.11.72

National Assembly

3.50- 4.00 p.m.

The hon. Member Mr. Zaheeruddeen who seconded the Motion, a few years ago when he was writing essays about the Cuban Revolution and when he was annoyed that they were not printed in the *Mirror*, did not talk this way but he has learned from the Prime Minister the tricks of the trade in opportunism. So we have this manoeuvring going on, all kinds of statements being made here and there, self-contradictory when you put them together. The basic reason why we have this set of contradictions is because the Government has not got a firm anti-imperialist position. This is the reason why we cannot make any progress, why we cannot have a new development plan, because a new development plan will have to spell out carefully, not just verbiage that we are going to feed, clothe, and house ourselves by 1976.

4.00 p.m.

We have to have it carefully thought out formulated and analysed from all angles. This is why we cannot have it. People are suffering, people are disillusioned in Guyana.

Mr. Speaker: Are you going on to another point?

Dr. Jagan: Yes sir.

Mr. Speaker: Well I think it is a good time to suspend the sitting. This sitting is suspended for thirty minutes.

Sitting Suspended at 4.00 p.m.

4.30 p.m.

On resumption --

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. Jagan: Sir, I was making the point about confidence as an indispensable ingredient for success. It is not enough mainly to have a plan even if the plan is correct. What is absolutely necessary is that there must be confidence by the people of the country. Can we say that today in Guyana there is confidence in this Government? In the days of the P.P.P. when we were attacked for so many people leaving this country you will recall sir, that the gates of England were open, when anyone could have picked up his boots and departed without any restrictions. Today, those gates are closed. If one has to go to Canada and the United States it poses interminable problems. We see the long queues every day. Yet more people have gone away since this Government is in office, far more than was ever imagined to go away during the time of the P.P.P. If there was the same freedom to leave as there was in the time of the P.P.P. Guyana will probably be denuded of almost half of her population, and I do not think I am exaggerating here. Go in Canada, go in a place called Scarborough you will see a Guyana colony there, and daily the colony is growing. Not only ordinary people who are this Government's supporters want to leave but even business people who are its supporters, small businessmen and others who see no future in this country. Basically this is happening because there is no confidence in the Government. The leadership that the Government is today providing is not inspiring the people to stay here. I admit, I agree that people have to make sacrifices in Third World countries, but how do you expect people to make sacrifices when Government Ministers are living it up, their life style is such as to create a wider gap between the rich and the poor.

Our hon. Friend the Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs at one time, not very long ago, said, "You people used to make me the butt of your target, \$4, 000 a month. Why are you not saying anything about the \$10,000 and \$12,000 a month? This is what we are talking about. Rover cars, Damlier, big allowances, \$10 a day pocket piece for Ministers in our time reduced from \$15 in the Interim Government has been increased to \$65. [**Mr. Ramphal:** "That's untrue."] Tell us what it is. They are calling on the people to make sacrifices. Surely we agree with this. Why the Members of this Government do not try to follow the life-style of Castro? Why do they not set the example to the people? We must have a Government free from corruption. What about commitments made by the Prime Minister about setting up an anti-

corruption body with teeth in it? A body to see that there is no discrimination in the country. Then the people will begin to have confidence in the Government.

Participation is the third ingredient to success. They tell us about self-reliance, they tell us about sacrifice. Fifteen years ago the Western countries were betting on India, ridiculing and reviling China, saying that it is communist. Surely, they have their self-reliance and sacrifices. This is why they succeeded. But that is not the only reason they succeeded. They succeeded – *[Interruption]* The hon. Member is talking about democracy when at every step of the way they shoot people down and then ask questions after. They refused permission to people to march and tear gassed them when they marched. They refused to give newsprint and they get civil servants to do their dirty work. Is this what this Government calls freedom of the press? Is this democracy? What we have in Guyana today are fascism and neo fascism. *[Interruption by Mr. Ramphal]* The hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs is diverting me unnecessarily.

Mr. Speaker: I think you are an experienced Parliamentarian.

Dr. Jagan: Well, sir, you have to rebut the rebutters, the hecklers. I want to make the point that sacrifice alone is not the answer. You must have participation. Let the Minister of Labour and other Ministers like the Minister of Mines go to Chile and they will understand what participation means. **[Mr. Clarke:** "The Minister of health was there."] Oh yes, I saw my friend sojourning there. Having gone to UNCTAD he was there again at the Health Conference. I was surprised to see him there when he should be looking after the health problems here. People are dying in the hospital for want of care. *[Interruption]* Cubans are not dying from shortage of doctors and health inadequacies.

Sir, the point I want to make is that no matter how sound your plans are - and that is here - unless you have the participation of the people, their confidence in addition to their participation, the country is not going to succeed. *[Interruption by Mr. Carrington]* We are hearing "nice noises" from the Minister of Labour but he does not get down to the root of the problem. The

question of union recognition: This is a primary question. A few days ago we read where the masses of the workers at Mackenzie have no confidence in the Union. How are you going to resolve this question of worker participation? Are you going to select from the workers or are you going to select from the Union? Clearly, the primary question in the Trade Union movement must be sorted out; this implies democracy elsewhere in the society. One hon. Minister is crowing every day that Village Councillors are not attending meetings, civil servants are not going to Local Government meetings. Why is it? It is because, basically, there is no democracy. These councillors were put there on the basis of fraud and many of these who are elected were looking for rewards to be paid. They have not been paid, so they were absenting themselves, they do not care. I notice they are being given allowances, they are bribed in order to get the work done.

4.40 p.m.

But bribery is not going to succeed. Fraud at elections is not going to succeed.

You have to come down basically to the question of representative institutions like the Rice Marketing Board. In the colonial masters' days they had equal numbers of Government representatives and representatives of the farmers but because the chairman was drawn from among the Government's nominees, it always operated against the farmers' interest, and because of that, we amended the law to give the farmers a clear majority of 13 out of 16 on the Board. This was even moving towards what they are talking about every day, Co-operative Republic, co-operative socialism. The very thing they say they believe in, they are sabotaging it so far as the biggest earner for the small man is concerned, and that is why the production of rice have fallen.

The seconder of the Motion used to picket a few years ago calling for increased prices, and today he gets up in the House and argues against increased prices. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, until the last few days, was arguing consistently against increasing prices. All of a

sudden, we understand the fellows. That is the law of opportunistic adaptation, chameleon. The members of the Government know all these things that I am talking about, but basically it is their dishonesty. It is their opportunism that prevents them from doing these things. Eventually they will have to do what the P.P.P. have been saying. On any question. Even milk price. By bits they come to it, but bits cannot succeed, because at the same time, the position is becoming worse. A vicious circle is set up. The bits that they are advocating have failed in Latin America.

Eric Williams says what is needed is not Puerto Rico or Cuba, but between Puerto Rico and Cuba. The between Puerto Rico and Cuba, during the last ten years, was tried out in Latin America. Let Mr. Singh tell us about his experiences. Let him tell as what happened to Frei in Chile, the half-way house they are now advocating, partnership, which these two gentlemen said was the philosophy of the Government, as quoted by the *New York Times*. Yet the Prime

Minister talks about ownership and control and nationalisation, and because they fall between these two stools, the former Minister of Finance now Minister of Works and Communications says the question now is pace of nationalisation. This is how they manoeuvre to try to cover up their sins and shortcomings. This is the Nixon formula. Why get Zaheeruddeen to talk about Rockefeller and the multinational corporations. He was not straight in his thinking that is why he left us. I am sure the axe is going to fall on him as it fell on the Y.S.M. Congress members in 1967, when they were calling for nationalisation of this, that, and the other, and relations with Cuba and the socialist states, when they shouted them down. Why tell us?

This is how they pretend to be progressive, talking about multinational corporations. This strategy of imperialism now is partnership with them. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said so on a tour of Africa, that this is the thing to be done not only with private people but even with Governments. But whither are we going? The Alliance for Progress which Kennedy started in 1961 as a counter to Castroism has failed in Latin America. The Economic Commission for Latin America, its main props, regional integration, CARIFTA, like LAFTA, import substitution. They tried that for ten years in Latin America. Land reform. They talked about that too, yet they

are worse off today than they were ten years ago with this same between Puerto Rico and Cuba that Williams is talking about, that the Burnham Government is now adumbrating and carrying out. Any intelligent person will see that it has failed. Experience in Chile has shown that it has failed; even in the so-called most industrialised countries of Latin America, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil. They are manoeuvring not to see if they have to come back to elections in Argentina and so they invite Peron to come and stage a show for democracy. Under Kennedy it was alliance now under Nixon it has turned from alliance to partnership.

It is clear, let me repeat for the hon. Minister. A domestic and foreign policy must be coordinated, and I do not want to argue with the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs, who is going to tell me, "We have a Progressive Policy." I do not concede this. Their main line of two super powers is what Yankee imperialism wants today because the whole world is against American imperialism. What they do not want is the Third World to move closely with the socialist world without which they cannot fight imperialism. You choose to make a distinction between China and Russia and the other socialist countries and you play the game of Nixon, that is why the seconder of the Motion can make all these distinctions and say we will make our own. What is our own? What is our own and what they are practicing now is what has been pushed down their throats. The seven-year plan was pushed down their throats by Arthur Lewis, Davenport, the Yankee Adviser to the Prime Minister, the Governor of the Bank of Guyana, Horst Bockelman. We told them that it would fail. They scrapped it before. Now they are bringing a model which has failed in Latin America and they call it their own.

Let us for a moment concede, for the aura of importance of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, that they have a progressive foreign policy which I do not concede, as I told him in the Lobby. Even if they have, this alone does not make for progress. De Gaulle had a very good foreign policy but his domestic policy was for capitalism. Brandt, who just won the election, had a good foreign policy but the local policy is still based on capitalism and imperialism.

The two things have to be co-ordinated, domestic and foreign and the domestic economic policy. They say they are waiting on the Non-Aligned Group to formulate something. But, sir, the Non-Aligned Group has three different positions on economic questions. Cuba, Chile, etc. I name them: Williams in Trinidad, Guyana's Burnham and all through, like Indonesia, Malaysia which walked out of the Conference. The other day they went to the Conference of Heads of States in the West Indies and they broke up because the Less Developed Countries, the smaller islands, are catching hell at Carifta – [Mr. Ram Karran: "As Guyana is"] as Guyana is.

4.50 p.m.

The two things have to be co-ordinated, domestic and foreign and the domestic economic policy. They say they are waiting on the Non-Aligned Group to formulate something. But, sir, the Non-Aligned Group has three different positions on economic questions. Cuba, Chile, etc. I name them: Williams in Trinidad, Guyana's Burnham and all through, like Indonesia, Malaysia which walked out of the Conference. The other day they went to the Conference of Heads of States in the West Indies and they broke up because the Less Developed Countries, the smaller islands, are catching hell at Carifta – [Mr. Ram Karran: "As Guyana is"] - as Guyana is.

Therefore, they have to make some concessions. But those concessions are not going to solve the basic problem because it is still being: made within the umbrella of the multi-national corporations that my friend is talking about, their dominance in the Caribbean. They have not faced up to the main fundamental questions.

But like Kennedy, with his Alliance for Progress, let us catch a few shows here and there, let us build a few schools here, and a few health centres there - we get like them. Like the La Jalousie Health Centre that the P.P.P. built. The Government abandoned it, no dispensary was put there, no watchmen. The cows went in and now at long last they realise that they need health centre. And from the newspaper report it is stated it would cost \$1,900 and if the people do not contribute \$1,000, they would not have it. This is a disgrace. [Hon. Members: (Government)]

"Who destroyed it?"] Hear what they are quibbling about? Who destroyed it? The fact of the matter la the cows went in also.

But it is the Government's policy of drift that has caught this country in this calamitous position. That is a classical example of its policy. That Health Centre should have been kept up from the time the P.N.C. got in Government, but like the one at Handsome Tree, it has been abandoned. Wherever it has no support it penalises the people; it uses coercive methods and force the people to do self help if service is to be given to them. Do you expect that a country will make progress like this? This Government has betrayed the people of this country.

Sir, let me come back to the main questions. There must be a correct domestic and foreign policy. I submit that the domestic policy of the Government's economic planning is a new strategy of imperialism; I submit that the foreign policy which appears to be progressive is the new foreign policy of Nixon imperialism. I submit that this country, no matter how much money it gets, it got many millions, from \$128 million at the end of 1955, the debt burden has jumped to \$508 million this year. What can we show for this money? We are told about agriculture, but the proof is not in the pudding. Where is it? What prices people have to pay for local foods? That is the problem. Do not show us some split peas and some peanuts. That was growing in the time of the P.P.P. too; we started it. But where is it today? Can you buy it in the markets? How much do you have to pay for it? Is this how you measure agricultural success? After eight years what can this Government show? Money alone is not going to help this Government.

At the Conference in Trinidad, one moment they refer to Cuba, the next moment they stretch their arms, "Please, United States, do not hurt me too much, I am going to join the OAS". They got Manley to beg for them to enter in the OAS in order to get loans from the Inter-American Development Bank. This is how this Government operates; it cannot make up its mind. The time has passed for this vacillation. Basically the Inter-American Bank had been working for the Alliance for Progress for the last ten years. The man from Alliance for Progress,

Abel Santa Maria, has resigned. Why? Because the whole thing has been a fiasco. It must be a fiasco because you cannot make up your mind. You know Uncle Sam is going to blockade you if you take a positive step so that the same moment you vacillate and say, "All right, we are going to be with you; don't worry we are still with you, so you must let us in."

But the Government has been getting money, from \$127 million to \$508 million in eight years. The P.P.P. did not have all this money. When we left that included all the debts previously. What has this Government done with all this money? Money alone is not going to solve all your problems. It is no use the Minister going to UNCTAD and saying Third World Countries are swallowed up with debt payments." Any fool can make noise like that. Because the figures are there to show, but the question is what strategy is adopted. Nothing is said here except vague generalities about agriculture and industry.

"Where are the factories?" Mr. Burnham used to ask in our time. Where are they now to give employment? They will be caught between two stools as many who have tried this road before: Sukarno, Nkrumah, Obote, and others. Even those who talk about revolution! The Mover of the Motion, used the word revolution.

5.00 p.m.

Frei used to talk about revolution and liberty too. The Foreign Minister is telling us about liberty and democracy. Frei, that was his slogan, revolution in liberty, that Castro had a dictatorship. Where is Frei now? Working with the C.I.A., working with I.T.T., trying to sabotage a Government which wants to do what they say should be done, own and control the resources of the country. Their inconsistencies, their vacillations, in time will match up with them. But what is so tragic about it all is that the Guyanese people have either to run away, roam the streets - - -

A boy, about 17 years of age, showed me his shoes, holes right through. Wants work. Roaming the street trying to find jobs. Crime developing. Shooting people, calling them criminals. Shooting them in their backs and giving out statements which no reasonable person will believe, and the day the man is shot and killed, they issue a statement that the man was wanted as a criminal for two years before. What blasphemy! Not even respecting the dead after shooting him *[Interruption]* You are disgraced for being a Minister of Home Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Leader of the opposition, I do not think that is called for.

Dr. Jagan: I withdraw that, but he deserves it. Then they give a statement that the man was approaching the policeman with a weapon in his hand, some kind of pipe. Then, the policeman in self-defence shot, but he missed. When the man is near to him, point blank, he misses. That man should not be in the Force. He misses when the man is at point blank. He can hit when the man is running away. The Government has to have a credible position.

As I said, it would be perhaps not tragic if they could get along with the way they are going - had it not been for what is happening in the country today. This is their dilemma. When the issue of terrorism comes up in the United Nations for debate, they abandon their friends in Africa with whom they always want to be identified, because Africans make a distinction between crude criminals liberation movements such as in Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique, but in the West Indies, now, because they cannot face the electorates with free and fair elections in Trinidad - all of a sudden, we hear about terrorists in the West Indies.

What is the distinction between terrorists, as they call them, in the West Indies and in Africa? Is Granger a terrorist with whom 60,000 people marched against the Williams Government? Is Weekes a terrorist? In the same way, daily, they are harassing people who have a democratic right not to be harassed - at Enterprise. And when they talk with their Venezuelan friends, they say they will have co-operation at the technical level to fight terrorists. Whom are they talking about? I am talking about their joint sins. This is why they were caught in this

contradiction and they had to vote with the United States and against their friends, because when the chips fall, they depend on their American friends to back them. Today's terrorists are tomorrow's heroes and the more they suppress the freedoms of the people of this country, whether for its press freedom, whether it is freedom for free and fair elections.

I notice the *Chronicle*, the Government's mouthpiece, said the other day in an editorial, that our entering the House in shirtjacs with slogans calling for free and fair elections was a gimmick that failed. Let Carl Blackman write in the columns of the *Chronicle* and elsewhere about the two films he saw in London, one called, "The Trail of the Vanishing Voters", and the other one called, "The making of a Prime Minister." He saw them. Ask him if they were gimmicks. He would not write about that. His bread is well buttered and that is how this Government hopes to win and to develop this Country.

5.10 p.m.

I repeat what is needed in Guyana today is a consistent position, the stopping of mouthings about revolution and socialism and so on, less damage more sincerity and honesty of purpose. We are willing to co-operate. We have said so over and over, but you cannot expect us to co-operate under these conditions. The Prime Minister once told me that we must have a bipartisan policy on bauxite. *[Interruption by an hon. Member]* Yes, we agreed to nationalise we forced the Government. But the Government cannot expect us to agree to the same super structure \$10,000 and \$12, 000 a month. We will never agree to that.

Mr. Speaker: As far as I recall hon. Leader of the Opposition, it was one of your Members who inserted a clause that the terms and conditions of employment shall be no less favourable than those which were previously enjoyed.

Dr. Japan: Sir, there is a difference between employees and bosses. You should know that by now. *[Laughter]* And if you do not know that, I am sorry. If you are going to tell me that

we were talking about those people, then the Lord help us. We asked for a bipartisan policy. Do you think that the P.P.P. will agree to take the bauxite and put it in Philips Brothers hands? I was told that Allende is doing this, that Philips Brothers is the marketing agent. This is a falsehood. *[Interruption by Prime Minister]* How are you going to get anywhere? The Prime Minister always likes to go in for hilarity and we must excuse him.

I wish to conclude by calling on the Government to have a consistent policy based on sincerity which will include the three points I enunciated at the beginning - correct strategy for economic planning and development which means correct domestic and foreign policies, that there must be true participation by the masses of the people in Guyana which will generate the necessary confidence without which Guyana cannot go forward. This, above all, is necessary today. *[Applause]*

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mrs. DaSilva.

Mrs. DaSilva: Mr. Speaker, there is a well known and a well-worn cliché which says that brevity is the sole of wit. Wit is described, and I wish to describe it from the *Oxford Dictionary* as, "intelligent, understanding, imaginative faculty, amusing, ingenuity of speech or ideas persons noted for this".

The President's Address was certainly brief but as to which part of the wit is intended or is applicable in the definition I have just given, remains to be seen. It is accepted that the President's Address sets forth the policy of the Government for the ensuing session of Parliament. To shift it as the President did in his Address from the duty of the President to the responsibility of the Minister of Finance by saying that it will be further explained in his Budget Speech is neither fair to the Minister of Finance nor fair to the citizens of Guyana. It is the duty of the President's Address to enunciate and to make quite clear what the Government's policy will be for the ensuing year. It is the duty of the Minister of Finance to present in his Speech how

the money will be acquired for the running of the country where it will be spent and to what purpose it will be put.

The President spoke in glowing terms and with some pride about the achievements of Carifesta 1972. Also, we were told about it by the Mover and Seconder of the Motion. Some have spoken about it, it is now past, it is now so much water under the bridge. Some have said that that we cannot even afford not to afford it. Well it is past and done with, but what we the citizens and taxpayers of Guyana have not been told is what Carifesta cost the nation. We have been told in the Press that the gate receipts were in the vicinity of \$186,000. But we have not yet been told what it cost the nation. No balance sheet, no financial statement has been forthcoming. We do not know where, if any, there were losses; we have not been told where, if any, there were profits, what mistakes were made or how we could learn from them for the future.

It is a duty that is due to the citizens of Guyana; it is taxpayers money that was used and they have a right to know how their money is spent. I can almost hear the Minister of Information and Culture saying to me that, "You cannot measure Carifesta in terms of dollars and cents,"

Whilst I do applaud the getting together of our Caribbean family, uniting as one in a cultural revolution as it is called, I still maintain that we have a right to know how much it cost the nation. [Mr. Aaron: "The cost does not matter."] How can anyone say the cost does not matter, once you spend tax payers' money you are expected to know how it is spent. I want to quote from page 4 of the President's Address.

"Committed to the building of a Co-operative Socialism and inspired by the principles of self reliance, my Government's energies will be devoted in large measure in the forthcoming session to advancing the national objectives of Feeding, Clothing and Housing Guyana. In the achievement of these goals the role of the co-operative in channelling and canalising the energies of our people and ensuring the proper distribution of the fruits of that development is of special significance."

Before I comment on the qualities of co-operative socialism, I should like to say that it struck me very forcibly in this Address that in talking about feeding, clothing and housing ' the nation, the President did not say, by 1976.

5.20 p.m.

It seems to me he left out part of the slogan, as if they say, "We want to make the small man", and then you do not hear the rest. Feeding, clothing and housing Guyana by 1976. The "1976" is left out. Is it that the Government is going to change the date? Has it realised that it cannot be done by 1976? Or will it be before 1976? We are accustomed to hearing "by1976". We would wonder why it is left out so glaringly.

Then going back to the matter of co-operative socialism, how long is the Government of Guyana going to stay and watch the citizens of Guyana suffer on this principle of trying to build our nation on co-operatives alone? Co-operatives alone cannot build the nation. Co-operatives cannot find the jobs and get money to give to the families to build the nation. How long will this go on? The President says at page 31

"...my Government is ready to embark with fearless imagination on new methods and to use new mechanisms which offer real prospects of development."

I like this bit about fearless imagination and new methods. Why cannot the Government use this fearless imagination, and new methods to build the nation? Why can the Government not bring that to bear on its principles of running the country? Why do the members continue to bury their heads in the sand like ostriches while fellow Guyanese continue to suffer, while some just have the fat of the land? It is interesting to know what others think about us, to see ourselves as others see us. I have a cutting from the New York Times dated Tuesday, 31st October, 1972. It is by a reporter called Richard Severoe:

"At age six, this nation, the nation of Guyana, the nation of 600,000 people frustrates outsiders who would try to define it. The deflation or lack of it is important to Guyanese right now because although the Government is trying to build a socialist state it wants and needs capitalist treatment but investors are shying away from the problems of a developing nation and from a Government whose aim they either do not accept or do not fully understand. The communists say that they regard Mr. Burnham as more of a political opportunist than a committed socialist. They are unimpressed by his announcement that he 'ill seek diplomatic and economic relations with Cuba and assert he is a pawn of the United States which continues to support Guyanese development with loans."

He talks about the bauxite industry and he talks about the racial troubles, and he continues

"The Burnham Government could probably do much to alleviate internal tensions by reducing unemployment..."

and the official figure given here is 15 per cent

"and that could come with development but development promises to be slow unless foreign capital enters the country."

This is the way others see it. This is the way we of the United Force have spoken about it over and over again. We cannot build Guyana, we cannot find jobs, we cannot give jobs to our unemployed, unless industry comes into the country and opens up our country and provides employment. The co-operative alone, as good a thing as it is, cannot build the nation. At the rate we are going, there will not be any young people to grow up for Guyana, to develop Guyana. I am hoping to hear that we have positive plans for dealing with deaths on the roads, for dealing with crime amongst our young people. Remember the recent unfortunate and unhappy incident of Caesar. What is being done about the problem of drugs in our schools and amongst our young people? These are the things we want to hear. It is a shame and a disgrace and it is time that the Government did something about it and went into this problem of drugs before it gets completely out of hand and before it becomes a worse situation than it is now.

The problem of unemployment, to go back to it, does not only concern our young people. It concerns all the unemployed people of Guyana, who are daily looking for work. The argument used by the hon. Prime Minister that we do not rant foreigners to come into Guyana and to take out of Guyana that rightly belongs to Guyana, we of the United Force support 100 per cent. We are all loyal Guyanese and this is our country as much as anybody else's. Eric Williams in Trinidad, to take one example, has foreign investment coming into Trinidad. Go on the highway between the airport and Port-of-Spain, see the line of foreign factories which provide employment for the Trinidadians. Do not tell me our Prime Minister does not have the brains of the Prime Minister of Trinidad, Eric Williams will see Trinidad is protected, that Trinidad is for the Trinidadian's, do not tell me that our Prime Minister cannot do the same thing. We want to see the fearless imagination that is spoken about put into practice. We do not just want to see it just in a speech. We want to see the fearless imagination that is spoken about put into practice. We do not want to see it just in a speech. We want to see the new methods used. With all the brains at their disposal, the fearless imagination, all the new methods could be gone into to see what is the best way of dealing with the unemployment situation, finding jobs for the people by allowing foreign investors to bring capital into our country without taking away what they should not.

The President talks in this speech about the Carifta countries. We should learn from the Carifta countries. We too here can be manufacturing the tomato ketchup, and canning the sweet corn, the peas and carrots as they do in Trinidad. They do not grow the corn and peas or the carrots in vast quantities in Trinidad, or the tomatoes for the tomato paste, but they get the raw materials into the country and this also finds employment for the people in the building trade.

5.30 p.m.

This finds employment for people who work in the factories; they get jobs, the Government gets the revenue. If other Carifta countries can do this and can get up in this area why should Guyana be kept back. Because our Government is too proud to admit that it has made a mistake with this

idealistic policy of a Co-operative Republic; self help alone cannot build the nation. The system of self help and co-operatives is fine. But as a means of livelihood and a means of finding jobs it does not work and it cannot bring prosperity to our nation.

A former Minister of Finance, I think it was the hon. Dr. Reid in one of his Budget Speeches, at one time spoke about youths being in a hurry. Our youths are in a hurry and the Government by its ambition is driving them out of the country, driving the best of our young people; they are going abroad, they are getting better facilities, they are staying and their country of adoption is benefiting from it. We, in Guyana, are the worse for it, we are losing by it. Are we to continue doing this? Are we going to stop foreign investors coming in and bringing capital into the country? Are we going to have the only avenues available for our young people to earn money to be choked and robbed, crime and prostitution? Are we, the leaders of this country, the Government, going to allow this kind of thing to continue? It is a shame and disgrace that any government should allow such a matter and it should be carefully thought out and this matter reconsidered, this policy of trying to develop Guyana on Co-operatives only. In conclusion, I should like to quote the very last sentence that is in the President's Address:

“National Unity will remain a priority in all my Government's efforts.”

I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Prime Minister and Members of this House that yesterday evening my party while campaigning - as a matter of fact, we met the hon. Member Mr. Aaron along the way and exchanged hellos. We were campaigning along the West Coast, Berbice, and at Belladrum the behaviour was disgraceful. Stones were thrown at the land rover bearing the United Force activists and its equipment as they left the meeting. The window of the land rover was broken and one of the young G.U.Y.S. in the land rover barely escaped being hurt.

Is this how the Government is fostering national unity? Every political party in a democratic country whether it be the P.P.P., the P.N.C., the U.F., has the right to campaign. This is what I do not understand. About two weeks ago we had a Remembrance Day ceremony at the

Cenotaph and our Prime Minister on behalf of the nation laid a wreath for those who died in the cause of freedom and democracy. We do not have freedom and democracy in Guyana now-a-days. Every party should have a right to be able to campaign, to be able to call the people. The people behave the way their Leaders tell them and maybe the leaders of the Peoples National Congress should go forth and tell their people, if they say they believe in democracy, they should go and tell their people that is not the way. Heckle at a meeting; by all means, that is part of hazards of political life, but do not let the people throw bricks and stones that would maim or injure anybody.

All parties, the P.P.P., the U.F., the P.N.C., or whoever else may come, is entitled to go and put their case forward to the citizens of Guyana. If the leaders of the party encourage that sort of hooliganism the state in Guyana of so-called democracy and freedom will go from bad to worse. It is an opportunity when we talk here about "National unity will remain a priority in all my Government's efforts," to remind this House of this. Incidentally, the Prime Minister reminded me a little earlier "It is not the President's Speech, it is my Speech." Therefore could the Prime Minister instruct his activists how to behave if they do not know how to behave?

These are a few of the points we wish to draw to the attention of the House. It is stated In the Address that the proposals will be elucidated in the Speech by the Minister of Finance. This is a gentleman who is held in the highest esteem by all Guyanese. We look forward to hear what he has to say, that he will clarify what the President said, that he will say what the President has left unsaid and not be like his predecessors just brush over it and go on to the next point.

Mr. Speaker: Hon, Member Mr. Hamid.

Mr. Hamid: Mr. Speaker, under normal circumstances my comments on the President's Address would have been to show the emptiness therein, but having been a Member of Parliament for a number of years and having become accustomed to the many broken promises of this Government I can understand what is responsible for the system which this Government

has adopted. It has accepted a system of rigging and fraud at elections, it places persons in high offices; so long as this system continues, so long will our country be a backward one and insolvent.

5.40 p.m.

Today I may wish first to read the first paragraph in the President's Address in which it states:

"May I first congratulate you on the able manner in which you have guided the Session of this honourable House over the past year, and may I note with admiration the firm and impartial manner in which you have presided over and conducted the sittings."

But when the President said these few words and I gazed across at you when you were sitting in your most comfortable seat, I saw that you became most uncomfortable. I said to myself that I realize the reason for this was that you yourself know the limited time in which this House is called to determine the business of the nation and even when meetings are called we find that the distance between sessions is so long that sometimes you become lost as to know what is really happening in our country. Then I recall the important occasion during this year when you were recalled from your luxury holiday in Europe –

Mr. Speaker: I consider this to be a blatant falsehood that you continue to repeat.

Mr. Hamid: When in fact, sir, the hon. Deputy Leader –

Mr. Speaker: If you do not withdraw the remark I shall have to strike off the record.

Mr. Hamid: All right, Sir. If it is not pleasant. It is false. I wish to withdraw –

Mr. Speaker: It is not a question of being pleasant. It is false.

Mr. Hamid: Well Sir, I am going according to public opinion and if you feel it is not a true statement, I withdraw it. On that occasion, our Deputy Speaker of Parliament, who was quite capable of performing his duties as Speaker and presiding at sessions, was in fact denied this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: If your premise is wrong, how can you follow that argument?

Mr. Hamid: I am of the opinion that it was wrong not to allow the Deputy Speaker to preside and I gather this from correspondence between the Clerk of Parliament and the leader of our party, and as such I take it for granted that it was a most wicked and malicious act. When we look at the other paragraphs of the President's Address –

Mr. Speaker: Having said all of that, what is the relevance of it to the first paragraph?

Mr. Hamid: Well, we are congratulating you, sir. There is nothing more we can do. We have to join with the President.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member Mr. Hamid, the truth has a way of coming out in very funny ways.

Mr. Hamid: Things move in devious ways: On page 3, paragraph 4,

"But while my Government seeks to ensure through its efforts at the international and regional levels, an increase of the opportunities for the development of Guyana and the betterment of the lives of its peoples, there remains much to occupy our time and attention and engage our energies at home,"

In the paragraph before this, I think, the President saw fit to state that the many circuses and hosting of foreign guests cannot solve our problems, and went on to show in the following paragraph that:

"The primary tasks of development are those to be performed at home, in our towns and our villages, in our fields, in our offices and our factories, in our coastal, our riverain and our hinterland areas - in all these sectors there is need for national effort and for a contribution to nation building by every citizen of Guyana."

I may wish to stress quite a lot on this particular paragraph because apart from the Government hosting the foreign guests at Carifesta and the Non-Aligned Conference, he saw fit to show the nation that this sort of circus, as I term it, will not solve our problems in Guyana and, as such, in the second paragraph he went on to show that the emphasis must be laid in Guyana and especially in our towns and our villages. And further, he went on to speak of the contribution to nation building by every citizen of Guyana.

This is an important statement by the President because when he spoke of citizens of Guyana, I wondered what he was speaking about. Surely, the central government did call on its supporters on many occasions to have some progress made in the country and practically every one failed, and when we think of the system of rigged elections where foreigners are casting their votes to determine who should be at the head of this administration, then we wonder if we are going to include citizens who are contributing directly or indirectly by way of taxation - income tax - to the countries in which they are living and those of us, who are in Guyana, who are also contributing to the welfare of our State. When one considers the amount of votes which this Government acquired from overseas voting, one would say they are citizens of Guyana and one would expect them to be here in Guyana to contribute to whatever is proposed by way of development so as to make whatever is to be done a success. We find that this is not so, then in looking at the voters list, we find it is well padded with names of people who never existed, we find that the names of children under 18 are included in the voters list, we see that many people who are dead, and those are in the thousands, their names still remain on the voters list.

When one calculates the number of votes that the P.N.C. party would have won then it will show it is indeed in a vast majority and as such, one would expect when the President spoke in terms of citizens to build the nation, that all these people would play a part. But what do we see? We see in the building of the road from Madhia in the interior, the Government could not get the Guyanese that supported the Government, and the very limited numbers that were up there, they were being treated as though they were just ordinary labourers. The people who are well taken care of were the foreigners who came were more or less on a holiday. They were housed in luxury. All they did was to drive around and show their faces and they knew nothing of what they could do. With this exercise, millions of dollars went down the drain.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Who built the 120-odd miles of the Madhia road?

As I was saying it was merely a showpiece to impress the people outside of Guyana what this country can offer them. After the elections many Guyanese left the countries in which they were residing to come here to be employed. I am sorry to say they came and they went back homeless and maybe stateless too, because they could not understand why they were called in Guyana as all these promises made and the promises were not fulfilled. This is typical of this P.N.C. Government. I am merely giving this information because I may want the Members to learn that if the central Government administering by way of rigged elections and would expect the world to know that it is doing well, we in Guyana know it differently.

The whole thing is a farce. The development programme has been scrapped, and in fact, there is nothing that you can see where you can say well at least our Government is doing something.

The President's Address stated, "emphasis should also be in town and villages". At the local government elections level it was only one thing that the Government did not seek to

introduce and that was the system of voting overseas. The list still comprised of many dead people, many that were unborn, many children under age, and coupled with that a system of voting by way of proxy. When the village council elections were held in June 1972 the P.P.P. contested the elections. We felt that it was something in which we should participate because we knew that we had quite a lot of supporters in the country and that we will be able to at least muster a substantial amount of support. But when the results of the elections were declared we found it was impossible for us to continue to contest at such a high level of rigging. Therefore, “we did not contest the remaining part of the elections. We made that decision after the P.N.C., carried through its system of rigging, of fraud, and proxy voting allowing the unborn and the dead to vote. We gave them the green light and told them to go right ahead and carry on their elections. It is natural after all that they control all the local authorities. Surely if they are going to control local authorities in this respect then with all the efforts they made, with all the people who voted for them, where is all the progress?

As soon as the P.N.C, Government assumed office it began a system of taxing the people. When the Marshall Plan was introduced it was clearly stated that a project as a pilot project should be implemented so that people will learn the system of the Marshall Plan, so that people will be able to acquire the knowledge of local administration. They must learn the system in which more autonomy will be given to the people, as such they will be able to project this and so the Government will be able to have more local authorities educated under that system of the Marshall Plan. But this was not so. Instead, the Prime Minister and other Ministers who spoke at public meetings told the people that if they the electorate do not cast their vote, in favour of the P.N.C., they must not expect if another party is elected to get any loans from the Government. Surely, they are in control of all local authorities. Now what is preventing them from getting these loans? What is preventing them from getting grants? Nobody can answer because the coffers of the Government are empty. The people whom they say were supporting them on the padded list do not contribute to the state machinery and as such the country is in a state of insolvency. The former Minister of Local Government realising that the Government was under

a financial strain advised the villagers how to raise funds. This is what he said, and I am quoting from the *Guyana Graphic* of 25th October, 1971, page 3:

"The Guyana Local Authorities are being encouraged to invest in trading activities such as the taxi services, the car parks, cemeteries, cremation, markets, abattoirs, beer gardens, land and housing schemes."

What a shame for Ministers of this Government or a Minister to make such a statement? I just do not know how to put it. Mr. John Ford who was then Mayor of the City introduced a system in East Street for cars to be parked at a place set aside in Georgetown called "John Ford Car Park". The only thing I see parked there is the rubbish cart because nobody is interested in that. The Minister is telling the people who control local authorities to invest in beer gardens, and in cemeteries. I believe he is taking a leaf out of Mr. Merriman's book who runs a sort of funeral parlour and maybe he is successful because I do not know how he runs it.

This does not solve the problem of local authorities. Many systems of drainage and irrigation are not carried out; many Boards are not functioning. As a result of this, the villages are flooded: for instance, Cane Grove, Mahaica, Abary, in the Essequibo, in Leguan. All these places are severely flooded because Government is not interested in the farmers as a whole. I wish to quote what the present Minister of Local Government had to say In the *Guyana Chronicle*, of 23rd October, 1972:

"Minister of Local Government Mr. Abdul Salim has warned that many village councillors may be sacked towards the end of this year for the display of lack of interest in village affairs. The Minister hinted this over the weekend while addressing the 96th quarterly Meeting of the East Demerara Union of Local Authorities at Helena/Mahaica Government School."

It went on to say:

"The meeting was so poorly attended that the Minister declared it is evident that meetings of village councils are always poorly attended. He emphasised that such meetings be 100

per cent represented by local authorities. The Minister said if councillors are not interested in their meetings then it is necessary to dispense with their services.

6.00 p.m.

We cannot tolerate recalcitrant councillors and I must here inform you I have already discussed this matter with the Prime Minister explaining how very little these councillors and officers are interested in their work and the affairs of their local authority."

This is what the hon. Minister said but the hon. Minister, although being a Member of this Parliament, seems to be losing touch. At the elections, they seek their best political hacks to sit on local authorities and these were promised over \$100 as a duty allowance. This is a form of bribe to put them there and to keep them there so as to be able to tax the people. But many of them resigned, and the limited number that remained, failed to attend three consecutive statutory meetings hoping the authorities would have expelled them but instead, they remained quiet on the issue and allowed the councillors still to be members because to have replacements was difficult. As a result, many local authorities are not functioning. The members are resigning and as such, the whole system of rigging, this time, not at the central government level but at the local government level, has again shown that rigging in its entirety is a complete farce.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member Mt. Hamid, I wonder if I heard you correctly. Did I hear you say that rigging is a farce?

Mr. Hamid: I said the whole thing is a farce because of rigging. The system of rigging is bad. We need free and fair elections. If free and fair elections are not introduced, so long will we remain a backward country, so long will the farmers suffer and so long will this Government be looked upon as a Government that is not interested in the welfare of the people in this country. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bhola Persaud: Mr. Speaker, the President's speech which accommodates five pages is perhaps unfortunate for the persons who have written it. They may have conveniently

left out many of the boring things that are happening in our country and I think it is very unfair to this nation, for the President to come to this National Assembly and to use the Parliament to mislead this nation and not to mention most of the important matters that are affecting the nation. Replying to the hon. Mover and Seconder of the Motion, it is a pity at least for one of them, although he is living in the Essequibo, maybe he is not existing there because, as I made a note here, he mentioned electric sluices when he was talking about agriculture in the Essequibo. There are no electric sluices in the Essequibo. There are sluices, but there are electric pumps operating these sluices, for his correction. He does not know what is going on in the place. With regard to that pump, that pump is not working. It is installed in the wrong place, it should have been at Hampton Court, and so there would have been more drainage facilities.

When we had the recent breach in the Essequibo, they all jumped up and said P.P.P. Government should be blamed - saboteurs. It was all published. Government refused to accept its fault. The breach was the result of the mismanagement and the people whom the Government has working there. The people who were working there were not paying enough attention to their work. There was seepage going on for months and all they were doing was going around drinking bush rum, and they were not looking at this. There was evidence which we were willing to give to the Ministry with respect to that breach and in relation to the Dawa pump, the P.P.P. built that pump. Water overflowed into the Pomeroon for a number of days. They failed to accept this, that for years they have not dredged the outlet of the Pomeroon. I wonder if the hon. Member does not live in the district, to be able to inform this House what is happening in the Essequibo and with regard to the flooding.

The Mover of the Motion on several occasions mentioned people's involvement. People's involvement. What people's involvement do we have? They talk about self-help. They are forcing people to do self-help while they are helping themselves. How are you going to involve people when there is discrimination from the top to the bottom? The hon. Prime Minister brought into this country the international Commission of Jurists in 1964, your Honour will remember

this, to make recommendations. And what is the position? Let them answer whether these recommendations were put into practice or whether they were thrown into the waste basket.

The population of this country is around 750,521. Out of that you have 52 per cent Indians, 33 per cent Africans, 9 per cent European, Chinese 2 per cent, Mixed 4 per cent. The I.C.J. made recommendations with respect to the Police Force and other departments. For the sake of the record, the Guyana Defence Force was created from the Special Service Unit in 1964 - 50-50 per cent was recruited then. What happened subsequently? It was reduced. The Police Force from 1965 to 1971, from 33 per cent to 28 per cent; the last recruitment was 20 per cent to 15 per cent which is 5 per cent below. This is in respect of the Police Force. Let the Minister answer how people are going to be involved in all these services when there is discrimination.

The Commission said there must be a balance in the Police Force, in the Guyana Defence Force, and the Civil Service. Let us take some other departments. Guyana Marketing Corporation, out of the whole employment, there are 2 Indians; Guyana Telecommunications Corporation 3, Guyana Airways Corporation 4. Guyana Electricity Corporation 5 — he said that is enough; that is how you involve people - Guyana Credit Corporation 6, Guyana Rice Corporation 7, Guyana Rice Marketing Board 8,

6.10 p.m.

Guyana School of Agriculture 9, Guyana Printers 10, Guyana Broadcasting Service 11, Bank of Guyana 12, Guyana Bauxite Company 13, Guyana National Co-operative Bank 14, and Guyana Transport Services 13. This is how the Government talks about having the people involved.

Let us take for instance, under-graduate scholarship. *[Interruption]* I am talking about racial discrimination because the hon. Mover of the Motion mentioned the question of having people involved. This is the racial breakdown: East Indian 14, Chinese 1, Portuguese 1, African 68, Scholarships for the year, Indians 49, Chinese 5, Portuguese 1, Africans 222. How are we

going to get this question of involvement? *[Interruption]* The Prime Minister said I resigned from the general council, the *New Nation* has it big in the headlines. I made a release to the Press and the radio; all the other papers carried it. Why did the *New Nation* not carry it? Why did the *New Nation* not publish the kicking out of Pat Limerick from the P.N.C. I have my personal reasons for resigning. They fail to understand that they have contributed to my present condition, first of all, when I was detained for two years sixteen days. Secondly my passport was seized; I was prevented from going abroad. As a result of my condition I had to withdraw from the general council. This does not mean that I am not a member of our party. And they were so misleading, they said I am residing in Bartica; I am in charge of the *New Amsterdam* office. **[Mr. Clarke: "Admit that I gave you a passport to go to Russia"]** We had to speak to the Prime Minister. *[Interruption]* But that was after it was suspected that the foot would have to be amputated; this is how the Government, to release my passport.

But Mr. Speaker, the Mover of the Motion had nothing more to say but to praise the President's empty Speech. Because of the unpopularity of this Government, it had to resort to this business of proxy collecting which has been rampant so much so that we were made to understand that not only civil servants, not only teachers are being forced to do this job, but even members of the Police Force are involved in this system of proxy collecting.

The hon. Member Mr. Van Sluytman made a release in the *New Nation* that the P.N.C. is making inroads in the Essequibo. If the Government is making inroads, and it is getting support, why does the Government still have to collect proxy votes? Not only the Police Force, it was brought to our attention that a certain religious body which is headed by responsible people of this country is involved in this dirty act. The people had to take their own action; this is why the cinema is closed. This question of proxy collecting is most ridiculous and dirty. We have our record where the Headmaster for the Tain Government School is involved in this business of proxy collecting. He was promised the post of Education Officer. When the people rebelled against him, he clipped out the signatures and the I.D. numbers and gave it back to them, he never returned the proxy forms. When the people caught the man who was collecting the proxies

they seized the proxy forms and took it to the police station. Instead of the Police making investigations and trying to prosecute the correct person they detained the men who made the report. Furthermore, people who were forced to do the trick, went to make their statement to the Police it was brought to our attention that even the women were locked up and detained for a period.

6.20 p.m.

How are you going to involve the people?

The hon. Member Mr. Hamid was talking about the Local Government Elections. Let him tell us about the bold promises to the villagers. Every month there has been changing of chairmen in the Sheet Anchor District. In the Susannah District, the chairman alone is operating in the district. This is why he had to threaten them, because he found himself embarrassed not only for himself but for the Government. Not only that district but other districts, local government meetings are not called because the persons are being involved to do proxy collection. They are talking about self-help. They say we are accusing them of squandermania. We have a right to accuse them and let them answer it.

When we were in Government, our overall expenditure for Government services with our limited resources amounted to 41 per cent. Let them answer us how much they are spending now. We ran this country with nine Ministers; they have doubled the number, eighteen now. From 41 per cent, it has gone to 46 per cent. Debt charges when the P.P.P. was in the Government amounted to 12 per cent, now because of squandermania and misspending, they are now spending 20 per cent, an 8 per cent increase on debt charges. Social services: They accused us, when we were in the Government, on the question of health and schools - services for the people. We have a record; it is there, look at the Malali, Torani, Makouria. They used to call them white elephants. Ask them how long they will take to solve the problem of the ferry

services. We were spending 47 per cent on social services. What has this Government done? It has taken off 13 per cent and it is spending it on government services and public debt. When the Mover of the Motion mentioned the question of squandermania, how can they deny the question of stealing? How much money have they lost through the Rice Action Committee? Seven million dollars. They have been changing them year after year. Ask them why they have to involve the local authorities. Is this not squandermania? Let them tell us. Every year, every month or can hear: money missing in Ministry, money missing in Post Office, finally money missing from the New Amsterdam Police Station. Let us hear if it is untrue.

We know they say we must tie our belts. Feed, clothe and House. Year of Performance. Efficiency year. Every year there are new slogans. Peed, house, clothe, the nation by 1976. We see this is impossible. How? Because of the system. This is why they cannot go to the people and when they go they have to go through their thugs. Why they cannot go? They have to use their police, their officers. That is how they operate. We have the right to accuse them and to tell them that this slogan to feed, clothe and house the nation is impossible. And these slogans which they are making will become useless. How much did the efficiency year produce? They said they will get out all the thieves. We told them that in order to get rid of the inefficient ones, they have to involve the people. But if you involve the people, you will catch up with the thieves, and some of them are over there. The efficiency year they talked about, that has gone down the drain, and so this year, we are hearing about feed, clothe and house our nation by 1976. This will also be a failure.

I want to wind up and say that this slogan also will fail because they fail to understand that their friends, the Americans, the developed countries, they have not been able to solve this question of feeding, clothing and housing their nations. What about these little robots who are making slogans year after year. With this in mind, I am totally against the Mover of the Motion, for he himself does not know what involvement of the people is. There is the question of discrimination throughout the country. The Secunder of the Motion apparently does not know his own district, whether it is his constituency or not, because he failed to tell the House that the

20.11.72

National Assembly

6.20- 6.30 p.m.

Government discriminated against Essequibians who suffered losses, the people in the, Pomeroon, in Cullen, because of the Government's inefficiency the people have suffered. Why is it that the Government discriminated against those people and the hon. Member is misleading the House and the nation? That is why I am totally opposed to the Mover and the Seconder of the Motion.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, "That this Assembly do not adjourn until Tuesday, 21st November, 1972, at 2 p.m. [*The Minister without Portfolio and Leader of the House*]

Adjourned accordingly at 6.30 p.m.
