

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 2]

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
FIRST PARLIAMENT OF GUYANA UNDER THE  
CONSTITUTION OF GUYANA.

50th Sitting

Monday, 20th March, 1967

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

*The Assembly met at 2 p.m.*

*Prayers*

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

*Present:*

His Honour the Speaker, Mr. A. P. Alleyne

*Members of the Government*

*Ministers*

The Honourable L. F. S. Burnham, Q.C.	- Prime Minister
Dr. the Honourable P. A. Reid	- Minister of Trade
The Honourable P. S. d'Aguiar	- Minister of Finance
The Honourable N. J. Bissember	- Minister of Information (Leader of the House)
The Honourable R. E. Cheeks	- Minister of Local Government
The Honourable E. F. Correia	- Minister of Communications
The Honourable L. John	- Minister of Home Affairs
The Honourable R. J. Jordan	- Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources
The Honourable W. O. R. Kendall, C.B.E.	- Minister of Health and Housing
The Honourable C. A. Merriman, J.P.	- Minister of Labour and Social Security
The Honourable M. F. Singh	- Minister of Works and Hydraulics
The Honourable S. S. Ramphall, C.M.G. Q.C.	- Attorney-General of State

*Parliamentary Secretaries*

Mr. D. B. deGroot

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Prime Minister's Office*

Mr. G. Bowman

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Ministry of Agriculture and  
Natural Resources*

Mr. O. E. Clarke

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Ministry of Education*

Mr. P. Duncan

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Ministry of Local Government*

Mr. J. G. Joaquin, O.B.E., J.P.

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Ministry of Works and  
Hydraulics*

*Other Members*

Mr. W. A. Blair

Mr. T. A. Sancho

Mr. J. Budhoo

Mr. R. Tello, Deputy Speaker

Mr. M. Kasim

Mr. J. H. Thomas

Mr. W. G. Carrington

Rev. A. B. Trotman

Mr. D. Mahraj

Mr. H. M. S. Wharton, J.P.

Mr. H. Prashad, J.P.

*Members of the Opposition*

Dr. C. B. Jagan, Leader of the Opposition

Mr. E. M. G. Wilson

Mr. A. Chase

Mr. M. Hamid, J.P.

Mr. B. H. Benn

Mr. J. R. S. Luck

Mr. Ram Karan

Mr. H. Lall

Mr. R. Chandisingh

Mr. Y. Ally

Mr. B. J. M. Hubbard

Mr. L. Linde

Dr. Charles Jacob, Jr.

Mr. R. D. Persaud, J.P.

Dr. F. H. W. Ramsaboye

Mr. S. M. Saffee

Mr. M. Bhagwan

Clerk of the National Assembly

- Mr. F. A. Narain,

Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly

- Mr. M. B. Henry

*Absent:*

The Honourable Mrs. W. Gaskin - Minister of Education

Mr. C. V. Too-Chung - Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of  
Finance - on leave

Mr. R. G. B. Field-Ridley - on leave

Mr. C. V. Nunes

Mr. D. C. Jagan - on leave

Mr. M. Khan, J.P. - on leave

Mr. M. N. Poonai

Dr. S. A. Ramjohn

Mr. E. M. Stoby.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

## LEAVE TO MEMBERS

**Mr. Speaker:** Honourable Members, leave of absence has been granted to Mr. Mooneer Khan from today's sitting, and to Mr. C.V. Too-Chung from today's and tomorrow's sittings.

## PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

The following Report was laid:

Report of the Advisory Committee appointed to investigate the Trade Dispute in the Sugar Industry of British Guiana. [The Minister of Information on behalf of the Minister of Labour and Social Security.]

## QUESTIONS

## PURCHASE OF FISH FROM BOOKERS SHIPPING (DEMERARA) LIMITED

**Mr. Hubbard:** I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Trade Question No. 54 standing in my name on the Order Paper: Will the Minister state the terms and conditions of the contract or arrangement under which the Guyana Marketing Corporation has undertaken to purchase fish from Bookers Shipping (Demerara) Limited?

**The Minister of Trade (Dr. Reid):** There is no contract under which the Guyana Marketing Corporation has undertaken to purchase fish from Bookers Shipping (Demerara) Limited. The Corporation purchases fish according to its needs.

**Mr. Hubbard:** As a supplementary Question, I would like the hon. Minister of Trade to tell us whether, having purchased fish according to its needs from Bookers, the Corporation has had to destroy any of that fish because it had gone bad?

**Dr. Reid:** No.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The following Bill was introduced and read the First time:

Georgetown Town Council (Amendment) Bill, 1967. - [The Minister of Local Government.]

## PUBLIC BUSINESS

## MOTION

## FOREIGN POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF GUYANA

"Be it resolved that this Assembly approve of the foreign policy of the Government of Guyana and the action taken by the Government in the field of foreign affairs since Independence." [The Prime Minister.]

**Mr. Speaker:** In view of the importance of this Motion, which is before the House, I want to appeal to hon. Members on both sides to assist in maintaining a high standard in this debate.

**The Prime Minister (Mr. Burnham):** At midnight on Wednesday, 25th May, 1966, the lowering of the Union Jack and the raising of the National Flag of Guyana, which were of great symbolic importance, meant not only that certain powers which were exer-

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

cised before by the Metropolitan power were going to be exercised by the elected Government of Guyana, but also that the nation of Guyana formally set sail on the rather difficult, sometimes tempestuous, sea of foreign relations. Even though for more than a year before that the British Governor and Government, anticipating the inevitable, had never, as an absolute discretion, exercised real dominion with respect to our relations with foreign countries, at least, during that incubatory period, so to speak, of 1½ years approximately, Guyana had at its disposal the services and establishment of the British Government in the former's dealing with countries outside of Guyana.

Nearly a year has passed since Independence has been achieved, and during that period the Government of Guyana has sought, within the limits of its financial and material resources, to have relations with foreign countries. At the same time the Government has sought to adumbrate a philosophy, tactic, strategy and approach in its relations with foreign powers.

This being the first debate on foreign affairs in this Parliament, it may be necessary for us to indulge in certain statements of aims and goals and even to move into the field of philosophy. I am hopeful, however, that, this being done on this occasion, the necessity will no longer exist in future debates.

Perhaps, significantly, one of the first acts of this Govern-

ment after achieving Independence was the signature of a letter by the Prime Minister to the then *charge d'affaires* of the United States Embassy in Guyana on Thursday, 26th May, 1966, which letter was part of the exercise of exchange of notes between the U.S. Government and the Guyana Government, and by that exchange of notes an agreement was consummated, as a result of which over 20,000 acres of Guyana's land, which had, during the Second World War, become for practical purposes American property in exchange, with other bits of land throughout the Caribbean, for 90-odd old destroyers, reverted to Guyana.

The American lease on Atkinson and Makouria came to an end, and this territory became absolute Guyanese territory. Perhaps we can dwell on this and other facts somewhat later.

2.20 p.m.

What is foreign policy? I would say, with special reference to the nation of Guyana, foreign policy represents the philosophy and objectives motivating our relations and dealings with foreign nations. Foreign policy, as stated by various Governments, usually has a high philosophic content and a large degree of idealism. There is nothing intrinsically wrong in that, I would concede, but I would rather think that behind all the high ideals, protestations and postures for public consumption, there is always the underlying factor of national self-interest or, rather, what is good for the particular country. It is not necessarily what the

particular country can get out of the pursuit of a particular policy by way of goods, services or finance, but what in the whole context of the country's existence, particularly vis-a-vis foreign countries, is good for the country and its citizens in the judgment of the Government of that particular country.

With respect to the philosophic or idealistic side I may say that, in my view, even though, as is conceded by knowledgeable commentators in all parts of the world, the self-interest content of foreign policy is important, if not predominant, idealism and philosophy are not without value or importance and in many cases can contribute to the material side of the policy.

So far as philosophy is concerned I would say that the foreign policy of this Government is motivated by a desire to play an important and significant role in the achievement of permanent peace in the world and putting an end to the exploitation and enslavement of man by man. [*Interruptions.*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I appeal to hon. Members to endeavour to maintain a high standard of conduct during this debate.

**The Prime Minister:** This is part of a desire universally posited to build a brave new world where the dignity of the human being is accepted. Even in this idealistic part there is, for countries like ours, a certain basis of self-interest. Developing countries like Guyana

would have a greater opportunity for developing resources, human and natural, for obtaining assistance in such development, if there were peace and if the large expenditures by the super powers in the arms race were to be considerably reduced.

Coming as we do, after a period of being a colonial territory, Guyana, like so many other newly independent territories, cherishes its independence and seeks in international forums and on the world scene to exercise its independent judgment on matters which arise from time to time and which are either of intense interest or great significance to Guyana.

The tag which is banded on developing countries in these days is the tag of neutralism. Sometimes the synonym in these circumstances, "non-alignment", is used. It is important to note that there is a great deal of difference between the term "neutralism" and the term "neutrality". Neutrality to my mind connotes an unwillingness to come to a decision and remaining completely neutral on many, if not all, important international questions, giving no opinion, coming to no decision and voting neither way. Not only is such an attitude cowardly, but to my mind, I would submit, it is unrealistic.

Neutralism on the other hand connotes that there is no commitment to come out or make a decision on either side in a dispute before the facts are ventilated and the mind applied to such facts. Neutralism I would describe as the pursuit of an independent foreign policy, the

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

exercise of an independent judgment on any international questions which may arise from time to time.

2.30 p.m.

A country which pursues a neutralist foreign policy is a country which neither of the super powers or great blocs can depend on automatically for support of any issue. Perhaps we should consider this question of neutralism in the context of our foreign policy more fully. But, it may be apposite at this stage to deal with certain misconceptions based on emotionalism or inability to digest what we might have heard or read here or elsewhere.

Countries, like Guyana, which have experienced the colonialism of a western country, and which are anxious to confirm, establish and advertise their independence are frequently led into a position where the emphasising and confirmation of that independence take the form of a constant anti-western posture. On the other hand, there are some developing countries, newly independent, which pursue equally disgusting, if not more disgusting, series of postures. Believing that the West is richer, believing that the West is more generous, they commit themselves to a primitive adulation of everything western, and to automatic support of the West in cases where the West does not have any right, and in circumstances which sometimes draw the contempt and surprise of those whom they support.

To pursue a policy of neutralism or non-alignment, it is submitted, is not easy but it is necessary. The impact of a country which commits itself automatically one way or another is no impact at all. That country earns the respect of neither side, and that country can justly be described as a satellite in the circumstances.

Since Independence, the Government of Guyana has shown a willingness, and expressed that willingness tangibly, to be friendly with all other nations who are prepared to be friendly, and in the realm of realism, the last clause is important because there is little or no point in a Government like ours, or any other Government, in spite of protestations and asseverations, bending over backwards to be friendly towards a Government which has shown open hostility.

In the world today there is too great a tendency to consider matters in terms of black and white as if those were the only colours. In fact, I was taught by my art master that neither of them was a colour. Black connotes an absence of all colours and white a presence of all. Between the position of one group or block and the position of another group or block there can be intermediate positions and the contribution which young, small nations like ours can make under given circumstances is to help the blacks and whites to find the grey. We can be intermediaries and we can employ the powers of suasion where those powers are relevant.

This brings me to another thesis, and that is, that a nation of the size and the resources of Guyana should not fool itself that it can make a tremendous impact to change the entire scheme of events or the trend of circumstances. In 1965 or 1966, there was a big argument in the U.N. among Russia, France and U.S.A. over article 19 for the peace-keeping exercise in the Congo. A number of small nations were jumping up and down and making noises. A number of them thought that they were seized with the wisdom of the gods, but the outcome of that confrontation between Russia and the U.S. was dictated by what the U.S. was prepared to do in the circumstances, and what Russia was prepared to do in the circumstances, I think that we young nations, who, after our appearance on the international scene, run around pontificating, give an impression similar to that of the little new boy at school who does not even know his basic alphabet, but seeks to instruct the teacher and the rest of the class on the vagaries of third dimensional physics. The Government of Guyana certainly does not propose to be the ignorant little new boy.

Further, we accept frankly and unapologetically the position that, since our entry on the international stage is less than 12 months old, there is a great deal that we have to learn, there is a great deal that we have to understand, and there are a number of nuances which we have to know more about. There are some persons abroad, full of enthusiasm, who would not understand, for in-

stance, the full significance and connotation of the Russian Amendment at the 21st General Assembly and the Resolution for the admission of "Red" China; the Russian instance was that the Motion should go further than merely seeking the admission of "Red" China, but have a second part to the effect that the Government of Formosa should be excluded from the U.N.

2.40 p.m.

There is a great deal that young countries like ours have to learn about what may be vulgarly but accurately called manoeuvring on the international stage and some of us, with more enthusiasm than wisdom, can easily mistake protestations for conviction and the posture for belief. In any case, the Government of Guyana does not propose to make itself the protagonist or advocate of one or other of the super powers or blocs. Both super powers and blocs are armed with enough material force and wealth to look after their interests in cold and hot wars, and both of them are armed with sufficiently brilliant and skilled advocates to have their cases presented effectively and attractively.

In any case, as I observed before, what impact can we make in those circumstances by jumping on to one band-waggon or another? A country like Guyana, even more so than a country like India, cannot, if the ultimate situation or position were reached, even supply decent conventional arms let alone missiles and nuclear weapons. Further, if countries like Guyana were to concentrate on pursuing their own interest

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

and devoting the greater part of their energies, efforts and abilities to the solution of their domestic and internal problems, much more will be achieved in terms of human happiness than if we attempted to set ourselves up as the greatest international discoverers.

In the world today there are two major blocs called the western bloc and the eastern bloc. There seems to be some doubt, in these days, as to whether the eastern bloc unanimously subscribes to one leader or leadership. Perhaps we will hear more of that anon by those most knowledgeable and whose tourist exploits have taken them so many thousands of miles from Guyana.

But there has been what has been called "a third bloc" but I do not know that it is really a bloc. What has been called the third bloc consists of the neutralist powers or nations and the predominant number of these belong to what is called the Afro-Asian group. But, as I said, I do not know that it is really a bloc in the same way as you have the western bloc and the eastern bloc, for the western bloc has as its leader a super power that is racing for the moon and the eastern bloc, until recently, had as its undisputed leader another super power racing for the moon. In each case, these super powers are armed to the teeth; these super powers have, in their possession and at their disposal, instruments of devastation and death. [Mr. Luck: "C.I.A. too."]

The group of neutralist powers is not powerful, not armed, but consists of a number of nations, as I see it, who want to maintain their independence, who want to be able to exercise independent judgment on important and material matters and who do not want to be in the pocket of either bloc. This third group has got a role to play and one may say that Guyana belongs to this third group. [Mr. Luck: "You only may say so."] [Mr. Ram Karran: "Tell us what you really mean."]

Most, if not all, of the members of this group consist of underdeveloped countries or nations. There is the euphemism "developing nation" in these days, but that is just politeness. [Interruption by the hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran.] I thought that the Leader of the House had promised you some time, now that you have cut your hair. These underdeveloped nations are disappointed that the decade of development started in 1960 has proved to be a flop so far in the seventh year. These underdeveloped nations can, in spite of their limited resources, develop not merely or only formal political links but trade and economic links. They can come together for their mutual benefit and protection - especially in cases where they are the sole producers of certain important commodities, goods and minerals - they can earn a greater deal of respect and can confine their major efforts on the international field to seeking to bring about some compromise which may be indicated, as happened in the Third Committee during December of last year on the question of human rights and on other questions.

Guyana, by its history, falls into this bloc or group. Guyana has a certain common history and also a community of aspirations with what are described as the Afro-Asian nations at the United Nations. We have been, since the attainment of Independence, developing our relations with these countries or nations. A part of this was the invitation to President Kaunda which he accepted. A part of this was the close working with this said group in the United Nations, not only on questions like Rhodesia and South-West Africa, but also on questions of trade arising out of the United Nations Conference of Trade which was held in Geneva, I think, two years ago. As I see it, further efforts in this field can be remunerative to Guyana as it can be remunerative to those other Afro-Asian nations.

2.50 p.m.

It may be said that we have not yet been able to establish Embassies or High Commissions in the capitals of these Afro-Asian nations, but that is a question which will be dealt with very shortly. I can say this: our High Commissioner in London and our Permanent Representative at the United Nations use the situation of their posts for furthering closer and better understanding and relations with members of what is called the Afro-Asian group. Of course, I shall have to deal later with our attitude to and our involvement with the rest of the Caribbean which, I think, is important if not primary.

Perhaps, at this stage, I may merely observe, for the purpose

of the record, that Guyana is a member of the United Nations and continues to be a member of the Commonwealth and a number of international organisations and agencies such as the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, I.L.O., F.A.O., W.H.O., and, perhaps, I should pause for a moment to comment on our membership of the Commonwealth.

I recall that when the formal Motion for our accession to membership of the Commonwealth, after the achievement of Independence, was being debated in this House, the cowards abstained after putting up a number of specious if not facetious arguments against our continuance in the Commonwealth. Guyana's being in the Commonwealth marks a subscription by Guyana to the ideals of the Commonwealth - democracy, human dignity, and the equality of man. On the materialistic side, Guyana benefits from being a member of the Commonwealth. If the cowards who speak against our being in the Commonwealth and abstain when the division is taken were to tell us how, in the present circumstances, at the present level of the world price of sugar, we are going to dispose of our national product, I shall be the first, for even the ignorant may become wise, to listen to their advice. [*Interruption.*]

**Mr. Speaker:** No interruption, please. You will have your opportunity to speak.

**The Prime Minister:** Our membership of the Commonwealth is a combination of idealism and materialism, and so it is with

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

I several of other members of the Commonwealth, and so it is with Britain. Since the war Britain's trade with the Commonwealth has increased, and the value of her trade has increased even more than the volume of her trade. It is of more than passing significance that the Commonwealth is no longer described as the British Commonwealth, but "the Commonwealth". There are some members of the Commonwealth who are richer than others. There are some members of the Commonwealth who are more powerful, militarily, than others, but that must not mean that the Commonwealth is not a free association of all its members - a free association whose survival is dictated by a combination of idealism and materialism.

At the moment the Government of Guyana is happy to be a member of the Commonwealth. If circumstances change, if alternatives are real alternatives, consideration will be given to them.

Maybe, at this moment, I should refer to the Organisation of American States. There has been a great deal of discussion in this country as to whether Guyana should accede to the O.A.S. but this is an academic question though I shall deal with certain aspects of it today. Either those who beat the drums and make noises are unaware of the legal position, or they are intellectually dishonest when they seek to give the impression that this Government is on the way to becoming a member of the O.A.S. Under Article 3 of the Act of Washington no country can have

its application for joining the O.A.S. considered by the Council of the O.A.S. if there is in existence a boundary dispute with respect to a standing member of the O.A.S.; and if that dispute arose prior to 1960, and between such member and an extra-hemispheric body, and if that dispute has not been resolved by peaceful means. In these circumstances, the application by a nation such as Guyana cannot be and will not be considered. So far as Guyana is concerned, within the meaning of Article 3 of the Statute of Washington, there is no point in Guyana's applying for membership of the O.A.S. Those who are making a great deal of noise about it can set their hearts and their minds at ease.

3 p.m. h.

Let us assume that Guyana was eligible and that either there was no Article 3 of the Statute of Washington or that there was no dispute or that the dispute had been resolved by peaceful means in the opinion of the O.A.S. members. Before this Government can undertake any such application it would have to study and come to firm conclusions on a number of things. One, for instance, is the cost worth it, the cost of membership, the initial payment, annual payments and the call which is made for the I.A.D.B? Secondly, what measure of sovereignty would the Government of Guyana be yielding if it were to become a member of O.A.S.? What interest of Guyana would be improved or furthered by joining the O.A.S.?

The answers to these questions would have to be found

before a decision is made, so I can assure the Assembly and the nation (a) that at the moment we are not eligible to join the O.A.S. and (b) that if we were to become eligible, the matter would have to be most carefully studied before a Motion is brought to this House proposing our accession to the O.A.S.

It is noteworthy in this context to remark that in July of last year, at a Conference in Ottawa which had a significant feature to which I shall refer, it was agreed between Jamaica, Canada and Guyana that there should be a joint study of O.A.S. I may here explain that Barbados was not a party to that decision because Barbados was not yet independent and Trinidad had indicated that a unilateral study was being made by its Government and that a decision was expected to be reached some time shortly. That decision is now public knowledge.

At this stage I may refer to our foreign policy in terms of the Caribbean. In March of 1965, it will be recalled, the regular Caribbean Heads of Government meeting for that year took place in Guyana. That marked a re-entry of Guyana on to the Caribbean scene and a re-integration of Guyana into the Caribbean family. That has been followed by what can be accurately described as a vast improvement in the relations between Guyana and the rest of the Caribbean. Undoubtedly, from time to time there have been slight differences and perhaps pin-pricks from one side or another, but these things are part of the facts of international life and should not unduly concern or disturb us.

There is no doubt that our re-entry on to the Caribbean scene was welcomed sincerely and seriously by the majority, if not all, of our Caribbean colleagues. We went further in December of 1965 when there was signed the Caribbean Free Trade Agreement at Dickenson Bay between Antigua, Barbados and Guyana. We do not say that the signing of this Agreement was on the sole initiative of Guyana, but what we do say is that the Guyana Government took a very active and important part in achieving CARIFTA.

Since that Agreement was signed it has been laid before the House and it has been debated and, as with our accession to the Commonwealth, there were arguments against, and cowardice at division time. The Government of Guyana appreciates very fully that CARIFTA, as it now is, does mean or represent a step forward, and does have the possibility, nay the probability, of increasing trade as between the three signatories and the rationalising of their respective and joint economies. But to stop at an association limited to three Caribbean territories is to do injustice to the concept of Caribbean regionalism and the Caribbean personality.

That is why Guyana welcomed the positive interest shown by Trinidad and all of the other Commonwealth Caribbean countries in CARIFTA. That is why Guyana, along with the two other signatory Governments, Antigua and Barbados, will shortly be taking part in two Conferences to discuss positively and meaningfully the expansion of CARIFTA. In these circumstances the Guyana

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

Government welcomes the recent statement by the Minister of Trade of Trinidad and Tobago that his country's accession to O.A.S. is not considered by his Government to be in conflict with its interests in acceding to a free trade agreement encompassing all the Caribbean Commonwealth countries.

I have recently come from the Caribbean, from matters other than business, and I have had the opportunity of assessing at first hand the response not only of Caribbean Governments, but of Caribbean people (a) to Guyana's participation with the rest of the Caribbean in exercises like this and (b) to the concept of a Caribbean nation.

3.10 p.m.

In these days when already independent and large - in some cases powerful - nations are seeking to come together, it seems elementary that such an exercise is desirable in the Caribbean. It is true that the Federation came to grief, but it is also true that the West Indian peoples in fields other than cricket or in addition to the field of cricket, are most anxious that they come together. We do not underestimate the difficulties. We do not for one moment attempt to ignore the individual problems which may arise. But of this we are sure. There will be a Caribbean nation in our time, and Guyana is in a peculiar position to make a tremendous and significant contribution to the achievement of that fact. We do so, not out of a

desire to rule anyone or run anyone's affairs. In fact, the Guyanese delegations to these Caribbean meetings are noted for their understanding and for their attitude of equality, and also for their unwillingness to talk down to anyone.

It seems to us that if we are to have a West Indian nation, we have got to realise that survival of all is dependent on the efforts of all. We have dedicated ourselves to making an important contribution to the building of a West Indian Caribbean nation, starting from the level of trade followed by economic co-operation and integration.

We have, as I mentioned before, been working very closely with the Afro-Asian group in the U.N., and this everyone in Guyana ought to know. Not only do we take a strong and unequivocal stand with respect to South-West Africa, but our Government was one of the sponsors of a Resolution which was passed in the General Assembly by 97 - 2, calling upon Britain to take strong action with respect to Mr. Smith and to use force. I do not consider it necessary to enter into a long dissertation on what is happening in places like South-West Africa which was originally a League of Nations trust territory, or what is happening in Rhodesia, and the obvious failure by the Government of the United Kingdom to deal as firmly with Smith as its predecessor dealt with Jagan and Burnham in 1953. I do not sing a long song about what is happening in places like Angola and Mozambique. What is happening in those parts of

the world is known, and the attitude and stand of the Guyana Government in such matters is well known and cannot be questioned.

But nearer home, and involving a great deal of our energies, we have the problems which have arisen with our western neighbour, Venezuela. It will be recalled that in 1960 or thereabouts, the Venezuelan Permanent Representative to the U.N. put forward the claim that the arbitral award of October, 1899, with respect to the boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana, as it then was, was null and void. It will also be recalled that there was a Tripartite Conference in December, 1965, followed by the Geneva Agreement of February, 1966, which Agreement has been debated in this House and has been given the approval of the Assembly.

Everyone also knows that late last year the Venezuelans occupied the eastern half of Ankoko island, and that the Venezuelan Government has since been claiming that the whole of the island is Venezuelan territory, and been contending further that the question ought to be sent to the Mixed Commission. In our opinion, and in the opinion of our legal advisers, this is not a matter which comes within the purview of the Mixed Commission by virtue of the Geneva Agreement of February, 1966. The Government of Guyana has protested to the Government of Venezuela and subsequently put forward proposals to the Venezuelan Government, and received counter-proposals from that Government, through the Venezuelan Ambassador to Guyana.

At the moment, the Government of Guyana awaits a response to the last counter-proposals which have been put forward by it.

It must not be understood that the Government of Guyana considers that it has exhausted all means of achieving a favourable settlement, nor must it be imagined that the Government of Guyana yields or moves one inch from its contention that the eastern half of Ankoko is Guyanese territory. [Mr. Luck: "Peter says it is their own, though."] No member of this Government suffers from illiteracy.

3.20 p.m.

It may not be advisable, sensible or necessary to go into a long recital of what has been done, what is being done and what is proposed to be done by the Government of Guyana on this question. In the very nature of things I think everyone can understand why it is so, for, until the whole affair is completed, negotiations or discussions between and proposals to and from the two Governments should not be the subject matter of public debate.

Perhaps it is to be observed that, at the moment, we do not have a diplomatic presence in Caracas. But that is not because the Government does not recognise the importance of such a presence. It is because the limitations of the purse and personnel are such that we have not yet been able to go through the conventional exercise of having that presence there. But it is on the cards; for a diplomatic presence in Caracas would make communica-

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

tion between the two Governments much easier than they are now.

As everyone knows, at the moment, there are only three external missions maintained by the Government. There is the High Commission in London, the Embassy in Washington, the Head of which Embassy is also accredited as High Commissioner to Canada, and the mission in New York headed by our Permanent Representative. The Government would like to be able to set up other missions in other parts of the world, but the Government has had to consider its financial and qualified human resources and the decision with respect to these three capitals was dictated by what the Government thought would best serve the country's interests immediately.

London is a centre from which contact and close relations can be maintained with a number of other countries, particularly the Commonwealth countries with which we have mutual interests. Our High Commissioner to London is also accredited to France and will shortly be accredited to Germany. It is worthy of note that our High Commissioner to the United Kingdom is also High Commissioner for Barbados to the United Kingdom which, in itself, is an indication of the level to which co-operation between Guyana and the other Caribbean territories has reached. May I hasten to assure this House, especially the Opposition whose *penchant* for parsimony is shown only on these occasions, that our sharing our High Commissioner with Barbados does not mean any increased ex-

penditure. In fact, it represents a saving on our part as well as a saving on Barbados' part.

In the case of Ottawa, Barbados proposes to appoint a High Commissioner whose office will be in Ottawa and, at the physical level, both in Washington and in Ottawa, there is likely to be a sharing of office and a sharing of staff as between Barbados and Guyana.

Our mission in New York was inescapable because our membership of the United Nations, about which there was no issue in this country, dictates that we maintain a mission there. But the mission there serves the purpose, not only of servicing, in so far as we have to service, the United Nations organisation, but also of maintaining the closest and friendliest contact with nations to which capitals we cannot afford to send Ambassadors or High Commissioners.

If we had our way we would have a High Commissioner in New Delhi and one in Pakistan. We would have a diplomatic representative of ambassadorial status in West Africa and one to cover Eastern and Central Africa. [Mr. Luck: "What about Portugal?"] We would not send one. Since the question is seriously asked by my hon. and learned Friend I would say that the Government of Guyana has no proposal to send any diplomatic representative or Ambassador to Portugal because the Government of Guyana is in strong and hostile disagreement with the treatment meted out to the natives of Angola and Mozambique by the Portuguese Govern-

ment. Now the infants will stop mewling and puling in their mothers' arms.

We would like to be able to accredit a High Commissioner to the independent Caribbean territories and also a Commissioner at least to those which have not yet achieved Independence. We would like to have accredited an Ambassador to Caracas. But all of these things are subject, of course, to the availability of means and this Government has to take a realistic view. As soon as the opportunity presents itself and the facilities are available, we shall honour these desires.

The hon. Attorney-General and Minister of State (Mr. Ramphal), during the course of this debate, will deal in greater detail with the facts, with any particular acts on the Government's part, or any particular action that has been taken by this Government.

3.30 p.m.

I am satisfied that since this Government has taken over responsibility for the foreign policy and external relations of the nation of Guyana that (a) it has pursued a responsible policy within its fiscal limitations; (b) it has, at the international level, supported the causes which are worthy of support; and (c) it has not been the tool or the instrument of one bloc or another.

This is going to be a debate which is supposed to last two days, and during the course of that exercise we shall hear from the Opposition. I am led to

believe that there is no fundamental difference, in so far as the statement of principle is concerned, between the Government and the Opposition, but there may be a difference with respect to the application of this principle to facts as they may arise, and that is as it should be, for I myself would be bored by the monotony of unanimity. I myself would be disgusted if I were to find that the Opposition and the Government were in absolute and total agreement on the application of the principle to the facts.

All I ask, and I can only ask, is that during the course of this debate we get our sights and keep our sights clear. We, as a young nation, are prepared to be friendly with everyone who is prepared to be friendly with us. We, as a young nation, must seek to use our foreign policy as an instrument for the projection of our image and the assistance for our country at the political and economic levels. I would only ask that these goals, of which I am sure there can be no disagreement, are kept in sight. I can only ask, and I commend this Motion to the House for its approval.

**The Leader of the Opposition** (Dr. Jagan): The hon. Prime Minister this afternoon, in a very lengthy speech, has enunciated general principles and treated us with a great deal of detail, but anyone who has listened very closely and who has observed the course of events in our country over the last two years could not fail to come to the conclusion that action does not conform with

[DR. JAGAN]

pronouncement. Indeed, one could get lost in all the details which were presented to us by the Prime Minister. Of course, this is a good debating point of view. The fact is that we have heard certain fundamental questions pertaining to the question of peace and the question of exploitation of man by man, principles which the Prime Minister enunciated, but we have not heard very much about crucial issues in Vietnam. We have not heard anything about such issues as the intervention in Vietnam and, to come nearer home, the intervention in a place like the Dominican Republic.

On the other hand, there were some general statements: the world is made up of two blocs - two super states or two powerful blocs. Anyone can make such a quantitative assessment, but we have not been treated by the Prime Minister with any qualitative analysis of the difference in the position on international affairs between these two blocs, particularly relating to what he calls "self-interest". What is the interest of countries like Guyana which are sinking deeper and deeper into an economic and social morass? He alluded to the development decade of 1960 - 1970 which is aimed at arresting the widening gap between the poor countries and the rich countries. We have heard no serious analysis of these important issues which made for foreign policy and foreign affairs.

It is not that the Prime Minister is not aware of these issues. I will quote from an article which he wrote several

years ago in a publication called *Thunder* when he was the Chairman of the P.P.P. and when he and I were touring India. This quotation is also quoted in my book *The West on Trial* on page 424.

[Mr. Bissember: "Are you quoting from your own book?"]

Mr. Speaker: I do not know whether it would be proper for you to quote from your own book, Use another authority; do not use your own book.

Dr. Jagan: I am surprised at your ruling. Do you want me to bring all the volumes that are listed in this book?

Mr. Speaker: I rule that you do not quote from your book.

Dr. Jagan: At a certain period when the Prime Minister and I visited India in 1954 he said:

"Friends in India (and elsewhere) should remember that though the British lion is weak and imperialism is on its death-bed, it is aided by the young eagle from the U.S.A. So long as these people rule the world, the independence and freedom which you won with so much bloodshed and suffering is in jeopardy."

3.40 p.m.

We are treated with no qualitative analysis of the position in the realm of foreign affairs of two super blocs, but we are merely told to accept their existence. The Prime Minister says that Guyana is non-aligned. We could prove from this side of the

House that this is not so. The Prime Minister made another observation, namely, that we associated ourselves with the non-aligned countries, the Third World countries, and the Third World countries take a non-aligned position between the two super powers.

We contend again that there has been no qualitative analysis of what has been happening in the Third World because the Third World is not a homogeneous entity. The Third World has, as we see so clearly in Africa, two groups of states, two groups of nations, the Monrovia bloc and the Casablanca bloc, and even though they be linked together in a so-called "Third World", they hold distinct and opposite ideological positions and this in turn is reflected in their foreign relations and foreign affairs.

Therefore, when the Prime Minister tells us that we are associated, generally speaking, with the Third World countries, with the non-aligned countries, this is all well and good for propaganda purposes but the fact is that the bulk of these countries in the Third World, the twenty American republics, for instance, can by no stretch of imagination be said to be non-aligned because we know they are all satellites of U.S. foreign policy. We know, for instance, that most of the states that belong to the French community do not share the views of the Third World non-aligned countries. So that for the Prime Minister to say that we are not associated with the two blocs, we are associated with the Third World countries and are therefore non-

aligned, is mainly to turn things upside down and is meant to fool the people who are not informed.

The Prime Minister can make a statement that it is the foreign policy of Guyana to support the Rhodesian struggle against the Fascist Smith regime, in a Third World country. The Prime Minister can tell us, hand over heart, that this Government is opposed to the Fascist Government of Portugal in its treatment of the liberation fighters in Angola and Mozambique, but what about Vietnam? What about the Dominican Republic? Does the Prime Minister not see any ideological connection between the two?  
[*Interruptions.*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not wish any interruptions from either side of the House.

**Dr. Jagan:** The Prime Minister has not mentioned these crucial issues relating to the whole question of war and peace, relating to the question of sovereignty and intervention in the affairs of a sovereign nation, relating to the question of progress and prosperity and the end of exploitation of man by man.

Speaking for the Gallery is not going to get us very far. We must, as the Prime Minister said, and to use his exact words, "keep our sights clear". He said there was agreement between the Government and the Opposition on the general principle of foreign policy. While this is so on the enunciated views, as put out in electoral campaigns and at street corners by one side of the Government, we contend that there is no fulfilment of those stated

[DR. JAGAN]

objectives. We submit that this Government is a creation of U.S. foreign policy and today is a creature of U.S. foreign policy. Therefore, we will not, we cannot, support this Motion before the House.

The Prime Minister said in his opening remarks that foreign policy is based on philosophy and on ideals, and also on self-interest. If we are to keep our sights clear then we must note the clear distinction between ideology and self-interest. We must note that there need not be any contradiction between nationalism and internationalism and, indeed, that there can be a dualism between pronouncements and performance, a very valid dualism which can have meaning for a country.

What are the philosophical ideals which motivate this Government today? We are at a loss to understand what it is. During the electoral campaign, the P.N.C. said it was socialist. The United Force said socialism and communism were practically the same and its belief rested on capitalism, albeit what is called "people's capitalism" and "economic dynamism".

3.50 p.m.

Now that this amalgam - this coalition - has taken place, what is the result on foreign policy? It is neither fish nor chicken. It is neither socialist nor capitalist. If one were to give it a term one would say 'puppetry'. I said that this Government is a creature of U.S. foreign

policy, and it is against this background that one has to examine the details.

Incidentally, over the last month there developed in the United States of America a tremendous expose of the Central Intelligence Agency. The C.I.A. subverted churches, students, youths such as the World Assembly of Youth to which our delegates go from time to time, trade unions (the one mentioned with particular reference to us was the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees through its International Affairs Department and the Public Services International), agricultural organisations, research organisations, the International Labour Institute headed by a so-called socialist, Norman Thomas. I wish to quote from the issue of the *Thunder* of 12th March, 1967:

"The most conspicuous was the revelation that the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees had, in effect, turned its International Affairs Department over to the CIA in 1962 and 1963 to use as a case for strikes and other activities aimed at overthrowing Dr. Cheddi Jagan's Marxist regime in British Guiana."

My colleagues who are making international policy today should read this issue of the *Thunder*.

We have seen the kind of ideologies that are being spread by what someone termed as an "invisible Government", the C.I.A. With respect to our domestic and foreign policies, we ought to be told clearly where we stand so

that we will know whether we will make progress and whether we will achieve the objectives set out by the Prime Minister for the peace and well-being of humanity. In a very monumental work, Professor R.D. Fleming of Syracuse University, in a two-volume study entitled *The Cold War and its Origins* wrote in relation to the Truman doctrine on page 436. This is what he had to say:

"On March 6, 1947, President Truman made a speech at Baylor University on foreign economic policy which was a virtual declaration of irreconcilable conflict against both communism and democratic socialism. He explained that freedom was more important than peace and that freedom of worship and speech were dependent on freedom of enterprise. Something 'deeper than a desire to protect the profits of ownership' was involved.

Freedom of enterprise was limited when governments conducted foreign trade or when the governments planned the economy. In the latter case 'Governments make all the important choices and he (the trader) adjusts himself to them as best he can.'

This, said the President, 'was the pattern of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries' and unless we act, and act decisively, it will be the pattern of the next century . . . If this trend is not reversed the Government of the United States will be under pressure, sooner or later, to use these same devices to fight

for markets and for raw materials.' It would find itself in the business of telling every trader what he could buy or sell, and how much, and when, and where.' This was 'not the American way' and 'not the way of peace.' The implication was plain that state trading (in the U.S.S.R. and its satellites) and government control of trade (in Britain and much of West Europe) led to war.

This was serious enough, but even more ominous were the assumptions that the whole world should adopt the American system' and that 'The American system could survive in America only if it became a world system'.

Today, two fronts, East and West, are engaged in the struggle between two ideologies, capitalism and socialism. On the second front there is so-called national liberation of the people in the colonies, people like us who recently came out of colonialism. Let me say that the two struggles are not isolated, the second is a part of the first. May I just say that before Truman declared his doctrine in 1947, Churchill, in 1946, went to Fulton, Missouri, and declared that in the interest of civilisation and humanity the English-speaking world should get together to fight against the hordes coming from the East.

**The Leader of the House** (Mr. Bissember): Before you take the suspension, it has been agreed by both sides that we stop at 6.30 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** This sitting is suspended until 4.30 p.m.

*Sitting suspended accordingly  
at 4.00 p.m.*

4.37 p.m.

*On resumption --*

[**Mr. Deputy Speaker in the  
Chair.**]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** At the suspension the hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking. He may continue if he so desires.

**Dr. Jagan:** We contend that in order to make foreign policy intelligently we must understand the origins and trends of foreign affairs. We submit that this Government takes mainly an opportunistic approach to the question of foreign affairs, opportunistic not in the sense of doing what is in the interest of Guyana, but doing what is in the interest of staying in power. If we must correlate the events in this country over the last two years and the methods pursued in gaining power with what followed particularly in this hemisphere in the last two decades, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that our Government has come to what someone calls 'the theory of fatalism'.

-Even if you perceive that the dominant power in this hemisphere is wrong, that its foreign policy is inimical to your interest, you cannot fight it, therefore, you must fall asleep. This motivates the whole thinking of the Government. The power struggle between the two blocs, the super blocs, and the struggle of countries like Guyana, which are trying to

become socially and economically free, are definitely correlated.

4.40 p.m.

I took pains to quote from Professor Fleming's work to illustrate the dominating ideology of U.S. foreign policy. This, of course, is an extenuation of the Monroe Doctrine in a different historical period when the struggle was not against the same ideology. When Monroe fought against European powers in their attempt to dominate Latin America, it was American expansion vis-a-vis European imperialism, but in the post-war era the Truman Doctrine initiated the struggle of capitalism against socialism. I will paraphrase the words of Truman:

"Ideological freedom and democracy are synonymous with the free enterprise system."

In terms of political theory, political economy and political action these are the key words - "the whole world should adopt the American system. The American system would survive in America only if it became a world system". We saw where, as a result of this doctrine, the Cold War was launched. The key to the policy behind the Cold War in that period was that communism should be contained by instruments, by the signing of treaties, by the establishment of military bases in foreign countries - NATO and the North Atlantic states including Portugal and later Franco's Spain. Democracy had now turned upon its head.

During the war, democracy meant capitalism plus communism fighting against fascism, but now it is capitalism plus fascism fighting against communism. We had the Baghdad Pact which provided the link in the Middle East between the European countries and South-East Asia under SEATO. The South American countries were involved in the O.A.S., formed in 1948. It was said that the Latin American countries were threatened by communism from without and from within. Are you going to tell us now that we must carry out a big study about the O.A.S.? Dr. Eric Williams, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, will undertake a long study of the O.A.S. and then go and join. You will get a lot of historical material written about these things, but these are the bare facts for anyone who wants to go deeply into the history of this organisation.

Truman was not alone in the formulation of this policy. The arch-imperialist, Sir Winston Churchill, was his close associate. When India demanded its freedom he declared.

"I was not appointed as Her Majesty's first Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

While the treaties and the military bases were holding back communism, an iron ring was being formed around the world to hold back national liberation. Europe, Britain, France, Indo-China, Malaya, Indonesia and the Netherlands were involved. After the war those colonials who had to give their lives and help primarily in chasing the Japanese out were attacked. The fight

against communism to liberate the so-called satellites of eastern Europe and the going back to resume occupation with a colonial force in colonial territories were not isolated events. Indeed, it was during the same era that the Constitution was suspended in British Guiana. Jomo Kenyatta was imprisoned at the time, and so on.

Let us get our sights clear and see whether the action taken for national liberation will improve the economic and social well-being of the poor people whose conditions are getting worse, as admitted by U Thant and others. Let us admit, as Truman has said very clearly and categorically that democracy and freedom mean the free enterprise system. Our Government agrees with this philosophy and with this economic doctrine. If this is so, does this account for its foreign policy? One would say, reading the *Sun*, the organ of the United Force, or listening to the speeches of certain Members in the past, that this is indeed their policy. If one observes what has been done by way of fiscal and economic policies in this country, one would say that this is indeed so. But when one hears our Prime Minister one hears a tale of a different kind. He says that this Government is a socialist Government; it has a non-aligned foreign policy. Where is the non-alignment? Non-alignment implies two things: not only the concept of sitting and examining; it does not only mean that we will sit and listen and then make up our minds. [Mr. Jordan: "We should make up our minds before we listen!"] It presupposes that with colonial-

[DR. JAGAN]

ism there are certain conditions which must be adhered to. There should be no military intervention in the affairs of a country; a country should not allow its territory to be used as a military base; it should accept aid and trade from all countries with the object of changing the economic structure which is inherent in the economic structure of a primary producer, the economic structure of a one-crop economy, which we find all around us in Latin America, the economic structure of sending out raw material at low prices and buying manufactured goods in return at higher prices.

4.50 p.m.

This is the concept also of non-alignment, and for someone to say that it simply means that we will sit and listen and then we will decide is to make the concept and science of political economy into children's games. We see in Africa a great upheaval, a continent in birth so to speak, two streams of thought, the Monrovia group and the Casablanca group. We saw a few days ago where Julius Nyerere, President of Tanzania, nationalised the plantations, the insurance companies, foreign trade. This is the result of no military treaties with anyone. This is non-alignment.

We see not only these two strands, but we see recent events in Africa and Asia where people like Ben Bella, Nkrumah, Sukarno, Mrs. Bandaranaike, the exponents of non-alignment, the champions, the leaders, are re-

moved. The American system will survive in America only if it becomes a world system. There are counter-revolutionary efforts in two directions, not only to remove progressive leaders but, in some of these territories, to remove those puppets who have become unpopular by military right-wing dictators, as we have seen in Africa. We cannot understand how it is that some military dictators are taking over, not from progressives but from reactionary leaders, because they cannot produce the popular backing necessary in the long run.

We submit that an examination of the events in this country will show by our associations, by the fiscal and economic policies we have pursued, that we are moons away from this concept of non-alignment. The first thing the Prime Minister referred to was the Agreement signed with the United States. What he did not speak of was the fine writing, such as the writing we see in insurance policies, and that is to the effect that the United States has the right to establish military equipment, land military planes, build any installations and fly over the country at any time. It is not a long step from this to joining the O.A.S.

We hear a lot about Caribbean unity, yet Cuba, right in the hemisphere, right in the Caribbean, was not invited to our Independence Celebrations. Formosa was invited and the excuse was that it is a member of the Security Council. Of course, Russia and Yugoslavia were invited. The United States says, "Let us make peace with these two and let us keep Cuba and China

off the scene" This is the logic.

The Venezuela border question, another aspect of our foreign policy, is now blowing up in our face. It was a question that was closed, yet we now sign the Geneva Agreement. Don't take my word for it, but read the release by the Venezuela Ministry of Information which says, "There is validity in our claim. Look, the Governments have set up a Commission to examine the question!" This is not intervention in our affairs like the marines landing in the Dominican Republic or Vietnam. This is indirect intervention or the threat of indirect intervention. The British intervention was called "indirect rule" in Africa. It was, nevertheless, as direct as anything else and so we have to look at this other bit of chicanery and see where our so-called "foreign policy" is leading us.

"Aid and trade" is one of the main causes for backwardness of poor countries. Today, aside from the question of foreign ownership of the means of production, exchange and distribution, there is the fact that there is unequal international trading. There are poor countries which are selling their products at lower and lower prices and are having to pay higher and higher prices for their imported goods. What about trying to reverse this process? What about trying to sell dear and buy cheap for a change?

The leaders of this Government who said they would get \$10 a bag more in the international market for rice, who said they did not need Cuba, are now getting \$10 a bag less. Commodities

were bought in this country fairly cheaply. Now the Government has put them under severe restriction quotas. At public meetings I generally refer to this instrument - a Canadian Parker pen. It cost \$21; it fell down and broke. Hon. Members will see that one end is blue and one is green. It was not possible to get a green barrel. Now it is \$2 for this. My friend referred to "Chinese Parker". The price is \$1.50 for a whole pen.

5 p.m.

I heard people in this country saying, "You know, Burnham is tied to Washington and Jagan is tied to Moscow, and we don't want to be tied to either." We have heard some people saying that it is no use jumping out of the arms of one and jumping into the arms of the other. We do not want to become satellites of anybody, but, clearly in this equation there is a qualitative difference in the associations, the policies, the economics or the political or ideological strings which have connected us with our mother countries even when we were colonies. Now that we are not colonies, we are made to maintain the economic strait-jacket.

When we were in the Government, these people on the Government Benches used to say "Coolie" Government. Now that they are in the Government, they are saying that agriculture will be the backbone of this country for a long time. They said that we were only thinking about drainage

[DR. JAGAN]

and irrigation and agriculture. But we were not only thinking about agriculture, we were going ahead with industries. We made the law for the I.D.C. to promote, encourage and undertake the establishment of industries. On 2nd June, 1966, the I.D.C. law was amended, and the key word "undertake" was deleted. These are the people who talked so much about industries.

In our time there were no feasibility studies, but at least we did something about them. There were surveys, but they said, "Change the law". Why? Freedom and democracy are synonymous with the free enterprise system! Government must not go into business. Truman Doctrine! Where is the evidence of non-alignment? It is a known fact that the Russian delegation was here during the Independence Celebrations. They said, "We would like to establish diplomatic representation with Guyana". If Guyana is non-aligned, it will be better to have the Russian embassy here so that you can negotiate with it for aid and for trade which you definitely need now - trade, to sell the goods which you cannot sell now, and aid which you cannot get from the Americans to industrialise your country. It does not follow that you cannot afford to set up a reciprocal embassy in Moscow because you do not have an embassy in Germany, but you have the German Ambassador here. Where is the non-aligned foreign policy?

The other day, a paper which supports one of the parties - the P.N.C. - had an article about the

conditions attached to Canadian aid. But what about the conditions attached to American aid? What are the facts? Let the former Minister of Economic Development speak, if he dares, of the American philosophy which does not even encourage the setting up of co-operatives in this country. The members of the Government have been put in power by the Americans so they cannot criticise them. They dare not! At one time the Prime Minister said that it was wrong for intervention to take place in the Dominican Republic. But during the last trip to the United States, when he was wined and dined and taken around - [Mr. Luck: "To ride horse." - he said, "I have seen the facts. My eyes are open. Now we can see that the intervention was justified".

I repeat that one cannot divorce the Monroe Doctrine from the Truman Doctrine, or indeed, from the Johnson Doctrine. [Mr. Luck: "Johnson is a criminal." - Yes, Johnson is a criminal to be tried by the World Tribunal to be set up by the great philosopher, Bertrand Russell. I am sure this one will not be subverted by the C.I.A. like the International Commission of Jurists. The Johnson Doctrine, which is an extension of the Truman Doctrine, states; "Not only will we see that our system becomes the world system, but we will intervene directly if necessary". No wonder our Ambassador to the U.N. was perturbed the other day. He said that the *New York Times* was not very helpful when he landed there. The *New York Times*, which exposed the C.I.A. plot in the

overthrow of the P.P.P. Government, is one of the most influential papers and it is highly respected and circulated in the U.N. headquarters.

The image of this Government must be that it is non-aligned on the issues of Rhodesia and Angola. But this is a fraud because if that were so, there would have been a consistent approach similar to Rhodesia and Angola. We, on this side of the House, join with the Government in saying that the fascist Smith regime should be overthrown by force. We join with it as we did at the Tricontinental Conference.

5.10 p.m.

I will now come to the next point. The Prime Minister said "Let us not worry ourselves with all these international problems. Let us try to solve our problems." You cannot divorce yourself from the world today. Wendell Willkie wrote a book called *One World*. Today we are closer to that than when he wrote it. There is going to be no improvement in the deteriorating conditions here. The cost of living is increasing, prices of farmers' products - rice, plantains, ground provisions, coffee, milk - are going down; workers are struggling day after day. One U.F. organ said that there is an epidemic of strikes. Another U.F. organ said that a strike fever is hitting the country. This is only an expression of growing dissatisfaction among the people.

We know that there is an ideological war between the East and West. We have the United States, Great Britain, France and

Canada on one side. But in the little war which is going on - big capitalism eating little capitalism - there is the necessity for national survival. France has dismantled the whole of the N.A.T.O. apparatus. France recognise Communist China long ago and she trades with Communist China. The United States is still fighting the Cold War.

Farmers in Canada are suffering greatly; unemployment is increasing. Of course there is the Vietnam war to stimulate prosperity, a little injection. This year farmers lined up their tractors on the public highways. Whether it is Conservative or Liberal, the wheat markets in Cuba, China and the Soviet Union are all important to the well-being of the Canadian people. Self-interest. What do they do? They do not go into the O.A.S. because this is a military alliance, part of the Cold War apparatus. But our Prime Minister who knows this is going to investigate it! While Canada was voting with America at the United Nations a few years ago, this last time it abstained on the question of entry of People's China in the United Nations. This was again a movement based on Canada's national self-interest.

Our former Minister of Economic Development (Mr. THOMAS) went to Taiwan. Everyone is talking about People's China becoming a super power in the world, meaning a power which has the ability to send inter-continental missiles. They are all seeing that but our Government does not even want to go and explore what is happening over

[DR. JAGAN]

there to find out what is the key to success. This is a Government which says that it is non-aligned and not taking sides.

Clearly, we cannot support this Motion and I urge the Government, in the interest of the Guyanese people, to reverse its foreign policy for this cannot achieve the three objectives which were cited by the Prime Minister: the objective of world peace, the objective of the end of exploitation of man by man and the economic well-being of the Guyanese people and, indeed, the people of the world.

All we have to do is to look around and see what is happening to some of these poor countries. India is next door to China. China is making progress and India is virtually at the door of starvation. What is the reason for this? Apart from the internal politics and the economic and fiscal policies which are influenced to a very great extent by certain wings of the Congress Party, by big business men like the Bilas and the Tates, there is a fantastic load which a country like India had to carry from the very start when Pakistan became a member of SEATO and the Cold War. India had to spend 50 to 60 per cent of her Budget on defence.

Latin American countries have had to spend nearly two billion dollars a year, which they could ill afford, because of this same concept of fighting communism. A political consequence which has arisen out of this is that this kind of military mania is helping the military vis-a-vis the poli-

ticians in Latin America. It has strengthened the military because the whole apparatus of the State is keyed up to militarism. Not too long ago an American writing an article for the *Saturday Evening Post* said that before the Mutual Security Act of 1947 and its successor the O.A.S. of 1948, there were only three dictatorships in Latin America, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic and Argentina. Today almost every South American country is a dictatorship of one kind or another. This has been a consequence of the policy adumbrated under the Truman Doctrine and by the O.A.S., and also of the fact that these regimes cannot be stable because the economic and fiscal policies they pursue cannot produce economic prosperity and economic growth. Popular will cannot therefore be expressed.

For many years we have fought against colonialism and the fight in this country has been long and bitter. We must not pragmatically try to go through the fight against colonialism with all the same heartaches and pains. Let us learn from our neighbours in Latin America. They were free from colonialism but had superimposed upon them British, Italian and German neo-colonialism which is not supplanted by American neo-colonialism.

5.20 p.m.

I have on several occasions in this House mentioned that at the best time of the post-war era the economic growth in Latin American countries was 2.4 per cent *per caput*. Today it is not a question of an increase; it is virtually zero. These countries

have been embraced by the West, but they cannot solve their social and economic problems. We on this side of the House say that this Government must, with meaning, translate what it says into practice. Let us trade with both East and West; accept aid from the East and from the West; do not allow our country to be used as a military base, or our borders to be used by a foreign power to dominate another country, as the Prime Minister puts it, while issues are being fought in the United Nations.

We saw when the British, French and Israeli attacked Egypt that 62 nations at the United Nations said it was wrong. There would have been great slaughter if the aggression had continued. A slaughter of a greater degree is now taking place in countries like Vietnam. Why are we silent on this? Are we afraid to talk? When are we going to get a proper policy from the Government? Four out of every five dollars on the Atkinson-Mackenzie Road will have to be spent in the U.S.A. on personnel, equipment and material, and some members of this Government have the gall to talk about Canadian aid with strings! How are we going to get out of this trap?

Fortunately, there is a thaw taking place in the Cold War in the United States. Let us hope that some of that cold wind will blow over the heads of our Ministers in Guyana. One of them should be sent to Portugal because he will never change. People, from their own experience, are speaking out today in the schools and in the universities

of America and asking for a change in the foreign policy of the U.S.A. Let us add our voice, however small it may be, for this will affect us in the end.

Writing about this same ideological thaw which is taking place in the U.S.A., Herbert Apthekar in an article called *Recent Developments*, said that in the U.S.A. there are talks about the wind of change in academic circles, student circles and so on. He referred to something which has some relevance to us. He quoted Professors W.K. Medlin and W.M. Cave.

"The transition of Uzbekistan from an overwhelmingly agrarian, technologically undeveloped society to a rapidly industrialising one with dynamic programmes for change must be classified as a major achievement of the Soviet system. To gain some perspective on the enormity of this accomplishment, one need look no further than those countries contiguous to the Uzbek Republic: Afghanistan and Iran. While they cannot be compared uncritically with Uzbek society, both have a great deal in common with Uzbekistan, particularly with regard to religious ideology, ethnic composition, and cultural history. Yet, for the most part, they remain comparatively backward societies with a high percentage of illiteracy and a persistent philosophical orientation toward the past. Conventional explanations (such as lack of economic investment and technical assistance, etc.)

[DR. JAGAN]

do not suffice, for both Iran and Afghanistan have been the recipients of huge sums of foreign capital. Still, pastoral economies and traditional social structures persist."

Iran was formerly called Persia, and that was one of the first victims of the Cold War. The Government was overthrown when it nationalised the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. An original investment of £5 million took out millions of pounds. Nationalisation of an enterprise is not within the concept of the Truman Doctrine. Reorientation of the economy of the country is not permissible in such foreign countries. You have these two things side by side: one society abandoning the Doctrine and going ahead, and another society continually looking to the past and remaining stagnant.

As nationalists and patriots we are concerned about our country. We will support what the Government does if it is good. For instance, we said openly that we would support the Government's "Buy Local Campaign". Of course, the Government's "Buy Local Campaign" is nothing more than our import-substitution policy which was adumbrated in the Kaldor Budget.

5.30 p.m.

It is a rose by a different name. We cannot be expected to support hypocrisy. It may be that the Government is ignorant of what is going on. I do not think this is so. There are many persons with brains on that side. Guya-

nese are perhaps among the most politically conscious people in the Third World countries.

If it is not due to ignorance, then it is clearly due to scheming and opportunism. But opportunism cannot help even the short-sighted leaders of our country in the long run because history is littered with the bones of puppets - Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Menderes in Turkey, Jimenez in Venezuela. Jimenez was the leader whose example Dulles said we should follow. He ran his country with an iron hand for ten years after the overthrow of the Betancourt Government, another victim of the Cold War in the 1930s.

We cannot support politics which are based on opportunism, on pragmatism, or what goes under the name of pragmatism today. We therefore will not, as we have done on certain occasions, abstain. This was not done, as the Prime Minister so crudely stated, because of cowardice, but because we have positions and because we know the force of propaganda. "Yes" or "No" does not always provide an answer to a question. On this occasion, however, we are categorical in our opposition to the foreign policy as enunciated by the Government. Rather than setting up offices, even the few that we have, and spending large sums of money, which we cannot afford, to produce nothing - because, in effect, this is what our foreign offices are doing - go cap in hand to the C.I.A. and let them offer you all the assistance! We don't have to pay for that. We can ill afford these expensive luxuries to do nothing.

If our Ambassadors in the U.N., in London, in Washington were selling British Guiana - [Interruptions.] - I would say "Yankee" Guyana, if you prefer. [Laughter.] Thousands of hard-earned dollars are now being used to prop up a foreign service, which in our context today is meaningless. So the Government might as well do as Switzerland does. Don't worry with embassies and foreign representation! Stay at home!

I believe in a vibrant foreign policy, based on anti-imperialism. That is why Felix was there in New York to adumbrate this position, but the Government rolled his head. We ask the Government in the interest of the Guyanese people, either to have a foreign policy which is dynamic, which is meaningful, or to abandon the farce of our showpieces such as "To Sir with Love". "Sir" is a good showpiece, I admit that, but showpieces don't build countries, as Arthur Lewis or anybody else will tell you. Get down to seeking a broad consensus in this country! Find out what the members of the Opposition want! Let us debate it. Let Guyanese debate it freely and frankly at all levels in our society, from the University down to the classroom and then let us decide, if necessary even by referendum, what road we should take. Then we will see Guyana moving forward. Until then we are opposed to this Motion and to the nonsense that goes under the name of Guyana's foreign policy. [Applause.]

**Dr. Jacob:** At long last we are debating the foreign policy of the Coalition Government. We

listened not so long ago to the very shallow and misleading comments of the coalition Prime Minister with respect to foreign policy. In my view, the debate now taking place could have been much more fruitful had the Government seen fit to present, prior to this debate, a White Paper on its foreign policy. I can well appreciate the reluctance of the Prime Minister to state in writing what is the foreign policy of the Government.

Apart from not having a foreign policy that deserves to be called a policy, the Coalition Government is afraid of a penetrating analysis of whatever it puts forward as its foreign policy. It is adopting the common tactic of rushing through this Motion, as it has rushed through many important Bills in this Assembly, with the suspension of Standing Orders and other devices of that nature.

The foreign policy of any state is exceedingly vital to the very existence of that state and to the progress and prosperity of its people. We all know that because of the foreign policy of the existing Coalition Government, the domestic policies are so framed that they militate against the interests of the masses, the Guyanese people.

That is why I lay so much emphasis on the need for a White Paper to have been presented. The so-called "policy statements" made by the coalition Prime Minister, even though there is merit in them, provide inadequate time for the members of the Opposition to consider them and reply to them. A White Paper, if it had been presented, would have af-

[DR. JACOB]

forded us an opportunity to study carefully the Government's foreign policy. Not only that, it would have provided the nation as a whole with a permanent record of the policy of the Government.

5.40 p.m.

I think it is most deplorable that an important matter such as this should be dealt with in this manner. We have been told by the Prime Minister that the coalition has shown a willingness to co-operate with all other nations which appear friendly to it. May I, without entering into a long discussion, ask this question: What about Venezuela? Has Venezuela shown a friendly attitude towards Guyana? There is close co-operation with the neighbouring State that wants to rob us of more than one-half of our territory.

In my contribution, I wish to spend some time dealing with the question of aid as it is affected by the foreign policy of the Government.

It is well known that, like all other underdeveloped countries, we have been victims of exploitation by the western or capitalist countries. It is characteristic of an economy such as ours that mass poverty is prevalent and, in Guyana as we all know, it is increasing because of domestic policies which are influenced by the foreign policy. Another characteristic is the backwardness, economically, of these so-called "ex-colonies". It is shameful, that on

the attainment of Independence, a Government which has been in office for a short time, should tailor its foreign policy to help maintain those very conditions against which some of the members of the Government voted in the past.

Despite all that the Prime Minister has said about seeking assistance from all the countries of the world, the facts as we know them are that no aid or, rather, no attempt at securing aid from countries which are in a position to help and have actually helped developing countries, has ever been made. In the international sphere there is great need, as there is in the domestic sphere in Guyana, for some kind of redistribution of wealth. Because of its foreign ties, no attempt has been made domestically by the coalition for this to take place. But there are states in the world which help developing countries like ours to bring about this redistribution to increase the welfare of the people as a whole, and also to bring about some international redistribution of wealth.

The policy of this Government makes no attempt to assist in creating this international redistribution. As a matter of fact, the policy which is being pursued by this "independent" Government is not different from that pursued by the imperialist power when she controlled foreign or external affairs. It is probably worse. When Britain controlled the external affairs of this country, she took steps to see that the exploitation that she perpetrated or carried on was not indulged in by her rivals.

In other words, we had to contend with one imperial exploiter. With Independence, however, there are several rival or competing capitalist countries that want to exploit us economically, and this is why our position is worse. All of these competing capitalist powers are headed by the United States of America.

Now, there are, really, only two alternatives facing an under-developed country with respect to its foreign policy. The country can either align itself with the capitalist or the western powers as they are called, or it can join the camp of the socialist countries. But, at the present time, there is the possibility of a developing country seeking to stay aloof. The Prime Minister attempted to explain, rather inconclusively, that his Government took the position of the so-called neutral countries, the non-aligned countries, but the Leader of the Opposition has exploded this myth which the Prime Minister tried to sell in this House, and there is no need, therefore, for me to dwell on that point. However, it must be stated that this attempt at assigning to itself a non-aligned policy does not convince even the most ardent supporters of the Government.

In 1964, just before the Election campaign, the P.P.P. declared that its policy with respect to foreign affairs would be based on peaceful co-existence with all countries in the world, regardless of their social or economic systems, and also that Guyana would refrain from getting itself involved in aggressive military pacts, and

that it would liquidate all foreign military bases in this territory. As we all know today, foreign military bases do exist in Guyana, and they will continue to exist as long as Guyana is run by the type of Government it has today.

5.50 p.m.

When a country decides to remain unaligned it can pursue an independent foreign policy and it can avoid entanglement. Indeed, it can be in the position of securing aid - financial and technical - from all sides, and it is also in the position of determining which kind of financial and technical assistance is best suited to its needs. It is therefore necessary, if you are genuinely non-aligned, to decide from which camp - the world is divided into two camps today: the imperialist camp and the socialist camp - you will try to secure aid.

Experience teaches all under-developed countries - and even those developed countries which are blinded or have been mis-educated but which know it and do not say it - that the two paths to development, to economic progress and to the elimination of poverty are the capitalist path and the socialist path. Experience also teaches us that the capitalist path which many poor countries have been forced to follow has resulted in greater mass poverty. We in Guyana know this. It also results in a flight of peasants, of people from the countryside, to the towns. This aggravates the social and economic problems in the towns and it leads to crime, vice and other evils.

[DR. JACOB]

It also, in a community like ours, aggravates racial tensions. Those are the results of following the capitalist path.

Let us now take a look at the results of following the socialist path. First of all, there can be central planning of the economy. You can have - and you must have it if you want to progress - increased co-operation in agriculture as well as modernisation of agriculture. The co-operation that is possible among countries that follow this path would assist in the promotion and development of public enterprise. When any country stimulates public enterprise, that is the surest way, the best means, of ensuring that the results, the fruits of the economic development that takes place in the territory is equitably - I repeat - equitably distributed among the mass of the people of the country, and the proper object of any good Government is to raise the living standards of the masses, the working class, in the community.

It can also engender co-operation between public and private enterprise. Ultimately, the socialist path will lead to the establishment of an economy in which the public, all of the people, own, control and operate the means of livelihood in the country, the means of exchange and the means of distribution. As the Prime Minister pointed out, when this happens, when this ideal state is achieved, then and only then will exploitation of man by man cease and will exploitation of nation by nation end. Those are the two main roads.

I say that the Government's policy is one of total and absolute commitment to the imperialist powers headed by the United States; and it is as a result of this policy that all the domestic policies of this Government - fiscal, monetary and economic - have been tailored to promote the interests of a small handful, both local and foreign, and to place harsh, unconscionable burdens on the people who really need assistance, the masses of Guyana.

Much talk has been heard about development aid from the so-called "free world", from the imperialist countries, but the experience of all developing countries is that this aid was not meant to help these unfortunate territories to conquer the backwardness and poverty imposed upon them by the same people who said they were assisting them. It was meant to benefit the local and foreign owners of property in the territories. This is done in various ways. All kinds of strings and conditions are attached and, apart from promoting the so-called Truman Doctrine, this aid is also given to help protect and to perpetuate Governments that have become unpopular with the masses.

Any foreign policy which seeks to align our country with the West will help to strengthen the colonial and neo-colonial structures that exist in the country and to keep the country perpetually dependent upon the lenders and the donors. Already, because of this Government's foreign policy, much of our recently achieved national sovereignty has been sacrificed. And one has only to look at the character of the so-called 7-year

Development Programme, which was recently discussed in this Chamber, to see the hand of the donors clearly visible in all of the development projects that are supposed to be implemented under that Programme.

6 p.m.

I know, and the Coalition Government knows it too, that disillusionment is rife among its supporters, and that is an additional reason for proceeding with this matter in this manner, so as to prevent further fury that will be generated if the masses, or that section of the masses which supports this Government, realise that the foreign policy being pursued is leading us to ruin.

Perhaps I had better, for the benefit of the Prime Minister and his colleagues, state very briefly the further benefits to accrue to underdeveloped countries that are not aligning themselves with the imperialist powers as our country has done. If this Government were non-aligned, it would not be pressurised as it is, regardless of what the Prime Minister said with respect to the O.A.S. The Prime Minister of this Coalition Government says that no pressure is being brought on his Government to join the O.A.S. [The Prime Minister: "I never said that; I said we cannot join."] He will consider the question and, like Dr. Eric Williams, he will join the O.A.S. We know that immediately after the difficulties with Venezuela are removed he will have to toe the line and follow the dictates of the U.S.A.

If this Government's policy was really one of non-alignment,

it would be in a position to reject the proposals being made to it to enter this military alliance; and, furthermore, the expenditure which would be incurred to maintain membership is something which we can hardly afford. It is well for me to inform the House and the nation about the nature of the Organisation of American States. I believe that it was set up in 1948 at Bogota in Colombia. The United States has now taken hold of this organisation, and most of the 500 people or officials in the Organisation of American States are either North Americans or citizens of the U.S.A. and Canada. This organisation has recently become a military organisation, and it has been used by the U.S.A. as a cover for aggression in the Dominican Republic.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member's time has expired.

**The Prime Minister:** Let him proceed.

**Dr. Jacob:** I was saying that the organisation has been turned into a military outfit. Of course, like other creatures of the U.S.A., one hears of the lofty aims and objects of the O.A.S., namely, to see that peace and justice exist in member countries, but these lofty aims are merely the fig-leaves behind which the U.S.A.'s economic business policy operates in Latin America to discourage the development of public enterprise and to subvert the national liberation struggle in the Latin American colonies of the U.S.A. That is the type of organisation, I predict, that the Coalition Government will join at

[DR. JACOB]

the U.S.A.'s dictation, after it has carefully considered the pros and cons of membership. I make this prediction, confident that the Prime Minister will abide by their dictates.

It would be useful for us to get into the records of this House and also for the benefit of others, if I state briefly the conditions that would be acceptable to the Opposition (PPP) with respect to the receipt of aid from either the East or the West, or the North or the South. [The Prime Minister: "Why did Dr. Jagan go to Washington?"]

6.10 p.m.

We believe that economic aid should not be tied with strings of any sort, be they military, political or economic. We also feel that aid should be long term and either interest-free or at very low rates of interest. In addition, there should be a moratorium, a period during which no repayment of principal and no payment of interest should take place, because one of the heaviest burdens borne by underdeveloped countries stems from high interest rates charged by the capitalist countries for aid.

Also, and this is very important, we feel that the aid should be on a multilateral, rather than bilateral, basis. That means it should be dispensed by organisations; it should be provided through international institutions rather than by individual countries. In this way there is less likelihood of strings being attached to the

aid. There are financial institutions existing that can provide this type of aid.

We feel there should be economic agreements between the lenders and the receiving countries so that scarce foreign exchange can be conserved and so that plant and machinery required for capital works can be secured from the best sources, that is, at the lowest prices. We know, from experience, that one of the strings attached to economic aid from the capitalist countries is that the aided country must purchase equipment, whether it needs it or not, whether appropriate for the purpose for which it is acquired or not. These economic agreements would do something toward overcoming this difficulty.

We also think that when aid is received from foreign countries to build enterprises, the enterprises, on completion of their construction, should become the property of the recipient countries and of the lending countries, so that together they may share in any profit which the enterprises might make.

In ways such as these we can overcome our backwardness and poverty. The kind of policy uttered not so long ago, which ties us to these countries and which would do nothing to change the pattern of development aid, is not going to help.

Let me continue. The credits received should be accompanied by technical assistance which would result in the aid being efficiently used and there should also be arrangements for the

education and training of personnel in the recipient country, so that on completion of the projects which would be owned by the people of the country, there would be no need to import expatriate personnel to man, operate and maintain them.

We feel that no aid should be accepted - [Interruptions.]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order!

**Dr. Jacob:** This Government is accepting aid merely to extend foreign private ownership in the country. Past history - and the Government knows this - has demonstrated that this kind of assistance does not help. We say it should not be accepted. It is meant, also, to spur the sales of goods made in the donor countries. This is exactly what the United States foreign assistance is meant to do.

I recall reading, not very long ago, in one of the mouth-pieces of American big business, the *U.S. News and World Report* that American aid was not meant to help developing countries, but was really a subsidy to American big business. All imperialist powers operate in accordance with this philosophy.

Finally, if we are not to remain tied to the West, financial and technical aid should be for the purpose of strengthening the public sector of the economy. These conditions are what the People's Progressive Party and the Opposition, in this Assembly would wholeheartedly support. I have heard nothing uttered by the Prime Minister which would make me believe that the foreign

policy of the Government is aimed at creating conditions such as these.

A lot has been said about our great benefactors in North America. I think it is high time that this myth be exploded. We would advise the Government that if it is really interested in the masses, if it sincerely wishes to alleviate mass poverty and suffering in Guyana, its policy should be genuinely one of non-alignment. The record of the Government clearly indicates that the policy is not one of non-alignment.

6.20 p.m.

Perhaps the same person who is laughing will refute what we have said when he gets up to reply. I would call this policy "puppetry". This is the policy of puppets who have no say in the running of the affairs of this country. One would have thought that, with political independence, some attempt would have been made to change the old colonial pattern. Instead of that, the country has degenerated into a worse form of rule, neo-colonialism.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** You have another minute.

**Dr. Jacob:** Since it is clear that the guillotine will be used, I conclude by saying that the Government ought to be true to the people of this country, and particularly to that segment of the people who supported it recently. It should adopt measures which would prove to the Guyanese people and to the world that it is not a willing tool, a dirty

[DR. JACOB]

instrument of the United States of America which seeks to perpetuate its policy of exploitation and enslavement of the people of Latin America.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Time.

**Mr. Luck:** It was my clear understanding that the speaker to follow the hon. Dr. Jacob was the Attorney-General and Minister of State. Here, again, we have a deliberate breach of agreement which one could describe as ungentlemanly. But that is just in passing.

The foreign policy of any country, as was rightly remarked by the hon. Prime Minister, is a matter of great difficulty, particularly for small countries. I agree entirely with his approach to this matter that the self-interest of our country should be the paramount consideration in drawing up both the strategy and tactics of our foreign policy. It could have escaped no one that the big powers in this world pursue policies based largely on their own self-interest. But I want to believe that all the great principles we heard about, have, in their origin - in view of the disorder prevailing in the Gallery, perhaps it would be a good time to take the Adjournment.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** You continue.

**Mr. Luck:** I was saying that the origin of the highest principles seems to lie in the self-interest of somebody or some class or nation. Therefore, there is nothing wrong with this

Government seeking to found its policy on the basis of self-interest. But wherein does our interest lie? In my submission, our first interest lies in the maintenance of the sovereignty of small states, the independence of small states, and we should seek to align ourselves with all those small countries in the world which are fighting to maintain their sovereignty and their national independence.

It is surprisingly strange that the extraordinary travails of the Vietnamese people should have passed unnoticed by Guyana which has so lately been under imperial bondage. The great Vietnamese people are today waging a war of unprecedented heroism and gallantry, and in the eyes of all thinking people, their struggle elevates to a new level the sacredness and concept of human freedom. While bombs rain on the Vietnamese people, this Government stays silent. I wish, at this point, to say that I do not urge this Government, nor do I urge in my party that we should undertake an anti-American crusade, but if an individual in a country is constrained to remain silent in the face of intolerable wrong, such a policy would not be defended by any moralist, and so it is with nations.

Today, the most intolerable wrong is being done to the Vietnamese people. Nobody over there [indicating Government Benches] can name a single conflict in which the aggressor is so clearly identified. The wrongs they are doing in Vietnam are heinous wrongs. The barbarity being practised on the Viet-

namese people exceeds all the known barbarities since history started. Not even Hitler has been guilty of the abominations which the Americans practise against the Vietnamese people, and this Government, composed and led by the people who have felt whips and scorns of the oppressors have remained silent. The anger of the Americans is today a terrible thing. They destroy Governments, they destroy people simply because they dare to say what is right, and indeed, the worthy President of the United States has been reported in *Time*,

that American propaganda magazine, as having threatened the brother of the late President Kennedy with political extinction if he dares to utter any criticism of the murderous policies of the American Government, in Vietnam.

#### ADJOURNMENT

*Resolved*, "That this Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, 21st March, 1967, at 2.00 p.m." [Mr. Bissember.]

*Adjourned accordingly at* 1.30 p.m.