

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
OFFICIAL REPORT
[VOLUME 7]**

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

182nd Sitting

2 p.m.

Thursday, 22nd March, 1979

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (63)

Speaker

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

Members of the Government – People’s National Congress (46)

Prime Minister (1)

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

Deputy Prime Minister (1)

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

Senior Ministers (12)

Cde. H.D. Hoyte, S.C.,
Minister of Economic Development and Co-operatives

Cde. S.S. Naraine, A.A.,
Minister of Works and Transport

Cde. B. Ramsaroop,
Minister of Parliamentary Affairs
and Leader of the House

Cde. C.V. Mingo,
Minister of Home Affairs

*Cde. H. Green (Absent)
Minister of Health, Housing and Labour

*Cde. H.O. Jack, (Absent)
Minister of Energy and Natural Resources

*Cde. F.E. Hope, (Absent)
Minister of Finance

*Cde. G.B. Kennard, C.C.H., (Absent)
Minister of Agriculture

*Cde. M. Shahabuddeen, C.C.H.,
Attorney General and Minister of Justice

*Cde. V.R. Teekah,
Minister of Education, Social Development and Culture

*Cde. R.E. Jackson (Absent)
Minister of Foreign Affairs

*Cde. J.A. Tyndall, A.A., (Absent-on leave)
Minister of Trade and Consumer Protection

Ministers (2)

Cde. O.E. Clarke
Minister – Regional (East Berbice/ Corentyne)

Cde. C.A. Nascimento (Absent – on leave)
Minister, Office of the Prime Minister

Ministers of State (10)

Cde. F.U.A. Carmichael,
Minister of State – Regional (Rupununi)

Cde. P. Duncan, J.P.,
Minister of State, Ministry of
Economic Development and Co-operatives

***Non-elected Ministers**

Cde. K.B. Bancroft, J.P.,
Minister of State – Regional (Mazaruni/ Potaro)

Cde. J.P. Chowritmootoo, J.P.,
Minister of State – Regional (Essequibo Coast/ West Demerara)

Cde. J.R. Thomas
Minister of State, Office of the Prime Minister

Cde. R.H.O. Corbin,
Minister of State, Ministry of National Development

Cde. S. Prashad,
Minister of State – Regional (East Demerara/ West Coast Berbice)

Cde. R.C. Van Sluytman,
Minister of State, Ministry of Agriculture

Cde. L.A. Durant,
Minister of State – Regional (North West)

*Cde. F.U.A. Campbell,
Minister of State for Information, Ministry of National Development

Parliamentary Secretaries (5)

Cde. M.M. Ackman, C.C.H.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister and Government Chief Whip

Cde. E.L. Ambrose,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture

Non - elected Ministers

Cde. M. Corrica,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Education, Social Development and Culture

Cde. E.M. Bynoe,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Trade and Consumer Protection

Cde. C.E. Wrights, J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Economic Development and Co-operatives

***Non-elected Ministers**

Other Members (15)

Cde. W.G. Carrington, C.C.H
Cde. S.M. Field-Ridley
Cde. E.H.A Fowler (Absent – on leave)
Cde. J. Gill
Cde. W. Hussain (Absent)
Cde. K.M.E Jones
Cde. J.G.Ramson
Cde. P.A. Rayman
Cde. A. Salim
Cde. E.M. Stoby, J.P (Absent – on leave)
Cde. S.H. Sukhu, M.S. (Absent)
Cde. C.A. Sukul, J.P.
Cde. H.A. Taylor
Cde. L.E. Willems
Cde. M. Zaheeruddeen

Members of the Opposition (16)

People’s Progressive Party (14)

Leader of the Opposition (1)

Cde. C. Jagan
Leader of the Opposition (Absent)

Deputy Speaker (1)

Cde. Ram Karran,
Deputy Speaker

Other Members (12)

Cde. J. Jagan (Absent)
Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud, J.P. Opposition Chief Whip
Cde. Narbada Persaud
Cde. C. Collymore
Cde. S.F. Mohamed
Cde. I. Basir (Absent)
Cde. C. C. Belgrave (Absent)
Cde. R. Ally (Absent)
Cde. Dalchand, J.P
Cde. Dindayal
Cde. H. Nokta
Cde. P. Sukhai (Absent)

(ii) Liberator Party (2)

Mr. M.F. Singh, J.P

Mr. M.A. Abraham

(Absent – on leave)

OFFICERS

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

Acting Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly – A. Knight

22.3.79

National Assembly

2:15 – 2:20 p.m.

PRAYERS

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Leave to Members

The Speaker: Leave has been granted to the Hon. Member Mr. Feilden Singh for today's sitting. Yesterday I made an admonition in respect of the **Mirror**. I want it to be clearly understood that it applies to all newspapers, if they report incorrectly any statement made against any member of this House, and it is brought to my attention. It is not applicable only to the **Mirror**, but in respect of all newspapers and the radio.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

NOTICE

APPROVAL OF ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE 1979

Assembly resolved itself into Committee of Supply to resume consideration of the estimates of expenditure for the financial year 1979.

Assembly in committee of Supply

The Chairman: We will commence consideration of the 83 Heads and the 21 Divisions of the Estimates of Expenditure for 1979. Today we will deal with those Heads and Division which are under the responsibility of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Development, and the Minister of Economic Development and Co-operatives. Lets us now turn to pages 16 and 17.

HEAD 1 – OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$199,404 for Head 1, Office of the President, stand part of the Estimates.

2:20 p.m.

The Prime Minister: Cde. Chairman, I crave your indulgence to move an amendment to this Head to provide for inclusion of a provision for the purchase of medals in connection with national honours.

Previously, this item appeared under the Head 21, Ministry of Home Affairs, and in fact on page 49, on which that Head is found, there is a legend noting that the item is transferred to Head 1, President. Unfortunately, the transfer has not been made in the book of Estimates and I would hope to be able to make the necessary correction, therefore, I seek your leave under Standing Order No. 83 to move that Standing Order No. 66 (1) be suspended to enable the amendment to be taken at this time.

The Chairman: Leave is granted.

Suspension of Standing Order

The Prime Minister: I now move that Standing Order No. 66 (1) be suspended.

Question put, and agreed to.

Standing Order No. 66 (1) suspended

The Prime Minister: May I intimate that I have the consent of the Cabinet to move in this particular item. It is to effect that a new subhead 16, to wit, National Honours, with a provision of \$46,540, be inserted. That will then bring the total provision up to \$245,943.

Question -

That Head 1, be increased to \$245,943.

put and agreed to.

The Chairman: Those who would like to speak on Head 1, pages 16 and 17, kindly indicate.

Head 1, Office of the President - \$245,943 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 26.

Head 7 – PUBLIC AND POLICE SERVICE COMMISSIONS

Question proposed that a sum of \$812,909 for Head 7, public and Police Service commissions, stand part of the Estimates.

Cde. N. Persaud: It is noted that in 1979 the establishment provides for the same number of persons to be employed.

The Prime Minister: Is this the only speaker?

The Chairman: Yes

Cde. Ram Karran (The Deputy Speaker): Cde. Chairman, I cannot see the relevance of that question.

The Prime Minister: You are not Speaker yet. Cde. Chairman, it is not for him to rule. It is not for him to see relevance. If he wants to raise a point of order, let him raise a point of order.

Cde. Ram Karran: Every member has a right to raise a question.

The Prime Minister: I asked if that was the only speaker. This is not Bel Air.

The Chairman: Comrades, kindly let us proceed with the matter. What do you wish to ask Cde. Ram Karran.

Cde. Ram Karran: I am saying that hon. Prime Minister has no right to limit the number of question on the side of the House. That is what he seeks to do.

The Chairman: He cannot do that. I shall do it, if it is necessary.

The Prime Minister: I was not attempting to do that. I asked if he was the only speaker so that I can make notes.

Cde. Ram Karran: Cde. Chairman, -----

The Prime Minister: Don't sit down and address the Speaker.

The Chairman: The matter is closed. I have already indicated that. Are there any other speakers on page 26?

Cde. Ram Karran: There might very well be other speakers, sir.

Cde. N. Persaud: I was saying that the establishment provides for the same number of persons from 1977 right on to this year. From experience in the Public accounts Committee, there have been a number of problems with regard to staffing. I am going to deal with them under the relevant Heads. I am speaking about the Public Service Commission not the Police Service commission since the Public Service Commission, as I understand it, is the body that is responsible for the recruitment, the appointment and the promotion of civil servants. For example, I see at item (6) that whereas 18 persons were provided for on the establishment and the sum approved in 1978 was \$107,926, only \$36,949 is shown in the Revised Estimates column. To my mind, that is clear indication that this department is understaffed.

My point is that this department is the department which has to deal with the recruitment, appointment and promotion of Public Servants within the whole Public Service and if this department is understaffed then one can very well understand what is taking place in the other Ministries. It has been brought to my attention that applications that have been received by the Public service Commission have been lying there for more than one year. More than one year ago there were advertisements in the newspapers inviting applications for certain categories of Civil Servants. Applications were received. The point is that now, one year after, those applicants have not been interviewed. They have not yet been written to. I want to know whether it is a shortage of staff in the Public Service Commission itself that is causing this delay.

If that is so, then I ask the honourable Prime Minister to use his good offices. I know that the Public Service Commission is an independent body but I ask him to use his good offices because the whole Public Sector is suffering because of the lack of personnel and, more so, trained personnel.

The Chairman: Are there any other speakers in respect of page 26? Cde. Prime Minister.

2:30 p.m.

The Prime Minister: Cde. Chairman, at one time we hear the Opposition claiming that the Government is increasing the bureaucracy and at another time we hear that the bureaucracy is understaffed. That, of course, is the privilege of the irresponsible opposition. Cde. Chairman, if one read correctly, one would have noticed that subhead 1, item (6) is referred to Administrative Assistant (In-Training)/ Administrative Cadet. Now, these persons, if and when recruited, do not man the Public Service Commission. This is the sort of global Head under which persons are trained, who are taken in as Cadets or Administrative Assistants, who give an indication of being fliers. One cannot necessarily anticipate how many of these there would be in any given year and consequently *ex abundanti cautela* the vote is put at over \$100,000 then there is careful selection of the would-be fliers. That is why we put last year's \$107,926, only \$26,949 was expended, and we don't know what it is likely to be this year.

Head 7, Public and Police Service Commission - \$812,909 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Pages 30 and 31

Head 10, Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

Question proposed that the sum of \$1,402,510 for Head 10, Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Cde. Collymore.

Cde. Collymore: Cde. Chairman, I would like to speak on page 31, subhead 16, scheme for Remigration of Guyanese. When we look at the figures we note that there seems to be ---

Cde. Ram Karran: I would like to raise a question on page 30.

The Chairman: Very well, Cde. Ram Karran.

Cde. Collymore: When we look at the figures, we notice that there seems to be great reluctance by Guyanese who are overseas to return to this country and this is a source of severe and deep concern to us on the opposite side. For instance, when we pursue the Estimate we note that in 1976, Government spent \$397.5 to get Guyanese to return to Guyana. The actual sum spent in 1977 was \$200, 000. There was a reduction in 1978; this Parliament approved \$200,000 but then we spent only \$28,727. This tremendous drop shows that more and more Guyanese who are overseas are showing great reluctance to return and for this year, our optimism is rising again and we are putting aside \$150,000.

On previous occasions when I had to speak on this particular subhead, I asked the Prime Minister to say how many Guyanese have returned. On this occasion, I don't think that question would be relevant, because it seems that the exodus is increasing and we are very concerned about it, quite honestly speaking. We are aware that many of our skills, our youths, our entrepreneurs, are leaving the country and in order to replace this deficit we have to embark on accelerated training schemes. So the economy is freezing. In other words, we are suffering a tremendous net loss of personnel and skills and we are very concerned about it. We would like to ask the Prime Minister if he can intimate what Government is doing, because we would like to know exactly why these Guyanese are so reluctant to return to their country.

We have to point out at this junction, that many students who are overseas and who have studied on Government grants are not coming back to Guyana. They prefer to repay Government the money. This again is an area where the economy is suffering. We want our Guyanese to "decelerate" the exodus. No doubt, something is happening in the economy which generates this tremendous flight of personnel and we would like to ask the Prime Minister if he can indicate in

what areas the Government is embarking to encourage Guyanese to stay in Guyana, and to return, and to encourage students studying overseas to come back and take up positions.

I would also like to ask the Prime Minister to indicate, seeing we are voicing our concern, in what fields, or in what areas, we, on this side of the House, could be of assistance in getting these Guyanese to remain in Guyana and students overseas, who are reluctant, to return to this country.

The Chairman: Cde. Ram Karran

Cde. Ram Karran: I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister will give us some indication of the status of the Guyana Youth Corps.

The Chairman: Could you please let me know on what you are talking, item and page.

Cde. Ram Karran: Page 30. The items range from item (21) right down to the end of page 30. We notice that the charge of \$1 has been listed against these items for 1978 and 1979. Is that organization still in existence? If it is in existence, how is it proposed to pay the persons who belong to it?

The Chairman: Cde. Prime Minister

The Prime Minister: Cde. Chairman, the Guyana Youth Corps has been absorbed into the Guyana National Service. This is the seventh time I am giving this answer – I never thought that I was being paid to run a kindergarten school. As I was saying, it has been absorbed by the Guyana National Service, legislation with respect to which will be before this House immediately as the Budget is over and these posts are merely put in here under the rules so as to retain for the persons holding them now, over in Guyana National Service, their pension ability. The next time I may not be a patient as this.

So far as Cde. Collymore's observations are concerned, I supposed it is not for me to doubt the sincerity of his last alleged concern but I do not accept it. I, however, would answer his last question: how could the Opposition help. The Opposition could help by putting an end to

22.3.79

National Assembly

2:30 – 2:40 p.m.

the filthy lies which it carts overseas.

Head 10, Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet - \$1,402,510 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimate.

The Chairman: Page 32

HEAD 11- PRIME MINISTER

GUYANA DEFENCE FORCE

Question proposed that the sum of \$39,500,000 for Head 11 Guyana Defence Force stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Cde. Collymore.

2:40 p.m.

Cde. Collymore: In the general debate on the Budget, we had intimated that the military establishment is too lavishly supplied by State funds for the well-being of this country. We had intimated that perhaps if the Government can revamp its Foreign Ministry, the qualitative output of the foreign Ministry, there would be less need to have such a tremendous military expenditure which we conclude is to the detriment of social services.

The Chairman: I just want to ask for my own information, if you are also the chief spokesman for foreign affairs for your party.

Cde. Collymore: No. Yes, Cde. Chairman, we note that military spending is very heavy, that it peaked in 1976 at \$102 million and it is now to be \$52.9 million. In 1977, it was \$55.7 million and in 1978, it was \$54 million. We are of the view that much of this money could be scaled down if certain austerities are carried out by the Government. They are carrying out austerities elsewhere and we are saying no meaningful austerity is being carried out in the military establishment. When we analyse the figures on this page, page 32, we note that Personal Emoluments which were approved in 1978 at \$24.6 million were revised at \$26 million. The

Government spent \$1.4 million more. For 1977, these Personal Emoluments will be \$26.9 million. This seems to indicate to us that there is going to be an increase in ranks and that there was an increase in ranks in 1978. In our contribution in the general debate we intimated that military ranks should be scaled down. We are therefore asking the Prime Minister if he would consider scaling down military ranks in view of the economic stringencies which are now current.

Dealing with Other Charges, we note that this National Assembly approved in 1978, \$11.6 million and these Other Charges were revised upwards by the end of the year to \$17.1 million. In other words, the Government expended \$5.5 million more. We are concluding that these heavy sums went to buy guns. This is why we are saying that there seems to be more solicitude for guns than for butter and our friends on the opposite side do not seem to appreciate this observation. We note also that for 1979, Other Charges are going to be \$14.6 million. More guns again. We are of opinion that our friends on the opposite side may be preparing for war and this is why we have said in the general debate that there should be a qualitative output from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because this would have an impact on the defence requirements.

In order to refresh the memories of our friends on the opposite side, we are asking the Prime Minister to consider certain suggestions for austerities in the military establishment. We are asking that purchase of equipment be frozen. We are also asking that the Guyana People's Militia be democratised. In other words, let it function on a community basis in the various districts, with maximum participation by the people in the various areas. We have made these points over and over again and as long as these things are not being met we will continue to raise them. We are asking that the G.N.S, which is an integral part of the military establishment be demilitarized. We note that the Government is spending a lot of money on the Guyana National Service and we know from figures and facts that a lot of these funds go towards the military aspect of National Service. We are asking therefore that the Militia be used as a recruitment source for the professional army, the G.D.F., and not the National Service and the Government can save a lot of money by demilitarising this force.

When we compare the G.N.S. expenditure with the capital expenditure of the military professionals, we note a significant disparity. For instance, in 1977, the G.N.S. used up \$14.1 million out of the Army's budget and at the same time the capital expenditure of the Army was \$8.7 million. In 1978, the G.N.S. consumed \$10.5 million whereas the military used up only \$0.9 million in capital expenditure. For this year, we are giving the G.N.S. \$13.4 million and the G.D.F. is getting \$1 million in capital expenditure. We feel that this is a disparity which seems to indicate an emphasis by the Government on the G.N.S. rather than on the Guyana Defence Force. We are calling for all the military aspects of the G.N.S to be removed.

We note also that a lot of expenses are being incurred at the G.N.S. training camps and we will urge the Prime Minister who is responsible for these activities to look into the possibility of closing down some of these training camps strictly pertaining to the G.N.S. We will ask the Prime Minister to consider whether it is not necessary in view of economic stringencies to economise on further charges.

The Prime Minister: Cde. Chairman, I got lost.

Head 11, Prime Minister – Guyana Defence Force - \$39,500,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 199.

DIVISION V – PRIME MINISTER

Question proposed that the sum of \$15,345,000 for Division V, Prime Minister, stand part of the Estimates.

Cde. Collymore: Subhead 4, National Service. If the hon. Prime Minister had given a more expansive answer, I would have been the most surprised person in this honourable House. Under the G.N.S. capital expenditure, under the Ministry of Defence, we have been making the point over and over again that the G.N.S. is a Cadillac- style operation in a bicycle economy. What are the figures? From 1974 to 1979 we have \$97.3 million in six years. In 1974, it was \$6.4

22.3.79

National Assembly

2:40 – 2:50 p.m.

million, 1975, \$30.5 million, 1976, \$22.5 million, 1977, \$14.1 million, 1978, \$10.5 million and in 1979, they are going to spend \$13.4 million, an aggregation of \$97.3 million in these years.

2:50 p.m.

When we carry out a further analysis of the figures, what do we find? We find that revenue over the years from G.N.S. aggregated to only \$4.2 million. So, if between 1974 and 1979 we spent \$97.3 million and received only \$4.2 million in return, we have made a deficit in the National Service of \$93.1 million. That is why we are saying that this organisation is a military one. In other words, revenue was only 4.4 % of the expenditure on the Guyana National Service.

Last year. We spent \$10.6 million and we earned \$2.6 million. The deficit is \$7.9 million and if we take into consideration what is reported here in the Government's newspaper by the Director-General of the National Service, Norman McLean, we see that there is much to be done because he admits that National Service is inefficient and says that there will be efforts to make it efficient in 1979, efforts to cost account many of the activities so that they may be able to break even or show a higher revenue. We do not expect the National Service to make profits because there are certain redeeming features in it and that is why we are calling for the losses to be minimised by the Government removing the military aspect of the institution.

When we look at the figures for National Service over the two previous years we note that the bureaucracy in 1977 took up 45.5 per cent of its budget. In 1978 it increased to 68.7 per cent. How much it is today we do not know, but in the same period of two years the agriculture sector, which the Government is emphasising so much in the mass media, took up 5.4 per cent of the budget in 1977, which is equal to \$800,000, believe it or not, and in 1978 it was 5 per cent of the budget, \$400,000, half of the expenditure of the previous year. When we take into consideration these enormous expenditures and how much actually goes into agriculture, which is being emphasised by the Government, we come to the conclusion that the real purpose is militarisation. That is why we are concerned about it and ask the Government to consider

demilitarising the Guyana National Service.

Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud: I have a point for clarification. In the same **Sunday Chronicle** of March 18, 1979, there is a report which states that the Guyana National Service earned \$2.6 million but the details are not given. It stated that the amount of \$985,000 in cash was paid in to the Treasury. The Estimates reflect revenue of \$750,000 and not \$985,000. Of course, the newspaper report could be wrong. The Prime Minister might be willing to clarify.

The Prime Minister: As I understand it, the Director-General when speaking was giving revenue to the time that he was speaking, whereas the Estimates are supposed to be estimates of what it would be on 31st December. That might account for the discrepancy.

So far as Cde. Collymore's general debate is concerned, I am reminded of the Shakespearian character Jacques in "As you like it." "He who knows not and knows not that he knows not is a fool. Shun him."

Division V, Prime Minister - \$15,345,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF PUBLIC CORPORATIONS

Question proposed that the sum of \$17,793 for Head 14, Ministry of Public Corporation, stand part of the Estimates.

Head 14, Ministry of Public Corporations - \$17,793 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

HEAD 15 – PUBLIC SERVICE MINISTRY

Question proposed that the sum of \$1,736,172 for Head 15, Public Service Ministry, stand part of the Estimates.

Head 15, Public Service Ministry - \$1,736,172 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

DIVISION VIII – PUBLIC SERVICE MINISTRY

Question proposed that the sum of \$12,493,000 for Division VIII, Public Service Ministry, stand part of the Estimates.

Cde. Narbada Persaud: I note that the legend against subhead 1, Scholarships and Training Courses – Foreign, on this page states ‘To provide for scholarships and training Courses’. The sum of \$1.4 million was approved last year. If I read the Estimates correctly, nothing was spent from this sum of money during the year. Perhaps the Prime Minister will be in a position to say whether I have read it correctly and, if so, I should like to ask him why. The emphasis in any developing country would be on training as many persons as possible, more so when the brain drain is a general phenomenon. In Guyana, for many reasons, the brain drain is getting more and more acute year after year.

Subhead 4, Public Sector Manpower Training, shows that the sum of \$2,327 million was approved for 1978 and only \$82,040 was spent. This is a very negligible sum in relation to the amount approved. The legend against this subhead in 1978 is the same as the legend appears in these estimates. I read it: ‘‘To provide for a Public Sector manpower training programme. USAID Loan.’’

3 p.m.

May I ask the Cde. Prime Minister to inform the House what really is the position with regard to the Public Sector manpower training programme, whether it has been started or not? If it has not been started, then Cde. Prime Minister would be in a position to say on what the sum of \$82,040 was spent last year. I notice, Cde. Chairman, that again we have a very large sum, \$1,451 million, provided for the same subhead for 1979. In all, we note the sum of \$12,493 million allocated for the year 1979 for training, but I did not take the opportunity to raise the number of vacancies when we were dealing with the current expenditure. I am sure that the Permanent Secretary for this Public Service Ministry knows only too well the difficulties he has. There are a number of vacancies existing in the Public Service Ministry and my remarks as

regards the Public Service Commission are more or less relevant also to the Public service Ministry in that they are responsible to look into the needs as far as staffing of the various Ministries is concerned.

This particular Ministry which is given that particular job is also understaffed and I want to put the responsibility for the various shortages in the various Ministries to some extent, on the Public Service Ministry, to defend to some extent, because the Public Service Ministry is not in a position to cope with the heavy demand because of the heavy outflow, the heavy brain drain.

May I ask the hon. Prime Ministries to inform us on this programme that he has here where it is anticipated that \$12.493 million will be spent for this year as against the Revised Estimate of \$7.12 million for last year more or less an increase of \$5 million, whether he feels that this will really take care of this great outflow of professional, skilled and even unskilled people that we have in the Public Service Ministry.

The Chairman: Cde. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister: Cde. Chairman, I am reminded, when I hear my good friend, that he has been promoted to the high estate of being a citizen of Kitty. It was my sponsorship. He blames the P.S.M. but then doesn't so much blame the P.S.M. I think the learned Attorney General will agree with me that in law there is the maxim that you cannot approbate and reprobate. He had better make up his mind what he will do. I must congratulate my good friend Cde. Narbada upon his manoeuvres with the figure and on the face of it he sounds impressive, but only on the face.

Now, with respect to subhead 4, Public Sector Manpower Training, there was put in there in 1978, the total of anticipated receipts from a U.S.A.I.D. loan for manpower training. The minutiae have to be settled. There are some emphases that we prefer and there were other emphases that we rejected. Finally, agreement was reached and, in any case, the programme was to be phased so that the first phasing began in 1978 and only \$82,040 was spent. It is hoped and expected that \$1.451 will be spent this year and if one looks that is still below the final total. The

sum appears in a lump sum but there is phasing over a period of three years.

Now, I should in fairness to the House ask leave to make a slight correction to the legend on subhead 6, where this legend reads, “To provide for the Management Seminar Training Programme U.S.A.I.D. loan”. It should be, “To provide for the Management Training Programme under C.I.D.A grant.”

Now, we hear – and I feel disposed to enter into some dialogue with my friend Cde. Narbada – Cde. Narbada saying that so many people have fled, so many people are leaving. Of course, but you know, Cde. Chairman, I have had a discussion with Cde. Narbada’s leader who remarked that millions of people leave various countries where revolution has taken place, where change has taken place. His leader was telling me that once he was travelling in a plane with Rene Dumont, once the blue-eyed pet of the P.P.P., and in their conversation Dumont had said it was a terrible thing that one million Cubans were leaving. Whenever we sit down and speak about these things, we can always appreciate why other people leave other places. You know, there is a legendary character called Oedipus who killed his father and married his mother. Most people think that the significance of the Oedipus complex is to love one’s mother. I think there is another part to it. It is a man who carries congenitally, maybe sometimes suppressed, maybe not suppressed, a patricidal emotion. This is what we find in the P.P.P. If people left the Soviet Union because they don’t like Communism, they are terrible people, they are reactionaries; if they leave Cuba, my God they should be shot. If they leave Guyana, it is because of the Guyanese Government.

We so frequently find that the P.P.P. wants it both ways and therefore if carrying forward certain radical changes, certain revolutionary changes, some people who are accustomed to the old order flee, we are told it is because of the terrible Government. But if the same thing happens in Cuba, the same things happen in Soviet Union, or any part of the socialist world, the people who flee are criticized. It is about time that the P.P.P. becomes consistent. It is about time that the P.P.P. understands, if it hopes to be an alternative Government, or even part of a

22.3.79

National Assembly

3 – 3.10 p.m.

Government, that it must be more perspicacious and show more perspicuity. I am really disappointed at the quality of the contribution. Cde. Narbada tried his best and I must congratulate him.

The Chairman: Cde. Prime Minister, you are disappointed, what about me?

The Prime Minister: I must say, Cde. Chairman, that you are paid to be disappointed by all of us. Cde. Narbada shows hopes. One day he will reach there but, you know---

Division VIII , Public Service Ministry - \$12,493,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

3:10 p.m.

The Chairman: Page 73.

HEAD 31 – MINISTRY OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$7,890,145 for Head 31, Ministry of National Development, stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Will all the Members who wish to speak kindly indicate

Head 31, Ministry of National Development - \$7,890,145 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Pages 79 to 81.

HEAD 33 – MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$2,432,039 for Head 33, Ministry of Economic Development, stand part of the Estimates.

Cde. N. Persaud: Cde. Chairman, I wish to speak on page 79, subhead 1, items (2), (3), (19), (21), (22), (23), and (31). On page 81 I would like to speak on subheads 6, 8, 16, 27. With

your permission, may I proceed? On page 79, subhead 1, item (2), Supernumerary Permanent Secretary, I note that provision had been made for a Supernumerary Permanent Secretary in the 1978 Estimates. This year we note that provision is removed and \$1 has been put. In 1978, the establishment called for two persons. The legend explains that one office is no longer required and one is now catered for in 1979. May I ask the Cde. Minister of Economic Development to state whether there is a holder of any one of these two posts at the moment, since my information is that nobody ever held this post. First of all, there were two and we are being told that one office is no longer required but \$1 is there, and one is catered for in 1979. Would the Minister state what is the present position as regards that.

Item (3), Chief Economist. This deal with the administration and I find it a bit difficult to know why a Chief Economist is placed there within the administration that high up. I would like to know the function of this Chief Economist in the administration that high.

In the Statistical Bureau, if I may take all together, I have noted that there are going to be about twenty new offices. This Statistical Department is being strengthened. May I ask the Minister, since it is going to be strengthened by so many additional persons, to explain what are the additional functions of the Statistical Bureau. Getting statistics from industries and commercial firms etc. in the past was a function of the Statistical Bureau. If I understand it correctly now, the State Planning Commission has taken over these functions. Since 1978, I understand they were asking for the same information as the Statistical Bureau. If that is so, perhaps the Minister may be inclined to say so.

I also understand that the Statistical Bureau was feeding information into the section which is now replaced by the State Planning Commission. I do not recall its name. If that is so and the Statistical Bureau will continue to feed information to the State Planning Commission, I would like to ask the Minister whether he does not consider it necessary to have the State Planning Commission and the Statistical Bureau housed in the same building, since I understand the State Planning Commission now occupies the building previously occupied by the Small Industries Corporation in South Road.

In the Data Processing Unit at item (31), I have noted that provision was made last year for \$34,518 but only \$31,216 was spent. May I ask the Minister of State how many vacancies exist here and in what grade.

Page 81, subhead 6. Library and Publications. I would like to ask the Minister why is it that there had hardly been any publication available for the year 1978, that is, all types dealing with imports and exports etc. The very Minister in his Budget Speech stated that the public must be informed and obviously he would like to be informed as far as these statistics also go. I would like the Minister to state why.

Subhead 8, Labour Force Survey. I have noted that \$38,000 was spent last year and this year provision of \$75,000 is being sought. The legend states: "Introduction of Phase II of the Survey." May I ask the Minister to state whether Phase I is completed and, if so, whether it has been published, if not, how soon it is expected that Phase I would be published and made available to the public.

Subhead 14, Contribution to UNICEF. I have noted that \$13,440 was provided for the last year and nothing was really spent. May I ask the Minister to explain since this is more or less a statutory contribution, what is the position as regards to the contribution for 1978.

3:20 p.m.

At subhead 16, Contribution to SELA, I see that the sum of \$28, 965 was approved for last year and the legend in the 1978 Estimates stated "Increase in Contribution". In 1979 the provision has moved up again to \$35, 585 and again it is stated "Increased Contribution". May I ask the Minister to explain this? Since the legend stated "increased contribution" last year when the sum sought was \$28.965, why do the Revised Estimates show only the sum of \$5,707?

I move to the last question and that is subhead 27, Population Census. I note here that the sum of \$ 275,000 is being sought for a Population Census. If my information is correct, the last time a census was taken was in 1970. I should like to ask the Minister whether he thinks – I do not know what is the operation as far as the region is concerned – that the sum of \$275,000 is

[Cde. Narbada Persaud continued]

adequate to carry out a proper census in Guyana.

The Minister of Economic development and Co-operatives (Cde. Hoyte) With respect to the first question about the Permanent Secretaries, we had last year two supernumerary Permanent Secretaries. The information which the member, Cde. Narbada Persaud, had to the effect that one of these posts was never filled is wholly inaccurate. One of the Supernumerary Permanent Secretaries is Cde. Bernard Crawford. For some years now he has been seconded to the Upper Mazaruni Development Authority which Authority finds his salary but, for the purpose of continuity of service and preservation of superannuation benefits, one has to keep his post on the Estimates. The other Supernumerary Permanent Secretary was Cde. Worrell.

The Chairman: As this may save Comrades and hon. Members from asking further questions, may I say that this is the general policy: whenever \$1 is put for some provision, it is to keep the pensionable position of the person who has been seconded.

Cde. Hoyte: Cde. Worrell was seconded to the National Service and is now substantively the Permanent Secretary at the Ministry of Works. The post of Chief Economist is necessary because the Ministry of Economic Development is concerned on a daily basis with a wide range of economic discussions and negotiations with the numerous countries with which Guyana has economic and technical co-operation agreements. One needs to have a person with an economic background, and a senior person, to have charge of these negotiations when people of high official rank come from abroad. The Chief Economist functions partly as economist, partly as an administrator, partly as a negotiator.

The Statistical Bureau is in need of strengthening. In fact if one is considering seriously national economic planning one has to have an accurate data base, one has to have information flowing continuously and in a timely fashion. The work of the Statistical Bureau has not been taken over by the State Planning

Commission. The functions of the Statistical Bureau is to provide the base of information and it is to enable it to discharge this function effectively and in a timely manner that the arrangements have been made to strengthen it and perhaps the very explanation which the Cde. Member seeks, as to why there have not been more publications in the course of the last year, is rooted in the fact that the professional staff of the statistical Bureau was small. If we are going to have all the information which the Comrade requests, if we are going to have it in a timely fashion, and if we are going to have it in an accurate way, then we need to have a very strong and well-staffed Statistical Bureau.

It does not matter, to my mind, where the Bureau is sited. I do not see that there is any magic in sitting it in the same building as the State Planning Secretariat. The important thing is that the Bureau should be in a position to provide the information when required and to provide the information in an accurate way.

With respect to the question on the Data Processing Unit, the answer is that many of the people who were employed in this Unit were employed under the Open Vote so that even though there were posts, they had not been formally appointed to them. My information is that they have now been appointed and in the course of this year their salaries will be reflected under subhead 31.

On the question of Library and Publication, I have alluded to that matter already and I do not think I need touch on it again.

Subhead 8, Labour Force Survey. The answer is that both stages of the work have been completed. What we are doing now is having the information, the raw data, processed, compiled and put through the computer. We hope to publish it in the course of this year.

With respect to the contributions to international agencies and organisations to which we belong: like all other developing countries we had a problem with foreign exchange last year and we have been discussing with most of these agencies the possibility of paying all or part of our contribution on local costs. In fact, many of these organisations have agreed that rather than

22.3.79

National Assembly

3.20 – 3.30 p.m.

remitting foreign currency we could pay local currency to finance local operations and where they do not have local operations they are prepared to open local accounts. That explains many instances we have not paid. It was because we were negotiating these more favourable conditions.

With respect to subhead 27, Population Census, this amount is not to carry out the Census. The Census is due to take place in 1980 but there is a lot of preparatory work to be done and Cde. Persaud himself observed this is a regional exercise. This sum represents our contribution to the regional expenses for the preparatory works which lead right up to the actual census-taking in 1980.

There is a slight error at subhead 1, item (6) on page 79, which I have to ask you to correct. The word “Ministeral” crept in there and should be deleted.

Head 33, Ministry of Economic Development - \$2,432,039 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

3:30 p.m.

The Chairman: Page 215.

DIVISION XIX, MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$20, 476,000 from Division XIX, Ministry of Economic development, stand part of the Estimates.

Cde. Narbada Persaud: Cde. Chairman, on this page, I have two questions on subhead 14 and 20. Subhead 14 deals with the Cotton Textile Mill. In the 1978 Approved Estimates, provision was made for \$8.5 million. The legend to that Estimate stated that it was to complete the construction of the Cotton Textile Mill. It is noted that the Revised Estimate said that a little over \$6 million was spent. It would mean that a little around \$2.5 million was not spent from the \$8.5 million requested, as stated in the legend of the 1978 Estimates, to complete the construction of the Cotton Textile Mill. I have noticed that this year \$5 million is being sought. It

means that from \$8.5 million we are asking now for \$10million including the \$2.5 million not used. In the legend it says, "To provide funds for Textile Mill. Chinese Loan." We know it is a Chinese loan, but nothing is said here about its completion. Obviously, some references is made in the Budget speech about accelerating the completion of the Textile Mill and some other projects during this year. Nothing else is stated in this legend as compared with the 1978, one which said it was for completion. I would like the Minister to say, if he is in a position to say, how much money has already been spent, how much more is anticipated to be spent for the completion, and if it is likely that the mill will be completed this year.

Subhead 20, Cement Plant: In the 1978 Estimates, we had \$360,000 provided and \$75,900 was actually spent. In the legend of the last year it was stated that provision was for feasibility studies. May I ask the Minister, since no provision is made for 1979 whether the feasibility study ----

The Chairman: I am not allowing that. There is no provision under this Head. Not even \$1 for you to speak about. It is just to show you what happen in 1978.

Cde. Hoyte: Cde. Chairman, with respect to the question on the Cotton textile Mill the position is that there was some delay in completion for a number of reasons. One was, as is generally known, because the matter received wide publication in the Press, there were labour problems resulting in a shut down of the project and a reorganisation of the work. Secondly, there were problem with the flow of equipment and materials. For example, one very important part of that project was delayed for several months because we could not get a very special kind of bitumen out of the Netherlands. It took a long time to get it and that was the only place we could get that special kind of bitumen which was required. Then there was the problem of shipping, making the connections, and then the bitumen got caught up with a dock strike in London and all sorts of things like that over which we had no control.

The factory is very well advanced and I would invite the Cde. Member, whenever he so wishes, to go and inspect that project, see what is happening and how far it has advanced. We are hoping that in the course of this year it will be completed. The total cost spent to date, I am not in

a position to say off hand but I could supply that information to the hon. Member. He will recall that this project was being funded through resources provided by the first loan which the People's Republic of China granted this country so that the cost of the mill is being borne by the People's Republic of China.

Division XIX, Ministry of Economic Development - \$20,476,000 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Page 82 to 87.

HEAD 34 – MINISTRY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$7,002,789 for Head 34, Ministry of Regional Development, stand part of the Estimates.

Head 34, Ministry of Regional Development - \$7,002,789 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimated.

The Chairman: Page 216.

DIVISION XX – MINISTRY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question proposed that the sum of \$3,979,600, for Division XX, Ministry of Regional Development, stand part of the Estimates.

Cde. Nokta: Cde. Chairman, I observe here on page 216, subhead 9, Matarkai Development Authority, there is a vote of \$1.5 million and the legend states, "To provide for development works in the Matthews Ridge Area". Over the many years we have been hearing so much about development works and development projects, I would simply like to ask the Minister to tell us what sort of development works are going on, or what he plans to have in this year.

Subhead 19, Assistance to Jonestown Agricultural Complex and the legend says, "To provide for the development of the Jonestown Agricultural complex". Now, in 1967 when the

Pomeroy manganese project was closed down, we were told that the area would have been put into an Agricultural Complex. The slogan then was “changing miners into farmers” and they called it then Matthews Ridge/Port Kaituma Agricultural complex. And so many officers and so many experts were sent up and to help to develop agriculture. Co-ops were formed, state farms were formed and over the years we have not been able to see any revenue come out of this Matthew’s Ridge/ Port Kaituma Complex. After a while, the Government having realised that the Complex had failed, it was really a complex, changed the name and called it Matarkai.

Within the same boundaries of Matarkai, I am seeing again, another complex coming up, this is a complex within a complex, Jonestown complex. Now, it is customary that if we have to go into these investments, we carry out a feasibility study. The sum being asked for here is \$170,000, which is quite a tidy sum. We have been hearing about the many things which were found at Jonestown, guns and drugs ---

3:40 p.m.

The Chairman: Cde. Nokta, if I may make a suggestion, you saw how Cde. Narbada asked his questions in a civil, polite and excellent way? And he had all answered. You saw others how they asked and what answers they got. I am not telling you how to ask your questions. You can do what you like.

Cde. Nokta: If we have to go into an investment like this, then some feasibility study ought to be carried out to see whether Jonestown Complex can really be convenient for agriculture. I would like to ask the Minister if any feasibility study was carried out before they started to invest money in agriculture. What crops will be grown there? How many people are they prepared to employ there and do they intend to have a factory set up to manufacture some goods that they would be producing from the land? Things like that. I would like to ask the Minister to elaborate on this for our benefit.

Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud: On the very subhead 19, I do not think we should put our heads in the sand. Jonestown has got a history. I would like to know from the Cde. Minister how

many acres are involved at Jonestown. Has the Government carried out a complete investigation of the place? What was found there? In what way the takeover would be made, bearing in mind it is Government's land? We heard a lease had been granted. But this is the highest forum of the country and I think the nation can be informed through this forum as to what the position is. We have read in the newspapers and we heard Government saying many news items were not correct. I think this is an excellent opportunity for the Government to put the record straight. If we are going to go into agricultural cultivation there, I think a number of things must be borne in mind, bearing in mind my earlier contribution for agricultural development, because we would wish to maximise it.

In the first instance when this place was named Jonestown, was the Government involved at that stage in a feasibility study before the lease or leases were granted? What types of crops, originally even before now, were to be grown there? I think these questions are reasonable and fair and I hope, Cde. Chairman, I have put them politely enough to get answer from the Minister concerned. Now we have got a provision for the first time and it looks, from the Estimates, that there was no financial involvement by the Government earlier. What will the \$170,000 be used for? Does the Minister envisage further financial involvement? Who are the people that will manage it, bearing in mind that we have got experience of other projects which have failed. The one I referred to earlier was Kibilibiri. Is the Government moving to take it over, because it is already there or is the Government satisfied that if they carry on from there we would be able to have real development and real production/

The other question is, what has become of the assets that were there before? Is there an inventory? If so, could we be told what was there? What is the value of any item and can the items be made available to this Parliament? I think these are vital questions because nothing has been said so far in any of the statements, both written in the Budget Speech and spoken by the various Government Ministries and persons who spoke.

The Chairman: Cde. Persaud, I only wish to invite your attention to the fact that this is a new subhead for the development of an Agricultural Complex and I could not conceive for

myself the relevance of your questions to this. I quite agree with some of the questions you have asked, what it is to be, and what they are going to do, but what it has to do with some of the questions you are asking, that will probably find itself under another Head, maybe.

Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud: It is difficult for me to ascertain what questions you agree and what you disagree with. With all respect to you and speaking for myself I am probably not as informed as you are to know what it is all about.

The Chairman: I am concerned about subhead 19, it states Assistance to Jonestown Complex \$170,000, to provide for the development of Jonestown Agriculture Complex.

Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud: Let me deal with the language. Assistance to Jonestown Complex will imply that the complex is already in existence. Is the existence date subsequent to the fiasco or prior to the fiasco? If it was prior to that, what is the extent of the Government's involvement in the project? The Government can be involved on the project and nothing is shown in the Estimates in money's worth, but the Government can be involved in providing other facilities for the development of the area, technical skills, know-how, feasibility studies. I think those questions are relevant and pertinent. Those are simple questions.

At what stage had the Government become involved in the Jonestown project? Was it before the fiasco or subsequent to it? If the Minister takes my inquiry, then we will be able to get a proper report of the position at Jonestown because we need to know and the nation needs to know.

Cde. Hoyte: Cde. Chairman, I can see that both Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud and Cde. Nokta have been misled by the inelegance of the language used to describe this subhead and in the legend. For that reason I quite appreciate the number of questions which they have raised based upon, as I said, their being misled by the language. What has happened is that the Government has incurred heavy expenses directly related to the Jonestown incident. Planes had to be flown in, personnel had to be taken on, medical and other personnel, and of course, the Government has had to have a presence there, first of all, to complete an inventory of the assets,

22.3.79

National Assembly

3.40 – 3.50 p.m.

and secondly, to preserve those assets. It is well known that the Government has filed an action to recover from the People's Temple the expenses which it has incurred so really this subhead is to provide for the formal recording of those expenses, or at least, some of the expenses, to enable the Government to have at the national level a record of the cost of the operation to which I have referred.

3.50 p.m.

Only recently, the Ministry of Regional Development had to pay a large sum of money to GAC for GAC's involvement. One cannot say that GAC should be saddled with those costs. The Central Government had to pay and the Central Government has to have a head in the Estimates, has to have some statutory authority, to enable it to pay these expenses. We hope that when that action is heard – we may be successful – we will be able to recover all the money from the People's Temple.

With your Honour's permission I would seek to amend the legend by striking out the words "Assistance to", by putting a semi-colon after the word "complex", and by adding "expenses relating to Governmental presence and activities", I would seek to amend the legend to read:

"To provide for expenses relating to the inventorising and protection of assets".

The Chairman: Cde. Persaud has asked that if you are going to inventorise then he wants to know what these assets are.

Cde. Hoyte: The inventory is going on now. It is being undertaken by Cde. Emerson Simon. I think somebody wanted to know who the people we had there were.

The Chairman: In fairness to the Opposition, they were misled by the legend and therefore many of the questions they asked about the development of agriculture and what took place --- so this is a new dimension. In view of the fact that you have now amended this legend, I shall put it to them and see what questions they will ask.

Cde. Narbada Persaud: Now that we have some information on Jonestown and we are hearing about assets – I am told that after the massacre a police station was set up there. I should like to know whether this is true and how many persons are in this force that was set up. We are hearing about assets. What do they really mean?

The Chairman: Please do not let me anticipate you but you have just heard that they are now carrying out the exercise by somebody who is put there, Cde. Simon, so there is no sense in asking what the asset are.

Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud: Will the Minister inform us, seeing that Government expenditure is involved at the moment, that when this inventory is completed a faithful report of the assets and other factors relating to Jonestown will be reported to the Parliament? I want to be fair to the Minister in that if the inventory is not completed, one assumes it will be completed and as this is the highest forum of the land, will that report when it is completed be laid before the House?

The second question to the Minister: How soon it will completed, whether the assets are there bearing in mind the Government has filed an action?

I add to that, if agriculture ---

The Chairman: Agriculture is out of it now. The expenses for their presence are due to the unfortunate incident that took place.

Cde. Reepu Damon Persaud: The last question that I am trying to ask: if there were agricultural crops there, bearing in mind that the Government is taking an inventory, if the crops are there and if the crops can be retained, maintained and expanded, whether the Government has given consideration to or has examined the project on that score. You see the point, sir.

The Chairman: I understand what you are saying but this is not a relevant section for that question. That is something else. You will have to find some other subhead.

Cde. Reepu Daman Persaud: If the Minister will answer the questions that I have posed

earlier.

Cde. Hoyte: I cannot tell the Member when the inventory will be completed. I do not know. I know it is on-going.

The Chairman: He asked two things, how soon you intend to complete it and when it is completed if Parliament will be informed of that.

Cde. Hoyte: I am coming to that. I do not know when it will be completed. Secondly, the Government will do nothing illegal. That is in answer to the question as to whether the Government will retain assets notwithstanding a court action. We will leave it to the Courts to decide what are the rights of the Government.

With respect to the laying of information before Parliament, I think the Government has announced that it will have a public inquiry and I assume that all relevant information will be laid before the Commission of Inquiry showing the whole history of this project right down to the time of tragedy and probably immediately thereafter. I would believe that it is at that forum where all information in the possession of the Government, and in the possession of any other person, will be laid and what I am sure about is that the Government will lay that report in the National Assembly.

It is not correct to say that there is a police station established at Jonestown. There is a police presence. There is a police station at Port Kaituma and because of the incident which occurred and because of the fact that it is necessary to protect the assets, there is a police presence. We know that people go in and help themselves. There is no magic about the term “assets”. What we are talking about are the houses. The people have houses there. They have machinery, they have vehicles and they were growing crops. Somebody has to be there to protect those things, to maintain them where they require maintenance and to ensure that such crops as are there are not allowed to go to waste. So that is really what we are talking about when we talk about assets.

22.3.79

National Assembly

4 p.m.

4 p.m.

There was the question by Cde. Nokta on Matarkai. Matarkai Authority is now a legal entity. This sum here is provided to subsidise the activities of that entity. I did explain two years ago that the Matarkai Authority is expected to become self-sufficient financially on its own and the old excuse which used to be given that people in Georgetown were not acting promptly and that they were being controlled from Georgetown will no longer be available to those person in charge of the Authority.

This sum of \$1.5 million is a subsidy and if my recollection is correct I think this is the last year that this subsidy will be advanced to the Authority. As from next year they are expected to be wholly self-financing and to be not only self-sufficient but to provide sufficient, for export so to speak, outside of the region.

Division XX, Ministry of Regional Development - \$3,979,600 – agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Estimates.

The Chairman: Tomorrow we will consider the Ministry of Works and Transport, the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, and the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Assembly resumed.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, “That this Assembly do now adjourn until Friday, 23rd March, 1979, at 2 p.m.
[The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House]

Adjourned accordingly at 4 p.m.
