

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 1]

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

18th Sitting

Monday, 21st November, 1966.

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 Home Affairs
The Honourable P. S. d'Aguiar	- Minister of Finance
The Honourable N. J. Bissember	- Minister of Housing and Reconstruction (Leader of the House) •▲
The Honourable R. E. Cheeks	- Minister of Local Government
The Honourable E. F. Correia	- Minister of Communications
The Honourable Mrs. W. Gaskin	- Minister of Education and Race Relations
The Honourable L. John	- Minister of Agriculture
The Honourable R. J. Jordan	- Minister of Forests, Lands and Mines
The Honourable M. Kasia	- Minister of Works and Hydraulic
The Honourable W. O. R. Kendall, C.B.E.	- Minister of Trade, Shipping and Civil Aviation
The Honourable C. A. Merriman	- Minister of Labour
The Honourable J. H. Thomas	- Minister of Economic Development
The Honourable S. S. Ramphal, C.M.G., Q.C.	- Attorney-General and Minister of State

Parliamentary Secretaries

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Mr. D. B. deGroot | - Parliamentary Secretary,
Prime Minister's Office |
| Mr. G. Bowman | - Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Labour |
| Mr. O. E. Clarke | - Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Education and
Race Relations |
| Mr. P. Duncan | - Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Local
Government |
| Mr. J. G. Joaquim, O.B.E., J.P. | - Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Works and
Hydraulics |
| Mr. C. V. Toe-Chung | - Parliamentary Secretary,
Ministry of Finance. |

Other Members

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Mr. W. A. Blair | Mr. T. A. Sancho |
| Mr. J. Budhao | Mr. R. Tello, Deputy Speaker |
| Mr. W. G. Carrington | Rev. A. B. Trotman |
| Mr. R. G. B. Field-Ridley | Mr. H. M. S. Wharton, J.P. |
| Mr. H. Prashad | |

Members of the Opposition

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| Dr. C. B. Jagan, Leader of the Opposition | Mr. J. R. S. Luck |
| Mr. A. Chase | Mr. D. C. Jagan |
| Mr. B. H. Benn | Mr. H. Lall |
| Mr. Ram Karran | Mr. M. Khan, J.P. |
| Mr. R. Chandisingh | Mr. Y. Ally |
| Mr. H. J. M. Hubbard | Mr. L. Linde |
| Dr. Charles Jacob, Jr. | Mr. R. D. Persaud |
| Mr. C. V. Nunes | Mr. M. Poonai |
| Dr. F. H. W. Ransahoye | Dr. S. A. Ramjohn |
| Mr. E. M. G. Wilton | Mr. E. M. Stoby |
| Mr. M. Hamid, J.P. | Mr. S. M. Saffee |

- Clerk of the National Assembly - Mr. F. A. Narain
Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly (ag.) - Mr. M. B. Henry.

Absent:

- The Honourable D. Mahraj, Minister of Health
Mr. M. Bhagwan - on leave.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

Resignation of Dr. J.K.M. Richmond

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I have received a communication from Dr. J.K.M. Richmond which I shall ask the Clerk to read to this Assembly.

The Clerk read the letter as follows:

"7, Brickdam and Manget Place
Georgetown
November 21, 1966

The Hon. Speaker
National Assembly of Guyana
Public Buildings
Georgetown

Dear Mr. Alleyne,

I hereby resign my seat in the National Assembly. This follows my resignation earlier today from the United Force.

Please, sir, accept my appreciation of your personal courtesies to me.

Sincerely,
(Sgd.) J.K.M. Richmond."

**MOTIONS RELATING TO THE
BUSINESS OR SITTING OF THE
ASSEMBLY AND MOVED BY A
MINISTER**

The Leader of the House (Mr. Bissember): I move that the entire proceedings on the National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill be exempted from the provisions of Standing

Order 9 (2) of the Standing Orders which govern procedure in this House.

Question put, and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

MOTION

FINANCIAL PAPER NO. 4 OF 1966

"Be it resolved that the Committee of Supply approve of proposals set out in Financial Paper No. 4 of 1966 - Schedule of Additional Provision on the Current and Capital Estimates for the period ending October, 1966, totalling \$4,386,742." - [The Minister of Finance.]

The Minister of Finance (Mr. d'Aguiar): I beg to request that the debate on this Motion be deferred until Friday, 25th November.

Mr. Luck: To a point of order. I should like to quote from Standing Order No 69 - Supplementary Financial Provisions. It is my submission that the request of the hon. Minister cannot be entertained. Standing Order No. 69 (1) reads as follows.

"If a Minister presents a Paper setting out the details of any proposals for expenditure likely to be incurred in the course of the current financial year either in respect of a service or of several services for which no provision has been made in an Appropriation Ordinance for that year or in respect,

[MR. LUCK]

of further financial provision beyond the total sum already sanctioned for a particular head or for particular heads, that Paper shall be ordered to be printed and shall stand referred to the Committee of Supply without question put and shall be appointed to be considered on a day to be named by the Minister presenting the Paper but not earlier than one clear day after that on which the Paper was presented."

2.10 p.m.

The Minister appointed Monday, today, as the day on which Financial Paper No. 4 of 1966 is to be considered. [The Prime Minister: "No, he did not."] Yes, he did. Please stand corrected, Mr. Prime Minister. He did appoint today as the day on which this Paper is to be discussed.

Subsection 2 of Standing Order 69 reads as follows:

"On the day named under paragraph (1) of this Order . . ."

- the day named is today, Monday -

" . . . the Committee of Supply shall stand as the first item of Public Business and the Assembly shall resolve itself into that Committee without question put."

We are now without question put in Committee of Supply. [Mr.

Bissemer] "Are you making a speech?" The clear implication is that on the day named under paragraph (1) - and today has been named by the hon. Minister of Finance - the Committee of Supply shall stand as the first item of Public Business and the Assembly shall resolve itself into that Committee without question put.

It is my humble submission that these Standing Orders provide for the speedy and expeditious despatch of all supplementary financial provisions. They do so provide and they do not allow for the deferment of these matters. That is my submission.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. d'Aguiar: I will refer you to a previous occasion.--

Mr. Speaker: Please reply to the arguments.

Mr. d'Aguiar: You already allowed, on a previous occasion, the deferment of supplementary provision. The Standing Order states that the Minister shall name the day. Well I have now named the day as Friday.

Mr. Speaker: I want you to convince me that this Financial Paper ought not to be taken as the first Item, according to Standing Orders.

Mr. Bissemer: Last Friday you had allowed a deferment of this very Item which appears on the Order Paper. May I reply to my hon. and learned Friend. The first point I wish to make is this: The hon. Minister of

Finance, who is responsible for this Motion, has in fact named today as the day for consideration of this Paper. He now seeks to name another day. The second point is this: This Standing Order is to prevent an earlier discussion than on the day named. This is a later date we are asking for. If we were seeking to bring forward the day named, then we would have been in contravention of the Standing Order.

I should like to refer to page 371 of the Fifteenth Edition of Sir T. Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*. I checked it this morning but I have not got it here. It states that a Motion deferring a debate can be moved by a Minister but it does not mean that the question must be put. His Honour the Speaker just announces the day appointed by the Minister responsible for the Bill. As long as it does not seek to debate a matter earlier than the day named, the Government always has the right to say which matter is urgent, and which matter should be deferred. It is a Government Motion; it is not an Opposition Motion.

Mr. Speaker: Clear up the point for me. The Minister named today. The Standing Order states that on the day named the Committee of Supply shall stand as the first Item. I want to hear you on that point.

Mr. Bissenber: This is the first Item on today's Order Paper. The Minister is seeking to name another day. When he names the other day it will stand as the first Item on that day. May I develop the point. This matter must be the first Item to

be dealt with on the day named. It is not being dealt with now by the request of the Minister responsible, therefore, he has the right to appoint another day. When that day comes up, that will be the first Item. He can name another day when that day comes up. I submit, with the greatest respect, that the point taken by the hon. Member Mr. Luck is without any foundation, any substance. If we had sought to have this matter debated last Friday, or earlier than last Friday, there would have been good foundation. I therefore ask you to reject the submission out of court.

Mr. Speaker: The whole thing seems to be a storm in a teacup. The Minister could have obviated all of this by speaking with the Leader of the Opposition and getting him to agree.

The Leader of the Opposition
The hon. (Dr. C. B. Jagan) I wonder if I could just make a point here. From time to time I have had to make complaints to you about the way business of this House -

Mr. Speaker: Do not let us slip away from this.

Dr. Jagan: On this one particular issue I must tell you that only yesterday morning I had to speak to Dr. Jacob to summon a special meeting of the whole parliamentary group last night to deal with this matter. I mention this in view of the remarks you have just made. Is this the way this House is supposed to be dealing with a matter like this?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Burnham): On a point of order. A point of order has been made and it is your duty, I submit, to rule, or, if you are seeking assistance from any Member of the House, that Member may speak. This is not the time for discussions of this nature.

Ruling by the Speaker

Mr. Speaker: Under the Standing Order it seems as if the Minister of Finance must proceed today. I must concede to the Leader of the Opposition. I rule that this Financial Paper must be proceeded with today.

2.20 p.m.

Assembly in Committee of Supply.

[Unintelligible remarks by the Prime Minister.]

Mr. Hubbard: Apologise! You have insulted the Chair and the House!

The Chairman: Is the Prime Minister questioning the Ruling?

The Prime Minister: No, sir. I am not questioning the Ruling, but I say it is wrong. I cannot question it. When the Speaker rules, he rules, but I say and know it is wrong.

The Chairman: The whole way the Government is proceeding with this business is wrong. I am sorry I have to make the remark but I think the whole way the Government proceeds with this business is wrong. If a Financial Paper is set down for today

and if it is so important to the Government -- [Prolonged Interruption.]

Assembly resumed.

Mr. Speaker: This sitting is suspended for 20 minutes.

Sitting suspended accordingly at 2.21 p.m.

2.40 p.m.

On resumption --

FINANCIAL PAPER NO.4/1966

Assembly in Committee of Supply.

Mr. d'Aguiar: In accordance with article 80(2) of the Constitution, I signify that the Cabinet has recommended this Motion for the consideration of the National Assembly.

The Chairman: We will deal with this Financial Paper item by item.

UPKEEP OF WAR GRAVES.

Mr. Luck: On page 1, item 1, I see that the additional provision sought for the upkeep of war graves is \$100. The Legend states: "To provide for the payment of an outstanding account due to the Commonwealth War Graves Commission in respect of the year 1965." I warmly support the proposition that the heroic dead of our land should be properly interred, but I would like to know in which war did these people die and on whose behalf were they killed. In which war did these people fight? Whose army were they in? Are Cuffy and Akbar among these dead people?

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Transport and Travelling

Mr. Ram Karran: With reference to item 3 - subhead 2 - Transport and Travelling the original amount voted was \$21,000 and the hon. Minister of Finance is now asking for an additional \$4,460. The legend states: "To provide for increased travelling owing to the establishment of the Guyana Embassy in Washington, the Guyana Permanent Mission to the United Nations, as well as for the overall increase in local travelling." One would have thought that these items would have been separated. These items are dealt with under the head of Department of External Affairs.

I should be grateful if the hon. Minister of Finance would tell us the amount he anticipates will be spent on external travelling, and on travelling internally. I cannot see the reason for lumping the two heads together. I am sure the Ambassador to the United States would object to money being spent in Guyana and expressed in these Estimates in this manner. This would be an indication that he is wasting money. When this gentleman was a Member of this House he was rather cautious about spending money. Why should the hon. Minister of Finance tie up local travelling with travelling in America? The hon. Minister of Finance should certainly give us a breakdown of this amount.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Hubbard: I have had occasion to state in this House on more than one occasion that the Minister of Finance operates on the principle of the pawnshop clerk in everything he does. The last time he came to this House to ask for money for Washington and New York, he was unable to tell us how much he wanted for Washington and how much he wanted for New York. Unfortunately for him the Minister of Economic Affairs had to deal with the matter, and we found out that the Minister of Finance had used abracadabra in presenting the Estimates. The last time he said that the money was needed for furnishing Washington and furnishing New York. Today we are told that there is travelling in Washington and local travelling. Abracadabra cannot help him today.

In the first instance the Minister of Finance asked us to provide \$21,000. Today he is asking us for an additional \$4,460 on the ground that what he originally estimated was inadequate. He has already asked us for money, and he is now asking us for another \$4,386,742.00! His Estimates are dishonest and he should stand up now and tell us what he is hiding or covering up.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Ram Karran: I am sure that the hon. Member Mr. Hubbard has treated the hon. Minister of Finance with some sympathy by referring to him as a pawnshop broker. I feel that the Minister is incompetent and unable to defend his Estimates. He cannot

[MR. RAM KARRAN]

say that this is not a valid criticism. I ask him to stand up and tell us how much money has been spent locally and how much has been spent in the United States. My hon. Friend Mr. Hubbard has been very charitable in dealing with the hon. Minister of Finance.

Perhaps he will tell us something about item 4 - subhead 3 - Miscellaneous. He is asking for \$2,124 and the legend states: "Voted provision proved inadequate owing to the overall increase in the work of the Head Office and the Overseas Missions." To what Head Office is the hon. Minister of Finance referring? His constant preoccupation with business has caused him to degrade the most important Ministry of External Affairs. I beg to move that the name of this Head be properly designated.

2.50 p.m.

We used to speak about a Head Office in places like the Transport and Harbours Department, but surely there is no Head Office at the Ministry of External Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PERSONAL EMOLUMENTS

Mr. Khan: Will the hon. Minister offer some explanation on item 2 to this House? When the hon. Minister of Finance was in the Opposition he always criticised the Government for not supplying proper annotation, yet here he is seeking additional provision and the note reads:

"To provide for the the creation of one post of 'Accountant' on Scale A9a."

We are told that the post is that of an accountant. Is it not possible to make a calculation in order to arrive at the exact amount required? Is this incompetency?

Miscellaneous

Dr. Jagan: My hon. Friend referred to the creation of a new post. I am not going to deal with that aspect under item 4, subhead 3 - Miscellaneous. It seems to me that there is something wrong with the manner of estimating. The Minister came to the House at the beginning of the year and asked for \$3,500 and now comes to ask for \$2,124 extra. There is something wrong in the system of estimating. In addition, the word "miscellaneous" covers a multitude of sins and we should be given an idea of how the Government is spending the taxpayers' money.

What is this all about? It is not only that inadequate explanation is given but the sum involved is almost seventy per cent - [Interruption.] - sixty per cent of what was originally voted. Surely the Minister owes an explanation to this House. This is not a proper way to deal with Members of the House. We must be given more information. The Minister should make a speech when each head is being debated in order to supply further explanation. [Laughter.] When the hon. Prime Minister was on this side of the House he used to complain that the legends in the supplementary estimates were

totally inadequate and said that the Ministries should put up supplementary papers to give the information required. Why do we have to try to squeeze out the information while the Minister sits as though rooted to his chair? It is not a question of dialectics; it is a question of trying to run the government properly and not trying to win a cheap trick. [Interruptions.] I am very serious about this. I know that the Prime Minister likes to make a joke out of everything, but a time comes when one has to be serious. Therefore, I would urge the Minister to get up and give some explanation of what is happening on this page.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Hubbard: I should like the Minister to tell us whether he is going to go through the farce of sitting down all afternoon grinning and looking like one of his inebriated customers and refusing to answer questions. We are representatives of the people and we are entitled to have the information that we request, otherwise Parliament is a farce and all that the Prime Minister said when he accepted the gift of the Speaker's Chair is mummery.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Page 2.

Special Allowance to Mr. A. R. Alli

Mr. Persaud: I think that item 8 needs some more explanation. It is stated here that there was a miscarriage of ar-

rangements with respect to one A.R. Alli. The House is asked to approve the sum of \$320. Will the Minister kindly tell us what was the "miscarriage of arrangements"?

The Prime Minister: As Minister of External Affairs, I think this question deserves an answer. Some time in 1964, early 1964, my predecessors in office arranged for Mr. Alli to take up an assignment at the British Embassy in Washington. In October of the same year the said administration withdrew its instructions and changed its plans. As a result, this Government has been saddled with the sum of \$320 to recompense Mr. Alli for the miscarriage of arrangements by the previous Government.

Special Hospitality Expenses

Mr. Luck: I should like to refer to subhead 16 (New)-Special Hospitality Expenses. This is a recurring decimal. If money is not required for special hospitality it is required as a special allowance. Previously the sum of \$15,000 was needed for tips. We are now asked to vote the sum of \$5,100 "to meet expenses in connection with the holding of a reception by Guyana after admittance to the U.N." One must assume that our diplomats used tax free liquor so that a bottle of whiskey cost \$6.50 whereas it would cost the ordinary person \$25. If we assume that three-fifths of the money was spent on liquor, we can see that whiskey flowed like water, for \$3,000 in tax-free liquor would be equivalent to at least \$10,000 worth of liquor.

[MR. LUCK]

This is a poor country and countries such as this do not add to their wealth in the world body by going to medicants to obtain the things that the civil charges and so having its diplomats live like lords. I know that my hon. friend (the Prime Minister) lives like that. One cannot live well and be poor or one would have to be dishonest.

I wonder whether this liquor that was considered was duty-free or were our diplomats so inexpert as not to care what they purchased!

3. p. m.

Guyana Defence Force

Health Services

Dr. Jacob: I wish to refer to item 10. The Government is seeking authority to spend \$5,000 for the employment of a part-time Medical Officer to the G.D.F. I should like to know what are the hours of work of this part-time Medical Officer; what are the terms of his appointment; and whether he will have an office in the compound of the G.D.F., or whether members of the Force who wish to consult him will have to go to some office outside of the compound.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Luck: There is no answer being offered from that side. I await an answer otherwise I will have to repeat the question. Surely, if it is necessary, we can repeat this question until

an answer is given. Will the Minister say what are the terms of this officer's appointment? This house is being reduced to a nursery.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Hubbard: In view of the Government's silence on these completely reasonable questions I am forced to the conclusion that somebody, somewhere is drawing commission out of this. Ministers of the Government must recognize their responsibility to the taxpayers of this country and make available to them all the necessary information requested. The Government is employing a part-time Medical Officer. We know that the members of the Government have their friends to put into special offices; they even go abroad to bring them here. Surely we are entitled to know how many hours of service we are going to get from this part-time Medical Officer for all this money we are spending. How much of this money will be kicked back to Ministers of the Government?

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Ailly: These questions deserve answers. Members of the Guyana Defence Force have to seek outside doctors. Will the Minister please clarify the working hours of this part-time Medical Officer?

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

**OFFICIAL
RECEIVER**

Ex-Gratia Payment to Mrs. Williams

Mr. Wilson: Item 13: The legend states: "To provide for the payment of an ex-gratia award to Mrs. Lena Williams consequent to the accidental shooting of her children Aubrey Williams and Hazel Williams (deceased) by a member of the Guyana Police Force." I should like to find out from the Minister concerned what steps are being taken to pay compensation to the family of Ramroop who was shot at Zee-lugt on the 3rd May. [The Prime Minister: "Not by the Police."] The Police shot Ramroop at Zee-lugt, West Coast Berbice. The man said he thought something was being thrown at him and that is why he fired. I am awaiting an answer.

Mr. Luck: I join my hon. Friend Mr. Wilson in asking that this House be given some details as to the circumstances - the sad circumstances I have no doubt - which justify the payment of an ex-gratia award to Mrs. Williams for the accidental shooting of her children Aubrey and Hazel Williams (deceased) by a member of the Guyana Defence Force. We would like to know - surely we are entitled to know - what are the conditions which justify the payment of an ex-gratia award to this lady. I have no doubt that the circumstances are entirely justifiable, but this is the Parliament of this country and the whole country must know in what circumstances the Government will pay out ex-gratia awards to anybody.

This is not the first time - nor will it be the last - that a member of the Force has wrongfully shot innocent people. My mind goes back to a most disgusting incident at Buxton whereby a hostile crowd advanced on the home of a gentleman living there. The gentleman took out his gun and the crowd called a policeman and said, "Look, that man has a gun." The policeman took away the man's gun and his entire house was burnt with amazing rapidity - 15 minutes in all. That is the sad sequence of events consequent on the Police action. Surely, such a circumstance demands some payment on behalf of any humanitarian Government. These are undoubted facts.

First of all, I would hope that this is only the ill humour of a passing moment and it is not to be a permanent feature of the affairs of this House. Legitimate questions are being asked constantly and there the Minister of Finance sits down, the public watchdog - Dr. Richmond made him look like a puppy the other day. Each of these questions deserves a proper answer and, as I remarked earlier, we can speak for a long time. If you do not want to make up time, we can make it up in full.

As I remarked earlier, it is very refreshing that the Prime Minister - probably it was because of his new arrangement for domestic felicities, for which I congratulate him - gave a very good example to his Ministers by promptly answering a pertinent question which pertained to his Office. I repeat the request of the hon. Member Mr. Wilson:

[MR. LUCK]

In what circumstances is the award being made to Mrs. Williams?

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Jagan: Can the hon. Minister say how old were these children and what was the nature of their injuries? [The Prime Minister: "Fatal."] I should like to know how old these children were in order to see whether this lady has been adequately compensated. [Mr. Luck: "Yes, we might want to give her more."]

We all know that one cannot take any action against the Government in such a case but where, as in this case, a member of the Police Force shot someone and that person died, the Government should pay, as compensation to a relative of the deceased person, the sum of money that the relative could have recovered if he had brought an action for damages against the member of the Police Force. Will the Minister inform us on what basis this award was made to this lady? In my view, looking at it, I think that this sum of \$1,750 is very, very inadequate for the death of two children. I am sure my hon. and learned Friend the Prime Minister will agree with me that, if this lady had brought an action for damages against a policeman who shot any one of her children and if she had established a case, that policeman would have had to pay almost \$1,750 in costs alone, much less damages.

3.10 p.m.

In view of that I hope that the Minister will be able to give us

some explanation as to the ages and so on of the children because, as my hon. and learned Friend on the other side knows, the amount of damages, etc., are determined according to the age of the person, whether the person contributes to the maintenance of the mother and other relatives, and so on. All these things are taken into account in assessing the amount that should be paid. In view of that I hope that the hon. Minister will give us some explanation.

Dr. Jagan: I had requested the hon. Ministers to provide some answers to the questions that are being asked.

The Chairman: They are not answering. There is nothing to force them to answer.

Dr. Jagan: I have already started to draft questions. With due respect to the House --

The Chairman: If the Ministers decide not to answer questions, nothing can be done.

Mr. Ally: Are we to proceed with this Estimate without any answers?

The Chairman: You are saying the same thing again and again.

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Expenses - General Emergency

Mr. Ram Karran: Item 16. Ministry of Home Affairs, Expenses - General Emergency - \$350,000. The voted provision was \$900,000. Now, we are being asked for \$350,000 additional provision. In 1964, \$934,168 was

provided and in 1965, \$950,000 was provided. I charge the hon. Minister with dishonesty, unadulterated dishonesty when he puts on the original Estimates \$900,000 knowing that he would have to come back to this House to ask for additional provision. That was done with the intention of creating the impression that the Budget was balanced. I would like the hon. Minister to explain - his advisers are there - if he wants to remove this charge of naked dishonesty, how he arrived at \$900,000 originally.

I will refer to more and more items if the hon. Minister continues to sit down without answering these questions. After all, these moneys that are being spent by the Government do not come out of the pockets of the Government. These moneys come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country. We, as the watchdogs, wish to know from the hon. Ministers how they spent this money. I am sure that the public, the newspapers and everyone will impute all sorts of motives for the Ministers' contempt for the House if they sit there without answering questions. Why can we not get answers? These are pertinent questions. The Minister has already reduced these Estimates from \$1,982,000 in 1965 to \$900,000 at the beginning of the year, and he is coming back to us now - nearly at the end of the year - to ask for approximately a quarter of a million dollars. This is a very large sum of money and the taxpayers in this country are, I am sure, entitled to get an answer as to how this money is to be spent.

Dr. Jagan: With respect to the same Head which my colleague just spoke on, we see that this additional expenditure of \$350,000 is being asked for to cover expenses for payment of salaries to Special Constables and members of the Second Battalion of the G.D.F., and also allied expenses in connection with the British Army. Will the Minister please tell us how much of this \$350,000 is to be allocated to the Second Battalion, and how much to the British Army? What are these so-called "allied expenses"? What kind of expenditure is this which is now put in? Is this an extraordinary expenditure? Why is it put here and how much is it?

[*The hon. Minister offered no reply.*]

Dr. Jacob: I should like to be a little more explicit. The British Army is supposed to have left our country. What I would like to know is whether the amount of money requested here is to purchase the surplus stores and equipment which the British Army left here. In other words, is it to repay, to some extent, the British Forces which have been in our country? The Minister ought to have figures or information in his possession to indicate what proportion of the sum of \$350,000 which is now requested is to be spent in connection with the British Army which he calls in this note "Allied expenses". We certainly want to know what kind of obsolete and perhaps useless equipment has been left. The taxpayers' money is going to be wasted if this requested provision is passed.

[*The hon. Minister offered no reply.*]

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**POLICE****Supernumerary Deputy Superintendent of Police**

Mr. Persaud: Item No. 17, 1 - Personal Emoluments - \$1. The Minister of Finance wishes to provide for the post of "Supernumerary Deputy Superintendent of Police". Will the Minister please tell us if this officer has been appointed? If he has been appointed, we would like to know if he is a Guyanese and if the Government had agreed on a fixed salary for this officer. This is an important question and I hope that the hon. Minister will now wake up from his depression as a result of the resignation of Dr. Richmond, and answer this question.

[*The hon. Minister offered no reply.*]

Mr. Ram Karran: Could I ask the hon. Minister of Home Affairs what is the position of the hon. Member "Smoked Herring" - I beg your pardon, sir - the hon. Attorney General. How is it that we have a very highly paid Attorney-General and Minister of State and we are told here that we are going to get a Deputy Superintendent of Police to advise this Government on legislation for the Passport and Citizenship Act? [*At this stage the Prime Minister left the Chamber.*] I now know why the hon. Prime Minister has sneaked out. It must be a disgrace to the lawyers in the Government Ministries. The Ministry of Home Affairs has barristers who advise the police. You have the Attorney-General's

office and you have the "bird man" as we refer to the Ombudsman. If he has no work I am sure you can give it to him.

3.20 p.m.

If this sort of thing goes on, I am sure that Mr. Jordan will be searched again. You should have, at least, a barrister with experience at the bar and with ability to draft the necessary legislation. You cannot get a policeman to do this sort of work. You cannot get a policeman to draft and to advise the Government on legislation for the Passport and Citizenship Act! Our people are human beings, and they are entitled to certain rights and freedom. Of course, this Government does not think of the freedom and rights of the people. Certain members of this Government are always talking about freedom and the rights of people but that is the end of everything.

If there is to be legislation to control passports and the acts of citizens, then I suggest that a proper barrister should be employed to advise the Government and to draft the necessary legislation. I cannot believe that we want another barrister to draft legislation for this country, having regard to the fact that we are paying the hon. Attorney-General such a big salary. Yesterday he said that he could not draft legislation to support Dr. Ramsahoye's proposed Amendment to the Constitution. Anyway, if he is competent, he should be able to draft legislation and advise the Government on matters relating to the Passport and Citizenship Act.

If the hon. Minister of Finance is ashamed to get up because he has been sitting the whole afternoon, perhaps his colleague the hon. Minister of Home Affairs would be willing to get up and explain to the House why it is necessary to get a Supernumerary Deputy Superintendent of Police to do this job. He might also be willing to give the name of the person to be appointed. Is it now looking around to see whether he can get a job in the G.D.F? Is it a P.N.C. activist or somebody who has failed his examination? This House has a right to know what is taking place in this country. *[Interruption.]* Mr. Jordan seems to be willing to speak. If these Ministers do not stand up and speak, after a while they will not be able to find their voices.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Hubbard: I feel that this Government is beginning to show its first glimmer of common-sense. I think that the Government is telling us that the "bal-let dancer on a pin" according to an hon. Member on the other side of the House, to whom we pay \$4,000 a month and who has been named "smoked herring" by my hon. Friend Mr. Wilson, is incapable of doing what is required here.

I recall that not so long ago this highly paid scholar permitted a Bill to be brought before this House which had to have five foolscap pages of amendments moved to it, and I am beginning to feel that the Government has at last come to realise

that the \$4,000 a month which it spends - robbing the poor taxpayers of this country and putting the money into that returned exile's pockets - is not worth it after all.

I believe that in putting this item here, what the Government is telling us, so that we can mention it to the world, is that it made an error by paying \$4,000 a month to bring back this returned exile who has messed up the legal affairs of this country. I have not received a reply from the Minister, but I have the answer which is obvious

Mr. Luck: This item brings to my mind the fact that this is six months since British Guiana became Guyana. Since then we have had defectors and crypto-defectors in this National Assembly. Six months have elapsed since the Guyana Constitution came into force, which provides for the rights of citizenship to be conferred not only on Guyanese who were born here, but on Guyanese - legal Guyanese - who have been here for a long period of time. Up to now not one step has been taken to confer on thousands of people in this country the right of citizenship. *[Mr. Jordan:* "You are a Chinese."*] The Chinese can take care of themselves much better than most other people when the time comes. I see a high degree of callousness in the administration of these persons' affairs. The people are willing to become Guyanese under the provisions of the Constitution, but that racist who sits over there as Minister of Home Affairs is so callous*

[MR. LUCK]

that he has done nothing in the matter. [Dr. Reid: "You offered me \$500 a man."]

I repeat that the Constitution provides that citizenship be granted, but six months has elapsed since this country's Independence and no legislation in connection with this matter has been brought before this House. Can a Supernumerary Deputy Superintendent of Police be asked to draft legislation in connection with this matter? Some of them cannot even draft a proper letter. Today we are asked to approve the appointment of a Supernumerary Deputy Superintendent of Police to do this job.

I am speaking from personal knowledge in this matter. This Government may appoint some chap who has two subjects at the London G.C.E., and he will sit down and copy legislation from Hong Kong and Malaya and perform such acts of legal absurdity. He will copy the legislation, submit it to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs who will look at it, and three years will elapse before certain people will be admitted into full Guyanese citizenship. By that time the people will be deprived of the rights to which they are entitled.

I say from my personal knowledge that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs is not in sympathy with certain people. He has shown absolutely no sympathy to these people who are legally Guyanese under the Constitution. He does nothing to assist certain

people. In the life of a human being, six months is a very long time.

3.30 p.m.

Two years will pass before this is made into law and what is to be done in the meantime? These persons are stateless. I regret to have to tell this House that circumstances may impel me to leave this country. I say this with sorrow rather than with anger. It is not that I am afraid. People like me are not afraid of Mr. d Aguiar, much less of Mr. Jordan. It is a sad thing to note that the citizens of this country are all descended from immigrants and today there sits in this House a Minister of Home Affairs who feels that some immigrants have a prior right over others. Yet this whole country is made up of an immigrant community! Six months have elapsed and nothing has been done to introduce citizenship laws, which the Constitution guarantees to a wide category of Guyanese. [Interruption.]

I hear a lot of rude noises coming from one section. A poor man made an offer to a Minister and was locked up. [Interruptions.] Did I hear the Prime Minister say that because it was \$100 nothing happened in Court? Do I understand that the sum was respectable enough for proceedings not to be enforced?

Every act of injustice in this country is being scrutinised by a number of people in the outside world. Let us not fool ourselves that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs could act with contempt to a large section of per-

sons and those people would not inform others of the true nature and significance of such action.

This item shows that this Government has no serious desire to implement the Constitution. I know that there are a few thousand persons entitled to citizenship.

We say that the Englishman discriminates against us in England and that the English do not want our people to go there, yet the Minister has enforced more discriminatory laws in this country than any in England. I speak feelingly in this matter. These things are known to many and are examined by them. I urge the members of the Government to remember that every community in this country is an immigrant one and if we extend equal rights to everyone, as we should, we will have a happy life, but if we seek to hide behind the excuse of security, we are clearly being dishonest. [The Prime Minister: "You offered me \$500 for each man."] I do not understand what the Prime Minister is saying. He uses his mouth to speak lies and slander.

I do not understand why a lowly Deputy Superintendent of Police should be charged with the responsibility of this difficult task. It is my honest belief and firm opinion that he knows nothing about it. This is properly a matter for the Counsel for the United Force, the Legal Draftsman in this country.

Mr. Wilson: The Minister is refusing to answer our questions, perhaps because they are too difficult. I am therefore going

to ask a very simple question, under item 17. What is the nature of the advice which the Government is seeking to obtain from a Supernumerary Deputy Superintendent of Police, and what are the qualifications required for giving this advice?

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Persaud: This afternoon the Prime Minister rose very quickly and answered a question. I was most grateful to him for the answer. When the Ministers fail to answer our questions it is the duty of the Prime Minister to do so. Now that he is back in the Assembly I am sure he will not deny the nation the right to know what is the position with respect to the Passport and Citizenship Bill. The question is a very simple one. We should like to know, also, whether this person has been appointed - the note indicates that he should have been appointed on the 1st September, 1966 - and, if so, who is the person, what is his salary and where is his office.

If no answer is forthcoming shall we assume, as the hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran said, that some member who was named in the list of terrorists is working in this position? I am sure that the Prime Minister would not allow the nation to entertain such a belief. Silence can cause people to assume that is the position.

I therefore urge the Prime Minister to answer our questions under this very important subhead, both for the ben-

[MR. PERSAUD]

efit of the hon. Members and for the sake of the population as a whole.

Mr. Wilson: This is high discourtesy on the part of the members of the Government.

The Chairman: What is the use of going on to ask further questions?

Mr. Wilson: At least we must express our views on it.

The Chairman: I cannot see the sense in it. He is not answering.

Mr. Wilson: The House must be given some information.

The Chairman: It is your right to ask a question; it is the right of the Ministers to refuse to answer.

Mr. Wilson: If the Government fails to answer these questions it is an indication that the Minister of Finance is disgusted with the squandermania being practised by this Government.

Mr. Khan: May I ask a very simple question? I hope the hon. Minister of Home Affairs will answer. Is this person a Guyanese? If he is a Guyanese is he a serving member of the Force? [**The Prime Minister:** "Yes".] This is a very serious matter. Are we going to sit

here and allow an outsider to be appointed without knowing who the person is?

3.40 p.m.

The Chairman: I am moving over to page 4.

Mr. Hubbard: I have a very important point to make.

The Chairman: What is the use of saying anything?

Transport and Travelling

Mr. Ram Karran: I should like to say something on item 18. May I? It is an important question of policy. Under a previous Head I intimated what the amounts voted in 1964 and 1965 were. I propose to repeat them: In 1964, the sum voted under this Head was \$180,000. In 1965 it was \$209,000. The original vote under this Head for this year was \$270,000 and an additional provision of \$24,000 is now being sought. The legend is what interests me. It states: "To meet the increase in fares and freight charges of the Transport and Harbours Dept., and also to increase police patrolling in the Interior Divisions." I concede, and I am sure that the House and the nation do, that there must be increased police patrolling at Ankoko and surrounding areas. But I feel that the Minister is being very discourteous to the House in not separating these two charges - police patrol, and increase in fares and freight charges of the Transport and Harbours Department.

Some time ago we pointed out that the increase in fares and freight charges of the Transport

and Harbours Department services was a very serious burden to the coastal producers and particularly on the people in the North West, in Pomeroun, in the Canals and in areas in the Berbice River District where people produce agricultural crop for shipment to the city and other places. The point I wish to make is that, in 1965, the sum of \$209,000 was voted on this item; in 1966 the sum of \$270,000 was voted, and we are now being asked to vote an additional sum of \$24,000.

This vote is for the Police alone, and not for Government services. This vote - Police - Transport and Travelling - Ministry of Home Affairs - is going to be increased by a large sum and I ask the Minister to consider what a burden has been placed on the very poor producers for whom the Minister of Finance (Mr. d'Aguiar) was solicitous prior to 1964. He used to fight - I do not want to repeat it and waste the time of the House, but I have the *Hansard* here, I can read it. [An hon. Member (Government): "Sit down."]

The hon. Minister and his colleagues are only prepared to sit down and heckle. They are not saying a word in reply to the questions asked by us. You, Sir, have asked what is the use of asking these questions. Well it is very important for us to ask questions. We must place them on record for all time, for

posterity, as the hon. Minister said, to show the callousness of the hon. Ministers and to show the farce to which they have reduced this Parliament. They have upgraded it; it is no longer called Legislative Assembly it is called a Parliament. They even have a fancy Chair brought from India, but this Parliament is a real farce. They cannot say that the questions we are asking here are not relevant.

This vote has been increased from \$209,000 last year to \$294,000 this year and I ask the Minister of Agriculture to ascertain what a very serious blow has been struck at the primary producers in this country. I receive no answer from the hon. Minister

Uniforms

Mr. Hubbard: Item 19 - Uniforms. When the Minister of Finance presents his Budget it is printed in fancy form. He believes that if you put bad rum in a fancy bottle people will buy it. But he forgets that his Budget Speech is a record which cannot be forgotten in the same way that a headache can be forgotten with some aspirins.

This Minister of Finance, this so-called financial wizard - and he is a wizard - voted \$102,000 for Uniforms. But he has an outstanding account for \$100,000 and he does not make

[MR. HUBBARD]

any provision for it in the Estimates. I believe that, in addition to his profession of usurer and publican, the Minister of Finance is an accountant. Therefore, I cannot assume that he has been tricked into an accounting error. When he took over this Ministry he told us all sorts of things. He told us that the accounting system was archaic and that he wanted machines because they think better than men. But here, in order to print in this fancy booklet a better picture than what actually existed, he ducked a bill for \$100,000.

Do not let us fool ourselves. That is the level of the mentality and operational morality of this Government. It is always tricking the electorate. It is always hiding something and then it comes back later hoping that we will keep quiet and getting some of its newspaper friends not to publish it in the newspapers. This whole Financial Paper shows that the Government, in presenting its Budget - which I termed an Interim Budget at the time, and now we have proof of it - deliberately under-estimated expenditure

The members of the Government knew that they had ordered Uniforms. This is not something

that was done behind their backs because before the Uniforms were ordered, the Tender Board had to be constituted, it had to sit, quotations had to be received, and all sorts of things had to be done. They could not have forgotten, because the Tender Board operates right in the Treasury, so that the Minister of Finance could not persuade me, or any reasonable person, to believe that he did not know that this bill existed. We are not getting answers to our questions so, once more, the dishonesty of the Minister of Finance in particular, and the Government, in general, must be recorded.

When we debated the Estimates I warned members of the Government that they should not ever take on trust anything that this Minister of Finance tells them because whatever he tells them has something behind it which is undisclosed. He is handing you what he says is 14-carat gold, but when you file it and put nitric acid on it, you find it is only 9-carat.

Mr. Ram Karran: Will the Minister --

The Chairman: We are going on to page 4.

Maintenance of Mounts and Saddlery

Mr. Ram Karran: Item 21: Will the Minister say how much

of this \$5,000 is to be spent on the maintenance of the Prime Minister's horse? [The Prime Minister: "Horses."]

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

3.50 p.m.

Mr. Luck: I should like to know if this legend is really correct; \$5,000 on \$30,000 to provide for an increase in the price of oats! Is this accurate or does it really mean something else? Are we to believe that maintenance of mounts and saddlery cost \$30,000 and that the price of oats should have increased to such an extent as to increase the cost of the upkeep of all the horses? Are we asked to believe that oats alone is responsible for this \$5,000 or is it that the Government is treating this House with rank dishonesty? \$5,000 for oats! Good heavens! They must be eating Quaker Oats!

Mr. Wilson: What is the number of horses involved in this question of increase in the price of oats, and what is the average consumption of each horse?

Mr. Hubbard: I am grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for telling us from his seat that this sum of money includes provision for feeding his own horses at public expense. **The**

Prime Minister: "The Prime Minister is entitled to that. Sit down."

Security Precautions

Mr. Ram Karran: Item 25, Ministry of Home Affairs - Security Precautions - \$12,000. Would the hon. Minister of Home Affairs tell us under whose control would this increase of \$12,000 come? Is it controlled by the Commissioner of Police? Is it controlled by the Security Chief? I see a number of people coming here to the Minister and they look like terrorists. I know he had detonators hidden in his yard. I want to know whether this increased amount is under the control of the Minister, and whether these people who come here to him are given some of this money, or whether it is properly controlled by finance regulations. Is it under the control of the Director of Audit? Will the hon. Minister get up for a change and tell us how this amount is to be spent?

In the notes it is stated that: "Voted provision proved inadequate owing to need for security measures." What sort of security measures is the hon. Minister talking about? For Ankoko or Venezuela? Let the hon. Minister tell us. I appreciate that this is a vote for security. The Minister will not divulge all that goes on in the department. But I am certain that the hon. Minister will tell us under whose control this vote comes.

[MR. RAM KARRAN]

[*The hon. Minister offered no reply.*]

Mr. Hubbard: I am deeply disturbed about this additional provision for the vote of Security Precautions. We are shortly in this House to give currency to suspicion and tale-bearing and, therefore, I see a great deal of danger in this increase. This increase is more than one-third which means that the Government is preparing perhaps to recruit some of those who have had to be knocked off because of the squandermania which the Minister of Finance complains of outside.

The Government is going to take scarce money and pass it to these chaps to go and whisper defamatory things about their relatives and friends, perhaps, so that this new system of injustice can really get working from the start. I am dead against this increase in the item and I should like to move that it be deleted.

Mr. Luck: I rise to support this --

The Prime Minister: You cannot move the deletion at this time. You vote against the deletion.

Mr. Persaud: I beg to move its reduction to one dollar.

Mr. Luck: I wonder whether this large increase in the money to be paid to informers is not

due to the increased activities in this country of the American Central Intelligence Agency whose activities, I understand, give some alarm to the Prime Minister. I understand that he wants to know, if he is working for them, why do they need anybody else as obviously they do. The sum of \$12,000 on \$30,000 is a very vast increase.

No one likes secret police. We are erecting in this country all the apparatus of a Police State. This is the item out of which informers receive their pay. What sort of society is the Government seeking to create in this country.

Assembly resumed.

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

Sitting suspended accordingly at 4 p.m.

4.38 p.m.

On resumption --

Assembly in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Luck: On the adjournment I was asking the hon. Minister of Home Affairs to say why this sum of \$12,000 should not be reduced to \$1. We on this side of the House can see no necessity for such a large sum of money to be spent in this manner. Experience in this country has shown that this system of paying informers had led to abuse by members of the Police Force.

Some time ago we had a Chief of Security, a Mr. David Rose, a gentleman who is about to become our Governor-General. During his regime the gentleman in charge of security knew that there were four favoured officers who were promoted very rapidly; they became Inspectors and so on. That was during the period of 1953, and after Mr. David Rose was promoted there came to replace him a Mr. Benn as Security Chief. It is common knowledge - indeed the hon. Prime Minister himself told me the story - that Mr. Benn found all four of the officers attached to the Security Department to be rascals. Mr. Benn discovered - some of these officers are still in the Police Force - that they were giving him reports and saying that they were paying for the information. There was a case where it was alleged that \$40 had been paid to an informant on the West Coast of Demerara. One of these officers wrote the report, and Mr. Benn subsequently discovered that the officer had made a report on events which took place only in his own imagination.

4.40 p.m.

Benn discovered that all four of these high-ranking police officers were frauds and transferred one to the Rupununi, one to Lethem and one to Morawhanna. They were sent to the extreme ends of Guyana. These same men are now back at Eve Leary, men who were receiving money to pay informers who never existed. I challenge the hon.

Minister of Home Affairs to deny the truth of this statement, namely, that Mr. Benn found that the security officers favoured by Mr. David Rose were all dishonest persons who were receiving money to pay informers who never existed. I can think of many of them but it would be unfair for me to call their names. I know that one man is an Inspector and is always drunk. These tricksters got rid of Benn and under the present regime they are now back in the saddle. That is why this provision is so objectionable. These men are going to make reports and, from what the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has said about certain matters, these reports will be dangerous for they will have a flavour of the truth in them. These men are novelists; they can use their imagination and write what they believe to have happened. A former member of the executive committee of the People's National Congress recently described a certain Minister, who is present now, as a dog of a certain kind.

We could all indulge in writing reports. I would like to know what part of this expense is to be used for tapping telephones. My friend smiles. Decent people recoil at the thought of needless invasion into the privacy of any man. Mr. Harold Wilson gave an equivocal answer to the question about phone tapping in England, and we read in this morning's newspaper that his telephone line was inundated with telephone calls. Whatever

[MR. LUCK]

their short-comings - and they have many shortcomings - the English people cherish personal liberty and privacy for themselves. They love freedom for themselves alone. Why should we tap telephones in this country?

There are ingenious pieces of equipment for listening to people's conversation. I do not doubt that the security police do obtain correct information. For instance, there was the time when it was disclosed that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary had buried dynamite. [Interruptions.] On some occasions this money may be properly used, but look at the dangers. How many men have been falsely accused of burying dynamite? My friend was rightly accused of burying dynamite, but they did not accuse the Minister of Home Affairs and it is public knowledge that 500 detonators were found. In view of what I have said I strongly urge that this item be reduced to \$1.00.

Mr. Wilson: We have heard much about the stability of the country, that there is peace and calm. How, then, can the Government justify an increase of \$12,000, which is nearly 50 per cent of the original amount voted for security precautions? Is this proving the claims of the Government to be false? Is it that members of the Government distrust their own supporters and now have to pay for a watch to be kept on a larger number of

people, their own people as well as members of the opposition party? Is it because they are not governing in the interest of workers and they know that there is a rising tide of dissatisfaction against them and therefore they must pay more money to keep dissatisfied persons in check? Will the Government explain the need for this increase in a situation of calm? Surely this does not fit with the facts as we know them. There is calm, there is quiet and we have returned to normalcy, yet there is an increase in the amount of money allocated for security precautions. Are members of the Government afraid for themselves? Are they afraid of losing their positions? Is it that they are aware of the fact that they are usurpers and feel they will meet the fate of all usurpers and be displaced? Will the Government offer an explanation for this increase?

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Hubbard: On behalf of the mover of the Motion on item 25 I beg to withdraw it.

The Chairman: Page 5.

Mr. Ram Karran: I wanted to deal with item 26 on page 4.

The Chairman: Page 6.

Mr. Wilson: To a point of order. We have not yet dealt with page 5.

The Chairman: I called it. We are on page 6 now.

4.50 p.m.

[Pause.]

The Chairman: Page 7.

MINISTRY OF FORESTS, LANDS AND MINES -

Central Timber Manufacturing Plant

Mr. Ram Karran: Item 42. The legend states: "To provide for an increase in the purchase of lumber for seasoning to ensure a ready supply of material throughout the coming year." I do not object - and I am sure that no member of the Opposition would - to the increase in provision for the purchase of lumber, but one would like to know whether this exercise is being conducted purely to purchase the timber -- [Interruption.]

The Chairman: Did the hon. Member prepare this Paper?

Mr. Ram Karran: I did, but I was not quite prepared to deal with this page now. As hon. Members on the other side seem to have got back their voices, perhaps we will now get answers to our questions. I saw them in the Lobby exercising their mouths. They seem to be quite ready now. Does this exercise which is carried out by the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant provide for a profit, or is it a free service to the community? [Mr. d'Aguiar:

"There is a loss."] If there is a loss, is there a Head under which this loss is shown? Perhaps the Minister will let the House know the profits and losses anticipated out of the \$123,000 already voted plus the \$90,000 which is now being voted, so that we will know what provision will be made next year.

I would also like to know how much timber is purchased, how much of it is stolen, and how much of it is left at the Plant. I also want to know, at a later stage, what system is used for seasoning timber that the Government wishes to buy. Is it done by stacking, is it done by sand, or is it done by electricity?

The Minister of Forests, Lands and Mines (Mr. Jordan): The previous speaker shows evidence of being a fool. The position is this: The P.P.P. Government never supplied the Plant with timber and ran it to the dogs. That is why we have to ask for \$90,000 to try to make it into something respectable.

Mr. Luck: Will the hon. Minister tell this House when last was timber sold at this Central Timber Manufacturing Plant?

Mr. Jordan: The last time the hon. Member did an under-the-table deal with his friends.

Mr. Luck: I was at the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant two weeks ago and I asked for

[MR. LUCK]

seasoned timber. I was shown very great courtesies by some of the people working there. They were very anxious to help me but the only wood they could offer me was 1" x 1", the only saleable timber at the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant - wood the size that you make window sticks with, nothing larger than that could be sold.

I investigated the matter further and found that there were eight salesmen selling this timber. They did not make a single sale, I would suspect, for the last month. [Dr. Reid: "You are always suspicious."] After much walking around I told them that I would buy anything that they had and I was able to persuade them to sell to me, as a personal favour, the biggest piece of timber they were selling which was 1½" x 2". This is the absolute truth. I looked around and I said to them, "Now gentlemen, what provision do you have for me to send this home?" I was told, "Comrade Luck, you have to go and get something to carry it." I said, "All right."

I was amazed to see that the purchase of \$12 had to be checked by four people. That was all the work they had done for that morning. Eight salesmen, a cashier and checkers are attached to the Plant, and there were no sales whatever for the last few months! Not only is that the position now but they did not foresee selling any lumber

for this year, and there are dozens, literary dozens, of able-bodied men there drawing their pay and doing nothing.

The hon. Minister speaks about what the P.P.P. did. What has this Government done? It has been in office since 1964. This is 1966 and there is not one inch of saleable timber at the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant - we can go there now - nor will there be any timber to be sold for this year.

Mr. Jordan: That bears me out; the previous Government had run the Plant completely out of stock. It takes time to season timber. [Opposition Members: "Two years?"]

Mr. Benn: I am sorry that the hon. Minister is misleading the House. In 1964 and a part of 1965 the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant reduced the prices of seasoned wood in order to get more sales. It is not true to say that the Plant had been run down during the time of the previous Government. It seems as if the Minister did not take care to improve the stocks.

Mr. Ram Karran: In dealing with this matter the hon. Minister used very unparliamentary language. I do not propose to go back but the Minister was obviously referring to those Ministers who draw salaries and sit down without attempting to answer questions. I congratulate the hon. Minister of Forests, Lands

and Mines for being quite different from his colleagues - maybe the tea has helped.

Dealing with the Central Timber Manufacturing Plant, I wish to state that in 1963 the actual amount voted under this item was \$66,804; in 1964 it was \$94,197. In 1965 the approved estimate was \$100,000 and the revised estimate was \$125,000. In 1966 the amount voted was \$123,000, which is \$23,000 more than the approved estimate for 1965. [Interruption.] The hon. Minister speaks from his seat. I do not think the House should pay any attention to him; he should get up on his hind legs.

The hon. Minister said that the P.P.P. Government ran down the stocks. Let us look at the present position. This Government has increased the vote to \$123,000 this year, that is an increase of \$23,000 on last year's vote. The Government is now asking this House to vote \$90,000 supplementary provision for this year. But the stocks are not being increased. I have a limited knowledge of the timber plant but I know that there is absolutely no timber in stock. I presume that the Government wants to sell 1" x 2" so that people can make broomsticks.

If you look at the Estimates, you will see that the Government has reduced the expenditure on Investigations and Research by \$3,000; Silviculture by \$18,000;

and Forest Surveys by \$12,500 to provide money and create jobs for the boys.

5 p.m.

It cannot get the money to engage in the very important projects of investigations and research, which must continue, if we are to take advantage of the natural resources of our country, but the hon. Member and his colleagues who were silent all day wish to expand this vote in order to provide jobs for the terrorists, and they have not said one word about it. I challenge the hon. Minister to convince this House that that is not what is being done! I should like the hon. Minister to reply.

[The hon. Minister offered no reply.]

Mr. Luck: May I further amplify my point? The gentleman said that they have been buying stocks and the vote is to buy stocks. May I ask the hon. Minister when will the Plant be really opened for selling timber to the public? If it is not to be opened this year, save and except to sell lxl - I hope the public knows what is lxl - will not the hon. Minister give some consideration to removing the twelve able-bodied salesmen, because why have salesmen with nothing to sell? They have been there despite all the promises of the U.F. to have some control over expenditure; they have been there for this whole year doing absolutely nothing. When will this come to an end? When will you have timber at the Plant to sell?

[MR. LUCK]

If you are not going to have any timber that will be saleable for the next six months, will the hon. Minister see to it that these strapping men who go there every morning selling timber to themselves are removed because they are not selling to anybody else. The record would prove that they could not find the bill book to sell \$12 worth of goods because they do not get any sales. They do not even know the procedures.

As I am on this point I want to say that I was informed there, and I raise this matter in this House, that a certain gentleman was found in a glaring act of rascality. He was discovered. The policeman recommended that so devious was the rascality, no charge should be brought but that the man should be dealt with departmentally and he should be dismissed. My information is that this recommendation was acted upon, but when they saw his connections they decided that the policeman should charge the man. The very policeman who charged the man was the policeman who had recommended that no charge should be brought against him. I understand that this was done in order that the charge may be dismissed so that this rascal could be reinstated in the Timber Manufacturing Plant. The other terrorists decided that it was time to draw the line somewhere, and I was told that there was the greatest dissatisfaction over this matter.

It must lead to the demoralisation of all the workers when persons caught stealing are reinstated. My informant was positive that the charge was brought only to give the man a chance to get back his job. Imagine this! In which civilised country could a policeman act in this way? I dare my friend there to deny it. The policeman recommended that no charge should be brought against the man but that he should be dealt with departmentally, and when it was discovered that the man would lose his job, the policeman brought a charge for the matter to be dismissed so that the man could get back his job. So high is the feeling in this matter at the Plant that the whole Plant is demoralised. I hope the hon. Prime Minister has heard the grave allegation.

I defy the hon. Minister to rise. If he wants, I will tell him the names, dates and months. Do not believe that people cannot get information. I did not have to have informers. The fellows there probably said to themselves, "We cannot get promotion until the thieves are dead." That is why the terrorists will take note and listen because if a man is caught stealing, the other boys might say it is time to get this man out, while the head terrorist will, by devious ways, have restored that man to his job. I hope the hon. Minister of Finance is listening and if he cannot remedy this situation, his only course is to follow Richmond.

Mr. Ram Karran: I would very seriously ask the hon. Prime Minister who has just walked in that, having regard to the experiences of the hon. Minister of Forests, Lands and Mines at the Hamilton Sawmill and the fate of that sawmill, to remove the hon. Minister from the Timber Manufacturing Plant. I think he knows timber too well.

Dr. Jagan: I should like to deal with this question from a different point of view and that is to ask whether the Government is satisfied that this Plant will be operating economically. I am not talking about profits, I am talking about economics. A company does not need to make profits to be economical. The object of this Plant was to encourage the utilisation of secondary species. We all know that greenheart and other lumber such as purpleheart are becoming scarcer and scarcer, therefore, the need was recognised many years ago that secondary species must be utilised.

At one stage there was a very large stock in this Plant which could not be sold. Whether this was due to the inefficiency of the salesmen, one does not know. But the fact is that even the Government departments refused to buy these secondary species.

5.10 p.m.

A lot of the timber at this Plant was rotten, and in some cases some of the milled lumber had to be remilled as a result of

which losses were incurred. Therefore I am asking Government whether a proper inquiry has been carried out to find out whether this sort of thing is not throwing money down the drain. If it is the intention to give jobs to the boys, then let the Government say so frankly.

We warn the Government that, today, in many parts of the Government Services, on the road programme and so on, people are listed on the roll of employment but they cannot be found on the jobs. In the case of this Plant, we were told that it has salesmen but nothing to sell.

In other places we are told that people report on the job, but they cannot be found afterwards. I want to warn the Government about these things. We used to read about what took place in Brazil where certain people had jobs with the Government and were also holding secondary jobs outside the Government simultaneously. That was due to corruption resulting from political interference with many of the Government Departments.

We know that in some of these Latin American countries corruption is part and parcel of the way of life of the Government. Inefficiency is another factor of life. Today the Government is having a U.N. team to advise it. I was called in to tell the team something about the Service. After I referred to the experiences which the pre-

[DR. JAGAN]

vious Government had had with the Public Service and mentioned the fact that there was a political strike on more than one occasion, I was asked the question: "If the present administration is being supported politically by the Service, why is there this malaise and lack of interest?" It was obviously a difficult question to answer. The answer to the malaise and the lack of interest is to be found in the number of things to which my hon. Colleague referred a little while ago. [Interruption.]

The hon. Prime Minister likes to make a noise to deter people from speaking in this House. If the Government goes on like this not only are we going to have more and more supplementary estimates brought to this House as well as bigger and bigger deficits, but the whole machinery of the Government will come to a stand still very shortly and the country and the taxpayers will have to foot the bill.

**Macouba Co-operative Land
Society Ltd.**

Mr. Jagan: With reference to item 41 - subhead 6 (New) Ex-Gratia award Macouba Co-operative Land Society Ltd. - \$3,290, I notice that the legend states: "To provide an ex-gratia payment to the Macouba Co-operative Land

Society to enable the Society to meet part of its costs arising from an award of damages for trespass against the Society." It would appear that someone has committed a trespass against the Society and damages were awarded. I should be grateful if the hon. Minister would tell us what is the amount awarded to the Society and who had committed the trespass against it.

Mr. Jordan: This is a hang-over from the days of the P.P.P. Government. Mr. Chan was being pushed around after he had been sent on the land. The case went to court, after he stopped supporting the party, and he was awarded damages.

The Chairman: Page 8.

Miscellaneous

Mr. Hubbard: I wish to speak on item 43, page 7. I had intimated that I wanted to discuss this item.

The Chairman: That cannot be intimated to anybody in here.

Mr. Hubbard: I am humbly begging for permission to speak on item 43.

The Chairman: We dealt with page 7 long enough. We are now dealing with page 8.

**MINISTRY OF TRADE, SHIPPING
AND CIVIL AVIATION**

Extraction of oil from rice bran

Mr. Hubbard: With respect to item 46 -Head 31 - Ministry of Trade, Shipping and Civil Aviation, subhead 15(New) Research in the extraction of oil from rice bran - \$2,515, I am surprised to find that the hon. Minister has spent this amount of money in order to find out that oil can be extracted from rice bran. This is something that has been established many years ago. Oil has been extracted from rice bran ever since the days when we used to call it Rangoon oil. These Ministers are not answering questions, but I would like to hear something about this matter.

The Minister of Trade, Shipping and Civil Aviation (Mr. Kendall): This Government has not spent this money for any research in the extraction of oil from rice bran. This provision is being sought to pay for something which the previous Government has done. The previous Government took 500 bags of rice from the Rice Development Company without paying for it and gave a man called Thakoor who is now in England. I understand that he is a relative of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. In the circumstances, this Government is paying for something which it knows nothing about. [Hon. Members (Government): "Shame."]

Dr. Jagan: In answering this question the hon. Minister, who

has seen the contents of the files, has decided to talk in such a manner as to cast aspersions against me. This is rascality of the highest order, when he refers to Thakoor. He should have said that Basil Thakoor was an Industrial Officer for many years, and he was appointed by the Government of Guyana.

5.20 p.m.

It is all well and good to say that the previous Government incurred this expenditure, but what I would like to ask the Minister is this: Why is it that the rice bran oil factory, which was on the point of being installed, has been cancelled by this Government? We are told that we need industrialisation; we are told that we must do everything to make the rice industry as efficient and as profitable as possible. Here was an instance where the rice industry and the Guyanese people were to benefit. A capitalist, Lance Rayman, was then heading the Rice Development Company. He went into this matter in great detail and was satisfied that the bran oil factory would pay. He was prepared to put his own money into a joint Government-private enterprise company. This Government has chased away people like Lance Rayman who have brains. There is a mass exodus out of the country and everywhere there are round pegs in square holes running things. It is no wonder that the whole machinery of Government is breaking down.

[DR. JAGAN]

The Minister must not only tell us that the past Government incurred this expense of \$2,500. He must tell us why it was cancelled when the deal was almost consummated. If it had not been for the East Germany authorities there would have been a suit against the Government for breach of contract. An agreement had been made between the Rice Development Company and a company in East Germany for the purchase of this factory, but this Government, which is taking orders from the United States of America, does not want to have Government-run industries.

Members of the Government say a great deal about improving the efficiency of the rice industry, but this is one classic example of the scrapping of something that would have benefited the industry.

Mr. Kendall: If the Leader of the Opposition would like the country to know more about this matter, all he has to do is to table a Question or a Motion and I shall be very glad to give the background to all that he has been saying and to speak about this great industrialist, Thakoor.

Dr. Jagan: Speak about Rayman.

Maintenance and operation of Aircraft

Mr. Wilson: Under item 47, I should like to know whether there is a typographical error in the legend which speaks about

"Cessna Skylane Aircraft VP-G.C.D. owned by Government". I wish to know whether the Government owns this directly or whether it is owned by the Guyana Airways Corporation. If it is owned by the Government why is it not under the Guyana Airways Corporation, which is capable of maintaining the aircraft? Also, if this is owned by the Government, what are the special duties of the aircraft?

Mr. Kendall: This aircraft is owned by the Government of Guyana. I believe it was bought by the previous Government.

Mr. Ram Karran: Who owns the Guyana Airways Corporation? Will the hon. Minister please say?

Mr. Kendall: Guyana Airways is a corporation.

Mr. Ram Karran: I understand the hon. Minister to say that the Guyana Airways Corporation is owned by the Government and people of this country. The Cessna aircraft was bought for the private use of the Prime Minister and his entourage. It is being used by them when, in fact, had it been put under the control of the Guyana Airways Corporation for maintenance and for use, there would be immense savings on its operation. In addition to its use by Government, the aircraft could be used for the transportation of passengers and cargo on a limited scale.

I wish to say that this figure here of \$2,000 is misleading. It is dishonest on the part of the Government to set down a figure of \$2,000 under this subhead, a new subhead, when we all know that \$2,000 cannot meet the maintenance of even a motor car for a year. What the Government probably proposes to do is to allow the Guyana Airways Corporation to carry some of the charges and thus keep them hidden. The legend reads: "To meet the cost of normal maintenance and operation of Cessna Skylane Aircraft VP-G.C.D. owned by Government." It is not possible to operate and maintain an aircraft, even if it is a Cessna, on \$2,000 a year. The hon. Minister must give us all the information. On a matter like this he ought to have prepared a White Paper with the background to it. As I said this aircraft could be used by the Corporation to earn revenue when it is not required by the Government or by the Prime Minister, who must make his week-end jaunts. I am not saying this is wrong, but why try to mislead the House?

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

- POST OFFICE

Conveyance of Mails

Mr. Hubbard: Under item 50, I wish to draw your attention, sir, to the fact that the Minister responsible for delivery of mails is absent from his seat

when this item is being considered. The Minister of Finance is also absent. It shows that the passing of supplementary estimates is a matter of no consequence to the Government. I think the public should take very careful note of this. We are being asked, under this subhead, to vote an additional amount of \$100,000, and, according to the note, it is: "To provide for additional expenditure incurred as a result of an increase in mail traffic and for the payment of outstanding 1965 air-mail accounts due to foreign administration."

Here we are being asked to vote an additional provision amounting to one-third the amount originally placed on the Estimates. This is an indication of the incompetence of those who run the Ministry of Finance. Let me say at once that I attach no blame to the Functionaries, the circumlocutory officers, the civil servants who do the work, because I am convinced that they put the true facts - [Laughter.] - the facts before the Minister and the Minister alters those facts so that we get the kind of fairy-tale that we see every time that we have to consider expenditure in this House.

5.30 p.m.

Two things that are really not related have been lumped together, and this has been happening

[MR. HUBBARD]

throughout the supplementary estimates. The note states: "To provide for additional expenditure incurred as a result of an increase in mail traffic and for the payment of outstanding 1965 air-mail accounts due to foreign administration." I think this is reprehensible. I think it is more reprehensible, and perhaps a sign of confusion, that the Minister responsible for this disgrace is not in his seat to deal with it.

Mr. Ram Karan: My colleague is quite correct.

The Chairman: I will move on to page 9.

Mr. Ram Karan: I want to make an observation.

The Chairman: On what?

Mr. Ram Karan: On the same page.

The Chairman: I will allow one observation.

Mr. Ram Karan: Under the item dealing with Conveyance of Mails, the expenditure voted for this year was: Internal - \$28,000; External - \$28,000; Air Mails - \$244,000, making a total of \$300,000. I say advisedly that the hon. Minister of Finance has been deliberately underestimating figures in order to mislead the nation and the

House because last year the amount voted was \$356,000 and this year, according to the legend, additional expenditure has been incurred as a result of an increase in mail traffic and for the payment of outstanding 1965 air-mail accounts.

The Minister, or his deputy whom I saw walking out after the Richmond affair, must tell this House why the expenditure on this vote was underestimated to such an extent that the Government has to come back and ask for additional expenditure of \$100,000. It is not only a disgrace but it is downright dishonesty, and this gentleman must answer to the people and the nation for this bit of rascality, as it has been described earlier today. We cannot get through this Financial Paper. I know it might be boring to hear one thing over and over, but if we were given answers so many of us would not speak. Perhaps there are reasonable answers, but the hon. Ministers remain mum, even though they have had a good cup of tea. We will have to try and get something out of them.

I cannot understand, and I am sure my little son would not understand, how this large amount of \$356,000 was spent last year and only \$300,000 was put down on the Estimates for this year. The Government now comes, in the latter part of the year, to ask us to approve an additional ex-

penditure of \$100,000. This is disgraceful! Perhaps Mr. Too-Chung will get up and say something about this.

[*The hon. Minister offered no reply.*]

The Chairman: Page 9.

Miscellaneous

Mr. Wilson: Item 52: The legend states: "To meet increased cost of lighting at District Post Offices. . ." I have no row to make about this. What I would like to suggest is that Post Offices, in areas where the Electricity Corporation cannot provide electricity, be provided with electricity from the lighting plants in the areas where they are situated. If you visit these districts you will see that all the business places and private homes have electricity, but the residences of the poor postmasters have none.

Mr. Hubbard: I am a little puzzled by this legend. It states: ". . . for the employment of additional charwoman at the increased rates of wages to clean district offices in place of postal Apprentices." Will the junior Minister of Finance kindly tell us if a charwoman is being sent from district office to district office to clean Post Offices? [**Mr. Too-Chung:** "I do not look after charwomen."] The junior Minister of Finance says that he does not look after charwomen. One of these days we shall no doubt

discover what he does look after. It seems as if no information is forthcoming but I do hope that the Government is not overworking one charwoman by sending her from district office to district office.

Mr. Wilson: Under this same item, will the Minister say whether there are many Postal Apprentices still cleaning Post Offices?

[*The hon. Minister offered no reply.*]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS - TRANSPORT AND HARBOURS

Net Deficit in Transport Services

Mr. Chase: Item 55: A very large provision is made here to meet the net deficit in the Transport and Harbours Department. I recall that when the Minister concerned had announced a certain variation in fares in the Transport and Harbours Department, it was questioned by Members on this side of the House and the explanation given was that it was anticipated that the net deficit of the Transport and Harbours Department would have been substantially reduced as a result of the changes that were made.

It seems that, contrary to that anticipation, there has been a serious net fall in the revenue of that Department. This is a very serious matter because, instead of the Department earning more, it seems to be earning less. I remember that the hon.

[MR. CHASE]

Member Mr. Linde, in particular, drew the Minister's attention to the fact that there were fewer people using the steamer on the Berbice River. In fact, we tabled Questions on this matter to the Minister concerned.

It seems that the Minister does not really know what he is doing. That is the truth about the matter. It is a pity that he is not in his seat at this time. I would have thought that the correct course would have been to have this item deferred until he is in his seat because neither you, sir, nor this House should be treated with the sort of gross disrespect which seems most apparent this afternoon. Certainly, the Minister cannot be asking this House to vote a provision of \$½million and he is not even in his seat to answer a simple question in relation to the item.

5.40 p.m.

I should like to know from him whether fewer people are using the Berbice River steamer. What has been the net increase gained, if any, from re-introducing first-class fares on the railways? What increases, if any, are gained from the steamer having increased the fares and, in particular, the freight on cycles? Is there a loss as a result of the reduction of freight charges in respect of motor cars? How many soft-drink companies are taking advantage of the reduced

charges by the Transport and Harbours Department? What loss, if any, is resulting from this? Have there been any increases in the operating costs of these services?

We have before us an additional provision of \$250,000 for the Transport and Harbours Department, with merely two lines written in the notes. We do not know whether the railways are losing the money or whether it is the steamer section. We do not know from what part of the Transport and Harbours Department this money is going down the drain. This calls for some explanation. I would ask, since the Minister concerned is not here this afternoon, if the Leader of the House is not disposed to having this item deferred, whether one of his ministerial colleagues would be good enough to answer some of the questions which I have been asking, so that we can have some explanation why such a big provision is to be voted.

Another matter is whether this \$250,000 is an estimate of what will be the over-all loss at the 31st December this year, or is this only the loss up to the end of September or October this year? In other words, are we going to be requested, in due course, to vote a further supplementary provision in respect of the Transport and Harbours Department?

In many of the departments I notice that a lot of money has been claimed for secu-

rity and it is going to be a very useful exercise one of these days when we total up what sums are spent on security. What does security mean? What proportion of this \$250,000 arises from increased security measures in the Transport and Harbours Department?

There is another matter on which the Minister ought to have made up his mind by now. What is the policy with regard to the railways? There has been an old problem here as to whether the railways should continue or whether there should be a road system.

The hon. Minister should let us know whether we are losing \$250,000 on the rail transport service. Is this amount going to be increased next year or is a change going to be made in the foreseeable future? There have been a number of Reports on the Transport and Harbours Department, and it is time for the Minister to come forward in this House with the policy he intends to pursue with regard to the railways. We have had no expression of opinion or statement from this Ministry concerning these vital questions. It seems to me that the time has come, having regard to the deficits that are taking place, that a clear policy statement should be made by the Minister concerned on the operation of this Department. I repeat, I should like to know where this loss falls. Is it in the railway services or in the steamer services? If it is in the railway services,

which branch in the railway services? If it is in the steamer services, which branch in the steamer services?

Has the Government been able to get increased revenue as a result of the changes in the railway fares? This House was deceived when Members were told that, as a result of the changes, there would have been increased revenue, because certain changes were made before the presentation of the last Budget which clouded the real deficit and the real tax burdens that were placed on the working class of this country. Farmers had to pay increased fares when using railways and steamers. There were increases on freight charges and increases on bicycles crossing in steamers. We were told that as a result of all these things there would be more revenue and the deficit in the Transport and Harbours Department was going to be cut down. But a very huge sum, huge in relation to the deficit for which the Minister budgeted, is being asked to be approved this afternoon. If none of these questions is to be answered, I shall reluctantly come to the conclusion that what originally did happen was that the Minister of Finance deliberately understated the deficit of the Transport and Harbours Department, with the object of not giving this House a true picture of what was the deficit of the Budget which he presented.

When you add up this quarter of a million dollars with another

[MR. CHASE]

quarter of a million dollars this must be gross underestimation of expenditure in order to give the impression that the Budget was calculated properly. I am asking for an explanation as to the reason for this large deficit, and I am of the opinion that, if no explanation is given, it is due to "fingering" with the Budget.

5.50 p.m.

I hope that one of the Ministers will give me an answer. [Mr. Bissember: "What are you talking about?"] For the benefit of the Leader of the House I wish to point out that we are discussing page 9, item 55, subhead 1 - Net Deficit in Transport Services - \$250,000. The legend states: "Voted provision proved inadequate owing to the fact that revenue did not increase as much as anticipated." The hon. Minister must have been sleeping all along.

[The hon. Ministers offered no reply.]

Mr. Stoby: I am sorry the hon. Minister of Communications is not in his seat to listen to the points which I am about to make here. I would like to make a few suggestions regarding the running of the Pomeroun steamer service. I contact the steamer fortnightly, and I have a good idea of what goes on there. I am referring to the way in which the workmen operate, and I think that the Government

should send an officer to find out why so much losses are experienced in this Department.

The people in the Pomeroun area are experiencing a number of difficulties as a result of the carelessness in the management and operation of the steamer. Farmers have to wait for hours on the steamer. There is no proper shed for people to shelter while waiting on the steamer, and the mosquitoes make it rather uncomfortable for the poor people. Sometimes the farmers have to wait from the afternoon until the early hours of the morning before they can put their provision on the steamer. The moment the rain comes, the men will close the hatches and indulge in all sorts of conversation. Very often the boatswain works harder than a petty officer.

Mr. Wilson: This is the result of Government's policy to increase fares and freight charges in order to introduce first-class and second-class fares. I think the Government should now give consideration to the question of reverting to one class.

The Prime Minister: Under Standing Order No. 36(4), I beg to move that the Chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again. *Ex abundanti cautela*, I would refer you to the sixteenth edition of May's *Parliamentary Practice* at page 609 which states:

"Motions to support progress, etc. - It is the practice for Members who desire to close the sitting of a committee to move that the chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again"

It is, therefore, my right to move this Motion which, I would submit, is a closure of the Motion and which ought to be put without question. I now move that the Chairman report progress and ask for leave to sit again. All this means is that the matter under consideration will cease to be considered today, and that the next item on the Order Paper will supersede it.

The Chairman: The question is, "That the Chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again."

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes 26, Noes 20, as follows:

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Wharton	Mr. Saffee
Rev. Trotman	Mr. Stoby
Mr. Tello	Dr. Ramjohn
Mr. Sancho	Mr. Poonai
Mr. Field-Ridley	Mr. Persaud
Mr. Carrington	Mr. Linde
Mr. Budhoo	Mr. Ally
Mr. Blair	Mr. Khan
Mr. Too-Chung	Mr. Jagan
Mr. Joaquin	Mr. Luck
Mr. Duncan	Mr. Hamid
Mr. Clarke	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Bowman	Dr. Ramsahoye

Mr. deGroot	Mr. Nunes
Mr. Thomas	Dr. Jacob
Mr. Merriman	Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Kendall	Mr. Chandisingh
Mr. Kasim	Mr. Ram Karran
Mr. Jordan	Mr. Benn
Mr. John	Mr. Chase - 20.
Mrs. Gaskin	
Mr. Cheeks	
Mr. Bissember	
Mr. d'Aguiar	
Dr. Reid	
Mr. Burnham - 26.	

Motion carried.

Assembly resumed.

Mr. d'Aguiar: I beg to name Friday, 25th November, 1966, as the day upon which this Motion shall be continued.

BILL - SECOND READING

NATIONAL SECURITY (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

A Bill intituled-

"An Act to make provision for divers matters touching on National Security." [The Minister of Home Affairs.]

Mr. Speaker: This debate is on a matter of a very important nature, and I would ask hon. Members on both sides of the House to adopt some measure of restraint. I would also like this debate to be conducted at

[MR. SPEAKER]

a high level, and I am not going to permit any unnecessary interruptions from either side.

6 p.m.

BILL - SECOND READING

National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Dr. Reid): I rise to move the Second Reading of a Bill intituled:

"An Act to make provision for divers matters touching on National Security."

As we are all aware, this debate is of national importance, and this is as it should be, because it is a National Security Bill. The Bill itself tells the people that Government is aware that this nation must be secure and safe at all times and under all circumstances. With recent history in mind, Government has taken the step that should be taken to ensure that the people of this country are secure and safe in case any difficulties arise.

In some quarters there is talk to the effect that the Bill is not constitutional, that it intrudes on our constitutional rights, but I want to show to hon. Members and to let the nation know that there is nothing in this Bill that is unconstitutional. The Constitution of

Guyana, which I hold in my right hand, gives authority to the Government to make provision in a Bill for the security of the national interest. I should like to read from Article 5 of the Constitution of Guyana. I quote:

"Protection of 5.-(1) No person shall right to personal liberty. be deprived of his personal liberty save as may be authorised by law in any of the following cases "

and I shall read (e) -

"upon reasonable suspicion of his having committed, or being about to commit, a criminal offence under the law of Guyana;"

Hence, this Bill is in keeping with that Article of the Constitution. At a later stage I shall read Articles 3 and 4, both of which support this Bill that is now before the House.

Government has an obligation to this nation and regardless of the situation, regardless of partisan politics, Government must always honour this obligation. If this is not done, people will use their freedom to destroy the freedom of others. I want it to be noted very care-

fully that a man has a right to his personal freedom so long as he does not use this personal freedom to destroy the personal freedom of other persons. The moment he uses his personal freedom to interfere with the personal freedom of others, he then forfeits his own personal freedom. To give a simple illustration: A man is free to use his feet, but if he uses his feet to kick someone else, then he is doing something in contravention to the law; he is free to use his hand, but if he hits somebody else, he has done something against the personal freedom of some other person. As a matter of fact, a man is free to use his eyes, but if he is caught as a peeping Tom, then he is in serious trouble. I say this to illustrate that we cannot use our personal freedom to interfere with the personal freedom of others.

This brings me to the point that freedom carries obligations and responsibilities. If people think that there can be freedom without obligations and responsibilities, then we will not be able to speak about freedom in this country. We will have to use another word; we will have to speak of "licence". This Government is not prepared to allow anybody, regardless of his political situation, regardless of his status, to have licence instead of true freedom in this country.

There will be people who will say that countries like Jamaica

and Trinidad and Tobago have had no cause to have this type of Bill. True! But in recent weeks there was an uprising in Jamaica and promptly the Minister concerned with security declared a State of Emergency. It ought to be noted that when this was taken to the House of Assembly, both sides of the House voted in support of the Minister. The nation must know at all times that we, whether in the Government or in the Opposition, must be concerned with the security of all the people in this country.

Our recent history has been quite different from that in places like Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. Serious things have happened in this country between 1962 and 1964. We have it on record that some 200 Guyanese lost their lives because the Government of the day was not concerned with the welfare of all the people in this country. If the Government had taken the necessary steps to declare the emergency which was needed, and if it had taken action at the first sign of an upheaval or uprising, this country would not have experienced the recent sad history that is recorded in our books.

One may say those are things of the past. Well, Government has to be realistic. I am sure that during this debate we will hear much theory, but when it comes to functioning as a Government, that is a practical business. It is realistic and we must have measures that we can use effectually and swiftly so

[DR. REID]

that any threat to the personal freedom of the people and to the security of the nation will be dealt with effectively and promptly.

I have before me a long list of the incidents between 1962 and 1964. These are incidents that none of us would like to see repeated. It is my belief that hon. Members on both sides of this House will support this National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill so that all people in this country will feel free to enjoy their freedom and will know that they must not interfere with the freedom of other people.

Let us have a little patience and take a look at some of the incidents that took place over the years. Memories are short sometimes and this will be quite revealing. We need to be reminded lest we forget. In 1962 one policeman and four civilians were killed.

6.10 p.m.

In 1962 one policeman and four civilians were killed; 41 civilians and 39 policemen were injured; and 224 persons were convicted of offences against the security of the State, against the freedom of other people. That was in 1962. I am firmly convinced that if the Government of the day had taken firm steps, at the beginning of 1962, to stop this, we would not have had the very sad record that follows. In 1963 there was a continuation of the uprisings and upheavals, and here again we have the sad story: 1,647 persons were

charged for security offences, 730 persons were injured, 42 persons were shot by the Police 4 persons were shot by soldiers, 11 persons were murdered, plus the destruction of property. Yet the Government of the day did nothing!

As a matter of fact, instead of doing its duty to this country, the Government of the day showed callousness that one would not have imagined. So the story goes on, and we enter into 1964 and we find a repetition of events: 176 persons killed, 920 persons injured, 1,756 persons charged for offences against the security of the State. Even when the appeal went out for the Government to do something, declare an emergency, collect the arms and ammunition, the Government of the day did nothing.

Just a few days ago we heard in this House probably some of the reasons why, at that time, the Government of the day allowed these incidents to go from bad to worse. It seems as if that Government thought it was gaining political advantage and, therefore, there was no reason to prevent these happenings from occurring. But in the security of the nation we have to rise above partisan politics because we are responsible for the safety, peace and security of all the people. We on this side of the House find satisfaction in the fact that since this Government assumed office, because of its fairness, because of the known fact that this Government was determined that the people of

this country should live in peace and safety, these incidents have not altogether stopped, but they have been considerably reduced.

Freedom carries with it responsibility. There is no freedom without responsibility. Article 3 of *The Constitution of Guyana*, Chapter II, dealing with the Protection of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms of the Individual, supports me in this. I will now read Article 3:

"Whereas every person in Guyana is entitled to the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual, that is to say, the right, whatever his race, place of origin, political opinions, colour, creed or sex, but . . ."

and this is important -

". . . subject to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest, to each and all of the following, namely -

- (a) life, liberty, security of the person and the protection of the law;
- (b) freedom of conscience, of expression and of assembly and association; and
- (c) protection for the privacy of his home and

other property and from deprivation of property without compensation,

the following provisions of this Chapter shall have effect for the purpose of affording protection to those rights and freedoms subject to such limitations . . ."

-there is always this limitation - [Interruption by Mr. Luck.]

Mr. Speaker: Do not interrupt; the hon. Minister is making a quotation.

Dr. Reid: I will continue:

". . . subject to such limitations of that protection as are contained in those provisions, being limitations designed to ensure that the enjoyment of the said rights and freedoms by any individual does not prejudice the rights and freedoms of others or the public interest."

It is upon this basis that we on this side of the House make bold to bring this measure and sincerely hope that the Opposition will support it.

There is some fear that when this Bill is passed - [Mr. Benn: "If this Bill is passed."] - the Government will begin to lock up people. I have been hearing this all the time. [Mr. Luck: "You have been saying it."] If this Government finds reasons to lock

[DR. REID]
up people, this Government can lock them up now under the Emergency Regulations. But it is this Government that has released all the detainees. It is this Government that has been putting on restrictions and lifting them up according to the security situation of the country. [Mr. Jagan: "Let us hear about the rule of law."]

The explanatory memorandum states that this Bill will not come into operation automatically on enactment but only when the Emergency Regulations cease to be in force. Part II of this Bill cannot come into force unless an Order is made by the Governor-General. [Mr. Luck: "Who is he?"] Part II of the Bill deals with preventive detention and it is good to know that, after a person has been arrested, within seven days the Government must give to the Tribunal reason for his detention. The Tribunal is constituted by the Chancellor himself and I would hate to think that Members of this House have no confidence in the highest authority of law known in this country. [Interruption.]

I hope the hon. Member has studied the Bill carefully. [Mr. Jagan: "You did not study it."] The chairman and members of this Tribunal are appointed by the Chancellor. The Prime Minister has nothing to do with this Tribunal.

6.20 p.m.

We want to make this clear. The hon. Member is probably

thinking of the Advisory Tribunal. We have not come to that yet, so that this is, as it were, part of the Supreme Court of the land. I am certain that Members on both sides of the House have confidence in the Supreme Court of this land. But for quick action a Tribunal is set up; any person who is detained has the freedom to retain counsel, to have his case argued as to why he was detained, and so on. But all of this must be done within three months and if this Tribunal decides that there is not sufficient cause for detention, then the person must be set free, and the Detention Order must be revoked immediately.

Sir, with all the fears that are being generated, Government must be prepared to defeat insurgency. Government must always be prepared to protect the freedom of all the people. Government has information of all types of "build-up" that go on in the country. Government knows what types of things people use in this country. It knows where people learn to make pipe guns, and bombs, and it will not be doing its duty if it does not stand prepared for any emergency that will threaten the security of the State.

For instance, if there is an outbreak of an acute infection in a district, you do not want the medical men to get together at a medical congress, meeting for weeks or months, to discuss it. During that time people will be suffering, people will be dying as happened in 1962, 1963 and 1964.

Government must be in a position to use measures to cure the infection and this must be done promptly. At that time people will have no patience in a medical conference. They will want action that will mean relief, action that will bring safety and health.

The argument is sometimes advanced that the Police should be able to watch those who interfere with the freedom of other people, and with the security of the State. But there is a difference between what happens in small developing countries and what happens in large and wealthy countries. The point is that large and wealthy countries can afford to spend large sums of money to train men, but small nations which are struggling to develop, to build roads and schools, cannot afford to do that. We should not spend the taxpayers' money in that way. To support my argument, I shall read from the *Daily Gleaner* of February, 1966, and I hope that Members will listen and inwardly digest it:

"Unfettered liberty is a luxury which only the mighty, perhaps, can afford. Large and powerful nations spend undisclosed millions on maintaining intelligence agencies and all the complex array of security commitments so as to preserve them from danger - inside and outside.

In the powerful democratic nations, internal

enemies are not necessarily locked up; governments often learn much more by leaving them at large and so keep abreast of their movements. Once a secret enemy is exposed, he is succeeded by someone even much more secret and the game has to start all over again. Hence governments of powerful nations balance it carefully to decide how much rope to give the subversive citizen whilst watching him.

Little nations can hardly afford the luxury of this kind of tactic. Hence it is not sensible or fair to compare the facade of liberty in Britain and the U.S. with the urgent necessities for security in little places like Costa Rica or Jamaica (and may we add, Guyana).

Where the great nations can apply control and curative measures ultimately, small nations do better by protective and aseptic measures. Naturally, no nation admits its security arrangements. Hence any good citizen careful for his country's safety should beware lest he heed those who preach maximum freedom but may be in fact seeking freedom against the interest of the nation."

The powers granted by this Bill are in no way greater than the powers granted under the present Emergency Regulations, and

[DR. REID]

when Members on the other side want us to believe that this is an atrocious Bill, they seem to forget that we use the treatment that should be used in democratic countries.

Mr. Speaker: This sitting is suspended until 8 p.m.

Sitting suspended accordingly at 6.30 p.m.

8.04 p.m.

On resumption --

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At the suspension of the sitting, the hon. Minister of Home Affairs was speaking and he can continue if he so desires.

Dr. Reid: At the time of suspension I was about to make a point to show how countries deal with individuals who have no respect and regard for other people's freedom. We on this side of the House believe that the National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, 1966, is needed in this country, because we believe that the Government is responsible for the welfare of all of the people.

In some countries certain leaders are honoured and respected by members of the Opposition in this House. In some

countries there is something known as "the disappearance of people". Instead of being detained, some people just disappear and they are never heard of again. That happens often in places like Russia and even Cuba. In this very country we have seen demonstrated the type of treatment meted out to people whom others do not want to see here.

I wish to remind the House that in this very country there was demonstrated what is today known as "The Akbar Ali Treatment". Akbar Ali was a citizen of this country who was bold enough to exercise his freedom to feel free and do whatever he wanted to do, but certain persons felt that such a person should be destroyed. On the 9th February, 1966, Akbar Ali was sitting in his car, and he was destroyed. Today we think of that as "The Akbar Ali Treatment". We on this side of the House do not believe in that. I want to support this with a very brief quotation. I quote:

"Kingston,
Jamaica,
24th February, 1966".

This is something that came over the Jamaica Radio Rediffusion. In those days we were known as British Guiana, but today we are known as Guyana.

I continue

**"B. G. WARNED
TO TIGHTEN SECURITY**

Kingston, Feb. 24 -- An influential radio commentator

warns Caribbean nations to tighten up on internal security.

Louis Byles, in his popular 'Louis Byles Looks At the News' programme over Radio Rediffusion Jamaica on Sundays, based his warnings on an analysis of the Tri-Continental Conference held in Havana in January.

Decisions were taken to establish a permanent organisation in Havana to assist movements of national Liberation", he warns.

"And what really is a movement of national liberation?" Byles asks.

"In a word - rebellion."

In other words, violence and the destruction of the people.

8.10 p.m.

To be forewarned is to be forearmed. This Bill also makes provision for the control of ammunition, firearms and explosives. Some people have said it will be impossible even to play marbles, because the Minister of Home Affairs will be able to name the marble as a dangerous weapon. From our experience, we know that it is not practicable to name all the things that can be turned into dangerous weapons. Right now, I have in my office two cups, one marked "Ovaltine" and

the other marked "Fry's Cocoa". If good Christian people were to see these cups on their doorsteps - they look clean and new - they would believe that they contain Fry's Cocoa or Ovaltine, as the case may be, and would be tempted to pick them up, but these are cups that the police removed from certain districts. When one examined them, one finds in them nails, high-power batteries, bits and pieces of iron and steel, some blunted, some sharpened, so that unless the police had authority to seize these and to name them as lethal weapons, people in this country would not be safe and secure.

The police must be given such authority and the Bill allows them to be able to search people without warrant because if persons are carrying these types of dangerous weapons and instruments in their food saucepans or in Ovaltine tins, and one attempts to waste time by taking out a warrant, it would be found that these things would disappear or one would find them lying somewhere with no ownership at all.

This is a very practical Bill to meet a very practical situation in this country of ours. In struggling underdeveloped or undeveloped countries such as ours, we must be able to introduce practical measures that can deal swiftly and effectively with any person or group of persons who believe that they can use their freedom to destroy the freedom of other people and the security of the State.

[DR. REID]

One is told sometimes that this Bill is atrocious, that it will make people become Hitlers and all sorts of things, but in India there is a National Security Bill and I do not think any of the hon. Members on the other side would say that a man like Nehru - God bless his name - was ever a dictator. It was Nehru who said in 1949 and I quote -

"When man's liberty or peace is in danger he cannot and shall not be neutral."

In India itself there still is a National Security Bill. Not so long ago attempts were made by some people to lift the emergency in India and I quote from an article special to the *New York Times*:

"India will retain Emergency Power.

Several States Insist Rules are needed near Borders

J. Anthony Lukas

New Delhi, April 23

Objections by state governments have, at least temporarily, halted the effort of India's Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, to lift the three-and-a-half-year old state of emergency.

Although the national Government will continue to seek to limit use of emergency powers, a lifting of the emergency itself in the immediate future now appears unlikely.

The objections of several important state governments appeared to have prevailed at a two-and-a-half-hour conference of state chief ministers called here yesterday.

They called attention to the difficulty of preserving law and order confronting many state governments in this pre-election year and particularly in areas bordering China and Pakistan.

Each country must deal with its situation in a practical way. The same situation exists in Kenya, in Malaya, in Tanzania, so there is nothing here for people to fear and I want to reassure the public that this Bill is really in their interest and suspicions about it haunt the guilty. I hope this does not apply to my friends on the opposite side. We must, as a Government, prepare for the continued security of this country.

I have already told the House what happened in 1962, 1963 and 1964. Some people may want to believe that nothing happened in 1965, but this was not the case. I shall now give figures showing the incidents that affected the security of the state. During the period August to December, 1965, there were 148 incidents of a security nature; explosives found, 70; sabotage, 16 incidents. [Interruptions.] I am not excluding the Abraham fire. That is one of the reasons why they put

terrorists on Akbar Ali to destroy him. He was giving information leading to the revelation of some of the persons connected with it.

One would think that every thing ended in 1965. This was not so. There were 207 incidents in 1966. Therefore those of us who are in possession of all these facts must be prepared to ensure that the security of the nation is maintained. This Bill, when it becomes law, will not be there for ever and ever. Part II of the Bill has a duration of just 18 months. Clause 14 of the Bill spells this out. It says that Part II is limited to 18 months from the date of enactment and, as I said before, this Part does not come into operation until necessary and then an Order must be made by the Governor-General.

Some people will say that one must find the citizens who contravene the law, arrest them, charge them and bring them before the ordinary courts. Webster and Wolf made a statement about law in their book *History of Civilization*, copyright 1947, Vol. 1, Part 1, Chapter 4, page 65.

8.20 p.m.

"Every system of law aims to secure the just dealing of men with one another. How imperfectly this aim is realized among even the most advanced societies is seen in our own civil law,

. . . and in our criminal law with its many loopholes through which the guilty are able to escape."

This process sometimes take so long that it is difficult to bring the guilty to justice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister's time is up but I will discretionarily extend it.

Dr. Reid: In any case, I am about to conclude. Guyanese people will be given the liberty to think and to act as free people, and those who attempt to interfere with this system must not be allowed to have their way. A man must be free to fulfil his duty to himself and his neighbours. His life must be safe, his property must be safe, and his welfare must be safe.

This Bill is not designed to get rid of any political party. This Bill is for the national security of the nation, and this national security will include Members on the opposite side. They know that they have been safer and more secure since this Government assumed office. My friends on the other side are free today. They are free because they have more confidence in this Government, as far as their security is concerned. This Government will always ensure that all Guyanese, regardless of their race, political affiliation, or creed, enjoy their freedom. The National

[DR. REID]

Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill does nothing more than seek the co-operation of both sides of the House to ensure that the rights and freedoms of any individual do not prejudice the public interest or the rights and freedom of others.

Lastly, I want to reassure the public again that this Bill is in the public interest, and its name alone, the National Security Bill, means that the Government is taking steps in preparation so that, in case of any threatened trouble as occurred in 1962, there will be prompt and decisive action and we will not have a repetition of some of the things I mentioned before. I am very pleased to be given the opportunity to move the Second Reading of this Bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Chase: The Minister of Home Affairs has opened on a very wide ground involving matters of law and of the Constitution.

Mr. Bissenber: May I suggest that my hon. and learned Friend have his speech recorded?

Mr. Chase: You can record it for posterity. [Pause.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member may continue.

Mr. Chase: As I was saying, the Minister of Home Affairs adverted to law and matters of the Constitution which he

might better have left to the Attorney-General. He adverted to matters relating to 1962, 1963 and 1964 which will give the Opposition an opportunity to state who were the terrorists who were dynamiting Government buildings during those periods, and which parties they supported. He also adverted to India and other countries, giving us the opportunity to refer to the position in other territories.

As one who, by training and by predilection, is totally opposed to any form of arbitrary rule and detention, I take this opportunity to speak out strongly against the Bill which the Minister moved this afternoon.

This Bill is an atrocious piece of legislation. It was conceived with diabolical ends in view and it is aimed not at national security, but at the destruction of the legitimate Opposition in this country. I speak tonight not because I am afraid - neither will any Member on this side be speaking because he is afraid; we accept what will come to us and we are prepared for what will be meted out to us - but I speak in the interest of liberty and freedom, freedom for which we have fought and which is now being abused by those who occupy the Government Benches.

Let me say at once that I protest, in the first place, against the haste with which the Government is seeking to rush the Bill through Parliament. The

Bill was published on the 9th November, 1966 in an Extraordinary issue of the *Official Gazette*. It reached some Members on this side three or four days after the 9th, that is up to the 13th, and the Government was seeking, last week Thursday or Friday, to have debated in this House this matter, which the Minister himself has conceded is a matter of national importance. The Government was seeking to have a debate on a Bill which had only been in the hands of the members of the Opposition for some five or six days before it sought to move the Second Reading. When it is considered that this House has not had any long sessions, since about July this year, it seems to me that it is a very bad arrangement of parliamentary business to put down a Bill of this importance at such short notice and to pressure the Opposition, as it were, into debating it at late sittings at night.

8.30 p.m.

The Bill, no doubt, took many months to be drafted. The Attorney-General took some considerable time to draft this Bill, and the Bill which has taken several months to be drafted has had to go before the Council of Ministers, I am sure on no less than two or three occasions, and they expect that the Opposition will be able to deal with it in a matter of days. They have given no opportunity for interested organisations or bodies to make representations on this matter, nor has the Opposi-

tion been permitted the opportunity to consult with the electorate and public at large, on a matter involving such wide implications.

I hope, having regard to the pressure which the Government is using to rush this matter through the House, after a Ruling by the Speaker himself, that this will be counterbalanced with some amount of tolerance on the part of Government in listening to the views which we feel we are entitled to express in opposition to the Bill. I hope that the Leader of the House will stick to his word and will permit the Leader of the Opposition, the former Attorney-General and me, such indulgences of time to make our contributions as he had intimated.

I oppose this Bill on 21 main grounds. Firstly, I oppose this Bill because it is repugnant to the rule of law.

Secondly, I oppose this Bill because it is a transgression of certain sections of Chapter II of our Constitution dealing with the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual.

Thirdly, I oppose this legislation because it violates certain provisions of the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations.

Fourthly, I oppose this Bill because it creates a permanent State of Emergency under the general law of the land. What

[MR. CHASE]

the Government is seeking to do is to create by normal legislation, a permanent State of Emergency in this country.

Fifthly, this Bill is an abuse of power and it will result in suppression through law.

On the sixth ground, I oppose this Bill because the powers which are reposed in the Minister of Home Affairs are too sweeping and too general. I shall refer in due course to some of the wide powers, even of amending our laws which the Minister of Home Affairs is being given under the provisions of this Bill.

Seventhly, I oppose this Bill because it is the basis for the establishment of a police state in Guyana, and also the basis for the establishment of a Latin-American type of dictatorship in Guyana.

The eight ground on which I oppose this Bill is this: It is, to my mind, a prelude to the abandonment of free Elections, and the deliberate perversion of the ballot box. It is only the beginning of things. This is only laying the foundation for interfering with the free electoral process in this country.

Ninthly, I oppose this Bill because it fosters the myth that we have enemies within the State, and it will indirectly affect investments and income in this country.

The other ground on which I oppose this measure, the tenth

reason, is this: It will exacerbate the racial illwill in this country, and will sow the seeds of lasting divisions. There can be no doubt about it that this Bill, or the Act when the Bill is eventually passed, will be so used as to oppress one section of the Guyanese people.

The eleventh ground on which I oppose this Bill is that it signifies a portentous lack of faith by the coalition in the existing machinery of justice in our country. The coalition is not content to allow the normal machinery of justice to bring criminals to justice, but intends to use excessive powers in an executive manner quite outside of our courts of law in order to suppress the Guyanese people.

In this connection, the twelfth ground must be that it is denigratory to the Judiciary in bringing it into Tribunals that are essentially political. Judges will be asked to serve on Tribunals which are going to investigate certain cases relating to Orders made by the Minister of Home Affairs, and it is quite clear from all that the Minister has said this afternoon, and even tonight, that these Tribunals are going to be political bodies. I object strongly to any Government, and to this Government bringing the Judiciary into the political arena.

The thirteenth ground of objection to this Bill is - it

is indeed an unlucky number and it exposes too, what is in the mind of the framers of the Bill or rather those who seek to inherit the powers that the Bill will confer - it is the product of an insatiable penchant for power.

The fourteenth ground on which I oppose this legislation is that it shows an inability on the part of the coalition to rule without the paraphernalia of emergency laws. I have, in the past, referred to the fact that this Government which we have today was born under a State of Emergency. It has, up to today, lived all its life under a State of Emergency and from this Bill it is quite apparent that it intends to continue the rest of its life under emergency legislation.

8.40 p.m.

The fifteenth ground on which I oppose this Bill is that it is a resort to force impelled by the bankruptcy of the Government's policy which is unable to grapple with the economic and social problems of the country. It is because of this failure to deal with economic problems facing this country that we have a record number of strikes. Last year - the Minister will correct me if I am wrong - there were 120 strikes in this country, and this year we are heading again for another record of strikes because the working people are rebelling against conditions which have

been brought about by the Coalition Government. The people are now faced with a high cost of living which they are unable to meet. It is intended to use this Bill to terrorise trade unionists, and to lock up those who seek to assert and use their rights as trade unionists.

The sixteenth ground on which I oppose this Bill is that I regard certain penalties as retrograde. I refer particularly to whipping and flogging, forms of punishment which belong to the past.

The seventeenth ground on which I oppose this piece of legislation is that it puts officialdom above the law.

The eighteenth ground is that the powers conferred on the magistrates are excessive and unreasonable.

The nineteenth ground on which I oppose this legislation is this: It is, in my view, a forerunner of a trend of other suppressive measures to be introduced by the Government. This is just the beginning. [An hon. Member (Government): "Fortune-telling."] My hon. Friend says that I am fortune-telling, but, when I spoke on the first Motion by the Government in this House for the extension of the State of Emergency, I was told that it was only to be for a limited duration. I forecast then, and my forecast was correct, that it would not be the first application. The Government came before this House on no less than four

[MR. CHASE]

other occasions with Motions for the extension of the State of Emergency.

Today we are faced with the situation where the Government has come not only for the extension of the emergency but for ordinary legislation of the land to be endowed with the powers of an emergency.

The twentieth ground on which I oppose this legislation is that its operation will be one-sided and partial. There can be no doubt about it that it is clearly intended to be used against one section of the Guyanese community.

The twenty-first ground of my opposition to this Bill is that the Minister has failed to show good cause, or any good cause, for the necessity for the promulgation of such legislation. I was alarmed at the speech of the hon. Minister of Home Affairs this afternoon, which did not give this House any sound or valid reason why legislation of this nature is necessary in the context of our country.

Let me say that I feel this legislation has been brought forward because the Government recognises that it has not been able to secure, or even to encourage, the co-operation of all sections of the Guyanese community. It is born out of a vendetta which the leading Ministers on the other side of the House have for certain Members on this side of the House. What

I say to them is this: They should seek to govern by consent and not by force. They should seek to strike a tolerable balance between authority and consent; they must not use the big-stick, because this will not bring about co-operation in our country.

This Bill is being brought forward because at the end of the existing emergency it will come into operation. Although the emergency will be formally ended we will be beginning a permanent State of Emergency in this country with the passing of this Bill. I want to say at the outset that we on this side of the House recognise that there will be occasions of national emergency when it is necessary for the Government to have certain emergency powers to deal with certain situations. No one on this side of the House will deny this Government or any Government those powers which all civilized Governments need to have in order to deal with national emergencies.

We recognise that in times of grave national emergency the Government should have extraordinary powers. [Interruption.] In these circumstances, it would be dangerous to maintain the normal limitations. It is recognised that arbitrary arrest and imprisonment can be made legal by Act of Parliament. Such occasions arise in times of modern warfare when one has to abandon personal liberty. I ask the Minister of Home Affairs,

and the members of this Government, whether these conditions operate today in our country. Where is this national emergency for which they are seeking to secure emergency powers?

8.50 p.m.

The members of the Government are seeking to rule by regulations and by directions. How could we sanction that when there is not, and will not be, in operation a State of Emergency in this country? What is a State of Emergency? For a State of emergency to exist and for a government to have the powers which this Government seeks to have under Parts II and III of this Bill there must have been some action taken or threatened which is calculated to deprive the community, or any substantial portion of the community, of the essentials of life by interfering with the supply and distribution of food, fuel and light, or with the means of locomotion.

Even so, when there are such emergency conditions, proclamations are made for a limited duration. We have no quarrel with a government taking unto itself sweeping powers in cases of a declared emergency, but we join issue with it when it seeks to take unto itself certain powers which only normally operate in conditions of a national emergency. I ask the Minister of Home Affairs, and I ask his Government, what is threatened

in so far as the supplies to the people of this country are concerned? Is our fuel threatened? Is our light threatened? Are our means of communications threatened, or are they being interfered with? I say that these conditions of emergency do not at all exist in our country and since they do not there is really no justification for the Minister acquiring the powers which he seeks to acquire under this piece of legislation.

Under this law, the police are going to be endowed with some extraordinary powers. Both the police and the Minister of Home Affairs will have some very wide powers. Under clause 33 of the Bill the police will be enabled to use force "to any extent which is reasonably justifiable in the circumstances". Already the Police are endowed with certain powers and I wonder why the Minister has not given an explanation as to why he has considered it necessary to give the police this power under clause 33 of this Bill.

We all know of the wide powers of the security branch of the Police in this country. We all know that there is widespread tapping of telephones. We know that mails are being intercepted and interfered with in this country. I ask: What are the conditions of emergency in this country today that make these things necessary? Even Members on this side of the House, when they leave the country, are sub-

[MR. CHASE]

jected to searches by the security police at Atkinson Field.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Ram Karran: I beg to move that the hon. Member be granted an extension of fifteen minutes to continue his speech.

Dr. Ramjohn seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Chase: Letters which are in the possession of Members of this House are taken and read by security police, when these Members leave this country. The House is being asked to give the Police powers to search without warrant. Under Part III of this Bill we are being asked to legislate that persons who consort with or are found in company with persons who have certain explosives and ammunition in their possession will be deemed also to have ammunition in their possession.

This is a small community. The Minister of Home Affairs referred to such countries as India. The conditions prevailing in India and Malaya, to which he also referred, are not the conditions which operate in this country today. India is a vast country with hundreds of millions of people. One can be sympathetic with attempts of one kind or another to exercise some control in a country which is divided by a grave and violent religious split. In Malaya there were people fighting in the jun-

gles, fighting the armed forces. There are no such conditions in this country at all.

In a small country such as ours, where people can carry tales on each other, where any person, in order to get even with another, can give information to the Police to suit his own ends, we can see right away that we are opening ourselves to very great and grave dangers.

We are asked in this Bill to prescribe a presumption of guilt in certain cases. This Government is fleeing from the principles of English law and seeking to introduce principles of French law under which persons are going to be deemed to be guilty and will have to prove their innocence. Where are we going?

The Minister under this Bill is seeking to have power to detain persons as well as to restrict their movements if, in his view, it is necessary in respect of any person to do so "with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to public safety or public order or the defence of Guyana". The Minister sought this afternoon to read from Article 5 of the Constitution of Guyana to justify these powers which he seeks to obtain. Article 5 which relates to the protection of the right to personal liberty, makes certain qualifications and allows the executive to restrict personal liberty upon reasonable suspicion of a person "having

committed". I stress those two words. They mean he must have done something. What the Minister is seeking here is to get power to detain people not because they have done something but on suspicion that they may do something.

9 p.m.

Article 5 speaks of having committed or being about to commit criminal offences under the laws of this country. The Minister seeks to have power to restrict and to detain people on grounds of pure suspicion and, what is more alarming, under Section 5 of this Bill, the Minister is seeking power to punish persons who are detained for breaches of discipline. In other words, people who are picked up on mere suspicion are going to be subjected to punishment prescribed by the directions of the Minister of Home Affairs.

As regards the question of restricting the movements of persons, I must comment that no provision is made in the Bill for compensation to persons who are restricted and are unable to earn a living as a result of these Restriction Orders. The Minister spoke about releasing people from detention. Is he not aware that, of the persons who have been released, several of them are still restricted to their places of residence, and the Restriction Orders make it impossible for some of them to earn

a living within the geographical confines of the areas to which their movements are restricted? Would it be fair to detain a man or restrict a man on pure suspicion and, at the same time, not to make provision to take care of that man's financial obligations and commitments?

The Minister seeks wide powers to give directions under the Bill, directions which will not be in writing and which will not be gazetted. To these wide powers we will have to register our strongest objection. Under Section 15 of the Bill the Minister is seeking powers to vary the definition of the word "ammunition". The Minister wants this House to give him power to say that everything - note the word "everything" - declared by order of the Minister will be deemed to be ammunition. This craving for power to declare everything ammunition is something to which we on this side of the House cannot subscribe.

The Minister wants power even to disregard the findings of the Tribunal and, indeed, if the Tribunal orders or recommends that a detainee should be released, the Minister seeks power to still restrict the movement of a person whom the Tribunal may direct or may recommend should be released. It is quite clear that the aim of the Government in this piece of legislation is to liquidate and to cow the People's Progressive Party and, eventually, to liquidate and to cow all opposition to the Government itself.

[MR. CHASE]

This is the first step towards a Fascist dictatorship in this country, but the objective of this Government to liquidate the P.P.P. is an objective which the British Government, before its time, had embarked upon and had failed. Let me say also that if this Government thinks that it can liquidate the P.P.P., it really is not thinking clearly.

This government is beginning with preventive detention. Calling this Bill a National Security Bill is really a misnomer. Let us face the reality. This Bill is a preventive detention Bill. It is one step forward towards a state of absolute dictatorship. Other measures are going to follow. Step by step we are going to see the workers' right to strike restricted, that will come next, the freedom of the Press will next be suppressed, and, one by one, step by step, this Government is going to move until it has completely suppressed all opposition in this country.

The circumstances and conditions in Guyana today make a Bill of this kind completely unwarranted. The Minister of Home Affairs, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, referred to events which took place in 1962, 1963 and 1964. I was rather amused at his reference to these events because it must be quite clear that the events which were taking place in those years were events pri-

marily concerned with an Opposition seeking to dislodge a Government by force. It must be quite clear that the Government buildings which were dynamited - the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Home Affairs, public corporation buildings like the Rice Marketing Board - were dynamited by supporters of the then Opposition. [Mr. d'Aguiar: "Unity House too?"]

How can this Minister be seeking power, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, to deal with events which took place in 1962, 1963 and 1964? It is time that the members of this Government understand that what took place in this country in 1964 was a temporary phase through which this country was passing. Basically, the people of this country are peaceful, law-abiding citizens, but if driven to the wall, as this Government is seeking to do, this Government will find that the same people will no doubt protest in various forms against the suppressive measures which this Government is now seeking to introduce.

We do not need a National Security Bill at this time. We need legislation that will deal with building our nation. We need to embark upon the job of nation-building and we want to assure those on the opposite side of the House that we in the P.P.P. want to join in helping to construct a new Guyana, a viable economic unit, a country in which racial ill will is re-

moved, a country which is free and in which people can enjoy liberty and personal freedom enshrined in the Constitution.

9.10 p.m.

This Bill does not seek to lay the foundation for such co-operation. This Bill seeks to discourage this kind of co-operation. It seeks to advertise to the world that all is not well in the state of Guyana, and this is amazing because the emissaries whom the Government has sent abroad have been continually telling the world that things are peaceful and quiet in Guyana. Are they not going to discourage investments in this country? The same Bill which they are seeking to use to suppress the Opposition is going to be used against this very Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time.

Mr. Benn: I beg to move that the hon. Member be allowed another fifteen minutes.

Mr. Linde seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Chase: This Bill is entitled "National Security (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill". I ask, "What is the national security that is involved?" Which nation are we speaking about? If this is something in the interest of the nation, may I ask where does the Opposition come in? Where does the Leader of the Opposition come in? If this is something for the whole

nation as you say, then the Leader of the Opposition must have some place in something for the national good. In no place in this Bill is any provision made for consultation with the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the appointments of any of the Tribunals or any of the bodies.

What security is at stake? The Minister of Home Affairs quoted a number of figures. I ask him to come down to brass tacks and let us know within the last two years which Government building has been destroyed. I ask him to come down to brass tacks and tell us which Ministry in Georgetown, for example, has been dynamited. I ask him to come down to brass tacks and tell us what factories have been destroyed or dynamited in this country within the last year or two. Do not let us talk about national security when there is no national security involved. Why does the Minister not come to this House with legislation to deal with choke and robbers? We read about them in the newspapers every day. The country is gravely affected by the deeds of persons who choke and rob; that is common knowledge. But I am not aware of any special situation in this country where public buildings are being destroyed or where human lives are being taken.

The Minister of Home Affairs knows all about Akbar Ali. Members of the Government know how that has been inspired, so they must not mention Akbar Ali. If

[MR. CHASE]

the people of this country held such views of removing political opponents, then there could not be the freedom which we see exercised in this House - people being able to show such political indecency and fraudulence in crossing from one side to the other, without any fear whatsoever.

This Bill is not a National Security Bill because, as I have said, it does not involve the Opposition in any of its provisions. If it were really something intended for national security; then indeed, the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition ought to have had some part to play in it. But there is none! This is really a "National Betrayal Bill". It is a betrayal of the confidence which was reposed in the Government. It is a betrayal of those who voted for the Government expecting that they would enjoy liberty and freedom under the Constitution, and who have now found that active efforts are being taken to curtail the liberty and freedom which they enjoyed.

There are several organisations which are opposed to this Bill. Members on the opposite side have been shouting about the P.P.P. alone being opposed to it. The Guyana Bar Council is opposed to this legislation. The New World Group is opposed to this legislation. The "Amerindian Party" has gone on record against

this legislation. Several trade unions are against it. The University Students' Council has gone on record against this legislation. Therefore, it is not the P.P.P. alone! The Human Rights Association has gone on record against this legislation. It is not by any means the P.P.P. alone. There are other bodies which are expressing opposition to this legislation and if this Government gives people the opportunity to study the law which it is seeking to introduce, more and more voices will be raised in protest against this legislation. There is no opportunity really, for the views of other organisations to be ventilated on this matter.

The Guyana Bar Council sought an interview with the Attorney-General on this matter. He was written to on the 17th of this month. The Council received a reply from him indicating his willingness to meet the members, but requested that they should submit their views in writing before he would accord them a meeting. Assuming that this House had proceeded with the consideration of this Bill on Friday, as the Government had indeed proposed to do, had it not been for the Ruling of the Speaker himself, it would have meant that this Government would have proceeded with the Bill before the body which speaks on behalf of barristers-at-law in this country would have had an opportunity to even present its view to the Attorney-General on this matter.

The Guyana Bar Council has written to the Attorney-General expressing opposition to the principle of formalising emergency legislation in a permanent Act of Parliament, and it referred to all sections as well as Part III of the Bill to which it took the strongest possible objection.

The New World Group, a group of young Guyanese who are interested in the political affairs in this country, and who have no axe to grind for the P.P.P., have themselves been outspoken in their opposition to this piece of legislation. The leaders of various religious organisations have also spoken against this legislation. In view of the growing opposition to this Bill, and in view of the fact that there are several clauses which will need detailed consideration, I would formally ask the Minister of Home Affairs to postpone further consideration of this Bill until the matter can be fully, freely and frankly dealt with by the Opposition and other parties which are interested and concerned with this legislation.

9.20 p.m.

The Minister mentioned the fact that the detainees were released by this Government. The Minister must not claim any credit for that. The release of the detainees was due to mounting pressure by internal and external public organisations - such as Amnesty International - which were bringing this Government into disrepute, because it was

detaining persons under circumstances which were wholly unjustifiable. The release of the detainees is no credit to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs or to his Government. It is really the people's victory that forced the members of this Government to release those persons who were detained during their period of office. They released the persons, but circumscribed their movements; they refused to let certain persons leave this country for medical treatment.

Why did the hon. Minister deprive Mootoo of the right to go abroad to obtain medical attention, after he had been recommended by a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons for such attention? A qualified doctor recommended that this individual should go abroad for medical aid. Will the hon. Minister of Home Affairs tell us why he has refused to give another detainee permission to leave this country for good? Some persons want to leave the country for good, and yet the hon. Minister will not give them permission to do so. Is this not an indication of spite? Does this have anything to do with national security? Is this not something which springs from an intention to show force and power? That is the only reason why the Minister of Home Affairs is refusing these people the right to leave Guyana and relieve him of his burden by having to use his Security Department and spite against them. They wish to relieve him of that obligation, and yet the Minister of Home Affairs

[MR. CHASE]

refuses to allow these persons to leave this country.

The Minister, in his address, said that the Government has information as to the build-up. If he has such information, then let him put his men on the job, and let them liquidate the build-up. If he has the information he should know where the build-up is. I charge him that, if he knows a build-up is taking place and he does not seek to destroy the build-up, he is failing in his duty to the country. He must act in the matter, but he must not seek to obtain the power which he seeks in this Bill to deal with a build-up. He is merely seeking to use this as a sort of generalisation that he has information to make people believe that there is some justification for the legislation. I am suggesting that if he had information of any build-up he would have taken action to knock it down.

With the limited time at my disposal I cannot deal fully with this matter. There is going to be unleashed, when this Bill is passed, a reign of tyranny in this country. This legislation is not the same as legislation in other parts of the world. [Interruption.] I will refer my hon. Friends to a Commonwealth Journal without necessarily accepting its arguments, but because I know my hon. Friends subscribe to it. "The Commonwealth" - Winter Edition of 1965 dealt with the situation in Ghana, and draws a clear parallel to all that is about to take

place in this country. It referred to the preventive detention legislation in Ghana as well as the removal of the Chief Justice of Ghana. We have had a Chief Justice in this country who had to leave. It referred also to the removal of the Army Chief. We have had the peculiar case of Mr. Sattaur, the only Sandhurst trained Guyanese having to leave our army and the country. It referred to the falsification of the ballot-box. All of these things seem to have a parallel in this country. The Journal traced the development in Ghana and showed how this build-up led to the suppression of freedom and liberty in Ghana, and the eventual explosion that took place. I have no doubt that this Bill, which this Government has brought before this House tonight, is only the beginning of further measures which are going to be introduced to suppress the Opposition in this country.

When this Government starts to use these powers it will start with the P.P.P. [Laughter.] After the P.P.P. is dealt with, many of those who are smiling now will have to wipe the smiles from their faces. [Interruption.] Do not worry to talk about: "Do nothing, fear nothing." To adopt this attitude is to miss the real point in issue. Such laws should have no place in a democratic society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Ram Karran: I beg to move that the hon. Member be

given fifteen minutes to complete his speech.

Mr. Wilson *seconded*.

Question put, and negatived.

Mr. Ally: I oppose this Bill in its entirety. I oppose this Bill, not because it is framed by the hon. Attorney-General who is drawing a fantastic salary of \$4,000 a month, not because it is framed by a Coalition Government which is on the rocks now, but for other reasons. I should like to quote some advice to this Government in the hope that it will be accepted:

"Except the Lord watcheth the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

As far as the National Security (*Miscellaneous Provisions*) Bill is concerned, I should like to quote some very good advice from Al-Hadees

9.30 p.m.

I quote from page 580:

"Some rules for the guidance of the Leader:

Administration is the most onerous task and the greatest responsibility is placed on its chief. He is either a shadow of God or a Viceroy of God or a devil according he is just or unjust. Consequently there is a great merit in good and just administration and a great sin in bad and unjust administra-

tion. In order to be a good ruler he must have before his mind's eye the following things.

- (1) He shall take the world as a temporary resting place for preparation for the everlasting next world;
- (2) He shall try therefore by just administration to acquire as much religious merits as possible before his death.
- (3) He shall take himself as a mere servant of the people and a trustee for his subjects.

These things if kept by a ruler constantly in mind will go to make him the most successful man in administration.

A ruler shall observe also the following rules:

- (1) He shall love for his subject what he loves for himself;
- (2) His door should always remain open for hearing grievances and for redress of wrongs;
- (3) Justice coupled with mercy shall be the keynote of administrative policies;
- (4) If the ruler is a Muslim he shall observe the religious rites of Islam;

[MR. ALLY]

- (5) His Ministers must be pious, truthful and sincere;
- (6) He must have a strict eye on the government officers;
- (7) He shall frame rules for prompt and speedy trials;
- (8) He shall look to every community with an eye of equality so far as justice is concerned;
- (9) The people under administrative charge shall be governed according to their respective laws."

I am puzzled because there are some persons who talk about consultative democracy, some persons who pretend to respect human beings and to show kindnesses to them, who are doing a turncoat act now. Some people are vacillating from their party policies, whilst some are chickening out to save pride. I refer to the local Salazar, the leader of the United Force. He would swindle the Guyanese nation. This great gentleman made some good promises to the people. Let me quote from page 2 of his book *Economic Dynamism*. Let us hear what this great liberator had to say about human beings. I quote:

"We Believe
that all people are
equal under God.

that the purpose of Government is to fulfil the needs of the People and to safeguard their rights.

We Believe
that the needs of the People are:

Peace - to live their own lives without fear, coercion or molestation

Security - the assurance of adequate food, clothing and housing

Citizenship - the opportunity to earn a living and to participate as an equal, irrespective of race or creed, in the communal effort, both material and spiritual

Freedom - the opportunity to develop as individuals through education, and to enjoy a reasonable amount of leisure.

WE BELIEVE
that the rights of the People are:

Full education for citizenship and leisure.

Participation in Government by the exercise of the franchise at definite periods.

Participation according to their talents in the productive effort of

the community, and a fair share of the fruits of such effort.

Freedom of association for political, economic, religious, Trade Union and other purposes, and freedom of expression in speech and writing.

Freedom from arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, and from inhuman police and penal procedure.

Trial by an impartial and democratic judicature.

Accordingly it will be the policy of the United Force to fulfil these needs and safeguard these rights."

I should also like to quote from page 11 of another book, *Highways to Happiness*, written by this great liberator. I am quoting the promises he made and I read from paragraphs six to twelve concerning the ideal State:

"Indeed, the maximum of group power can be obtained by an armed force.

Since the person, or group, who controls the armed force has the maximum power, control over the armed forces is used by dictators to impose their will over the people.

But the ideal State is a State where decisions are not imposed by force, but are reached by peaceful, just and reasonable means.

Thus, in the ideal State the formation, control and use of any armed force is strictly limited.

The right to form an armed force is restricted to the State."

How true! As the years roll by we can expose ourselves to the criticisms of posterity. These same people, the defenders of freedom in Guyana, these local Judases who are willing to sell out the nation for thirty pieces of silver are cracking up. Someone with a conscience has left his party. It is hard to predict the actions of such a leader. They are like cow dung, "hard atop and soft below." I would like to know where these leaders of the United Force, the defenders of freedom, were when discrimination was practised and representation was needed for Kasim Bacchus, Harold Persaud, Rayman, Sattaur, Viapree, Dr. Chandra and many others. Where was the great liberator when advantage was being taken of these people? I would take a bet that this Bill would not pass in this House unless there were local Judases who, when the Bill is read twice, will be willing to deny the nation thrice.

9.40 p.m.

These are the same people who promised the nation that they

[MR. ALLY]

would pay \$10 per day. These are the same people who promised rice farmers thirty acres of land. These are the same people who promised the rice farmers that they would get \$30 per bag for rice. These are the same people who fooled the Guyanese people that they would collect \$9 million.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the hon. Member look at the Order Paper to see what we are really debating?

Mr. Ally: I am showing how these people promised one thing, and are now doing something else.

On page 18 of this same book *Highways to Happiness* there is an article on love, but I cannot locate one on divorce. I should like to quote from pages 23, 24, and 25 of this book. I quote from page 23:

"Reference to United Force Declaration of Ideals

'That all men are brothers.'

'Men live together in harmony as brothers, under the Fatherhood of God.'

. . . Foundation upon which the ideal State is built is that position depends upon proficiency without discrimination for reasons of race, colour, sex, language, religion,

political or other opinion, national or social origin, economic status, birth or any other social condition.' "

I quote the passages from page 24:

"Everyone charged with an offence is presumed innocent until proved guilty after a fair trial."

I quote from page 25:

"The accused person has all guarantees for his defence.

"Everyone will enjoy a full life . . . security . . . and liberty."

"Liberty of the individual is the first essential in the ideal State."

"Law and order is maintained with the minimum use of force."

"The rights of every person are protected and respected without discrimination."

"There is equal protection and justice for all."

"Every trial is conducted in public by an independent and impartial tribunal."

"Everyone is entitled to privacy in his personal and family affairs."

"In the free democracies people are free to enter or leave their country as they wish."

These are very good suggestions. The junior partner in the coalition gave very good advice. But what do we find? We find that the leader of the U.F. has published a fantastic report. [Mr. Bissenber: "Another one again?"] Another big one. [Laughter.] I should like to quote from the *United Force Draft Constitution of Guyana*. I will not read all of it. I will just read the important headlines with which this great gentleman tried to fool the people. [Mr. Wharton: "Which column?"] These are the headlines on page 3:

"Protection of right to life

Protection from inhuman treatment

Protection from slavery and forced labour

Protection from arbitrary arrest or detention

Provisions to secure protection of law

Protection for private and family life and home

Protection of freedom of conscience

Protection of freedom of expression

Protection of assembly and association

Protection of freedom of movement

Protection from discrimination on grounds of race, etc.

Protection from deprivation of property without compensation."

This great gentleman again had the audacity to quote a portion of the fundamental rights. No wonder my good friend "Odo" referred to him as being pregnant in wealth but sterile in political honesty.

Let us compare the intentions of this Bill with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I will quote Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

"Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial Tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him."

Let us compare this wicked Bill --

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, let us hear about the Bill.

Mr. Ally: I should like to quote clause 9 (3) (b) of this Bill which our friend the great Attorney-General has drafted:

"(b) any such proceedings may be held in the detainee's absence . . . "

[*Interruption by the Prime Minister.*] I quote again because the Prime Minister is disturbing me:

"(b) any such proceedings may be held in the detainee's absence if, in the opinion of the Tribunal, it is unreasonable to require his presence thereat on account of his illness or for any other cause.

I should now like to quote Article 7 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

"All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination."

I will now make one last reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I quote Article 13:

"(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, in-

cluding his own, and to return to his country."

9.50 p.m.

Let us consider the great job that this fantastic-salaried Attorney-General has prepared for this nation. At 12 (1) (a) in the Bill it is stated:

"12. (1) The Minister may, if satisfied with respect to any person (whether the Tribunal has given any report in his favour in accordance with subsection (1) of section 10 or not) that, with a view to preventing him from acting in any manner prejudicial to public safety or public order or the defence of Guyana, it is necessary so to do, make an order for all or any of the following purposes, that is to say

- (a) for securing that, except in so far as he may be permitted by the order, or by such authority or person as may be specified in the order, that person shall not be in any such area in Guyana as may be so specified;"

I believe this Coalition Government is having a "phantasmagoria." It cannot govern without an emergency over the nation. I should like to quote from this book, *The Minority of One*, page 16, first column, ninth paragraph, to show how our local system of Election was being tampered with:

"In the December 7, 1964, general election that followed, the U.S. Government was also heavily committed on the side of reaction. According to an article on the C.I.A. in The New York Times of April 28, 1966:

"It has poured money into Latin American campaigns in support of moderate candidates and against leftist leaders such as Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: What are you quoting from?

Mr. Ally: I am quoting from this book, *The Minority of One*.

"More recently, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., President Kennedy's adviser and aide, made this striking revelation:

"as I reported to the President, "an independent British Guiana under Burnham (if Burnham will commit himself to a multi-racial policy) would cause us many fewer problems than an independent British Guiana under Jagan." And the way was open to bring it about because Jagan's parliamentary strength was larger than his popular strength. He had won 57% of the seats on the basis of 42.7% of the vote. An obvious solution was to establish a system of Proportional Representation. This, after prolonged discussion, the British Govern-

ment finally did in October 1963. An election held finally at the end of 1964 produced a coalition government under Burnham . . . British Guiana seemed to have passed out of the communist orbit.' "

These masqueraders, these same people who pretend to be the defenders of freedom can fool some of the people some of the time, but they cannot fool all the people all the time. In fact, time is catching up with them. There are certain instances where these great leaders had to chicken out, they had to vacillate just to save face. They threw principle aside. How far can a young nation such as Guyana get when we have such Judases in our midst?

With such a Bill before us the Independence Conference was a farce. I wish to quote from page 14 of the Report of the British Guiana Independence Conference 1965:

"Provision will be made for amendment of the Constitution by Parliament, but special requirements will be laid down. All amendments of the Constitution will need to be supported in the Assembly by the votes of at least a majority of all the members. The more important provisions of the Constitution will be specially entrenched and will be amendable only if the Bill, not less than two months nor more

[MR. ALLY]

than six months after its passage by the National Assembly, is submitted to the electorate and approved by a majority voting in a referendum: in the case of certain of these provisions, however, a referendum may be dispensed with if the Bill is supported by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Assembly. The specially entrenched provisions are listed in Appendix II to this Annex."

But here we find the opposite is happening in our Parliament. In spite of our Speaker's impartiality, in spite of his advice to Members that he will not take sides from either the Government or the Opposition, in spite of the fact that he is prepared to uphold the dignity and decorum of the House, without an honest and sincere leadership, without a change of heart, without good will from Government Members towards Guyanese, I can only foresee disaster, disgust and disgrace for our new nation of Guyana.

I urge the Government to think well and reflect on my little contribution, to scrap this wicked piece of legislation so that our country and people can go forward as one people, one nation, and one destiny, and thus save Guyana from a Police State and Fascist dictatorship. I ask Members to remember this quotation:

"Unless the Lord watcheth the City, the watchman waketh but in vain."

Sitting suspended at 10 p.m.

10.20 p.m.

On resumption --

LATE SITTING OF THE ASSEMBLY

Mr. Jagan: I wish to say that the House cannot properly sit at this stage. Earlier today while the Order of Business was being dealt with under Standing Order No. 12, the hon Leader of the House said that he was moving the suspension of Standing Order No. 9 to permit the debate on this Bill to go through all its stages, or words to that effect. Such a Motion could only have been moved under Standing Order No. 9(5).

When one looks at Standing Order No. 9(5), and Standing Order No. 9(2) one will recognise the point I am about to make. Standing Order No. 9(2) means that any matter that is being debated will cease automatically at 9 o'clock, unless a Motion is moved under Standing Order No. 9(5). All the hon. Leader of the House did was to ask for the suspension of Standing Order No. 9(2) when he moved the Motion under standing Order No. 9(5), but nothing was done in respect of Standing Order No. 9(1) which limits the sitting to 10 o'clock.

RULING BY THE DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I rule that it is in order for the

House to continue. The Standing Order was suspended and the Motion was unanimously accepted.

NATIONAL SECURITY (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Mr. Poonai: I rise to oppose this Bill largely on the question of principles, and largely because I will never subscribe to arbitrary detention and arrest, or to the main Tribunal that will be set up to try people, especially when it is remembered that the passing of this Bill will make certain offences substantive law in this country. It is all well and good to have Emergency Regulations which will be a temporary measure, but this Bill is not going to be a temporary measure. This Bill is going to be substantive law, and certain offences will be created that will astound one."

I can imagine that in any State the occasion will arise when it will be necessary to introduce drastic legislation, but I believe that the younger developing nations will do well to follow certain concepts, principles and ideas that have been developed by older nations. When one looks at this Bill one sees that there are certain provisions that ruthlessly cut across certain principles, ideals and concepts that are well known to us - principles, ideals and concepts that we all cherish and embrace.

As soon as one looks at this Bill one sees the whole import

of two sections: one in the Constitution, and one in the Bill, which I will read *in extenso*. I shall read article 5(e) of the Constitution under which this Bill was made:

"(e) upon reasonable suspicion of his having committed or being about to commit, a criminal offence under the law of Guyana; . . ."

Clause 4(1) of the Bill states:

"Subject to the provisions of section 6, the Minister may, if satisfied with respect to any person that, with a view to preventing him acting in any manner prejudicial to public safety or public order or the defence of Guyana, it is necessary to provide for his preventive detention, make an order -

- (a) directing that he be detained; and
- (b) stating concisely the grounds for such detention, so, however, that no defect of any kind in such statement shall invalidate the order. . ."

The full import of these two provisions is that new offences unknown to civilized jurisprudence have been created. In other words an offence is now created for not having done anything at all. As I have said, in cases of an emergency it is

[MR. POONAI]

all well and good to make temporary legislation, but we should not make certain things substantive law. As a result of mere suspicion one can be imprisoned or detained under this Bill.

Now it is totally wrong for any State or any Government to bring provisions to Parliament whereby one can be imprisoned, detained, or restricted upon mere suspicion, or upon a person doing nothing. My conception of the criminal law or the criminal code is that one must do some act in order to commit an offence. This Bill provides a penalty for crimes unknown in law, because, according to what this Government terms as an offence, a man can be detained for an indefinite period.

If a man commits manslaughter he knows that he will get two or three years, or a life sentence, but under this Bill a man who commits an offence does not know how long he will be detained. All of these things are against certain concepts of law. To begin with the man is presumed guilty because, according to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, an order is made against him. This is a wrong procedure.

Writing in the *Guyana Graphic* the other day, one Lucius mentioned that the Tribunal to be set up under the provisions of this Bill is an extension of the Supreme Court; but I must forgive

this gentleman for his argument. It is either that he has not studied the Bill, or is not legally minded. To begin with, certain countries have been cited as having preventive detention legislation. Let us take the case of India - which was referred to by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs - where there is preventive detention legislation. One section in the Preventive Detention Act of India is different from the clause which appears in the Bill before the House in that the power of review of a detainee's case rests with the Supreme Court of India and not with the Tribunal that this Government wants to set up in this country.

Similar provision is also in South Africa. Even Ian Smith of Rhodesia has provision in that country's legislation whereby a detainee's case goes to the Supreme Court for review. Why do we want to set up a special Tribunal here?

10.30 p.m.

Why do we need a special Tribunal? The tribunal in these countries, as I said, is the Supreme Court. In this country it will not be within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to try the detainees; we are setting up a Tribunal. How are the members of this Tribunal to be appointed? It will not be in the same manner as Judges in the Supreme Court are appointed, that is, by the Judicial Service Commission. The members of the Tribunal shall be appointed by the

Chancellor. Is the hon. Minister of Home Affairs aware, and does he consider it right, that this is going to be an extension of the Supreme Court? If so, why does he not give it the same status as the Supreme Court and allow the Judicial Service Commission to appoint the members?

I am wholly opposed to the constitution of this court because these men are not necessarily going to be judges and they will be hand-picked to carry out the bidding of the Government. When a Bill like this comes before the Assembly we should be able to look at it and say, "This Tribunal will be like any other Tribunal in the land." The Supreme Court is an established institution with us; we have no row with it; it has an honoured and respected tradition. Why not send the cases to the Supreme Court?

Let us look at the procedure before the Tribunal. It is not going to hand down decisions as the Indian Court hands down in respect of a detainee. There is not going to be a trial. If we look at clause 5 (2) we will see that a detainee will have a right to retain a legal adviser to help him to present his case, yet when we turn to clause 9, which deals with the duty and procedure of the Tribunal, we see that no case will be presented by the Government to the Tribunal. We see that certain files will be handed to the Tribunal, which the members will read and from there on the functions of the Tribunal are statutory. The Tribunal can -

(a) hear any person having any communication to make before the Tribunal;

(b) put any question to any person before the Tribunal;

(c) invite the Minister to submit further information;"

But where is the detainee's right to put his case to the Tribunal? Where is his right to call witnesses? There is a fundamental concept in our law, and if the Government wishes to put a detainee before a court, it should not be called a "Tribunal" to let the population feel that a court of law is being set up, when in fact a rubber-stamp is being set up. Let it be a court of law and let somebody on behalf of the Government present a case. Give the detainee a right to cross-examine. I am sure the Judges in this land know what suspicious evidence is. They can even act on suspicious evidence and it can be so legislated. But let a detainee have a chance to ask questions; let him have a right to put forward a defence.

This Bill goes on to say that in the case of absence of the detainee on account of illness, the Tribunal may continue to sit. What kind of law is this? A man is ill and his case will be tried in his absence. Why not wait until the man recovers and then let him present his case? Is the file going to be passed to the Tribunal and the Tribunal will go through it and say "We are satisfied" and put a rubber-

[MR. POONAI]

stamp of legality on what the Minister of Home Affairs has already decided? This is an innovation. We are setting up laws of our own and certainly this is a departure from what has been developed and what we have learned and have come to respect as justice. This certainly should not be called a "Tribunal"; it should be called by some other name.

Another important point is that whenever the Tribunal in other countries, such as India or South Africa, gives a decision it becomes a decision of a court of law and becomes binding like the judgment of a court; it is cited with respect and is acted upon. There is a principle in law which says a man ought not to be punished twice, but what do we find in clause 6 (3)? quote:

"A person who has been detained by virtue of the provisions of this Part and who has been released from detention in consequence of a report of the Tribunal that there is, in its opinion, insufficient cause for his detention shall not be again detained by virtue of such provisions within the period of six months from his release on the same grounds as he was originally detained."

It this is a Tribunal that has the force of a court of law why not let us respect the

court's decision? Do not let us arrest the man again on the same grounds. All the man has is an immunity from arrest for six months. After that period of six months what happens to him? Can he be again arrested on the same grounds? The man will be suffering again after the Tribunal has given a decision. [Interruption.] The idea of a Tribunal is a camouflage to let the population believe that the Government is being kind by giving what is called a "Tribunal".

10.40 p.m.

If you want it so, do not let us argue, like the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, that this is an extension of the Supreme Court, or that the decision will come from the Supreme Court, when in truth and in fact it is not so. Let the people for whom you are legislating know that you are giving them a farcical tribunal which has not got the force of law and which cannot hand down a decision that will be respected as though it is a decision of the Supreme Court of this country.

I should now like to refer to certain countries - say Ghana and India - where there is preventive detention. We have seen, viewing the situation from here, that preventive detention was introduced in Ghana largely for the purpose of liquidating the Opposition. It was introduced in India largely to protect a decadent capitalist system and to keep the Congress Party leaders in their position. That

is why it was passed. But we have seen what happened in Ghana. The Attorney-General of Ghana, who was the author and architect of the Bill, lived long enough to be detained under the same Act. So it will do well for the Government to take heed.

It may well be that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has good intentions in bringing this Bill before the House. It may well be that he will handle this legislation fairly. But what guarantee is there that, in the future, our irresponsible Minister of Home Affairs will not use this Bill as a means of suppressing the population? [Interruption.] You can be assured that as long as we are on this side of the House that will never come about. [The Prime Minister: "That is right; as long as you are on that side you cannot do anything." I mean as long as we are on the other side.

In India we see what is taking place largely because of the system they want to perpetuate there. They want to perpetuate capitalism in India, and so we see that there is turmoil and unrest. In India they are using a Bill like this to suppress the people who are marching now because of the state of affairs that exist in that country. Let us have no misgivings about this: the inventor of the guillotine lived long enough to be executed by it. [Dr. Reid: "Is that a warning?"] You can take it how you like.

What we want in this country, which is divided right down

the middle, is legislation that will enable us to escape the past and not recount it. If we keep on recounting the past and if we draft legislation like this, we will find ourselves going backward instead of forward. If we accept the situation as it exists today and go forward, we will see that there will be no need for legislation of this kind. Why bring a National Security Bill before the House when there is peace and concord in the whole country?

The Government, in introducing the National Security Bill at this time, will certainly show that it is not as sincere as it is trying to make out because the power to invoke the Emergency Regulations is still in the Constitution and, if the situation warrants and there is national disaster, strife or an uprising in the land, we can always fall back upon the provisions in the Constitution and declare a State of Emergency. We can always invoke the Emergency Regulations and bring them back to life to deal with a situation. It is the Government's duty to do this.

In his earlier remarks, the Minister of Home Affairs said that, when the previous Government was in office and there was strife in the land, it did not move quickly enough to declare a State of Emergency. This Government has the power to declare a State of Emergency; it does not need a National Security Bill. Why do you want this thing on

[MR. POONAI]

our Statute-book? Why do you want to make it law? I cannot understand this. The country is not in a State where you want to declare a State of Emergency. You know that it will have to come to an end. Let it die, forget the past and enact legislation that will help the land in future years. Look forward, do not look backward for legislation. If you legislate for future years, and forget facts and figures of the past, you will be going in the right direction.

What are the reasons given earlier this afternoon for this measure before the House? We have been given facts and figures of what took place in 1962, 1963 and 1964. Is there any indication that what took place in those unhappy years is happening now or will happen tomorrow? If it is going to happen at all, why not declare a State of Emergency and invoke the Emergency Regulations? This Government has the power to do this. The day that this law is put on our Statute-book will be a sad, sad day for this country.

I notice that, under the provisions of this Bill, extensive powers are given to the police. The police can storm into your house and search for arms and ammunition. What guarantee have I got against a policeman who storms into my house, in a case where the normal law provides that he must have a war-

rant, and says, "I am searching for arms and ammunition", when, in truth and fact, he is searching for bush rum? This is how these powers can be abused. Take an incident that occurred at Black Bush Polder. The Ministry of Agriculture wanted to prevent paddy being taken out of the Polder to mills outside. An official from the Ministry stepped in and closed the gates. He was given the assistance of a Police Officer. They stopped the trucks that came along, there was trouble, and then the matter was taken to court. This is what transpires.

10.50 p.m.

Obviously a lawyer will want to know what authority there is for closing off a public way. They will say, "We were acting under the Road Traffic Ordinance." Obviously they were abusing the Road Traffic Ordinance. That is why I am saying that this power to go in and search can certainly be abused. [The Prime Minister: "But it exists already."] It does not exist except under the emergency.

Here, any Police Officer has the right to go in and search. [The Prime Minister: "Where? It states, 'Inspector'."] Even if it is an Inspector, he will still need a warrant. All he has to do is instead of going where he should have gone with a warrant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Time!

Mr. Ram Karran: I move that the hon. Member be permitted to continue his speech.

Mr. Wilson seconded.

Question put and negatived.

Mr. Stoby: In my opinion, I feel that there is no necessity for a Bill of this nature to be brought before this House. There is other pressing legislation to be made. I feel that preference should be given to other important matters.

This Bill is probably important to members of the Government. This Bill is strictly to assist them to continue in office. As their period of office is drawing to a close, they will use these provisions to keep themselves in office by intimidating people so as to postpone future Elections. This Bill is designed strictly against the Opposition. Any progressive thought by the Opposition must be suppressed by the Government, but at the same time it will allow its own kind of subversion to exist. This Bill will protect Members on that side of the house so that they will be able to use the subversive methods which are already being used in this country.

We all know that there are many informers. There are foreign personnel in this country working hand in hand with this Government, they are going all around the country and they are usually disguised. Some are pretending to be parsons, and so on. For instance, never before did the interior missions get foreign visitors. But now they go around spying, trying to find out what is going on. That is why I believe this Bill is strictly to create a Police

State. This Bill is a kind of Gestapo set-up. At any hour of the night you can be removed to any part of the country, but I hope that it will not cause further murder.

I shall give you an example. You may remember when Bacchus, a Police Officer, went to catch a thief and he got shot. The man who shot him did not get an hour's gaoling. If the policemen are allowed to go in people's premises at any hour of the night, without a warrant, there are people who will probably have guns and who would shoot with not only guns, but other weapons such as arrows and bows for instance. Arrows and bows do not make noise.

However, I should like to oppose this Bill for several reasons. Let us take freedom of movement. In the Constitution it is stated that we have a right to freedom of movement. This Bill, first of all, is to keep Guyana under a permanent State of Emergency. This country will always be under emergency. I have said before, in this House, that emergency will become chronic. As long as the members opposite remain in office we will have an emergency. [The Prime Minister: "And when you go in what will you do?"] We will revoke it.

This Bill is of no use to Guyana at the moment. If there were troubles, violence and so on, then there would be need for it. Surely, we would all agree with that. But when the members

[MR. STOBY]

of the present Government were in the Opposition and there was a temporary emergency they kept a racket about it and broke the Proclamation.

Mr. Hamid: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister is not in his seat and he is disturbing the speaker. I ask that he either sit in his seat or be quiet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You have already ruled.

11 p.m.

Mr. Stoby: I have listened to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs who has been trying to impress this House and the people of Guyana that there is need for this Bill. He said that he must take care of the inhabitants of this country. The point is that arresting people and sending them to prison may be security as far as the hon. Minister is concerned, but it will not be security for the man who is in prison. The Minister wants to lock up people, forget them in prison, and protect them with guns. That is what has been done to the people detained at Sibley Hall. The hon. Minister said that the detainees at Sibley Hall were well provided for, but the most important thing we cherish is our freedom.

The indigenous people of this country believe in freedom, and many of them are worried today because of the actions taken by this Government. Those people

are getting ideas as a result of education and association with others. The Amerindian people are becoming progressive, and this Government will not be able to suppress them much longer. I will try to speak as much as I can in this House to defend the people's democratic rights. Freedom of movement is something we have to fight for. When these poor people are arrested and imprisoned under this Bill, they will have to prove themselves innocent. They will also have to get money to retain a lawyer to represent them. How can these people prove themselves innocent when they do not have money to retain a lawyer? Some of those people do not know anything about consulting a lawyer and so on, and they will be left in prison for an indefinite period.

This Government should appoint the Amerindian Commission and give the Amerindians their rights to the land in order that they may get money from the Corporation to work the land. Today we have a Parliamentary Secretary who is also an Amerindian. Why does he not see that this Government does something in this matter?

This Bill is something very bad for Guyana. Many people who supported this Government at the last Elections believe that this is a good Bill. They say: "Do nothing; fear nothing". How are you to know that you will not get into trouble? I know that a man can be framed. I know that a man can be picked up

and charged for something he does not know anything about. I am in total disagreement with this Bill, and it should not have been brought before this House.

It is known that there are many educated people in this country who are against this Bill - well educated people such as law officers and lawyers who cannot come here and express their views against this Bill. The students of the University of Guyana asked the Government to defer consideration of this Bill for six weeks. The Leader of the Opposition asked that this Bill be deferred for two weeks, but the Government would not agree to that. The Government is depriving people of their democratic rights by trying to rush this Bill through today. Why does the Government wish to rush this Bill through this week? [**Hon. Members** (Government): "What about the Bill dealing with rice?"]

So far as the Bill dealing with rice is concerned, this Government met on a Saturday in this House in order to rush the Bill through. Anyway, I do not believe that this Bill will be discussed from now to Friday. There is no necessity at all for this Bill. I believe that too much powers are being placed in the hands of the hon. Minister of Home Affairs. His powers are equal to that of the Governor-General's. Birds of a feather flock together - both of them are the same.

The hon. Minister of Home Affairs is a politician and he will use his powers in a political manner. I think it would be better if he would use his powers in an economical manner, because our country is running into trouble. I do not know what the Government is trying to do with the country. The Government is deliberately trying to destroy this country.

For instance, produce is cheap; the price of oranges is as low as 50¢ per hundred. Why not introduce legislation that will benefit the people of this country? At Election time the hon. Minister of Finance told the Amerindians all sorts of things, but I doubt whether he will be able to get 600 votes at the next Elections. On the last occasion the P.N.C. intimidated the Amerindians.

I should like to conclude my speech by saying that there is no necessity at all for bringing this Bill before this House, and I maintain my stand on this matter. The situation in this country does not warrant the introduction of this Bill. I do not want to repeat what others have already said in this House. The Government is saying that this Bill is good for the country, but I know that a large number of members on that side of the House do not believe that.

11.10 p.m.

The members of the Government have no confidence in themselves as they were not elected

[MR. STOBY]

to office. They took their seats on their own. I wish to compliment Dr. Richmond for resigning his seat. It is a great thing he has done. During the last debate it was said that the P.P.P. had asked the hon. Member, Mr. Caldeira, to resign. Mr. Caldeira resigned on his own. [Interruptions.] I should like to end my speech now. [Applause.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there any other speakers or would you like me to put the question?

Dr. Ramjohn: When, during one of the debates on a resolution to extend the emergency, the Prime Minister said he was contemplating the enactment of a National Security Act, I said that the policy which the Coalition Government was pursuing could only lead to ruin and the extension of the emergency, in such a case, was a necessity.

In the year 1965 there was a record number of strikes in Guyana, and the year 1966 will, to all appearances, see the breaking of the record which was set up then. There is a great deal of public dissatisfaction, a rising cost of living, unemployment and a Government almost bankrupt. My colleague, the hon. Member Mr. Chase, has reminded this House that the Government has at no time governed, and never will govern, without declaration of a State of

Emergency or under a Bill such as the National Security Bill, which is a misnomer.

In his opening address the hon. Minister of Home Affairs gave some excellent reasons why this Bill should be rejected. According to the provisions of this Bill the Minister responsible for the maintenance of public safety must have a great amount of honesty, integrity, sincerity and infallibility, and I do not see these qualities in the hon. Minister. The net result of this Bill will be to convert Guyana into one vast prison with the hon. Minister of Home Affairs as its chief gaoler—and with every citizen in Guyana a prisoner.

It is true that in the circumstances prevailing in Guyana today those bodies which were so vocal in the past, when measures were brought before this House to deal with burning and looting on behalf of the United Force and the P.N.C., are now silent. It is felt by members of the People's Progressive Party — and I am sure no member of the public will deny it and, even if members of the Government deny it, they secretly know it — that the provisions of this Bill are primarily directed against the leaders and supporters of the People's Progressive Party. This may give to those who oppose the People's Progressive Party a sense of security inasmuch as they will feel immune from the provisions of this Bill. History, however, has taught that where the rights of citizens are eroded and they remain silent.

the erosion becomes greater until eventually it becomes total. Those who now feel secure will eventually be caught in the net of these same provisions.

During the past two weeks it has become the fashion to quote the words of Pastor Niemoeller who, during the Hitler regime, when he was finally cast into prison, reflected in sadness and said words to this effect, "When the Nazis came for communists I remained silent because I was not a communist. When Hitler's storm troopers came for the Jews, who were burned and mutilated, I remained silent because I was not a Jew. When Hitler's henchmen came for the Catholics, I remained silent because I was not a Catholic. When they finally came for me, there was no one left to protest for me."

11.20 p.m.

History has shown that the rule of law is set out. There is born a dictatorship where the rights of the individual no longer exist and, eventually, those same people who helped to create such a state of affairs - in this instance the supporters of the Coalition Government - will, in the long run, feel the brunt and the brutality of that same Government which they placed in power, as so many people in so many nations - in Haiti, in Germany - have discovered to their great misery and sadness.

Previous speakers have said it is a contradiction - in fact,

in my mind it is a conundrum - that, in their sojourn abroad, Ministers of the Government speak with one tongue and in Guyana they speak with another. But perhaps this is typical of the Government, for we read reports of speeches made by Ministers abroad that everything is under control, that there is peace, racial unity and tranquillity in Guyana. Indeed, the architects and perpetrators of violence now sit on the Government Benches reaping the fruits of what they have sown. There is no longer any reason for violence; therefore, it is not amazing - and it is a fact - that there is peace and tranquillity in Guyana. How can this Government now tell us that there is no peace and tranquillity and that there is the necessity for this obnoxious Bill?

The hon. Prime Minister, sitting in his seat just now, and the hon. Minister of Home Affairs have referred to Detention Acts in other countries, notably India. To my mind, in India, where there is a teeming population of over 400,000,000 people who face famine and grave poverty, where the divisions are very grave not only along racial lines but also along religious and cultural lines, where very often there is great upheaval, there may be need for some extraordinary power in the hands of the Government. But even in India, where this law has existed for so many years, persons detained under the law can appeal against any decision of the Tribunal. Indeed they have appealed and have been set free.

[DR. RAMJOHN]

Under the provisions of this Bill there can be no appeal against the decision of the Minister and the Tribunal. The decision is final. I am told that even in Rhodesia, with its illegal and horrible regime which we so hate, there is provision for appeal against the decision. This Bill has no such provision.

Let us take a closer look at this Bill because I feel that we may be able to glean some of the thoughts and the character of the men whose proposals these are. Let us take, for instance, clause 4 which states:

4.(1) Subject to the provisions of section 6, the Minister may, if satisfied with respect to any person that, with a view to preventing him acting in any manner prejudicial to public safety or public order or the defence of Guyana, it is necessary to provide for his preventive detention, make an order -

- (a) directing that he be detained; and
- (b) stating concisely the grounds for such detention, so, however, that no defect of any kind in such statement shall invalidate the order."

If we take a look at the Constitution where it makes provision for detention in certain

instances, we will see that Article 5(3) states:

"(3) Any person who is arrested or detained shall be informed as soon as reasonably practicable, in a language that he understands, of the reasons for his arrest . . ."

The operative words here are "reasonably practicable". Why were these words left out in this Bill? Clause 4 states:

". . . the Minister may, if satisfied . . ."

What does it take to satisfy the Minister? How much or how little does it take to satisfy the Minister? Is he satisfied by a notion - [Mr. Wilson: "His whim"] - or by a mere whim? The Constitution merely states "reasonable practicable". I am quite sure that the hon. Attorney-General and Minister of State could not have escaped the different meaning which is in this Bill.

Clause 4 of the Bill states that the Minister may make an order stating concisely the grounds for a person's detention. Concisely! Article 5(3) of the Constitution states:

in a language that he understands, of the reasons for his arrest and detention. . ."

The word "concisely" means "briefly", in two or three words. What does this mean? Why put this different interpretation on arresting a man and depriving him of his liberty? Why couldn't

the Bill state "in a language that he understands, the reasons for his arrest?" What is wrong with that? This Bill gives the Minister authority to state "concisely", in a few words, nothing or practically nothing. Then it leaves out the words "in a language that he understands." I hope that the Minister - though I will not put anything past Members who sit on the Government Benches - will not issue a Detention Order in Sanskrit or Arawak.

11.30 p.m.

It states in the same Article 5 (3) (b)

(b) upon reasonable suspicion of his having committed or being about to commit a criminal offence."

In clause 4 (1) of the Bill it is stated:

... the Minister may, if satisfied with respect ..."

It does not state anything about being "reasonably" satisfied. Again I ask, "How little does it take to satisfy him?" Why was this deliberately left out? What is wrong with inserting in this Bill the word "reasonably"?

In clause 5 (1) of the Bill it is stated that:

"Any person in respect of whom a detention order is in force may be arrested without warrant by any policeman and may be detained

in such place and under such conditions as the Minister may from time to time direct,

In other words, any conditions whatever that the Minister may direct; it makes absolutely no specification. The Minister may direct that he be detained in an enclosed room, in isolation, exposed to the cold or in any inhuman conditions. It is not stated here that the man must be treated as a human being, that he must be subject to conditions of detention which a person, for instance, may deem to be his right. It is not stated here that the detainee, if ill, would be subject to medical attention. It is not stated here whether he shall eat one or two meals a day. It depends entirely on the direction of the hon. Minister.

In clause 5 (2) of the Bill it is stated that.

"As soon as practicable after any person is arrested in pursuance of a detention order, a copy thereof certified under the hand of the permanent secretary shall be served by a policeman on such person and he shall be informed of his right, at his own expense, to retain and instruct without delay a legal adviser of his own choice and to hold communication with such adviser and, in due course, to present his case, in person or by his legal representative, before the Tribunal."

What does the Minister mean by the words, "As soon as practic-

[MR. RAMJOHN]

able?" In the Constitution of Guyana which has provisions for Preventive Detention, it states clearly "As soon as is reasonably practicable". Perhaps the Minister may not consider it practicable to inform the detainee for nearly three months. While the detainee is suffering inhuman conditions which the Minister has directed, he may take his time to consider what is "practicable".

In clause 5 (3) (b) it is stated that the Minister, by subsection (1) of this section, may give directions as to the maintenance, discipline and punishment for breaches of discipline of detainees. There is a code of discipline for persons. There is prescribed punishment for persons who have committed criminal offences. Under this Bill, it is possible, nay, likely, that a large number, if not all, who will be detained will be innocent persons. Yet they are not even privileged to be treated as persons. It means that if the Minister takes a fancy to give the detainee a whipping, to order a reduced diet, to order that he be placed in solitary confinement or that he goes through the Chinese water torture, all these things will be legal within the provisions of this Bill - whatever the Minister directs! Yet, in this Bill the importance of justice is referred to!

In clause 7 (2) and (3) it is stated:

"(2) The Tribunal shall consist of a chairman and two other members who shall be appointed by the Chancellor from among persons who are Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature or who are qualified to be appointed as Puisne Judges of the High Court.

(3) The Minister, after consultation with the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, may designate any public officer to perform the functions of secretary to the Tribunal and may revoke any such designation."

The Constitution envisages that when the Tribunal is set up, it shall ensure absolutely its own independence. This Tribunal shall consist of three persons who shall be appointed by the Chancellor; the secretary of this Tribunal shall be appointed by the Minister after consultation with the Chairman of the Public Service Commission. We must bear in mind that the secretary can bring great influence to bear on this Tribunal because the secretary will sit in on the deliberations of this Tribunal and will be the instrument by which reports will pass between the Tribunal and the detainee.

I, naturally, ask the question: If three such highly qualified gentlemen are to form a Tribunal, are they such idiots that they are incapable of choosing a secretary who can perform the functions which they desire,

in order that they may ensure their absolute independence?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You have one minute to wind up.

11.40 p.m.

There is much more than one can say regarding the provisions of this Bill to show where it is nothing but an atrocious piece of legislation which will remain in Guyana for a long time if, perchance, this Government remains in office to suppress and terrorise the citizens of this country. I would be amiss in my duty to the party which I serve and to those members of the electorate who have placed me in this House were I not to protest most strongly against this wicked piece of legislation. I say emphatically that I am opposed to this barbaric Bill.

Mr. Persaud: Those who are seeking today to enact legislation in this House without taking advice from Members on this side will not find it an easy matter. I am not going to predict what is going to happen in this country. In view of this, one would have expected that the Government, instead of creating a situation whereby more force would be used to create fears in the minds of Guyanese, would have embarked on a programme which would have helped to create an atmosphere of peace and goodwill.

What bothers me very much is that those who are vocal today about justice and the security

of the State are the very people who, on a number of occasions in public and in private, provoked a breach of the peace in this country. The hon. Mover of the Motion is not excluded from this charge. I was present within the very precincts of this building on the occasion when the now hon. Minister of Home Affairs was walking around this House holding a big placard. Even though there was provision in those days to prevent people from picketing, the then Government did not enforce the law because it believed in the liberty of the populace and believed that people should have the right to demonstrate and protest against what they felt was wrong. The now hon. Minister of Home Affairs not only moved around with a picket, but I was present when he took a placard and struck the car in which the then Premier (Dr. Jagan) was travelling. [Mr. d'Aguiar: "I saw Dr. Jagan shoot an innocent man from his car."]

The hon. Minister of Home Affairs, a man in whose yard 500 detonators were found, is today using this forum to place on the Statute Book of this country laws to give him the right to decide who must be free and who must be imprisoned. These are facts that Guyanese will take a long time to forget. The only way in which this Government will help the Guyanese population to forget these incidents is for it to do things that will create a situation of goodwill - a situation where all can be satisfied that they are free to make a

[MR. PERSAUD]

contribution to the welfare of this country.

When I decided to enter the political field, I joined the P.P.P. [Interruption.] I did not join the U.D.P. and then turn to the P.N.C. When I was in Canada I spoke with the hon. Minister about the holidays in this country. I said that the Hindus felt that a particular holiday should form part of the national holiday structure of this country. He replied; "What do we care what the Hindus feel? They do not vote for us." He is supposed to be a religious man, but I do not want to judge the entire Government by his actions. If that is the feeling of every Minister of this Government, then Guyana has dark days to face. They cannot deny that all of their actions, since they have taken over the Government, have been aimed at a particular section of this community. Rice is a shining example, but there are many incidents that have occurred which have caused many people to examine with care this measure proposed by the Government in this National Assembly.

The hon. Minister of Home Affairs seeks to call this Bill a National Security Bill, but it should be called a "National Scandal Bill". Security for whom? He seeks very often in this National Assembly to cite India. Why cite India? He believes that by citing India he will be able to create in the minds of a section of the commu-

ity that the Government is following the pattern of things in India.

11.50 p.m.

This country has a population of about 650,000 people. India, as one hon. Member said earlier, has a population of many millions. It has several states - as far as I can remember off-hand, there are 14 - not three counties. Therefore, we cannot honestly argue that because India has a certain law on its Statute Book, the same law is applicable to Guyana. It is a very poor argument.

Tonight we heard 21 points against the Bill, but the Minister has not attempted to give even one point in support of the Bill which he has introduced and for which he seeks the approval of all Members of the Assembly. He mentioned India, but even if there is a Preventive Detention Act in India, it is different from the one before the House now. This is two hundred per cent worse than the one in India. In India a person detained has the right to go before the Supreme Court if he disagrees with the ruling of the Tribunal. Not only that; there was a ruling in the Supreme Court of India on this matter. I seek your permission, sir, to quote two cases from a report in the *Week-end Post and Sunday Argosy* of November 20, 1966.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You may read from it but do not quote. I will not allow any Member to quote from a newspaper.

Mr. Per saud: This was a decision given on the 16th February, 1966:

"Briefly, the facts are that one G. Sadanandan, a kerosene oil dealer, was detained under the India Defence Rules on an order by the Home Secretary of the Kerala Government.

Sadanandan felt that the order against him was invalid and unjustified and he appealed to the Supreme Court of India.

The Supreme Court held that the detention order by the State of Kerala against Sadanandan was *mala fide* and directed that the State of Kerala pay Sadanandan's costs fixed at 500 rupees.

The Chief Justice, who sat as the Chairman of the panel of Judges, observed:

When we come across orders of this kind by which citizens are deprived of their fundamental right to liberty without a trial on the ground that the emergency proclaimed by the President in 1962 still continues, and the powers conferred on the appropriate authority by the Defence of India Rules justify the deprivation of such liberty, we feel unduly disturbed by the thought that the continuous exercise of the very wide powers conferred by the Rules on the several authorities is likely

to make the conscience of these authorities insensitive, if not blunt, to the paramount requirement of the Constitution that even during an emergency the freedom of the Indian citizen cannot be taken away without the existence of justifying necessity specified by the Rules themselves.

The tendency to treat these matters in a somewhat casual and cavalier manner which conceivably results from the continuous use of such unfettered powers may ultimately pose a serious threat to the basic values on which the democratic way of life in this country is founded."

The Chief Justice then went on to point out the defects in the Home Secretary's order. He found that the affidavit filed by the Home Secretary was so defective and so vague and ambiguous that it was not known which authority, acting for the State of Kerala, in fact, examined the case against the petitioner and what was the nature of the material placed before such authority.

The affidavit, the Chief Justice found, did not contain any averment that, after the material had been examined by the appropriate authority, he reached the conclusion that he was satisfied that the petitioner

[MR. PERSAUD]

should have been detained with a view to preventing him from action in a manner prejudicial to the maintenance of supplies and services essential to the life of the community.

There is also another case reported. This was the case of the State (Quinn) v. Ryan and others -

"The judgement was delivered on December 4, 1964, and the Court was constituted by O'Daly (Chief Justice), Lavery, Kingsmill, Moore, Walsh and Haugh.

The Chief Justice said: 'It was not the intention of the Constitution in guaranteeing the fundamental rights of the citizen that those rights should be set at naught or circumvented.

The intention was that rights of substance were being assured to the individual and the Courts were the custodians of these rights."

Agreeing with the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Walsh said: 'It is quite clear that a right to apply to the High Court or any judge thereof is conferred on every person who wished to challenge the legality of his detention.

It must follow, therefore, that any law which makes it possible to frustrate that right must be invalid having regard to the provisions of the Constitution.

In India, therefore, High Court Judges ruled against this type of detention. What is important in these two cases is that the Preventive Detention Act permits detainees to go before the High Courts. I say this fearlessly: A large number of people in this country have very great reservations about the judiciary in this country. I do concede that in order to discuss specific cases a substantive Motion must be brought before this House. [Interruptions.] I include the Judge who adjourned the Court in New Amsterdam to come and get directions. If people are in a position to question the very judiciary in this country how can this Minister honestly ask us to give support to a political Tribunal? The judiciary, so far as the Constitution is concerned, should have no political interference. The Minister wants to ask us to go before a political Tribunal. I do not wish to discuss the Diamond case with the Prime Minister tonight, otherwise he is going to leave the Assembly again. Because of governmental influence a matter, brought before the Supreme Court, was tried before the scheduled hour. It was tried at 8 o'clock in the morning. [Interruption.] It is normal practice for all Courts in this country - and I have been

with them for over nine years to meet at the hour of nine in the morning, but on this specific occasion, because of governmental influence and because the Prime Minister was directly involved, the Court sat at 8 o'clock in the morning.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, "That this Assembly do now adjourn until Tuesday, 22nd November, 1966, at 2 p.m." **Mr. Bissenber.]**

Adjourned accordingly at 12 midnight.