

**THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

OFFICIAL REPORT

[VOLUME 7]

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

33rd Sitting

2.00 p.m.

Friday, 10th December, 1971

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Speaker

His Honour the Speaker, Mr. Sase Narain, J.P.

Members of the Government

People's National Congress

Elected Ministers

The Hon. L.F.S. Burnham, S.C.,
Prime Minister

Absent

Dr. Hon. P.A. Reid,
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture

The Hon. M. Kasim, A.A.,
Minister of Communications

The Hon. H.D. Hoyte, S.C.,
Minister of Finance

The Hon. W.G. Carrington,
Minister of Labour and Social Security

The Hon. Miss S.M. Field-Ridley,
Minister of Health

Absent

The Hon. B. Ramsaroop,
Minister of Housing and Reconstruction (Leader of the House)

The Hon. D.A. Singh,
Minister of Trade

The Hon. O.E. Clarke,
Minister of Home Affairs

The Hon. C.V. Mingo,
Minister of Local Government

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

(Absent - on leave)

Appointed Ministers

The Hon. S.S. Ramphal, S.C.,
Attorney-General and Minister of State

The Hon. H. Green,
Minister of Works, Hydraulics and Supply

The Hon. H.O. Jack,
Minister of Mines and Forests

The Hon. E.B. Mc David,
Minister of Information and Culture

The Hon. Miss C.L. Baird,
Minister of Education

Absent

Parliamentary Secretaries

Mr. J.G. Joaquin, J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Finance

Mr. P. Duncan, J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture

Mr. A. Salim,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture

Mr. J.R. Thomas,
Parliamentary Secretary, Office of the Prime Minister
Mr. C.E. Wrights, J.P.,
Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Works, Hydraulics and Supply

Other Members

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

Members of the Opposition

People's Progressive Party

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Dr. C.B Jagan Leader of the Opposition | (Absent) |
| Mr. Ram Karran | |
| Mr. R. Chandisingh | |
| Dr. F.H.W. Ramsahoye, S.C. | |
| Mr. E.M.G. Wilson | |
| Mr. A.M. Hamid, J.P., Opposition Whip | (Absent – on leave) |
| Mr. G.H. Lall, J.P., - Absent | |
| Mr. M.Y. Ally | |
| Mr. Reepu Daman Persaud, J.P., | |
| Mr. E.M. Stoby, J.P., | (Absent) |
| Mr. R. Ally | |
| Mr. E.L. Ambrose | |
| Mrs. L.M. Branco | |
| Mr. Balchand Persaud | |
| Mr. Bhola Persaud | (Absent) |
| Mr. I.R. Remington, J.P. | (Absent – on leave) |

Mr. L.A. Durant
Mr. V. Teekah

United Force

Mrs. E. DaSilva
Mr. M.F. Singh
Mr. J.A. Sutton

Independent

Mr. R.E. Cheeks

OFFICERS

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

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

The National Assembly met at 2 p.m.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Prayers

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

The following Paper was laid:

Minutes of the Third Meeting of the Committee of Selection held on Tuesday, the 7th of December, 1971. [*The Speaker*]

PUBLIC BUSINESS**MOTION****APPROVAL OF ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE, 1972****BUDGET DEBATE**

Assembly resumed debate on the Motion moved by the Minister of Finance on 7th December, 1971 for the approval of the estimates of expenditure for the financial year 1972, totaling \$197,846560.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Jagan): sir, I think that there can be two main observations which can be made about this Budget at two different levels. The first is strictly at the quantitative level and the second is at the qualitative level, the question of content.

When one reads the Budget Statement, one sees that what this House and the country have been presented with from time to time is not really Budget, but a “guesstimate”.

For instance, for 1971, an estimated surplus of \$15 million turned into a deficit of \$9 million. It was down by \$24 million. This means that either there was complete incompetence or mismanagement. Expenditure, for instance, increased by \$14.8 million from 1970 to 1971.

Revenue at \$128 million declined by \$4.6 million as compared with 1970, but it was lower by \$17.3 million from the 1971 Estimates.

The hon. Minister in his Budget Speech gave quite a few grounds for this big drop in the expectation of revenue, but I do not think that he is dealing with the fundamental question, which is that there is a run-down of the economy; the masses do not have enough money, their purchasing power is curtailed and this accounts basically for this serious shortfall in anticipated revenue.

As regards the Estimates for 1972, we see that there is a net surplus anticipated of \$½ million. This is no doubt in keeping with the very optimistic expectations in the past which have ended up in deficits. No doubt, instead of this \$½ million surplus the financial situation will show a deficit, probably of another \$20 million or more.

I am not a prophet, but we can only go by what has been happening in this every House based on the facts and figures, their expectations and what finally materialized year after year. Of course, the Government must present a very rosy picture, because it wants to justify a very sound economic situation to the people of this country who are catching hell at all levels.

I hope that when my colleagues speak they will fill in a lot of detail, the inconsistencies and so on. I want to deal at a different level, the inconsistencies and so on. I want to deal at a different level, not the microscopic, but the macroscopic level, the fundamental issues, the content of what the Government is doing, not the quantum.

We hear a lot about how gross domestic product is increasing and how this, that and the other is increasing, but the proof is in the streets. Find out about the cost of living. Find out about the unemployment situation. Find out about deterioration in the social services. This is what really counts when we are talking about whether the country is doing well or is not doing well.

We have in this country today an unemployment level approximating to 25 per cent. One-third of the youths in the major cities, Georgetown and New Amsterdam, is unemployed.

Another one-third is underemployed. Inflation and rising prices are affecting not only the unemployed but those who are employed and who are under-employed.

2.20 p.m.

There are inadequate social services. One hears all over the place complaints being made about pensions, about hospitalization and so forth. Only two Sundays ago in one of the newspapers there was a photograph showing two women in one bed in the Maternity Ward in the Georgetown Hospital. It stated further that the Ward had only thirty-two beds but had over sixty pregnant women. This is the situation.

We have high prices that have come about through high indirect taxes put on from time to time, which are now having their cumulative effect on the people. The ex-Minister of Finance spoke in his Budget Statement about redistributive justice. In other words, the fiscal and other policies of the Government will lead to a redistribution of the income of this country. But who can deny that the reverse is taking place; the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. One only has to look in the streets, those who are hanging around trying to find work as against the large numbers of cars creating not only traffic jams but even inconvenience to those who go shopping, because they take up all the available parking space.

Clearly, there has been no amelioration so far as the aggregate social and economic conditions of the people of this country are concerned. There will be no amelioration. We categorically say that there would be no redistributive justice so long as the Government continues with the existing policies and maintain neo-colonial economic structures. Despite the attempt to camouflage this, it is there for all to see.

Foreign economic domination is still there in the key sectors of the economy. Apart from the nationalization of one of the two bauxite companies, the sugar industry is still in private

hands. So are the banks; so are the insurance companies; so are the major trading firms in Water Street.

We have been hearing a great deal about what will be done. Every year we get that record played. But the Minister's statement clearly stated that the economy rests on sugar and bauxite. As he puts it increased production in sugar will bring in additional income this year. For even though production of bauxite has increased, the revenues, because of falling prices apparently, have remained about the same. Rice production is going down. Agriculture apparently, generally is in a state of stagnation. This is due fundamentally to the overall agricultural policies which the Government has been practicing for the last six years.

Sir, last year in the Budget Statement the Minister of Finance said and I quote him:

“National ownership of certain basic and strategic resources as well as control over the major economic decisions is vital to implementing either the policy of self-help and self-reliance, or its corollary, rural development. Further, public sector control over the majority of large scale, modern, economic activity is essential to laying a basis of the construction of Republican Co-operativism.”

When the Government in 1969 came forward with its slogan of “Co-operative Republic”, that co-operatives would be the vehicle to bring socialism to Guyana, we said then that this was a fraud intended to fool the people. By 1970 the Minister of Finance comes along and says in different words precisely what we have said. But, words are one thing, implementation is another.

The Minister talks about national ownership and basic strategic resources being essential if self-help, self-reliance and co-operativism are to succeed. The Prime Minister goes to the West Indies and says that the people must control their natural resources, etc. No wonder all over one hears that there is much talk and no action on the part of the Government. Even in the yesterday's *Chronicle* mention was made about jobs on the front page: It stated:

“Mr. Burnham ended with a plea for more talk and less action and said that any workers so desirous would be given land or training relevant to Government’s programme.”

More talk and less action! This is not just a slip of the Printer’s type. This is subconsciously stating what is happening in the country, plenty of talk and no action. We do not want just talk, demagoguery is cheap. We do not want talk about Co-operative Republic, about “meaningful participation” and “miniaturizing the banks”. But what we want is meaningful action and this is what the country is not getting.

2.30 p.m.

Why is it, even though the Government says so, it does not proceed? What is stopping the Government from enlarging the public sector in the vital sectors – Reynolds Guyana Mines, the sugar industry? Why is it that the Government is afraid to nationalize these industries?

Up to the Budget of 1970, but mainly so at the 1968 elections, the Government prattled and argued a lot against nationalization. Its argument then was: where are we going to get the experts, where are we going to get the markets? Even the so-called intellectuals in the P.N.C. put forward these arguments. But we note that the new hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget statement praises the workers’ technological competence and intelligence to run and manage the industry in spite of what he suggested – sabotage, etc. Here it is the members of the Government are confounding themselves with their own arguments. But in time they will follow the P.P.P.

We read also in the Budget statement that China is desirous of buying sugar but apparently we do not have sugar to sell them because we prefer to have the lucrative market in the United States. I hope the Government will keep this in mind because a lot of puppets in the Caribbean are thinking of tying up the West Indies to the European Common Market in a form of

collective colonialism due to their concern about the future of such things as sugar and banana. I merely mention that by the way because there are other places which can buy these things. As the Minister said, China is interested in sugar from Guyana; this is what we have been saying.

Another point made, incidentally by the Minister, is that commodity prices coming from China are lower. That is what we have been saying all the time and what we have been calling for – the removal of the 10 per cent surcharge. The past Minister of Trade told me that the surcharge was to be on textiles only but we find it is now applicable to everything. This is how the members of the Government have been operating, confounding themselves, but we are glad they are going, step perhaps by step – *[Interruption by hon. Members (Government).]* – drifting. But I will show that this is not socialism, that this is only in keeping with the new strategies and tactics of imperialism; how Guyana will never come out of the mess in which it is at the moment. Not only are there neo-colonial economic structures still every dominant in the economy; there is also foreign manipulation. And it is well that the Guyanese people take careful note of the maneuvers not only of the imperialists but of those who are administering the affairs of this country.

The hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget statement talks on page 6 about the interrelation of domestic and foreign policies. This is precisely what we have been saying for a long time. This is how he puts it:

“Domestic and foreign policies are sometimes erroneously considered to be mutually exclusive or unrelated fields. But indeed, sir, for us there is a very close interrelation, and our domestic policy has therefore had a marked influence on our foreign policy”.

One can say “Amen”. But immediately comes in the question of content; what kind of domestic policy, and what kind of foreign policy? For clearly, if one studies the economic policies of Guyana, formulated from the time of the 7-year \$300 million development plan, one will find an economic approach of planning which was designed by imperialism, and foreign policy up to now correlated to that domestic policy.

Why can we not have an economic policy correlated with a genuine non-aligned foreign policy? That is also correlation. But this Government does not wish to talk about content. It talks in quantitative terms as in its super-power theory. “All aid is raid” – aid from the Soviet Union is equated with aid from the United States. Can this Government deny that our economic planning and our foreign policy are tied up with imperialism? I have set out some points. Who designed our 7-year plan? Sir Arthur Lewis, who was the one who brought the Puerto Rican model of economic development to the Caribbean, was the first economic adviser to Nkrumah in 1957. Who was the first economic adviser to the Prime Minister, Mr. Burnham? William Davenport, an American economist. Who was the first Governor of the Bank of Guyana? Dr. Horst Bockelmann, a West German.

Why is it they shot up Ramsammy and tried to chase out Clive Thomas; why did they not offer Clive Thomas the job as Governor of the Bank of Guyana, which the People’s Progressive Party wanted to do? Because his views do not conform with their imperialist strategy, which they have put on paper as the seven-year D-Plan, which, as we as said at the time, would fail. It failed; it was scrapped in 1969 although it was supposed to go on until the end of 1972.

2.40 p.m.

If you look through the Budget and the Budget and the Estimates, sir, you will see that this Government is completely dependent on the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom, on Anglo-American imperialism, for loans and grants. Even now, GUYBAU, which the Government nationalized – it said it was fighting against imperialism – has already had \$18 million worth of credits from the imperialist banks. It is the first time in the history of the world that imperialism has supported an anti-imperialist Government!

Another point to show the Government’s position, to show its so-called “progressive” domestic and foreign policy is this: experts and advisers from the imperialist states are the ones

who have been coming here. In return, Guyanese are going abroad to be trained in imperialist and fascist countries like Taiwan, Greece, Brazil. How many have gone to socialist countries - - accordance with the Prime Minister's aim to bring socialism to Guyana? Socialism is not only economic policies but a philosophy, a way of life. How many have gone to see how it works? Not one!

There has been diplomatic recognition mainly of imperialist states and only nominal diplomatic recognition of socialist states. This is a reality. It is not a question of dismissing it, as the Minister in charge of Foreign Affairs says. Find out who are the resident Ambassadors here. Find out who are not allowed to come here. Has the Government allowed the Soviet Union to have a resident Ambassador here? Has the Government not objected? *[Interruption.]*

They are socialists, sir, yet they have obstructed the process of socialism by refusing to employ people who have been trained in socialist countries. The Government obstructs people from going to socialist countries by withholding passports, by creating all kinds of difficulties, yet the members of the Government say they are socialists and anti-imperialist. Taken together, these things which I have just enumerated fall in line with the strategic and tactical maneuvers of U.S. imperialism for political and economic controls of countries like Guyana.

The hon. Minister of Finance, in his Budget Speech where he talks about the correlation of domestic policy and foreign policy says:

“We are committed to the ideal of Caribbean economic and political integration.”

Here again, we must not be led astray by the mouthings of the principal spokesmen of the Government on this question of integration, for integration can mean one thing under one set of circumstances and mean another thing under another set of circumstance.

The Prime Minister, for instance, said that not only was it intended to bring together the British, but also the French, the Dutch and even the Spanish territories in the Caribbean. But what are his associations in the process of time? He has been to Haiti; but has not gone to Cuba. After coming back from the United States and his sojourn in the West with Mr. Johnson,

President of the U.S.A., he said that after seeing all the facts he understood why the United States had to intervene in the Dominican Republic. This is what we call “hypocrisy” and what they call “progressive foreign policy”.

Let us take the Minister of State for External Affairs. He puts it a little differently from the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister says that in this modern day bigness is the important thing. All countries, socialist and capitalist, are coming together, getting bigger and bigger; you cannot survive unless you are big.

My hon. Friend the Minister of Trade has just come back from China and India. Fifteen years ago the capitalist planners of the West were saying “India is an example of democratic planning, whereas China is an example of totalitarian planning.” Where are they now? China is on the threshold of being a super power because it grappled with the foreign imperialists and it carried out correct domestic economic policies.

What about India? It is a state almost as big as China. India has a big population, almost as large as the population of China. Is size of territory and the size of population the only factor to lead to economic development?

Brazil is a sub-continent in this hemisphere, but what do we have there apart from starvation? Torture and concentration camps. In Cuba, on the other hand, what is happening? Let us not take what we say; take what Twentieth Century Fund, which is a capitalist foundation, said about Cuba:

“The Castro Government has carried out more ambitious and nationally comprehensive programmes in education and public health than in the other Latin American countries.”

Castro’s country is small. It is ninety miles away from the United States, ninety miles away from imperialism, yet they have transformed the economy. They are making substantial progress in spite of economic aggression by the United States. Is Cuba calling for integration for the sake of progress? The logic of the argument is unsound.

Let us leave the Prime Minister aside. Let us take the Minister of State. They are jazzing differently. It is the same tune but they are playing it differently.

2.50 p.m.

What does the Minister of State say? As I understand his argument, apart from his statements about cultural identity the Federation came into being before because it was a vehicle to bring independence; but it broke up after the separate territories could have achieved political Independence on their own; but now – it is a different era, we want economic independence; therefore we must get together.

The historical part of this is completely wrong, and I will show the Minister. First of all, when in an early period there was talk of the West Indies coming together, Critchlow was leading the masses in Guyana and Cipriani was here at meetings. They talked about industrial and political demands and also the question of socialism. But after Critchlow there was a gap. Even from the date of the Montego Bay Conference in 1945 there was an intervening period to 1958.

The Minister of State says that the West Indian Federation came together because leaders wanted independence. But let us take the very first Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams, what did he do? God bless him and may his bones rest in peace. Let me bring out the facts

In my book, there is cited a quotation on page 180 from the *West African Pilot* of October 1948:

“When a group of black men join hands together in order to see to it that a new day dawns for them, for all men of our colour there is always a willing negro to join the forces of the enemy. Our readers should mark and digest the news published about the activities of one Mr. Grantley Adams of Barbados in the

United Nations sitting in France and judge for themselves the type of African leader that Britain loves to advertise to the world.”

The point I want to make is that in 1948 Grantley Adams went to the United Nations and defended British colonialism which was under attack. That is why he was attacked by the *West African Pilot*, which was then the paper of the Azikiwe-led Nationalists who were then leading the Nigerian struggle.

What happened in the interval? In 1960, before the Federation was born, Harold Macmillan and the imperialists developed a new strategy; they granted the colonies independence. His famous “wind of change” speech was made because there was revolution everywhere. The Dutch had been driven out of Indonesia and the French out of Indo-China in 1954. In 1956, the British, the French and the Israelis were kicked out of Egypt. Iraq had a revolution in 1958; Sekou Toure’ brought - - - out of the French Community in 1958 and demanded Independence; Algeria was giving the “licks of Lisbon” to France; Castro had assumed power in Cuba.

It was in this situation that the imperialists said “Let us grant independence before it is too late”. Independence must be granted, but it must be controlled. It was a new concept. Federation was a device to control the very radical elements who would have gone on to a new path of anti-imperialism and socialism as was earlier enunciated at Bandung in 1955.

Azikiwe was the nationalist leader in Nigeria. The Nigerian Federation was brought in to allow the reactionary North, led by Sir Abu-Bakr Balewa, reactionary, feudal, religious to take control of a United Nigeria; that is, the Federation. The British tried to bring about a Federation with Rhodesia and the East African States. That is why even the Kabaka of Uganda opposed them; he was deposed because he was opposing that Federation.

Surely imperialist’s tactics would not have liked to see Zambia and Tanzania where they are today; they would have liked them all to be yoked with the reactionaries. In Malaysia, Marshall was causing trouble; Singapore was taking about socialism. Independence was on the agenda; therefore the Federation was a vehicle. This was the context in which it came about

historically and when it came in the West Indies, what did it bring? A glorified Crown Colony status. The independence date for the Federation was not fixed in 1958; it was fixed later because of the new tactics of imperialism.. I summaries: In that era, that is, in the late 1950's and early 1960's when the imperialists said that it was tactically wise to give independence, not to hold on any longer, their manoeuvre to control certain states which were likely to go socialist was to bring on a Federation.

In the West Indies there was also the P.P.P. Clearly, if you have a reactionary neocolonial regime, even if the West Indies became an independent Federation in which Guyana was involved, they could control Guyana's policy that way. Or if any other country became free the same thing would be done. I will come to the new strategy in this area. At the level of politics, the Puerto Rican economic model was put forward. But, like the Alliance for Progress in 1961 for Latin America, which was hastily got up to counter Castroism, so all those things failed because it was not intended to make any basic changes in the situation.

3.00 p.m.

In 1953, after they suspended the Constitution and removed the P.P.P. from office, what did the Robertson Commission say? A perpetual period of marking time so long as the P.P.P. maintains its policies and leadership! Either stay out completely or bring the boys into the Federation. Control them. That was the manoeuvre. The masses are suffering everywhere in most Third world countries where the pro-imperialist strategy is put into practice. Now they are paying not only for British colonial administration and exploitation, they have the same exploitation, but they have to pay for corruption, squander mania, extravagance in foreign relations and so on, added burdens, and they get little out of it.

So, the cry goes out: economic independence! All over, not only from the masses but also from some so-called leaders. But the imperialists have their own methods, their own

flexible tactics to meet this new situation. The so-called idea of partnership! Partnership is the new thing. There is William Rogers, U.S. Secretary of State. During his African tour in 1970, this is what he told the people:

“We believe that private investment can and should play a growing role, above and beyond public assistance, in African development. Africans themselves desire to participate in such investment. In many countries, in the face of limited capital resources, it is the government rather than the private sector which has the financial wherewithal to join with foreign private investors. Thus, joint ventures frequently involve a combination of foreign private and African governmental capital. We are prepared to encourage American investors to co-operate in such endeavours under adequate investment protection.”

The same as Macmillan said in 1958, “Let us give independence quickly. Wind of change.” So today when political independence is achieved, when the issue is economic freedom, imperialism manoeuvres and talks about partnership and co-operation. There is another quotation on the same theme from “Fortune,” a gloss magazine for the capitalist class in America.

“This may sound like a U.S. take-over of the whole Latin-American economy, and plenty of Latin-American businessmen believe that’s just what’s afoot. But the fear is not necessarily valid. As things stand now, most foreign-owned enterprises in Latin America reinvest a lot of their profits, thus tending more and more to be part of the landscape. Yet if they are really going to take up residence and avoid the take-over charge, U.S. subsidiaries will have to admit Latin Americans more readily to an ownership role. Telling them to buy stock in the parent company on Wall Street is so far not the answer, since getting the dollars, and getting them out, is balked by currency restrictions and tax law.

A quick sentence in the Punta del Este declaration hints at a long range solution; a common market stock market, which would let an Argentine buy stock in a Venezuelan brewery, or a Colombian buy stock in Brazil’s Willys-Overland.”

The tactics change. Necessity for flexibility. That is one aspect of it. Partnership! In doing so, local participation – capital and personnel, managers, directors – is also creating the political base to support imperialism, for when bureaucratic capitalists, like we have around the Table, take shares as in Green land Co-operative Society, and when the Government practices state

capitalism with loans and takeovers, and capitalist bureaucrats get all the big jobs and all the big salaries, then one can see the tie-up between foreign imperialism and local parasitic capitalism developing, reinforcing each other in the political sphere. It is clear; it is happening here.

To take it at another level, the level at which they are practicing now. The United Nations has changed its emphasis from industrialization in the previous period to co-operative, community development, self-help. Of course, the Americans have a big say in the whole bureaucratic machine and they are able to influence even some policy decisions there. The Economic Commission for Latin America has changed from the now bankrupt Puerto Rican model of economic planning to what they call the E.C.L.A. model of import substitution and integration. This is now the theme song of the Government: “Integration with the West Indies”, “Import substitution”, “labour intensive industries”. It all fits in with a nice little plan formulated from outside. *[Interruption]* I am not against economic integration. I am against the imperialist type of integration, like CARIFTA.

3.10 p.m.

I have a little booklet here called “NACLA Newsletter”. There is an article “Dependency and Imperialism – The Roots of Latin American Underdevelopment” which I should like to read to hon. Members. Talking about this so-called “Integration”, it states:

“But, in the absence of a transformation of national economic structures this panacea (supported by U.S. and international aid agencies as well as CEPAL) promises to be no more viable than import substitution: (1) because unless accompanied by strict regulations on foreign investments, economic integration will benefit foreign rather than local firms, the former having the capital and advanced technology to support regional enterprises which are beyond the capacity of local firms; (2) because the increased scale and advanced technology of regional enterprises aggravates national development problems, such as unemployment, unless these negative effects are counteracted through deliberate policies; (3) because regional integration removes the pressure for drastic social reform which would normally be created by industries of scale requiring large markets. Instead of enlarging the consumer base within each country by improving the economic status of the majority of the population, it is possible to combine middle and

upper class consumer bases of several nations (as is currently happening in Central America).”

What do we find in this long period in Latin America where we had one of the classic areas of underdevelopment, where we had the Puerto Rican model and where we had the ECLA model? In Puerto Rico, despite all the advantages it has of exporting some of its surplus labour to the United States and getting back excise taxes on rum etc.; unemployment reached a record height

“Unemployment in Puerto Rico reached a record height of 15.3 per cent in 1955 and has hung stubbornly above the 10 per cent mark ever since despite the average economic growth rate of some 10 per cent annually.”

That model has not solved the problem, according to Professor Lewis, and the plan created for the West Indies is the Puerto Rican model

I believe it was said that 192,000 jobs were to be created in a 10-year period. What is the situation today? There is unemployment and misery. The setting up of commissions is not going to solve the problem. What about Latin America, where the said ECLA model was put in force? There is import substitution, labour-intensive factories, integration. These are the ingredients. These are what you are now practicing here.

The post-war rate of economic growth in Latin America of 2 to 2½ per cent has dropped from 1957 and, even with the Alliance for Progress; it is less than 1½ per cent. The target of 2½ per cent fixed by the Alliance for Progress as rate of growth was not achieved.

What about the financial position? We see the handwriting on the wall here. I read from page 18 of NACLA Newsletter, from the same article I mentioned:

“Service (interest and amortization) payments on the foreign debt, as well as the flow of profits abroad, continue to mount in Latin nations, and consume an ever-increasing share of export earnings (now more than 35 per cent for the region as a whole). By the mid-1960s the total paid by Latin countries in debt service payments exceeded the amount of new loans.”

More money was going out than loans coming in, not only profits but debt payments.

One can go on. It says that at the end of the decade, that is the decade 1960 to 1970, the external debt had doubled since 1960. The rate of growth in Latin America was 1.5 per cent a year as compared with 2.5 per cent in the U.S.A. and 4 per cent in Europe and when, according to U.N. statistics, socialist countries have been gaining on an average of 7 to 9 percent rate of annual growth.

This is reality. These are the facts. You talk about the capitalist bloc as a whole, including Japan and Germany, the wizards in the capitalist world. One of the wizards fell, Chancellor Earhart.

The point I want to make is that the Government talks a lot about all the new things they are doing. But in what frame is all this being done and why do we think that Guyana, which is adopting the same strategy as Puerto Rico before and now as Latin America, will get out of the mess when Latin America is sinking deeper and deeper in the quagmire?

Let us come to CARIFTA. CARIFTA was going to be the savior of Guyana and the West Indies. [The Attorney-General: “Who said that?”] You all said so in this House. [The Attorney-General: “Nobody said that.”] What is the position today? Jamaica has increased her exports in the first two years by over 60 per cent, Trinidad by over 30 per cent and Guyana by a mere minuscule 5 per cent, mostly in rice.

A big boy, George Ball, who was an Under-Secretary of State when Kennedy was President, said the following:

financial“The multi-national U.S. corporation is ahead of, and in conflict with existing world political organizations represented by the nation state.

Major obstacles to the multi-national corporation are evident in Western Europe, Canada and a good part of the developing world. Set up a branch factory and have the whole market with all your and other resources behind you to squeeze, to destroy.”

In Brazil, one of these monopolies dropped the price to destroy a local company and when the company was destroyed the price was raised again after it got a monopoly position.

There is another quotation here from a Bankers' Report, the West German Bank, Mark, Finck and Company and Wallhausen. Our friends over there are comparing us with the Common Market. Europe had to come together, even England and others had to join.

3.20 p.m.

Listen to this Report from the Bankers about this Common Market:

“When Britain becomes a member of EEC, several thousands US companies which are already established with their own British subsidiaries in UK will also enjoy the benefits of this continental market . . . They will be able to mesh and synchronize their investments and operates in Britain and on the continent so as to quickly develop our all-European plan for their production and sales. In view of the size of their direct investment . . . generally speaking the Americans are in a better position than their British or European competitors immediately at exploiting the advantages of an expanded Common Market.”

What about our own area, Latin America? Fortune Magazine again:

“For U.S. private enterprise, the common market spells enticing new opportunity. Apart from the traditional mining (Anaconda, Creole Petroleum) and farming (United Fruit, W.R. Grace). U.S. investment until now has mostly gone into manufacturing for ‘import substitution’ – producing for a national market under protective tariffs. But U.S. businessmen are beginning to see in the Latin American common market the advantages that they seized upon in the European Common Market: the chance to move to the broader more competitive and potentially more profitable task of supplying a market big enough to be economic on its own terms. . .

In many a boardroom, the common market is becoming a serious element in planning for the future. Ford Motor do Brazil, which makes Galaxies, thinks it could mesh nicely with Ford or Argentina, which makes Falcons, thus deriving economies of scale by producing both cars for larger markets. Kodak which now makes photographic paper in Brazil, would like to make exportable film in Mexico and cameras and projectors in Argentina. I.T.T. with telecommunication-equipment plants in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico, wants to ‘rationalize’ production interchange the parts and raise production high enough to export from Latin America to other parts of the world, . . .”

Sir, it is clear from the horses mouth that the strategy employed by this Government, camouflaged and dressed up with a lot of nice slogans, really and truly is the same as the new strategies and tactics of imperialism. As in the late 1950's when revolution was knocking at the door, so now there is revolution knocking at the door. We saw it last year in Trinidad. What happened last year? American warships came into Trinidad waters. American guns and Venezuelan guns were sent to protect the Williams' regime. Venezuelan troops moved into the Venezuelan Border adjacent to Trinidad. We saw where the little revolution in Anguilla, which the Government of Guyana wanted to have crushed with its own Police Force and which Jamaica and Barbados agreed, had to be crushed by the British Marines. It made the British Marines a laughing-stock of the world – a big elephant jumping on a little mosquito. Americans do not want to be embarrassed any more to land their warships and their troops. After their attack in the Dominion Republic they violated their own Rio Charter which talked about self-determination, the recognition of sovereignty and independence. They violated it because now they have enunciated a new doctrine. There are no more geographical frontiers only ideological frontiers. Socialism is a big thing, all of us must get together and forget it. Let us therefore integrate at the economic level, at the political and military levels, in order to hold on with capitalism against the storm which is rearing its head all over, the storm of socialism, they say.

What do the Venezuelans get their lackies to do? The Venezuelans say that they will now come into fill the vacuum in the West Indies. It is easier for them, and imperialism will not be under attack.

If that were all, one would have enough to worry about, but one has to see within the sinister intentions even of this Government.

Incidentally, before I leave the subject of Venezuela it was the same Venezuela which raised the Border claim on Guyana only when it appeared that Guyana was to become independent under the People's Progressive Party after the 1961 Elections. Our friends over there signed the Geneva Agreement and then the Protocol of Port-of-Spain. They never took the matter to the United Nations. When Venezuela committed aggression why was it not taken to the Security Council?

This Government does not want to do this, because it is in league with all these manoeuvres that are going on. There is Venezuela with this claim still hanging over our heads to keep not only this Government in line but to keep any other Government in line. What about Brazil? Look at the hypocrisy. This Government said it is giving aid to Freedom Fighters in Africa, \$50,000 a year, but it jumped from one imperialist firm to another, from the frying pan into the fire, from ALCAN to the Philips Brothers.

Nkrumah had a chapter in this book dealing with the Anglo-American Corporation Limited to which the firms of Philips Brothers and the Oppenheimer concerns are tied. They are talking hypocritically about aiding Freedom Fighters when they are employing the South African subsidiary to do their marketing.

But that is not all the hypocrisy. They are aiding Freedom Fighters there. What about Freedom Fighters in Brazil? No. They are going to join to help to fight terrorists! Freedom Fighters, according to Malan, according to Voster, according to Smith and according to the Portuguese dictatorship, are terrorists.

3.30 p.m.

This Government calls them freedom fighters. Over there out in Brazil, they call them terrorist.

The United States, having got licks like peas in Vietnam, having been attacked for intervening in the Dominican Republic, violating the Rio Charter which it had signed, does not only break unilaterally financial agreements, as the Minister said, it went against the International Monetary Fund's provision, but breaks treaties which it props up. Now, Nixon has promised to remove the troops from Vietnam, because the war is costing too much, too many maimed and dead Americans and too much noise at home.

There was the publication of the Pentagon papers by one section of the ruling class who do not want to go along with those who believe in force, like Nixon and company, so Nixon devises a new strategy. Let us get Vietnamese to fight Vietnamese, and Africans to fight

Africans, Latin Americans to fight Latin Americans. Look at the Alliance in our hemisphere, Brazil, Nicaragua, Haiti, Paraguay, Argentina, five of the worst dictatorships in Latin America have joined what is called the Inter-American Peace Force. Too embarrassing for Americans to bring their warships into Trinidad waters to land 65,000 troops, so let the dictatorships come to the help of other puppet regimes when they are in trouble! This is the new strategy in which they are co-operating.

I came from the North West and I saw from the airport a lot of Brazilian fighters. This is part of the psychological warfare which the imperialists carry on. Not just economic and political warfare and propaganda. We have to see where they belong and what they call a progressive foreign policy. Incidentally, the same Brazil with which they are consorting has signed a South Atlantic pact with South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal. They are giving \$50,000 a year to freedom fighters but they are supporting the very people who are murdering the freedom fighters. This is where their policy leads to. They will deny this. They will refer to Yugoslavia and now to China.

I read an article the other day about non-alignment by my friend, Mr. Rickey Singh of the Graphic, when he said: how can the P.P.P. accuse the Government of Guyana when it is having relations with China; therefore it cannot be charged with not being non-aligned. The world has changed from what it was twenty years ago. The United States did everything to isolate and blockade and destroy China. She saw her competitors, France, England, Canada, sell wheat, sell buses, sell planes, sell all kinds of things; there were even created political problems in Canada when U.S. subsidiaries in Canada refused to produce flour and engines to send to China on the ground that this would be trading with the enemy, even violating Canada's sovereignty.

United States' trade has slumped from 34 per cent at the end of the war, to 15 per cent. This is why the United States, which was calling for free trade at the end of the war when nobody agreed lest they all be destroyed and swallowed up, has today put on a 10 per cent surcharge against imports from other capitalist countries. The realities? China is a big market and the United States sees its other capitalist competitors moving into this market, so she has to go in. But that is not all.

The adviser, Kissinger, wrote in his book in 1952 when he was a Professor at Harvard University: the United States must try to move into this conflict between the Soviet Union and China and see how to use China against the socialist world. So Nixon decides to go to China. So everything changes. The economic necessity causes a new political policy to be enunciated in a change. Even some of its puppets were given the freedom to vote in the United Nations, like Guyana, which twice sustained, once voted against, and has now come around. Of course, Uncle Sam had to say, “Boy Taiwan, I have to fight for you”, but the puppets were quietly told to go ahead, give China the vote. It is necessary now that China should come in.

Objectively, we see the motivation of America in the debate now going on in the United Nations on the Indo-Pakistan war, where China and the United States are on one side. I am not charging that China is imperialist or does not have a socialist economy, but objectively, because of the departure from proletarian internationalist positions, China finds itself ganging up on the same side with imperialism, in the same way these people find themselves wasting \$50,000 a year giving to freedom fighters. We support it, but I say it is wasted because they are supporting the imperialists.

3.40 p.m.

We are consistent, anti-imperialists. Were we in the Government we would not only give monetary support to freedom fighters in Africa; we would give to Vietnam; we would give to Brazil and we would give everywhere else. We would not offer nonsensical, without-meaning, sanctuary to Africans; we would give sanctuary to Brazilians. That has more meaning. This Government, just make propaganda for image building, makes a big stand about \$50,000 for freedom fighters when all its policy is geared to buttressing imperialism in its new strategies and tactics in this era.

I want to say one word about this labour-intensive business. Arthur Lewis propounded this theory some time ago: that the West Indies must intensify its agriculture because of poverty;

it should move the surplus labour from the countryside to labour-intensive factories and move the surplus to Guyana and British Honduras, now Belize.

The tragedy is that, because of its agricultural policy, even though this country, under this scheme, was earmarked for agriculture, agriculture is going down. The figures of the Government show this. In 1964, \$24 to \$25 million was spent on imports of foods. It is now \$40 million. The Government has got so ludicrous it is telling the people not to eat dholl, to eat black eye peas and put curry powder to colour it. Have you ever heard anything as stupid as that?

For the benefit of our friends, let me speak about this labour-intensive business. We know that the problem of unemployment is acute, but one has to look at this. There is the import-substitution policy in Latin America, the CEPAL models, but, because of technological and scientific revolution, obsolescence is taking place very rapidly. Factories are becoming obsolete in three, four or five years.

The imperialists, therefore, are not only exporting their goods; they are exporting their plants – they do not want to throw them away – to countries such as Latin America. You get cheap labour, sharp practices, unfair competition and so on. Destroy local capitalists who only produce for their own market – they have the whole Common Market or free trade area – but destroy them and then the process go up again! Cheap labour, little or no competition, monopolies, producing for the domestic market – prices go up as we know with Jamaican shoes, as we know with other goods. They do not have the most modern technology and they use their monopolistic position to charge whatever the market will bear, because the whole emphasis is to attract the boys, to give them benefits.

This again has been proved. One economist said that poor countries like Guyana, Latin America, are in the position that they can take advantage of the most modern technology in industrialization, not only for their home market but for the foreign market to compete.

That is why Japan and Germany were able to sell in the United States market; that is why there is the 10 per cent charge. Improved technology and cheaper labour. You have all of that.

You have cheaper labour than in the United States and in the advanced capitalist countries. You have raw materials which they have to buy and import from you and you can buy the most advanced technology. But what is happening? The capitalists are putting the most advanced technology in the things they own like mining, like bauxite, like petroleum and so on, throwing people out of work. Meanwhile for the home market they are bringing their obsolescent plants and are taking advantage of this situation.

This is the vicious circle from which one cannot extricate oneself unless one is prepared to take bold steps. I submit that this Government is only drifting and in doing so it is only fooling the people. When I said “bold steps”, members cheered. [**Mr. Hoyte:** “Derisively.”] You thought it was a point in your favour..

The Prime Minister made another observation. He said he is not stupid, that he is like a camoudi. A camoudi does not swallow everything at one time. It takes one at a time; digests it good and then swallows another. This sounds nice and logical. It is like seeing the sun in the morning, rising in the east and moving over - as I told some people in the North West District.

Mr. Speaker: You have spoken for more than an hour and a half.

Dr. Jagan: I intend to wind up now. After all, we hardly have time to speak in this House when the Government rushes through Bills [*Laughter*]

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Leader of the Opposition, on this occasion you cannot say that you have not had a full opportunity.

Dr. Jagan: I know, sir. Thank you for your tolerance and I thank my friends for their tolerance. Of course, they are learning a lot today, and that is why they are interested.

I told some people in the North West District. “You see this watch; you see the two hands, the minute hand and the hour hand? Open it and you will see many wheels, all interlinked. If one little thread, one little piece, goes out of one wheel, either the watch will work wrong or it will stop.”

And so it is with the Government's policy. It is not just a question of quantum, how many you nationalize. We are not saying that you should nationalize all on one day or in one year. Make your preparations. In the case of bauxite, DEMBA, there were no preparations; they fumbled into it. Thanks to the good sense of the working class, in whom we have confidence, the thing is paying.

What is needed in Guyana is an integrated programme like the wheels in this watch. This must involve, first of all, the takeover of the commanding heights of the economy as the last minister of Finance (Dr. Reid) said. He has more power now; he can do it. Secondly, we need clean, honest Government. You cannot put a crooked administration to run a nationalized enterprise. It is bound to fail. So many of these corporations are losing money today - the Electricity Company, the Guyana Rice Corporation, the Guyana Telecommunication Corporation. *[Interruption]* Perhaps I put it wrong in that case. I should have said that it is not doing as well as it was doing under the P.P.P.

Thirdly, we need workers' participation and control, democratic institutions at all levels. Unless the masses participate you will be nowhere. Even the Chancellor of the University of the West Indies, Mr. Wooding, has now put out this dictum.

3.50 p.m.

There is need for co-operation, involvement of all the masses.

What has the Government done in this respect? Every time that something comes out from the grass roots, it tries to crush it. In the place of the Rice Producers Association, where this Government cannot win elections it has put Rice Action Committees. In the sugar industry, this Government has refused to accept the Union that the people want; it has refused to create the machinery to determine which union is to be accepted. In the North West District the people wanted a farmers association; it brought in a Government – directed Association with a majority of hand-picked persons. How are things going to work?

Fourthly, there is need for a new foreign policy, genuinely non-aligned, not one that manoeuvres with the friend of the Government, Mr. Nixon. According to the Trinidad paper called *The New Beginning*, Nixon is reported to have said when Kennedy reneged on the Cuban situation, at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion, that if he had been President he would have moved in. 1 This is why this Government is now consorting with Nixon and its new policy with the People's China. It is not based on ideology or orientation but on direction from the United States. *[Interruption by hon. Members]*

They know that prices in Cuba are cheaper. The Government knew it all along; but the United States put on a 10 per cent surcharge, so this Government, because of orders from Washington has put on a 10 per cent surcharge on Communist goods so that we can buy more goods from the capitalist countries. *[Interruption]*

Let us have a new meaningful policy of non-alignment with all countries, both East and West. Let us have a new strategy of economic development so far as internal policy is concerned. Look at the latest expenditure, \$18 million for the filling of a big canal in Georgetown near the seawall. They have been concentrating on infrastructure. The result is that the generation of capital is not there in the economy; debt charges have jumped from \$5 million in 1960, to \$21½ million in the Estimates this year and it would have been higher but for a moratorium of five years and ten years on some loans.

What we want is concentration on industry and agriculture because it is known that this generates wealth faster. There again they have been caught in a dilemma. Imperialists will not allow them to industrialise. According to the West Indian plan, Guyana is to be an agricultural country but even the agricultural markets in the West Indies are being taken over by the Yankees. Eusi Kwayana has challenged this Government to deny that Americans are taking over the pork market in the West Indies. Jamaica has taken over our packaged rice market. When I was a Minister of Trade I had them take Guyana's rice.

I have a bulletin from the Trade Section of the Ministry of Agriculture where it is said imports of goods from the U.S. have multiplied several times in the West Indies in the CARIFTA countries. Why can we not do it? We are listed to be an agricultural producer. But the Americans are taking over our markets in the West Indies. We have to buy orange juice in cans, peanuts, oil. Last year the taxpayers had to meet \$2 million to buy oil and copra from the West Indies.

What kind of agricultural policy is this? Let them concentrate on industry and agriculture. This is interrelated. The time has come for land reform, for a comprehensive policy in drainage and irrigation. Could you imagine that this Government is in this day and age talking about setting up two committees to give credit to farmers? What a disgrace? There is no pricing policy.

I was in the North West district last week and I was told that one week they were buying by the pound and another week they were buying by the hundreds. One week the Government takes everything, another week it takes only the first quality. What is the cost of production? What is the cost of living? You have got no policy. Land reform is necessary to help people. These policies like price control, rent control, and exchange control have to go together. It should be a planned proportional development of the economy as Marx talked about. Why can you not send some of your experts to the Soviet Union which, without aid, under blockade, has come out from the seventh power in the world to the number two. In another five, then years time it will come out number one.

I say this: Guyanese are concerned about where this country is going. Maybe they do not understand all this high-falutin talk about economic strategy and so on but they know that their bellies are growling now. Once their bellies growl, the more dissatisfaction mounts. We are going to have here a bigger military bureaucracy, a Police and gaol bureaucracy. Other factors which the people will have to bear, bigger Police, bigger Prisons, a bigger Army for the Government to stay in power, more debts to pay when the moratoria wind up. Instead of getting better, it will get worse. As the night follows day, it is bound to get worse.

Sir, I have said enough. I can go on speaking for another four hours. But I will not tire you. The Guyanese people deserve better; they do not want all this talk and show, arrogance on the one hand; high living, squandering of public funds, on the other, and the giving of a lot of gaffe. How is the small man going to become a real man when the small man is catching hell daily? This is the reality of Guyana. One of the Ministers, Mr. Carter, whose conscience was bothering him, left the Government. But these apparently have no conscience.

4.00 p.m.

We have pointed to the road and we are willing to back them.

They talk about the self-help road to Mahdia. Two weeks free labour, two months paid labour! Ask the Amerindians in Moruka. And they call it self-help. We are in favour of self-help. The Chinese have built through self-help, but the Chinese did not have pro-imperialist policies. They had Marxist economic policies and this is why they succeeded. *[Interruption.]* I repeat. The people deserve better. It is not that they do not know what is right. The only difference between them and the P.P.P. is that the P.P.P. had the will but not the power. They have the power but not the will to do what the Guyanese people demand and deserve in this country.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps it is a good time to suspend the sitting.

Sitting suspended at 4.05 p.m.

4.30 p.m.

On resumption

The Attorney General and Minister of State (Mr. Ramphal): The hon. Leader of the Opposition, whose ranks are so sadly depleted at this moment, has opened the debate on the Budget introduced by my hon. And learned Friend with a contribution that has ranged very widely over areas of national and of international affairs as seen, of course, through the eye of

the Opposition and as interpreted, I would submit, on the basis of his own mistaken and, indeed, outmoded theories of economic development and of international relations.

In the course of this debate, the various issues raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be dealt with, as they relate to particular portfolios, by my hon. Colleagues on the Front Bench, and as they relate to other aspects of Government policy by other members on the Government Benches. My contribution is merely one such response and I shall aim to confine myself to the questions of our international relations as they seem to me to pertain to the activity which lies ahead of us in 1972, the year for which the Budget makes provision, and in doing so, to draw as far as we can on the experience of the past years and, indeed, on our current and contemporary experience.

In doing so, I will not ignore the fact that not so very long ago, we have had in this Chamber a fairly long, full-scale, thorough-going debate on foreign policy, and I will therefore endeavour to avoid the temptation, a temptation that is particularly acute in the light of the nature and character of the contribution by the Leader of the Opposition, to make this debate a mirror of that foreign policy debate.

I think it would be useful, Mr. Speaker, at the very outset, certainly of my contribution, for me to attempt to set out two aspects of this matter of Guyana's international relations, indeed, of international affairs generally, that seem to me to be fundamental to any discussion or analysis of the subject, and unless we are extremely careful, we can easily be led into error by the hon. Leader of the Opposition

The first of these is that international affairs do not unfold in a ritualistic way as if in compliance to some unseen but compulsive ideological unity. There is seldom I submit, any constant in the behavioural pattern of nations or indeed of groups of nations, despite their asseverations to the contrary, save that of national self-interest. Indeed, it is because national self-interest, is such a fundamental theme of the foreign policy of every country, that its conduct of its foreign relations will from day to day, from month to month, even from year to year be \

responsive to the more particular requirements of national interest rather than to the demands of philosophical or of ideological consistency.

This is why, of course, international affairs present such a kaleidoscope of shifting relationships, why States that in every other respect are strange bedfellows, find themselves in particular situations in close alliance, and why conversely, nations who might be thought to be in natural alliance find themselves at such variance sometimes at the ideological level, but always as a result of the practicalities of international existence. Do I need to draw upon actual example of our contemporary international scene to establish this proposition?

I think it is in this basic respect that the hon. Leader of the Opposition will lead us into error, for he constantly represents the international scene, debate after debate, year after year, in an ever-simplified and in a stereotyped form, with the result that the picture he produces has all the innocence and simplicity of a child's painting which, though pleasant enough, fails entirely to reflect the shadings, the overtones, the subtleties of colour and of paste that the changing international scene reveals to the more mature painter. Unless we focus upon these subtleties, unless we recognize these shadings and these overtones, we will surely misinterpret the international scene and we will misinterpret it in our international analysis, as I believe, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition constantly, although I have now come to accept, unwittingly, misinterprets and misrepresents that scene.

The second fundamental point which is not unrelated to the first, but which equally, I submit, we ignore at our peril, certainly at the peril of misunderstanding current international affairs, is that international affairs are always dynamic and never static, that the norms of today are all too frequently irrelevant criteria for understanding the events of tomorrow, as they have become irrelevant to understanding the events of yesterday. Explanations of the international behavior of nations have come to remain valid for increasingly shorter and shorter periods. The norms, for example, by which we explain international affairs in the pre-1939 period are almost totally irrelevant as yardsticks of interpretation of international affairs today.

Even the norms of the post-1945 period, the norms of cold war politics of the '50s and of the '60s are rapidly becoming irrelevant to the circumstances of the '70s. This means that we cannot approach international affairs on the basis of habitual ideas. If we do that, as I contend the hon. Leader of the Opposition tends to do, we will find ourselves entirely ill-equipped to deal competently with the issues of today. We will find ourselves floundering like a motor mechanic attempting, with futility, to use the tools of his trade to deal with the intricacies and complexities of computer technology.

Obviously, there are certain broad aspects of strategy that tend to outlive the changing tactics of particular periods; like the rivalries between the economic systems of the capitalist and the socialist world, like the military rivalries between the super powers; like the quest for influence which is a major objective, not merely of the super powers, but of every major power.

But the international environment in which these strategies are pursued varies greatly from one period to the next, and the variations are responsive to a whole series of developments, developments of new relationships, to the demands of national self-interest as they change from day to day, to the emergence on the international scene of new powers, to the disillusionment of states, or groups of states, with cherished theories, with the failure of once well-established methods, and no interpretation of international affairs which does not take account of the dynamics of internationalism can be anything but uneven, distorted and inaccurate.

These, then, I suggest are the pragmatic and hard-headed considerations that must inform the foreign policy of every state and, whatever may be the luxuries which Oppositions can indulge, Governments at any rate cannot afford to be out of touch with contemporary international realities or to respond to them merely on theoretical or ideological terms.

I have ventured to mention these general issues because I believe they contribute one of the major impediments to the emergence in this House of a bi-partisan foreign policy. It should be possible for us to disagreed greatly, fundamentally, about social and economic theories that should inform domestic policies, indeed, even to differ about our interpretation of the international scene while, nevertheless, agreeing upon the course that is best for Guyana in terms of its relations with the rest of the world. But I am afraid we will fail utterly to reach such a

common position if we cannot agree upon these fundamental approaches to international affairs, approaches of the kind that I have just referred to and I am afraid that the contribution just made to this debate by the Leader of the Opposition is in many respects a re-affirmation of his own rejection of these fundamentals and, therefore, once again a confirmation of the source of much of our disagreement on specifics.

Nevertheless, it might, I hope, be helpful if I did say a few words about some of these specifics. In the year ahead, as indeed in the year that is coming to a close, we see the conduct of our foreign relations dominated by the principles of non-alignment and more particularly by the guidelines of action into which those principles were translated at the Conference of non-aligned heads of State and heads of Government that was held in Lusaka in September of 1970.

This means that we shall continue with our colleagues in the non-aligned movement to work for the effective, or at any rate a more effective and certainly more realistic approach, to disarmament in global terms, that we shall continue to seek to complete the work of decolonization that the United Nations began in 1945 refusing, as we do so, to accept the failures that have so far marred the programme of work in places like Rhodesia, Namibia and Portuguese African territories.

It means that we shall have to continue to raise our voices and to give modest tangible assistance we have already pledged in the cause of advancing human dignity in those areas of Southern and Central Africa in which they have been so blatantly degraded by apartheid and in seeking, through collective effort of every kind, to put an end to forces of discrimination and oppression wherever in the world they continue to manifest themselves.

It means that we shall have to continue to seek for the developing countries that measure of economic justice that has so far been denied us by an international economic system that has failed to match by performance and by action the many expressions of solicitude that we have had over the last 10 years, to put it no higher, for the plight of the developing countries.

And it means, above all perhaps, that we shall continue with our colleagues in the non-aligned world to support and to advance the effectiveness of the United Nations, to advance its

effectiveness as an instrument of genuine internationalism and not merely as a forum and a stage for international posturing.

And while I speak of the United Nations, permit me to take this opportunity to place on record in the records of this House the acknowledgement by the Government on the occasion of the death of a very distinguished international civil servant, the late Dr. Ralph Bunche, of our consciousness of the tremendous contribution that he has made over many years of dedicated service to the cause of international peace and understanding, work that was given in a selfless and self-effacing way and which stands as a testimony to the service of so many nameless men and women who labour through the agencies of the United Nations in that very cause. We have in the name of the Government and the people of Guyana, through the Prime Minister, conveyed these sentiments to the Secretary General.

Guyana although new to the international scene and therefore inevitably to the non-aligned movement has already, I think, earned a place of respect in the Councils of the non-aligned states. It is a place that imposes on us very special responsibilities. The hon. The Leader of the Opposition made light of our policy of non-alignment and implied, I think, that our work within the non-aligned movement was something of a façade not taken seriously by ourselves and therefore by others. Let me merely put on record the facts. Together with Zambia, reflecting an arrangement that had been established at the Lusaka Conference, we constituted in the latter part of this year the Bureau of the Meeting of Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers that was held in New York in September.

4.50 p.m.

It is a Meeting of which I personally had the honour of proposing the Republic of Chile as the newest Member of the Non-Aligned Group quite apart from being a Rapporteur of the Meeting itself.

We are Members of the Steering Committee of Sixteen established at the United Nations to keep alive and to promote the implementation of a programme of action among Non-Aligned countries that was agreed upon at Lusaka. We are Members of the Working Group of Six that is charged by the Steering Committee with managing the day to day, week to week organization of this programme.

We are working in effective ways to prepare for the Conference of Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers which will be held later in 1972. I am glad to say, and to take this opportunity, to inform the House and the country that we have been invited by the Steering Committee to host the first preparatory meeting that will organize the Meeting of Foreign Ministers to which I have just referred. That Meeting of the preparatory committee will be held in Georgetown early in 1972, quite probably in February. We have been honoured by the invitation and have very gladly accepted it. Therefore, in 1972, we shall be bringing as it were to the people of the country an opportunity to participate in a tangible way in the movement that lies at the very heart of our whole approach to international affairs.

If, in the face of all this evidence, the Leader of the Opposition still continues to delude himself that Guyana's involvement in the Non-Aligned Movement is a theoretical façade then there is little that anyone can do to help him. I am entirely satisfied that so far as the rest of the Non-Aligned Movement is concerned, and I trust so far as the people of Guyana are concerned, the evidence is abundant that our policies have earned us the respect of the international community.

I think that it will be obvious to all who have followed recent developments among Non-Aligned countries that economic affairs have become a matter of paramount and specific concern. In contra-distinction perhaps to the earlier stages of the Non-Aligned Movement when at Conferences such as Bandung the political aspects of non-aligned policies and programmes tended to have priority. It is perhaps inevitable that it should be so with the advances that have been made in the decolonization and the realities that have emerged certainly in the 1970's of super power politics and all that it implies to international development. In this area of economic affairs the Group of Non-Aligned Countries occupies to a very large extent common

ground with the Group of Seventy-seven, the Group of Developing countries, a Group that has now grown to the ninety-five, and a Group that quite recently held an important meeting in Lima in Peru at which Guyana was represented by the hon. Deputy Prime Minister and a delegation. It was a meeting which was designed to provide an opportunity for the developing countries to reach a common position prior to the holding of the Third UNCTAD in Chile early in 1972. That Third UNCTAD is going to be a Conference of the most profound significance for the developing world and for its relationships with the developed world. The Agenda of the Conference is wide enough to encompass most of the issues that are of greatest importance and significance to the country.

We shall inevitably be involved in that Conference as we were in the Meeting in Peru. I think it only fair to say to the House that the Third UNCTAD faces both in terms of disagreement between the developing countries and disagreement between developing countries on the one hand and the developed countries on the other hand issues of such substance that constrain us to be cautious in our appraisal of the practical results that can be achieved. This is not to say that we should relapse into cynicism, into despair and therefore into inaction. I say it because it is part of the realities in our contemporary existence. The truth is that progress is redressing economic imbalance between the rich countries and the poor is going to be slow. But that collective action among the developing countries quite obviously represents the best hope that achieving whatever measures of success is attainable. If, for example, that collective effort were to stop for any reason as a result perhaps of the many frustrations which the developing countries have experienced, there will be, I submit, little or no hope for the Movement at all, and we shall have to face a prognosis of steady deterioration and of ever increasing imbalance between the developing and developed world. We believe that even the smallest State in the International Community, certainly I the developing world, can make a contribution to success, if that contribution takes the form not of mere posturing, not of mere demagoguery but of careful and competent technical contribution to the Councils of the developing world. That, Mr. Speaker, is the type of contribution that we see ourselves as attempting to make.

The year 1972 will also see us continuing our progressive development in our bilateral relations with countries around the world. I hope that despite the observations of the hon.

Leader of the Opposition hon. Members will agree that 1971 ends against a backdrop of not only considerable activity on the international scene and so far as Guyana's bilateral relations are concerned but with a creditable record. We have seen during this year the establishment of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. whose Ambassador resident in Brazil we have welcomed to Georgetown.

5 p.m.

We have seen more recently the establishment of relations with the People's Republic of China, whose permanent trade mission we look forward to welcoming in Georgetown in the very near future.

We have seen a re-emergence of trade relationships with Cuba which we have been exploring over the last several months. We have seen the establishment of formal relations with Colombia, with Chile and with Peru, with all of whom in the near future we hope to be establishing non-resident Ambassadors. We have seen the continuing relationships with our established Commonwealth colleagues in the Caribbean and beyond and with other friendly States with whom we have shared long-established relations both in the hemisphere and outside.

To all of these, both the new friends and established ones, we have held out the hand of friendship. We have held it out in terms of bilateral relations and in doing so we have made it clear that we hope to work in advancing those relations on a basis of mutual understanding and of mutual respect. Guyana is a developing country. Guyana is a country, which, as it develops needs the friendship and assistance of those States that have the capacity and the will to give it on these terms. Such assistance as they can give upon these terms, upon terms of mutual respect and of mutual agreement, we shall be glad and ready to receive.

The year, too, has seen fairly considerable activity within the hemisphere and more particularly within our own continent of South America. I believe that some of these changes have already exercised a fairly profound influence on the future of intra hemispheric

relationships and, indeed, of relationships between the hemisphere and the rest of the world. While they have been taking place, we have continued to develop ever-closer relationships with our colleagues in Latin America.

We are not, of course, members of the principal inter American political institution, the Organisation of American States, an organization which, incidentally, is itself passing through a period of very considerable and fundamental change and development. Nevertheless, we have been pleased with the development of the concept of permanent observer status in the organization and we have expressed an interest along with Canada in taking advantage of it. In this way, we will hope to work ever more closely with our Latin American colleagues and neighbours with all of whom our destiny is so irrevocably intertwined.

As I have said in this House on a previous occasions we do not look on our relationships with the Commonwealth Caribbean as a part of Guyana's foreign affairs. They are too intimately members of the West Indian family for our relationships to be categorized in that way, but it is perhaps right for me to mention that we see the year ahead as one of fairly intense activity with our Caribbean colleagues, both in the advancement of the programme of economic integration, which the Leader of the Opposition to my great surprise so stoutly denigrated, having regard to all he had previously said or at least been understood by me to have said about the Brewster and Thomas programme of economic integration, adumbrated in the Dynamics of Integration. Nevertheless, I suppose the Leader of the Opposition has the right too change his mind. Be that as it may, he now stands full square, it seems, against economic integration.

We shall, nevertheless, spend a great deal of our time promoting that programme as we shall in promoting the procedures that have already been established in the Declaration of Grenada. There will, I hope, the opportunity at another time in the House for us to discuss it at greater length and perhaps in more specific terms, questions arising under the Declaration. Let me merely say that we have not waned in our resolve to do all that is within our power to advance the cause of West Indian unity at both the economic level and the political level, and in every way to seek to ensure the emergence of a West Indian nation and to do so within our time.

What we can achieve, will, of course, be significantly influenced by the commitments that our Caribbean colleagues are prepared to enter into and to adhere to. Despite disappointments, we believe that we have made an encouraging start in 1971 in the direction of political unity. Certainly, we are satisfied that the dialogue of unity has begun. It has begun among the peoples of the several States of the Caribbean and it is going on across territorial boundaries and it is becoming a West Indian dialogue. It is now for all the peoples of the Caribbean to make that dialogue an effective one.

Despite some misrepresentations to the contrary, it is not a dialogue between Governments. There is a part for all to play, for Governments, for opposition parties, for trade unions, for the business community, for the universities, for thoughtful West Indians everywhere, and I hope especially for the young people of the Caribbean. Certainly, we in Guyana have no constitutional blueprints. So far as we are concerned, at the constitutional level everything is at large. Now is the time for all who are genuinely committed to the concept of West Indian unity, to its pursuit as a political objective, to contribute to the evolution of the form and the structure of the West Indian State. The time has passed when lip service to the cause of West Indian unity will suffice.

All this will mean that 1972 is going to be another extremely busy year. I have already said it will be a year that will manifest itself in terms of the people of the country to the visual identification with non-alignment through the meeting of the Preparatory Committee in February. It is the year when Guyana will be host to the next meeting of Commonwealth Caribbean Heads of Government. It will be a year which will make fresh demands upon our limited financial and human resources.

We will be establishing new Missions in Lusaka and in New Delhi, which will bring the complement of our Missions overseas to eleven, if we include as a separate Mission, the Consulate in New York. For all that, we have managed to retain a level of expenditure on external affairs at a figure which is substantially below that which, for example, exists in the case of our colleagues in Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago.

Let me hasten to say that in making this comparison I am in no way being critical of expenditure in our colleagues' states. Both of them have substantially more Missions than we have. What is important, I think, is that in Guyana we have succeeded in keeping the cost per unit of Mission and of headquarters at the lowest level among any countries in the Caribbean region.

At a later stage in the debate, when hon. Members are minded to look at figures, I shall be happy to make available comparative statistics of annual expenditure on external affairs, of comparative percentage increases over the years, of comparative costs of units and headquarters and I believe that hon. Members will be in a position to satisfy themselves that we, who perhaps more than most have had need for intensive efforts at the international level, have spent the moneys that have been provided by this Chamber wisely and well.

For this, much credit must go to our many hard working and dedicated officers not only in our headquarters but in our Missions overseas. Ambassadors and their staff are easy targets of criticism and our own Ambassadors and officers of the diplomatic service have not been immune from such criticism. All the more reason, Mr. Speaker, why on occasions such as this we should pause to give credit where it is due to them and the reason why we have been able, for the greater part, to retain expenditures at their current low level is because of their readiness to accept and to function at levels of remuneration and of allowances that are lower than any of their counterpart in the region and, indeed, among the lowest in the developing world.

These are the people who will be responsible for carrying out the programme of work I have outlined and for which, in due course, hon. Members will be providing financial authority. I am personally confident, as I hope the House is confident, that with them Guyana's interest in the area of international affairs will rest in capable hands.

The Leader of the Opposition, when he began his contribution this afternoon said that his approach to the debate was going to be macroscopic rather than microscopic. I think what he might have said is that search as he might under the microscope he could find no fault with the Budget or with the Budget presentation. [*Applause (Government)*] And that he would therefore

seek, instead, to create a diversion by avoiding specifics and by seeking escape in an international excursion.

These excursions, Mr. Speaker, are becoming an annual ritual with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but today's ritual had a heavily defensive aspect. It was as if somehow and at all costs he had to find some fault with the Government's international policies which are on all fronts regarded as eminently progressive. I have no doubt, and I know that none of my colleagues have any, about the verdict of history on the evolution of Guyana's foreign policy in these first years of our national independence and we are all content to leave the issue to the verdict of history.

I wonder, however, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition can say the same thing. As he spoke on West Indian Federation, for example, I had the feeling that he was seeking to rationalize his own past policies as he would rather like to see the historians write it. I doubt whether history will in fact be as kind to him as he was to himself today. [*Applause (Government)*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member Mr. Harry Lall.

Mr. Lall: When one listens year after year to the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance one comes to no other conclusion than that this is a Government of slogans. First there was the Minister of Finance who expounded economic dynamism. He came and he went. Then came the Minister of Finance who is no other individual than the Deputy Prime Minister of Guyana. He expounded that his Government will make the small man a real man. We are still waiting to see the small man become a real man. There comes this year our smiling Minister of Finance who extended his propaganda not for 1972 alone but from 1972 to 1976 when he said that there is a programme for clothing the nation feeding the nation and housing the nation by the end of 1976.

One will ask how is this going to be done? It is obvious that employment has to be created before you can feed, clothe and house the nation. This does not happen by wielding

magic wand. Let us look at the time when the P.N.C./U.F. Coalition came into power and examine what has been the trend of employment and unemployment from then on.

5.20 p.m.

If one should examine the situation one will find that from 1964 onwards unemployment was the order of the day in Guyana. The expert in business who was then the Finance Minister came into this House and raised the train fares. The poor working class of Guyana could not have afforded to travel by the train, thus, we saw the scrapping of the train service from Mahaica to Rosignal. What happened after? Over seven hundred people were put out of employment. What does this mean? Let us say that each person has three or four dependents, multiply seven hundred by three, it means that there will be 2,100 mouths to feed. Then we saw during this period another fiasco. We saw unemployment being created in the Ministry of Works, Hydraulics and Supply where hundreds of people were put out of jobs and as a result hundreds of children are crying for milk and bread.

The Prime Minister is the boss of slogans. One of his slogans was “No man shall go to bed sundry, we will give them cassava bread and milk.” How meaningful are these slogans? We would like the P.N.C. Government to put these words into reality, but this is left to be seen.

The External Trade Bureau came into existence. What happened when this Government established the External Trade Bureau? We saw in Guyana that hundreds of workers in the private sector were put out of employment. Let the Government deny this. What has the Government done to grapple with the unemployment and underemployment situation in this country. Several export and import agencies were closed. We observe that there is less important into our country. This reflects on the revenue of the country. It is clear from what we heard the Minister of Finance say in presenting his Budget Speech. He said that the shortfall of revenues was very great, over \$17 million. When the people import less there will be less employment on the waterfront, less broking, less money circulating, and less spending power.

Every penny a man or woman in this country spends helps the economy of the country also the revenue.

I wish to speak now on the fiasco of Sandbach Parker. Before I turn to that sir, may I just remind the Government that it was in this very House I drew attention to the fact that when Jessel came into this country the first thing he sought to do is to retrench workers in the Demerara Company and in the sugar industry estates. Now at Sandbach Parker more heads are rolling. Why I am bringing this to the Government's attention is to show it that I do not know how it is prepared to grapple with this situation of unemployment and underemployment of this country, if by words or by deeds: because my party was always telling this Government that its 7 – Year Development Programme was badly planned.

5.30 p.m.

That means that the Government was spending too much on the infrastructure. It was not spending money on projects that would generate wealth to assist the country and to have continuous employment. It spent money on the sector which is non-productive.

Now the Government is placing the emphasis on agriculture. After finding itself in a dilemma, it is taking the advice of the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he was telling the Government to spend the money in the productive sector. I hope the Government will steer the boat straight now and not lead it through a rocky channel. Here I have a copy of the Daily Chronicle, a paper of the Government. It states: "600 to lose work in 1972." That refers to the C.D.C. "Laundry workers to be retrenched", adding insult to injury. *[Interruption]* This paper is the Mirror, the only paper that tells the truth. Still we are going to feed, clothe, and house the whole of the Guyanese nation by 1976. Then came the closure of the road programme on the Corentyne, where hundreds of workers were thrown out of employment. Then there is retrenchment by Wimpey: sea defence. These are all swelling the figure of unemployment.

Yet the Government says it is grappling with the situation! How are we going to feed, cloths, and house every Guyanese by 1976? The unemployment among rice farmers: There were five people employed along with the rice farmer. Right now, because of the subsidy having been withdrawn, there is more taxation. Increase in the price of fertilizer: The rice farmers cannot afford to employ the number of people they were employing prior to 1964. The Government withdrew the subsidy, reduced the price of rice, and raised taxation on machinery and fertilizers. How does it expect to grapple with the situation?

I heard that there will be retrenchment on the waterfront. I did not hear the voice of the hon. Minister of Labour and Social Security, but I heard that he denied that there will be retrenchment. When there is retrenchment, I will take the waterfront workers and march them into the Ministry and say, “this Minister said there is no retrenchment! I confronted the Minister and indicated to him that before any mechanization is done in the sugar industry, G.A.W.U. must be consulted. I am happy to say that the hon. Minister called in the sugar producers and indicated to them that because G.A.W.U. is governing the industry as G.A.W.U. says, before any mechanization can take place in the industry, G.A.W.U. has to be consulted. We did not wait until the time arrived because we saw they were preparing the field for a cane harvester and before they could bring any cane harvester in this country, we warned the hon. Minister of Labour to stop it.

5.40 p.m.

I should like to refer to the Budget Speech, in which, under the heading “Review of the Economy”, the hon. Minister of Finance states:

“It was the recovery in output in the Sugar Industry, however, which was mainly responsible for the higher growth-rate in the Gross Domestic Product during 1971. Output of sugar which had fallen to 311,000 tons in 1970, expanded rapidly in 1971 and is now expected to reach a record level of 370,000 tons by the end of the year. Exports of sugar rose in sympathy with production and, as most of the increase was sold to the more lucrative markets of the U.S.A., gross export earnings from sugar are expected to reach \$88 mn. by year end compared with \$72 mn. at the end of 1970.”

This figure was reached because of co-operation from all concerned.

The hon. Minister continued:

“I think it would be fair to ascribe the record level of production not only to efficiency within the industry, but also to the absence of any major industrial conflicts in the industry during this year. Sensible measures by the Ministry of Labour and responsible union leadership in the industry have, without a doubt, contributed to this fairly quiet year for industrial relationship in the sugar industry, and its effect has been reflected in the high level of output and incomes that industry has been able to generate.”

This is a very big compliment to G.A.W.U. because the so-called “union” which is calling for an increase in the price of sugar sold to the consumers in Guyana is very important. It cannot call a strike; it cannot call off a strike, yet the Government is flirting around with that important union. What a disgraceful act! Help me to condemn it, Mr. Speaker *[Laughter.]*

It is true that sugar has made great strides in Guyana. The sugar workers have done their part. What is the Government prepared to do and what the industry prepared to do to give the sugar workers what rightly belongs to them?

I want to tell this Government that the sugar workers are living on credit. During a crop season they get work, but during the non-grinding period over 12,000 workers are out of employment.

I moved a Motion in this House calling for a guaranteed minimum wage for sugar workers throughout the year. I do hope that the Government will bring forward this Motion and let us debate it because the hon. Minister of Labour gave me an assurance that the Motion is reasonable one and his colleagues will support it.

Any Government that is prepared to make the small man a real man could bring forward such a Motion and support it so that workers would have a guaranteed minimum wage throughout the year. I do hope that the Motion will come to this honourable House in the near future.

The workers have done their part. We want industry to do its part. If you go into the extra-nuclear housing scheme, you will see that services, such as roads, are very, very poor. The roads are in a deplorable condition; sanitation is nothing to speak about and the water supply is very inadequate.

There is another burning question that confronts the workers. This Government owes the sugar workers of this country millions of dollars that they have paid through P.A.Y.E.

The Minister of Finance(Mr. Hoyte): To a point of order. I think that the hon. Member should not make such wild and untruthful statements in this honourable House.
[Interruption]

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, Mr. Ram Karran, please permit the hon. Minister to make his point of order.

Mr. Hoyte: The statement that the Government owes sugar workers millions of dollars is absolutely without any foundation at all. I ask Your Honour to restrain the hon. Member from such improper statements.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member, Mr. Harry Lall, will you please support your statement by some facts or figures, or kindly withdraw the remark.

Mr. Lall: Your Honour, I beg to withdraw the remark, but I want to ask the hon. Minister of Finance, if the sum is not in the millions, what amount the Government owes/

Mr. Hoyte: The point I seek to make is that the Government does not owe the sugar workers any money at all. I cannot understand where the hon. Member has received this kind of information and what is the basis for a statement as wild as this one.

5.50 p.m.

Mr. Lall: Your Honour on a point of information I should like to inform the hon. Minister that these workers I am speaking of are not taxable but they have to pay P.A.Y.E., they

were paying from 1964; they were not getting any refund. Although they made representation time and again no effort has been made to speed up payment. Therefore, indirectly the Government owes these people this money. I still maintain that.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member Mr. Lall I should just like to remind you that thirty minutes and more have past since you were speaking.

Mr. Ram Karran: I beg that the hon. Member be given another fifteen minutes.

Mr. R. Ally: Seconded.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House agree? *[Hon. Members replied in the affirmative.]*

Mr. Lall: Your Honour, I do not want to say that the Government, through the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund, has purchased security to the tune of over \$5 million. This can go back to the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Fund to pay for the services. It is very gratifying on the part of the hon. Minister of Finance to say how pleased the Government is with the industrial stability in this sugar industry. But the sugar workers have co-operated. As I understand it, co-operation begets co-operation. We have the bulk of the sugar workers living in the Corentyne area. In that area it is proposed to install three toll gates. The sugar workers have to pay the toll anyhow. I am asking the Government now for its co-operation. Since we have co-operated in giving it an extra \$15 million, we are asking it to co-operate. Since you are building we do not want you to break them down but do not charge any toll. *[Laughter]* What we want you to do is to put a symbol of consultative democracy on the toll gates and on one of them put "Unite all the Guyanese People".

The Government said that it has brought a taxfree Budget and yet it is getting the tax by hook and by crook. Is not collecting tolls taxation? This Government said it did not tax people, but yet the postage rates have gone up from 25 per cent to 100 per cent. It was not put in the Budget. But it was announced that from the 1st January, 1972 you have to pay increased postage. Is not this increased taxation? Whom does this Government wish to fool? The three toll gates will cause terrible hardship not only on the sugar workers but on the working class as a whole in Guyana.

Transportation has gone up considerably because of various factors. They pay additional taxation on tyres. They pay taxation on battery, on motor car parts. All these things help to carry up the cost of living. Now to pay a toll is additional burden on the poor people. I am saying it will bring further hardship on the people of this country. I ask this Government to co-operate.

Sir, I went to Chile. After I left Santiago going down the Pacific Beach I had travelled about one hundred and twenty metres it was only then that I saw a toll gate. The man in the car paid thirty-five cents. I went to Cuba passing through an underground tunnel going to the beach only where the millionaires go before the regime of Fidel and I paid ten cents (American).

6.00 p.m.

I am asking the Government not to be an oppressive Government but to be a Government looking after the rights and interests of the Guyanese nation. It is our duty. The members might not like the advice we are giving them. They might not want it, but this is the advice they need. I must commend the hon. Minister of Labour for listening to the query of G.A.W.U. and appointing scale supervisors, but the hypocritical thing in this was that the members of the Government gave us free and fair elections with the eleven, but with the twenty-two, the Government selected the scale supervisors. What is happening with the twenty-two? When they go to work, they go to bed. They work for two hours and then they go home. All thirty-three supervisors should be elected by the cane cutters and farmers, then there will be stability.

At page 24 the hon. Minister says:

“Production of Sugar is expected to exceed the 1971 output, given fair weather conditions and another year of industrial stability.”

“Hand wash hand make hand come clean.” There is the toll gate question and there are many other questions. We can barter. The hon. Minister wants co-operation which he had in

1971. It is our duty in the interest of the nation, in the interest of the workers, to give our co-operation but we cannot give co-operation at the expense of the worker, when the Government seeks to tax the workers from hell to heaven. I hope the hon. Minister understands the language.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps he does, but I do not.

Mr. Lall: They said, “G.A.W.U. be a good boy, we will give you sweetie to suck” – recognition. The year 1971 was 1971, but 1972 is another year. Because anywhere there is a strike – G.A.W.U. G.A.W.U. has to have dialogue with the hon. Minister. The workers have to play the game. The situation in Guyana is something to ponder over, the unemployment and underemployment. This is why we are cling on the Government to establish a system of unemployment dole in Guyana. Sure sly this is possible. The N.I.S. statistics showed that the N.I.S. purchased debentures from Government to the tune of \$9,138,818 in 1969 and 1970. This excludes cash in hand which is nearly \$1 million or \$2 million. Surely the Government can afford to take out \$2 or \$# million from this and pay an unemployment dole in Guyana. The year 1971 is a healthier year because in 1971 they registered the self-employed. Maybe you, too, Your Honour –

Mr. Speaker: I have already paid.

Mr. Lall: So the N.I.S. is in a more healthy condition to pay an unemployment dole. We are asking the Government to give it a thought because there are thousands of persons going to bed at night without anything to eat.

The N.I.S. needs a lot of streamlining. A man fell sick on 19th May at Albion. He is entitled to sick benefits. He did not receive his sick benefits after representations made by me until October 16, 1971. Another man at Albion factory lost his right eye and is partially blind in the other one. That was since 30th August, 1971. I had to bring this to the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour and Social Security.

It was only last month that this man received the first payment of \$192.

In another instance, a lady was struck in the eye by cane trash. Her eye was almost closed and the doctor said nothing was wrong with it. I had to take the lady to the Minister and the Minister asked Dr. Nicholson to re-open the case. The lady received over \$390 and now they are going to operate on her eye. This is the person who the doctor said could go to work.

I am saying that the N.I.S. needs streamlining because there are thousands of workers like these who are suffering; these are only a few of the cases. There are no less than 500 cases a week in New Amsterdam and Georgetown. We are saying that N.I.S. should be decentralized and should have an office in New Amsterdam so that the workers can get speedy settlement in matters relating to the N.I.S.

I thought that the Government would have given an indication in its budget proposals that it is taking positive steps to have legislation enacted to have security of employment in Guyana. A man can hire a worker at will and fire him at will. We want measures that will give security of employment to those who are employed.

We were expecting that the Motion concerning severance pay, which was passed in this House in 1963, would have been put into effect and that the principle of severance pay would have been put on the statute book in Guyana. We do hope that during next year the Government will make it its duty to bring forward legislation to have security of employment and to have severance pay laws enacted in this House.

In his Budget Speech, under the heading Budget Measures, the hon. Minister of Finance said:

“Mr. Speaker, I now come to the measures which really affect the small man who is a hardworking family man.”

If the small man is not getting work, how is he going to be hard-working? *[Laughter]*

The Minister continued:

“It is proposed as from the Year of Assessment 1972 to grant the following additional allowances:”

Hon. Members know what the allowances are - \$100 per year for medical expenses, a school allowance of \$100 annually for each child in excess of three. I have made the point before. How can the unemployed people in this country benefit from this measure? The man who is working for \$4 a day, the man who is under-employed, how can they benefit from this measure? This is a tax-free budget, the Minister of Finance says, but the small man when posting a letter from his home to this daughter's home has to pay an increase of from 25 per cent to 100 per cent.

These allowances will not affect the poor man, the unemployed man, the under-employed man. If the members of the Government want to do something tangible then I would ask them to implement the unemployment dole. That would be something realistic.

What has been done to help the old age pensioners? The cost of living is sky-rocketing but the amount that old age pensioners receive remains the same. We would have thought that the Government would have brought measures to assist pensioners and that it would have given them a pittance more to help them to cope with the high cost of living.

The Government should withdraw the means test. When a person attains the age of 65 he should not have a means test. Let him have his pension because John Public is taxed heavily enough to pay the old age pensioner. We are paying the tax; let the old people get in on it.

We come to the people who are receiving social assistance. Because of the state of our society, people are dependent on social assistance and on a pittance from Government. We would have thought that \$6.50 would not be able to purchase now what it purchased in 1964. Therefore, the Government should evaluate the purchasing power of this amount. It should evaluate the increase in the cost of living and increase social assistance and old age pensions percentagewise. *[Applause]*

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour and Social Security.

The Minister of Labour and Social Security (Mr. Carrington): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member Mr. Harry Lall has been the third speaker on the debate on the Budget Speech. We expect in this House that a debate such as this we would get from the Opposition who made an orbit into international affairs. He was far away from what was contained in the Budget Speech. The hon. Attorney General then had to reply in similar manner and confine his speech to international affairs.

Now the third speaker the hon. Member Mr. Harry Lall made an excursion into unemployment, old age pension, the toll gate, mechanization, C.D.C., Sandbach Parker, and the External Trade Bureau. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how I can really constructively reply to the hon. Member because what he requires is information from the Government as regards its proposals in the Budget Speech with respect to 1972 on the question of unemployment. Today we see in the Press and hear on the radio from the lips of members of the Opposition a lot of talk with regard to the question of unemployment as though it is a situation that has just come up in 1971. Guyana is plagued with unemployment for a long time. The facts reveal that percentage-wise it was much higher in 1962 and 1962 than in 1971. It is only because of the programmes and the policy of this Government that it has been reduced.

But let us examine whether this Government and when this Government inherited this legacy of unemployment. The hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran with a munificent speech opened the sugar terminal which was responsible for the unemployment of thousands and thousands of waterfront workers. In the year 1971 it was this Government which appointed the Denbow Commission to recoup some of the money. Today the hon. Member Mr. Lall makes reference to unemployment on the waterfront. I do not know of any retrenchment on the waterfront. I know what the Government is trying to do is to introduce a better system of employment and to make sure that there is a more equal distribution of employment on the waterfront.

Mr. Speaker, you should know what is the reason for all of this complaint on the waterfront. There was a time when the workers on the waterfront got work and those who got

work before the others depended on their strength. This Government set out to improve it. If by improving the system it means that some people would get less work than the others the intention is to improve the system.

On the question of unemployment the hon. Member admitted that when the Sugar Producers' Association suggested the introduction of mechanization in the sugar industry that this Government said that every employer has the right to experiment – to exercise the right to know what can be done in the interest of the industry. But this Government said that there will be no mechanization in the sugar industry unless it is satisfied that there is need for such. The Government took that decision because it is conscious of the fact that with the introduction mechanization unemployment will increase. Let us look at the attitude and the interest of this Government in 1971 and compare it with the magnificent speech by the hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran at the opening of the sugar terminal. According to the Members of the Opposition it is a clear indication that the Government is concerned about unemployment.

Let us see what this Government is not doing in the context of the Budget to reduce unemployment. The Government speaks of self-reliance. The hon. Minister of Finance refers from area to area where employment will increase and so reduce the unemployment figure. What worries me is the logic of Members when it comes to this type of debate. The Government has the hon. Members said, speaks of slogans. These are attractions and directions which the nation must follow. It is in keeping with the philosophy, the ideology of the People's National Congress. We speak of self-reliance; we speak of self-respect. Read through the Budget. When the Chinese and the Russians spoke of self-help as a way of life, it was good. I am waiting for the Opposition Members to make their contribution to this way of life in Guyana. The Government intends that in Guyana we must feed, house and clothe ourselves by 1976. This is not a question of a slogan. If we are to be a nation and we must be developed these are things that we must do.

If we do not want to continue being paupers, if we do not want to continue depending on others, we must do these things.

At least by 1976 we must feed, clothe, and house ourselves. Just as we said we will have a road to Madhia, we will do this regardless of what the Opposition says. By 1976 or before. What will this mean to the nation? If we embark on a policy of feeding ourselves, it must mean employment for thousands of Guyanese. The hon. Leader of the Opposition Dr. Jagan referred to the high percentage of imported foodstuffs in the country. The people must eat but what we must do is be able to produce it. We are reducing the quantity of imports. We feel it is too high. We want to bring it down to zero and we want to create more jobs for the unemployed.

Housing ourselves, I am sure that when the hon. Minister responsible for Housing and Reconstruction – if he is given the opportunity to speak on this particular subject, the Opposition uses so much time in discussing irrelevance that the Government cannot speak on these matters – speaks, he will tell the House that if we can be self-sufficient or if we can provide the number of housing units indicated in the estimates, it would mean further employment for the unemployed. The hon. Member Mr. Ram Karran wanted to know, and the answer is that there are incentives in the Budget to give encouragement to persons who are desirous of embarking on housing. Should the Guyanese people embark on a programme of housing themselves? I would say and most Guyanese would say, yes.

The hon. Prime Minister at his press conference and at other levels told the nation that Guyana would be very shortly acquiring a mill to produce textiles. So here again - -

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Minister of labour and Social Security, perhaps you will find this a convenient time for us to suspend.

Mr. Carrington: I would have liked to leave this House closing off my speech, but I find it will be necessary to return to this debate. I should like to say at this point that the

10.12.71

National Assembly

6.30 – 6.35 p.m.

Government's programme to reduce unemployment is already in the hands of a capable and interested Government, a Government that is truly interested in the workers' welfare.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Leader of the House, will you move the Adjournment of the House, please.

Resolved, "That this Assembly do now adjourn until Monday, 13th December, 1971, at 2 p.m." [Mr. Ramsaroop]

Adjourned accordingly at 6.35 p.m.
