

THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT  
[VOLUME 1]

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

*51st Sitting*

*Tuesday, 21st March, 1967*

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

*The Assembly met at 2 p.m.*

*Prayers*

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Present:

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

*Members of the Government*

*Ministers*

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

*Parliamentary Secretaries*

Mr. D. B. deGroot

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Prime Minister's Office*

Mr. G. Bowman

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

Mr. O. E. Clarke

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Ministry of Education*

Mr. P. Duncan

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Ministry of Local  
Government*

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

- *Parliamentary Secretary,  
Ministry of Works and  
Hydraulics*

*Other Members*

Mr. W. A. Blair

Mr. H. Prashad, J.P.

Mr. J. Budhoo

Mr. T. A. Sancho

Mr. M. Kasim

Mr. R. C. Tello, Deputy Speaker

Mr. W. Carrington

Mr. J. H. Thomas

Mr. D. Mahraj

Rev. A. B. Trotman

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

*Members of the Opposition*

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

Mr. J. R. S. Luck

Mr. A. Chase

Mr. H. LaFl

Mr. B. H. Benn

Mr. M. Khan, J.P.

Mr. Bam Karran

Mr. Y. Ally

Mr. R. Chandisingh

Mr. L. Linde

Mr. H. J. M. Hubbard

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

Dr. Charles Jacob, Jr.

Mr. M. N. Poonsi

Dr. F. H. W. Ramsahoye

Dr. S. A. Ramjohn

Mr. E. M. G. Wilson

Mr. M. Bhagwan

Clerk of the National Assembly

Mr. F. A. Narain

Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly

Mr. M. B. Henry

*Absent:*

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

- on leave

Mr. R. G. B. Field-Ridley

- on leave

Mr. C. V. Nunes

Mr. M. Hamid, J.P.

Mr. D. C. Jagan

- on leave

Mr. E. M. Stoby

Mr. S. M. Saffee.

## PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS

**The Minister of Finance** (Mr. d'Aguiar): I beg to lay on the table Financial Paper No. 1 of 1967 and to name Tuesday, 28th March, 1967, as the day on which this Paper will be debated.

### PUBLIC BUSINESS

#### MOTION

The Assembly resumed the debate on the following Motion:

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

**Mr. Speaker:** The Assembly will resume debate on the Motion before it. When we concluded last evening the hon. Member, Mr. Luck, had spoken for seven minutes. He may now proceed.

**Mr. Luck:** The pivot on which all else must turn in our relations with foreign countries is our relationship with our mighty northern neighbours, the United States of America. My party is not anti-American, nor would it wish that the Government of Guyana should pursue policies merely because they are anti-American.

What shall be our relationship with the United States? Shall it be that of a satellite state, one of the numerous states around the world created by American guns and maintained

against the wills of the peoples of those countries by American guns? Is that to be the relationship? It is true, beyond the possibility of dispute, that the present Government of Guyana owes its origin to the devious devices of the Central Intelligence Agency of America. That having been done, this Government is now sovereign, or allegedly sovereign, and we on this side of the House would like to see it assert its independence of the United States.

We seek no quarrel with the Americans, but it is common knowledge that the policies being pursued by the United States have unfortunately led it into conflict with many of the peoples who inhabit this globe. Yesterday I referred to the sad and unfortunate colonial war the United States now wages in Vietnam. In this country, at least half of the population has cause for alarm because its present dangerous position is the result of the plans and plotting of the Central Intelligence Agency. Even the Head of the Government is aware of the great amount of interference in the political affairs of this country in which the Americans indulge.

One would expect that a foreign policy statement by this Government would, first of all, while affirming friendship towards the people and Government of the United States, seek to assert our independence of the policies being pursued by that mighty country. This should be stated clearly and with no bitterness.

What is happening in this country? Operatives of the C.I.A.

[MR. LUCK]

promised various racial organisations to deliver the other race to them. There is, known to the Government, interference on a large scale in the internal affairs of this country. I urge the Government to let the United States know that its interference in this country must now end. For this to be done there must be a more liberal policy which would tend to bring the divided people into a unanimous support of a Government.

As I prepared for this debate I was conscious of a great deal of unreality in our discussions in this Assembly. We are debating as though we were truly independent and sovereign. We are discussing our foreign relations. But the American doctrine for this hemisphere conflicts with the concept of a free debate on this matter in this Assembly. Americans say quite openly that they will not tolerate Governments in the hemisphere with which they disagree. They say this openly and herein lies the difficulty in coming to some reasonable accommodation with the American people and their Government.

I say once more that the party of which I have the honour to be a member does not pursue policies which derive from an enmity of the American people. What we seek for ourselves is what the Americans themselves fought for in their War of Independence. I urge this Government not to put the members of the Opposition in the position that they have to compete for the approval of the Americans. This is an old imperialist tactic. The

Americans openly boast that no Government could exist in this hemisphere against their wishes as they have agents everywhere in Guyana who interpret these wishes to our people.

2.20 p.m.

Since we are discussing foreign affairs, I should like this Government to have a parliamentary inquiry into the activities of that notorious organisation, the Central Intelligence Agency.

I pass on now to other matters. Yesterday, the leader of this party announced, quite rightly, that we were in agreement with the principles of the foreign policy as outlined by the Prime Minister. But those are mere principles. When we look at the application of those principles, we see something vastly different. The hon. Prime Minister said that it is the aim of this Government to ensure that there is peace on this earth, and that there is an end to the exploitation of man by man. But only today, 400 Vietnamese are alleged to have been killed by the Americans, and this Government has yet to state its position on the Vietnamese conflict. There is no doubt that the American action in Vietnam is a thrust at the heart of China.

May I say that the support of the people of Guyana and, indeed, the support of the Government of Guyana would weigh but little in that momentous conflict in which, quite possibly, the destinies of all mankind are being decided. Therefore, please believe that I do not indulge in any special pleading in this matter. But it

pains me to learn that those who expect all mankind to be agitated over the cruel oppression in Southern Africa, those who expect all mankind to be agitated over the oppression and intolerance in Southern Rhodesia, turn a Nelson eye to the conflict in Vietnam. I do not plead for support of the Vietnamese people, nor indeed of the Chinese people. Those people will look after themselves well, but we expose ourselves to the shame and ridicule of the world when, in this terrible conflict, we remain silent. We behave as so many Guyanese when choking and robbing is going on on the streets of Georgetown. It is a matter of bitter regret that those who, I know, deplore oppression, turn a Nelson eye when oppression is directed against other people. There can be no one among the following of the imperialists on that side who can defend the intolerable actions of the American Government.

When I prepared this speech, I knew how important it was for us, on this side of the House, to divert the hatred and the anger of the American Government from this party. I have thought at great length of what reasonable accommodation these people will come to, assuming that we do not want to allow them to decide, on their own account, the destinies of mankind, and I can really find no formula which these Americans seem prepared to accept. However, life is long and for our part, we would seek any reasonable accommodation with these Americans, even to the extent of allowing them to do their foolishness, but they must at least give the people in this country a fair chance to run their own affairs.

There is one other matter to which I should like to direct the attention of this House. Abroad, there is a so-called treaty for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. If any single power on earth had proposed that it should have a monopoly of such frightful weapons of destruction, it would surely have earned the ridicule of all mankind, as such a proposal can only stem from a desire to dominate the rest of mankind. Is it any different if two powers now desire a nuclear monopoly? I would ask this Government to state its position on this question of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is true that for us it is academic. But, as a philosophical question, is it right that two countries, acting separately or in collusion, should decide the destinies of mankind?

It is clear from what I have said that I cannot support the idea that nuclear weapons should remain the monopoly of two powers. What I would support is that these weapons should be banned or we should create nuclear free zones. If, as human beings, we allow only two powers to have a monopoly of nuclear weapons, we would be yielding to them our destinies. What a remarkable difference it would have made to the Vietnamese conflict if on both sides there were these weapons!

2.30 p.m.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. d'Aguiar) has not got the news yet, but today they have ceased bombing people because they are communists. Communists as such have bombs. I hate to believe that geography has im-

[MR. LUCK]

posed upon us in this country the necessity to be silent on the great issues which confront mankind. I would wish the Americans to avert their anger from the honest people and the honest parties in this country. Let them try with the gangsters in Chicago. One thousand murders took place and there were not five convictions. Let them go there.

This is a small country and I would wish that we in this country were allowed to settle our own affairs and come to such accommodations as are necessary for the public good, free from American and other interference. What I deplore is the fact that our foreign policy is not directed towards that goal. A Canadian was chosen as the Principal of the University of Guyana because we have to get Canadian money to build the University. But do we have to have the Americans or the British choosing our Ambassadors and our Ministers of State? They were not chosen at Congress Place. Our Minister of State and our Ambassadors are all known to reflect their own personal views and it is one of the ironies of fate that the leading spokesmen for an independent Guyana have been chosen only because they opposed, throughout their rotten lives, the Independence of Guyana.

I do not mind men making their way in life. Honestly, I congratulate them for they are all estimable fellows. Do we gain proper representation as an independent country by men whose sole dedication has been the interest of the imperialists,

those who have power? If, by an analysis of the world situation, the members of this Government came to the view that the Americans were pursuing wise and just policies, then their clear support of that Government would be justified. But the truth is that their attitude is that "because we cannot beat them, we must join them". That has been the policy of the framers of this iniquitous policy. Is that a good enough policy for an independent Guyana?

We would like to see a non-aligned policy, but what do we see? We find that the Soviet Union has been quite unable to establish an Embassy in this country and I predict that this will be established when the Soviet Union speaks properly to the proper authorities in Washington. What a terrible state of affairs! Imagine that, the establishment of relations with the Soviet Union will be decided in Washington! That is the true position. I expect that we will soon see - even Castro has predicted it - a Russian Embassy in this country.

But what of the Chinese Embassy? As this House knows, I was privileged to be in China some while ago and while there I was treated very, very nicely. May I ask the members of this Government what on earth prevents them from trading with China when Canada carries on substantial trade with China involving millions of dollars? Why have they stopped it? If they are non-aligned why have they stopped it? It is on account of these important matters that we say that the lovely profession of

ideals which have been propounded by the Prime Minister are totally false.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time!

**The Attorney-General and Minister of State (Mr. Ramphal):** This is the first occasion on which the Parliament of independent Guyana will be having a full-length debate on foreign affairs in its most general sense. It is, therefore, a specially important occasion in the life of the House and of the country and it behoves us all to approach the many matters which the debate must encompass in the manner in which you, sir, exhorted at the start of the debate - with an appreciation of its national significance. In particular, it provides us in this House, which is so often preoccupied with considerations of party and, alas, oft times of personalities, with an opportunity to rise above these levels of partisanship and to give emphasis to the one interest in the area of foreign affairs which is, or should be, the concern of us all and which is, or should be, paramount to party - and that is the interest of Guyana.

I do not mean to infer, of course, that we should always agree as to what particular policy best advances the national interest. But if we are all resolute in pursuing that interest and in sublimating all other loyalties to it then I think, Mr. Speaker, we shall find substantial areas of accord. For - let us have no illusions about it - whatever differences may divide us in our domestic affairs, at the level of international

affairs we face problems that confront us as one nation - as one political community - as one economic unit.

2.40 p.m.

We can only tackle them effectively if we view them as national problems and remain mentally free to pursue practical solutions which will serve the national interest. This, after all, is the very essence of the principle of non-alignment which the Prime Minister yesterday enunciated as the basic principle of our foreign policy. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if in approaching these problems in the area of external affairs we remain so much the slaves of the political philosophies that divide us in our internal affairs that we fail to see them in any other light, we shall almost certainly fail also to find solutions to them or to find solutions which will serve the national interest. This, apparently, is the course which the Leader of the Opposition would have us follow and his posture becomes a little ridiculous when we recognise the realities of international behaviour in the middle of the twentieth century - when those countries who are the champions of the political philosophies he would have us apply at the domestic level are themselves motivated ~~paramountly~~ by national self-interest in their external affairs. This is another example, Mr. Speaker, of what the Prime Minister was talking about yesterday when he cautioned that with international affairs we must always recognise that we are dealing with matters that are never static but constantly

[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

changing. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that what some other Honourable Members on the other side need most to do is to face up to the realities of change and abandon the old-fashioned postures of 1920 radicalism.

The Motion that the Prime Minister has moved, Mr. Speaker, seeks approval of the Government's foreign policy and of the action taken by the Government in the field of foreign affairs since Independence. In his speech, the Prime Minister dealt with the essentials of the Government's policy and, Mr. Speaker, I would not myself have thought that there was much room for disagreement in this House over that policy. For a small nation there are not many alternatives in the area of foreign affairs that are consistent with survival on a basis of self-respect. This is why, Mr. Speaker, the new nations - the developing nations, the poorer nations, the smaller nations - have for the greater part found a natural affinity with the policy of non-alignment and have found it possible, within its philosophy, to create a climate of international opinion which recognises their right to retain freedom of action and to exercise an independent judgment on the great issues of world affairs. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not exhaust the discussion with a discourse on these basic themes of policy and particularly since this is our first debate on foreign affairs, it is right that we in this House should consider and appraise not only the Government's policy but the action that has been taken in its implementation. It is with these matters, Mr.

Speaker, that I shall try to deal in the course of my speech; for when we have finished all our philosophical discourses on these matters of high policy - some of them, alas, so far heard from the other side of little relevance to Guyana - it is to the area of action that we must turn for an evaluation of our performance in what will soon be our first year of Independence.

It has been inevitable, Mr. Speaker, that in the last ten months a great part of our energies in foreign affairs should have been expended in the essential tasks of organisation. It is true that a token start had been made before Independence with the establishment of a Department of External Affairs and over a period of years from 1962 a number of our young people had attended courses in diplomatic training. There were important and helpful beginnings, but much more remained to be done and some of it could only be undertaken after we became fully responsible for Guyana's external relations. In the months that have gone by we have had to pay much attention to structuring the Ministry of External Affairs and creating the Diplomatic Service. This was our first task.

A Diplomatic Service, Mr. Speaker, is not merely one of the attributes of sovereignty; it is essential to communication and comity between nations. Its establishment is therefore an indispensable feature of Independence and in a world in which such practical matters as financial and technical assistance and trade fall increasingly to be regulated on a multi-lateral



basis at an international level a Diplomatic Service becomes - and has been shown in the last decade to have become - of particular importance to a small nation striving to survive in an intensely competitive, and sometimes hostile, international climate

2.50 p.m.

The development and maintenance of good relations with other nations and the securing of a share in the fruits of international co-operation are responsibilities that Guyana now carries directly; only through a Diplomatic Service staffed by the most capable people and provided with the essentials of diplomatic life can these responsibilities be discharged with adequacy. On no account can they be allowed to go by default. In 1963, the Plowden Committee in the United Kingdom considering Britain's Representational Services had this to say on the question of the need for a Diplomatic Service. It said:

"The problem of earning our living in the world has become more difficult. It is now a major pre-occupation which influences all of our international actions and attitudes. An alert and efficient diplomacy can exercise an influence disproportionate to physical strength."

If this is true of Britain, with what greater force must these considerations not prevail with the small and economically weak countries who must survive in a world that is fiercely com-

petitive and in which a primeval self-interest remains the basic motivating force of all national endeavour.

In approaching the tasks of organisation, we established certain criteria which have become the guide lines of our planning. The first of these is that we were developing an institution to deal with the needs of Guyana in the middle of the twentieth century. This meant that while there was much that we might learn from the experience of others, there were no stereotypes that we should apply in an automatic way and that we should not be deterred by virtue merely of their novelty from pursuing arrangements that seemed best suited to our needs and our circumstances. The second criterion was a recognition of the limitations imposed by our slender financial resources - a recognition that made it inevitable that we should establish only those Missions abroad that were regarded as essential to the conduct of our foreign relations, and that they should be trimmed to the scale of our resources and be designed to function within our means. There are, of course, certain minimum requirements that are, as it were, the essentials of diplomatic activity and which it would be futile to dispense with if we expect our Missions to perform their basic tasks.

The third criterion was that, recognising our limited financial resources and the limitations they impose both on the number of our Missions abroad and on the manpower with which they could be provided, there should be an emphasis on quality in the selec-

[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

tion of our diplomats whether they be the Heads of our Missions abroad or the young people now entering our Diplomatic Service, who will be our diplomats of tomorrow and whether they serve in the Missions abroad or in the Ministry at home. Inevitably, the Ministry of External Affairs has been obliged to recognise that in the recruitment of personnel ours was not the only need, but I have no hesitation whatever in asserting that we have laid the foundations for a sound and effective Diplomatic Service staffed by officers of competence and ability. But more, we have in the last ten months - and to me, this a matter of very great importance and a source of much satisfaction - we have seen the emergence of a Diplomatic Service with a sense of cohesion and loyalty working together as a team and committed to the service of Guyana. I believe that we have in the making in the officers of the Ministry of External Affairs and of the Missions abroad a Diplomatic Service of which this country will become increasingly proud. The process of organisation is a continuing one and it is inevitable that over the years there will be need for expansion; but, guided by the criteria to which I have already referred, that expansion will be controlled, and it will be responsive to the needs of the country.

One aspect of the organisational arrangements to which I wish specifically to draw attention is the interesting experiment we have made with Barbados on the question of sharing overseas representation. I have al-

ready adverted to the fact that one of the major burdens of independence for a small country - whose resources, both financial and human, must in any event be strained by the challenge of economic development - is the high expenditure of both money and personnel involved in the establishment of Missions abroad. However carefully the organisation and the budget are pruned, the cost of overseas representation is high and daily becomes higher.

There is, unfortunately, much loose and misinformed talk about luxurious living and extravagance in Capitals abroad. This type of irresponsible and highly unjustified criticism does less than justice to our officers abroad whose emoluments and conditions of service compare unfavourably with those of most other nations - even of others from within the Caribbean whose circumstances are not dissimilar to our own. None of us is so naive as not to know that there are certain minimum requirements and certain minimum standards which Guyana's representatives abroad must meet and maintain and I sometimes wonder, when comments of this kind are made, - [Interruptions.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members, you are interrupting the speaker on the Floor.

**The Attorney-General:** I sometimes wonder, when comments of this kind are made - or, as they more often than not are, merely published - whether those responsible for making them are not fully aware that these arrangements are the necessary result of indepen-

dence and that what this carping criticism reflects is a dissatisfaction with independence itself which those who publish them feel constrained to cloak under criticism of this kind.

3.00 p.m.

There is, of course, another type of critic, such as the Leader of the Opposition - from his speech yesterday - who does not apparently object to Guyana's Missions abroad but merely to the fact that they do not spend their time propagating his particular brand of politics. Guyana's representatives abroad are engaged in promoting the interest of Guyana, and it is surely time that those who allow themselves the luxury of such criticism made up their minds where they stand on the importance of pursuing Guyana's interest for its own sake.

But, the point I wish to make is that despite this type of criticism it is Guyana that has led the way among developing countries in pursuing arrangements for joint or shared overseas representation with a view to minimising the costs of the Diplomatic Service. This matter had plagued most of the new countries and some have actually considered schemes of one kind or another for sharing these overheads. With Barbados, we have taken these ideas further forward into reality. In London, for the first time, a single High Commissioner has been accredited by two Governments - by Guyana and by Barbados - and Sir Lionel Luckhoo serves both countries as Head of our respective Missions in London with corresponding savings to both Governments.

In Washington and in Ottawa we are experimenting with different but related arrangements. With the concurrence and co-operation of the Government of Canada, it has been arranged that Guyana, while not establishing a High Commission in Ottawa, will have in the offices of the Barbados High Commission there a senior representational officer who will occupy a Guyana desk and who will be available for day to day contact with the officers of the Canadian Government and organisations and individuals in Canada in touch with the affairs of Guyana. This officer will be responsible to our Ambassador in Washington who has already been accredited as High Commissioner to Canada also. Correspondingly, Barbados while having a High Commission in Ottawa will not initially establish an embassy in Washington, but arrangements will be made for a senior representational officer from the Barbados Foreign Service to occupy a Barbados desk in the Guyana Embassy working to his High Commissioner in Ottawa, who will himself have been correspondingly accredited as the Barbados Ambassador to Washington.

In this way, by co-operation between our Governments, we have each sought to avoid the overheads of a Mission in one out of two North American capitals, while making use of the facilities established by the other to meet our necessary diplomatic requirements there. These arrangements must necessarily be regarded as experimental. We have agreed that they will be reviewed from time to time in the light of experience, but I believe that with continuing goodwill and good

## [THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

relations between our two Governments, we should be able, not only to maintain these co-operative efforts, but to expand them into other areas of representation and, who knows, perhaps to interest other countries in them.

Side by side, with the establishment of the Missions in London, Washington and New York and of the Ministry at home, we have been establishing and developing our relationships with a variety of international organisations with some of whom we were linked in the past but only through Britain's membership. These of course, include the United Nations itself, but also a variety of other international organisations, now 23 in all, including the International Monetary Fund, the World Health Organisation, the Food and Agriculture Organisation, the International Labour Organisation, UNESCO, UNICEF, the International Rice Commission, the Universal Postal Union, the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the International Communications Convention. Membership of these bodies has been undertaken only after a thorough-going analysis of the benefits, costs and responsibilities of membership, and only on the basis of our assessment that our participation in them serves the interests of Guyana and that through such membership we could in turn make a small contribution to the attainment of the lofty ideals of international co-operative action that inspire them. Such membership means, of course, that we shall be required to take our share of the responsibilities of membership, that we shall need to

attend their conferences and to share in their work. These responsibilities place a heavy burden on an already hard-pressed public service, but they are the concomitants of independence and their acceptance and discharge are inevitable features of our membership of the community of nations.

Of such significance, also, has been the establishment in Guyana of High Commissions and Embassies of Commonwealth and foreign countries respectively. Through their presence here they help greatly in the despatch of business between our Government and the Governments of their countries. It would be a happy circumstance if we could have reciprocal Missions established in all these countries, but alas, this is not possible and, particularly in these cases, the High Commission or Embassy here in Georgetown serves an even more important function. We have welcomed too from certain Commonwealth and foreign countries alike who have not established embassies here accreditations of High Commissioners or Ambassadors stationed in other places and it will be our aim in appropriate cases to similarly accredit our own Heads of Missions to countries in which we cannot for the time being have Missions established but with whom we have particular relationships.

3.10 p.m.

Turning from organisational matters to areas of action in external affairs, it was perhaps inevitable that our relations with our sister countries in the Caribbean should occupy much of

our time in the first year of Independence. The Prime Minister has on several occasions (and again yesterday) affirmed the importance which the Government attaches to the cause of West Indian unity and we have more than once pledged ourselves to the maximum degree of consultation and co-operation within the area in matters of common concern. Our declared policy has been unequivocally regional and the Government has lent its support to all practical proposals for the strengthening of regional links and the re-emergence of a West Indian identity. The Government will continue these efforts.

The agreement for the establishment of a Caribbean Free Trade Area which was signed at Dickenson Bay, Antigua, in December 1965 was a tangible indication of Guyana's seriousness in this regard. That agreement has already been fully debated in this House and I will not dwell upon its details here. We are now in the final stages of the preparations for the implementation of the agreement and the start of the Free Trade Area. A great deal of work has been entailed in these preparations and they cover for Guyana a much wider field than they do for either Barbados or Antigua. Nevertheless, it is our hope that the agreement will be brought into force in the very near future and that this first practical step towards Caribbean economic integration will soon be taken.

Guyana has never seen CARIFTA as an end in itself. In particular, we have always attached the

very greatest importance to the widening of the Free Trade Area to include the entire Commonwealth Caribbean and beyond. The accession clause of the agreement has given expression to this intention and we hope that it will not be long before other countries in the Caribbean are ready to sit down with us in discussions that will lead to this end. It is for this reason that the Government gave its full support to the Mission of the Incorporated Chambers of Commerce of the Commonwealth Caribbean that toured the area recently under the chairmanship of Sir Garnet Gordon. The delegation found on the basis of a comprehensive survey of the attitudes of Governments that there was considerable support for the idea that there should be a phased freeing of trade in the area, and this Government has indicated both to the Mission and to other Governments that it is willing to take the initiative in convening a meeting of interested Governments to discuss the possibilities of a wider Free Trade Area. We have, therefore, been pleased with the indications that have been given quite recently in Trinidad of their interest in taking part in discussions of this kind and it will be our hope that such discussions can be held in the very near future.

But, Mr. Speaker, the cause of Caribbean unity has been given practical support in a number of other important ways during the year. In the discussions between Commonwealth Caribbean Governments that preceded the formal Conference that was held in Ottawa in July 1966 between Canada and Commonwealth

[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

Caribbean Governments a significant step forward was taken in the joint approach agreed upon by the Caribbean countries in most of the matters before the Conference. This accord was maintained at the meetings in Ottawa to a very substantial degree and it has been the Government's policy in all these matters to maintain consultation with the other Governments in the area in the continuing action that has had to be taken.

I have already indicated the novel but imaginative arrangements we have made with Barbados for sharing the overheads of overseas representation. But there is yet another field in which we have found it possible to co-operate in a practical way with Barbados in the area of external affairs with a view to doing well what is required to be done and sharing between us the costs incurred. I refer to the complicated subject of Treaty succession which has proved a major problem for more than one of the newly independent countries. We have sought to approach this question in a systematic and methodical manner. To this end we are sharing equally the services of a distinguished international lawyer, Professor D.P. O'Connell, who, over a period of two years will act as a consultant to both Governments in our analyses of the many treaties to which we have each succeeded on Independence and in the establishment of an efficient and comprehensive system of treaty registers.

Professor O'Connell is perhaps the world's leading authority on

the question of State succession and, with the aid of one of the research assistants working alongside counterpart lawyers in Georgetown and Bridgetown, we hope, perhaps for the first time among the newly independent countries, to carry out this important task in an ordered and comprehensive manner and to avoid the difficulties that have been encountered by others. That we are able to do so in co-operation with a Caribbean country whose needs are similar to our own is a practical demonstration of what can be achieved if there is trust and goodwill and an indication of how much more might be possible if such a measure of trust and goodwill were to become pervasive throughout the area.

Finally, with regard to matters of Commonwealth Caribbean concern it has been a source of gratification to the Government to see the islands of the Leeward and Windward group, other than Montserrat, advance beyond the strictly colonial relationship to that of Associated Status - a relationship which the Honourable V.C. Bird, the Premier of Antigua, described with characteristic practicability during the recently concluded celebrations of that island as "Independence in Association".

3.20 p.m.

These arrangements have been worked out between the Governments of the Islands and the Government of the United Kingdom. They are novel in many respects and frankly experimental in most. In their working out a variety of problems not originally envisaged may yet be encountered; but

equally, and particularly with goodwill on all sides, they could herald the establishment of more satisfactory relationships not only between Britain and the Islands but between the Islands and the independent Commonwealth countries in the area. This Government will always be ready to give whatever assistance it can in the unfolding of these relationships and, in particular, in exploring new bases for closer association with the Islands.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we believe that there now exists a new and favourable climate for West Indian unity. No one can be sure exactly what patterns that unity might take and perhaps we should not attempt to draw up blue prints at this stage of transition when so many new constitutional relationships are just being established. But that there is now a climate that is propitious to regionalism few will deny. If we are responsive to it and sensitive to the many and changing moods of the area, if we try harder to understand the special problems of our several countries and to be tolerant of each other's behaviour in the search for solutions to them, if above all, we can suppress suspicion and replace silence by dialogue, there is much that we might yet achieve that has eluded the West Indies for so long.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, we shall continue our quest for regional solutions and continue our collaboration in matters of common concern. Already, for example, the Caribbean Examinations Council is proceeding with its plan to standardise regional

examinations by having them set and marked in the area - arrangements that must be an important step towards curriculum harmonisation throughout the region and the eventual integration of secondary and tertiary levels of West Indian education. We have already negotiated a more satisfactory basis for the admission of Guyanese students to the University of the West Indies and it should not be too much to hope that we may yet evolve a planned approach to university education in the region with the University of Guyana being complementary to the U.W.I. and Guyana participating in the regional establishment of those new disciplines - and I have particularly in mind legal studies - that can no longer be neglected.

I have been talking, Mr. Speaker, about our relationships with the members of our West Indian family with whom we have grown up. While the colonial relationship lasted it was with these immediate relatives that we had our closest and most continuing contact, and we were to a large extent shut out from intimate relationships with our neighbours in the rest of the hemisphere. With Canada, it is true, we had enjoyed a long friendship. The Canada/West Indies Agreement of 1925 and the trading patterns which it recognised and strengthened, the visits of the Lady Boats which came to be such a feature of our communication system with the outside world, and the work of bodies like the Canadian Presbyterian Mission here and of our own young people in Canadian Universities, most notably McGill, had served to establish close

[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

links between us during this period - bonds of friendship that have been strengthened since Independence.

With the United States, too, there was appreciable contact mainly through the many thousands of Guyanese living and working in the United States but for whom Guyana always remained home and through the training that so many of our professional people have obtained in American Universities; and, in this regard, we in Guyana must always pay a special tribute to the contribution that Howard University has made to our society. There were, of course, commercial and trading links with the United States and contacts with United States citizens during the War when Atkinson Field was built under the Leased Bases Agreement - now no longer applicable to Guyana. But, Mr. Speaker, save for these contacts with North America we lived in almost complete isolation from our other neighbours in the hemisphere. A sprinkling of contacts in the Caribbean itself, perhaps notably in Aruba and Curacao, represented our main point of reference with the non-British islands. Central America was a region unknown. As children in school we knew more of the geography and history of Europe than we did of Central and South America. We were a part of South America and we looked outward to the Caribbean - naturally enough - but without hardly ever a glance over our shoulders at our neighbours on the mainland. We spoke English and cultivated tastes for French and Latin when all around us spoke in the Spanish tongue. These, Mr. Speaker, are

now matters of historical record and I refer to them merely to point out how much more remains to be done in getting to know better the peoples of this hemisphere. For, Mr. Speaker, there will, I think, be few today who look with any care at the international scene that do not recognise to what extent the organisation of world society reinforces the argument that geography alone advances that we should come to know better all the peoples of the Americas - recognising that we share with many of them the common history of colonial rule and common problems that have been its legacy.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, recognises in full measure the need for these new relationships, particularly with Latin American countries, and I could do no better than repeat what the Prime Minister himself said in his reply to the speeches of welcome made on our admission to the United Nations on that great occasion on September 18 last when he declared that -

"situated as we are geographically on the Latin American continent, we cherish the warmest feelings of friendship for our neighbours, the Latin American nations, with whom we look forward to more than a lifetime of meaningful cooperation."

3.30 p.m.

It is, therefore, a matter for deep regret that in this mood and at this moment in the life of our young nation, our relationships with Venezuela should have



been so severely strained. The course of Venezuela's basic controversy with us is too well known to Members to need recounting here. This House has already debated and approved of the Geneva Agreement negotiated on the eve of our Independence and which we felt heralded an era of better relations with the Government and people of Venezuela and which we thought provided both opportunity and machinery for a resolution of the problems raised by Venezuela's complaints against Britain in respect of the Arbitral Award of 1899. The Mixed Commission, established under the Geneva Agreement, has got down to its tasks in a business-like manner and has only last week, indeed only a few days ago, ended its fourth meeting here in Georgetown in an atmosphere of cordiality and goodwill.

But the Ankoko incident has disturbed the tranquility which it was the aim of the Geneva Agreement to establish and maintain and it will not serve the purposes of friendship and good relations with Venezuela for me to be less than candid in deploring this unwarranted intrusion into Guyana territory. We cannot and we will not shut our eyes to this illegal occupation of the Guyana half of Ankoko island and all our efforts in so many areas to establish harmonious relationships with Venezuela must fail to achieve their maximum good so long as this act of aggression continues. I have no wish, in anything I say, to inflame the passions within our society that have been naturally and justifiably aroused by this affair and the Government for its

part is pursuing through diplomatic channels, as the Prime Minister has explained, all possible avenues that might lead to its resolution. We hope that our efforts in this regard will be matched by an acknowledgment on the part of the Venezuelan Government of the need to remove this new area of discord and that we can expect a response to our initiatives for a resolution of the matter which pays due regard to the established principles of international behaviour that it is the function of the United Nations Organisation - of which we are now both members - to uphold.

Fortunately, we have moved some way from the days of the nineteenth century when gun-boat diplomacy held sway and international bullying was really rewarded. Today, the smaller nations of the world are reaching out to a collective security founded not on military agreements and defence pacts but on their solidarity and an effective use of their combined influences in the Councils of the world and, through those agencies, to the international conscience.

Guyana is not without friends in this regard and it would be a mistake for anyone to suppose that we will be supine and silent in the face of threats to our territorial integrity. I do not feel that at this stage I should say more on this particular matter. We know that our cause is a just one and we shall continue resolutely our efforts to ensure respect for what is ours by right of every principle of international law and every tradition of international practice.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

I have already explained the Government's acknowledgment of our involvement in the affairs of the hemisphere and more particularly of Latin America. It is inevitable, therefore, that we should have given consideration to our relationships with the Organisation of American States. In the ten months since Independence much effort has been devoted to this question and we have been much assisted by the opportunities of consultation that we have had with Canada and with Jamaica and, more recently, with Barbados, in this regard.

This examination is continuing and it is good that this question should be receiving the attention of thoughtful people throughout the country at this time. The issues that are raised are many and complex and they need to be approached with great care and to be considered by cool heads. There are some who are emotionally hostile to the notion of Guyana's membership of the O.A.S. Let me remind them that in this matter our main concern must be the interests of Guyana and that in pursuing those interests emotion and dogma can never be a sensible or adequate substitute for sober and realistic appraisal and analysis. There are others, no less hasty in their judgment who talk glibly about our becoming now a member of the O.A.S.

In a very real sense we are living in a rapidly changing world. All around us nations, large and small, motivated primarily by self-interest, are taking decisions and embarking upon policies which affect

established relationships and have an influence on the course of our own affairs. Where opportunity exists we use our endeavours to protect our own interests by counselling those arrangements which will promote or at least ensure protection for them. None of us any longer in the world, and this is true of large and powerful nations as it is true of the small developing nations, can avoid the rippling effect of the behaviour of others on the international scene. We are not and can never be free agents in the sense that we can pursue a given course of conduct irrespective of what is happening in the world around us.

3.40 p.m.

Each step we take is conditioned upon patterns of international existence to which we contribute, but of which no single nation is a determinant.

It is essential, when considering such a question as membership of the O.A.S. that we should keep always in mind these realities of international existence and the miscellany of practical considerations they throw up. We must, therefore, take account of the very substantial political considerations involved, of the nature and effect of the specific rights and obligations which membership of the inter-American system involves, of the financial considerations and the considerations for our economic development that arise with regard to the inter-American Development Bank and the related questions of bilateral financial assistance,

of the implications on trade and development of potential membership of the Latin American Free Trade Area, of the Central American Common Market or of the Latin American Common Market that may yet emerge out of present discussions.

Amid all this, we must take account of Britain's dialogue with Europe and the possibility of her entry into the European Common Market on terms which could have the most far-reaching implications for our trade and for our economy generally. We must take account, too, of our special relationships within the Caribbean, of the momentum towards regionalism, of the prospects of Caribbean economic integration proceeding from the start which has already been made to the Caribbean Free Trade Area. These inter-locking considerations cannot be lightly or easily resolved or reconciled, and some of them are in a process of transition. The Government takes account of them all in its continuing appraisal of our relationships with the O.A.S. and always against the background of our wish to establish links of friendship and goodwill with our neighbours in Latin America.

But it would be wrong for me to give the impression that the decision is ours alone. In particular, proceeding from a Venezuelan initiative, paragraph 3 of the Act of Washington of 1964 which established procedures for the membership of the O.A.S. excludes Guyana from membership so long as Venezuela continues on the path she has chosen of seeking to ignore or at least to nullify the effects of the inter-

national procedures that established our present boundary. Article 3 of the Act of Washington states:

"that the Council of the Organisation shall not take any decision with respect to a request for admission on the part of a political entity whose territory, in whole or in part, is subject, prior to the date of this resolution, to the litigation or claim between an extra-continental country and one or more member states of the Organisation of American States, until the dispute has been ended by some peaceful procedure".

The Act of Washington does not in terms purport to amend the Charter of the O.A.S. Nevertheless, the main object of the Act was to establish procedures for the admission of new members to the O.A.S. and it may be assumed that the rules of admission set out in the Act of Washington will be observed by the Council of the O.A.S. with regard to applications for membership from non-American States. In any event, at the Second Special Conference held at Rio de Janeiro in November 1965, it was agreed that the Charter should be revised to provide, *inter alia*, regulations for the admission of new members to the O.A.S. in accordance with the Act of Washington. Pursuant to the Rio Conference, a Special Committee met in Panama in the first quarter of 1966 and drafted proposals for these amendments to the Charter, including an amendment dealing with the admission of new members, which incorporated the provisions of paragraph

[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

3 of the Act of Washington with only minor variations. These amendments were considered and approved by the Third Special Inter-American Conference recently concluded in Buenos Aires, and paragraph 3 of the Act of Washington will find a permanent place in the revised Charter.

I have already said that these exclusionary provisions of the Act of Washington proceeded on the basis of a Venezuelan initiative and I think it should be fully appreciated that the provisions were directed, if not exclusively, at least specifically, to the exclusion of Guyana. Thus when casting its affirmative vote on the Act of Washington in 1964, the Venezuelan Delegation expressly requested that the following statement be incorporated in the record - as it has been -

"The Delegation of Venezuela, at the time of casting its affirmative vote on the 'Act of Washington' states in the record and reiterates the pending claim of Venezuela to part of the territory of the entity called British Guiana. That claim has been formulated and reiterated to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on various occasions, among them, at the XVII, XVIII and XIX Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, at the headquarters of the Organization of American States, and at the meeting between the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela and that of the United Kingdom, held in Lon-

don in 1963. The Delegation of Venezuela desires to state expressly in the record that it gives its approval to point 3 of the operative part of the 'Act of Washington' in the understanding that this provision will apply both to the present situation of British Guiana and in the event that this entity obtains its independence without a prior settlement of the Venezuelan claim having been made."

Guyana does not complain of thus being excluded from membership of the regional organisation. Not being a member of the organisation it is not for us to regulate the rules of membership. But we think that it should be clearly understood by all, particularly by all our many friends among the Governments and people of Latin America that it is Venezuela's hostility to Guyana's membership expressed through these provisions of the Act of Washington that constitutes the initial barrier to our membership to the O.A.S. Until such barriers are removed, the question of membership of the O.A.S. is substantially academic. In a letter addressed by the Head of the Guyana Delegation at the Buenos Aires meeting to the Chairman of the Conference and the Secretary-General of the O.A.S., Guyana has specifically reiterated its acknowledgment that as an independent sovereign State in the Western Hemisphere, we have a special relationship with all other American States and has drawn the attention of the Conference and of the Council of the O.A.S. to the exclusionary effect of the provisions of the Charter agreed upon by the Cor

ference. Accordingly, when we have said all there is to say about the pros and cons of Guyana's membership of the O.A.S. - and it is right that these matters should be examined on a continuing basis - it remains the case that, at Venezuela's instance, the door to the O.A.S. remains closed to Guyana - at any rate for the time being.

3.50 p.m.

In the field of Commonwealth affairs, Guyana has made a modest but, I believe, effective debut. At the last Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held in London just before our admission to the United Nations, we were the youngest Commonwealth country and the newest member of the Commonwealth Association. Nevertheless, I think it is fair to say that we played a full part in the work of the Conference and the Prime Minister made a notable contribution to its deliberations and its conclusions. The Conference, as hon. Members are aware, was primarily concerned with and was almost entirely overwhelmed by the vexing problem of Rhodesia. Guyana's stand on the Rhodesian question, which was stated without ambiguity by the Prime Minister at the Conference, was that force was the swiftest means of bringing the illegal regime in Rhodesia to an end and should be resorted to by the United Kingdom, more particularly, since voluntary economic sanctions reluctantly agreed upon at the earlier Lagos meeting had proved to be ineffective.

At London we expressed the firm view that the policy of

sanctions, even if applied on a wider scale at the United Nations, through its mandatory procedures, was not likely to contribute significantly to the overthrow of the illegal regime, and we expressed concern lest their net effect might be to bring even greater hardship to the African population in Rhodesia and the people of Zambia as a whole. Nevertheless, Guyana shared the view of all other Commonwealth countries as expressed in the communique of the Conference, that all Commonwealth countries should continue to co-operate to the fullest extent possible in the pursuit of the basic objectives agreed upon for Rhodesia, notwithstanding differences of opinion among Commonwealth members as to the most effective means of achieving them.

Guyana's stand on Rhodesia was placed on record by Sir John Carter in the very first statement made by Guyana at the United Nations in the Fourth Committee and Guyana was one of the co-sponsors of the resolution put forward by the Fourth Committee and ultimately adopted by the General Assembly calling upon Britain:

"to take all necessary measures including in particular the use of force, in the exercise of its powers as the Administering Power to put an end to the illegal regime."

The Government continues to follow with anxiety the course of events in Rhodesia and its serious repercussions on neighbouring Zambia. The basic objective in Rhodesia must be the achievement

[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

of majority rule and there must be no question of Independence for Rhodesia before majority rule has been attained, nor must this same disaster be allowed to overtake the coloured people of Rhodesia through an indefinite and indeterminate perpetuation of *de facto* control in the hands of the illegal Government. The problem of Rhodesia is now a problem of concern not only to Britain with whom the main responsibility of leading Rhodesia to Independence rests, but to Africa as a whole, to the Commonwealth and to the world. The authority of the United Nations has now been invoked and it remains to be seen whether the conscience of the world can be quickened to the point where effective measures may be taken to put an end to the outlaw regime that now challenges international society.

The situation in Rhodesia in September last year did not permit President Kaunda to attend the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London and it was therefore a source of great pleasure to the Government to receive Dr. Kaunda some weeks later as part of his visit to the Americas. We hope that he took away with him from Guyana the warmth and friendship of our people for the people of Zambia and our resolve to do whatever we could to be of assistance to Zambia in the face of its enormous problems posed for it by the overthrow of constitutional rule in Rhodesia. We look forward to the very closest continuing ties with Zambia.

Finally, in what must inevitably be an all too brief resume of our activities over the last ten months, let me just say a word about the United Nations itself of which we became the 118th member on September 18, 1966. In his speech in response to the enthusiastic welcome given to Guyana on our admission, the Prime Minister affirmed the Government's subscription to the Charter of the United Nations and of its faith in the organisation, and gave his pledge that it would be Guyana's aim to be an active rather than a sleeping member of this great instrument of world peace and of world order. The 21st Session of the General Assembly was already in being when Guyana took its place. I think that it was as inevitable as it was right that that Session for us should be an exploratory one. Nevertheless, our representatives participated in the work of all the main Committees of the General Assembly and laid the foundation for the continuing work of our Permanent Mission to which, at the beginning of the year we were proud and happy to welcome Mr. E.R. Braithwaite as our Permanent Representative.

Our Permanent Mission to the U.N. established in New York is one of our three Missions overseas and it is one to which we attach very great importance - more particularly since we cannot afford the establishment of Missions in the very large number of countries with whom we have friendly relations and would wish to keep in contact. As the Prime Minister explained, the Mission in New York provides these opportunities and we have

already had good reason to acknowledge the wisdom of our decision in establishing it.

Hon. Members would not expect me to attempt a resume here of the deliberations of the 21st Assembly, but there are two particular issues which came before the Assembly on which I ought to say a few words. The first is the question of China's representation and the second is the vexing problem of South West Africa.

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

*Sitting suspended at 4 p.m.*

4.30 p.m.

*On resumption - -*

**The Attorney-General:** On the question of China's representation there were eventually before the Assembly three resolutions. The first, a procedural resolution sponsored by the United States together with 14 other countries representing the main geographical areas. This proposed in effect that any proposal to change the representation of China in the U.N. was an important question within the meaning of article 18 of the Charter. A second resolution sponsored by Albania and 10 other countries would have had the effect of seating representatives of the Peoples' Republic of China in the U.N. and all its organs and expelling those of the Republic of China. A third resolution sponsored by Italy and five other countries proposed the establishment

of a committee to look into all aspects of the question of China's representation with a view to submitting its recommendations to the 22nd General Assembly.

The first resolution, i.e. that the question "was an important question", was approved by 66 votes to 48 with 7 abstentions. Guyana voted for the resolution on the ground that the issue before the Assembly was one of fundamental importance which ought to be decided by two-thirds majority vote. In effect, what was at issue, having regard to the nature of the second resolution, was not merely the admission of the Peoples' Republic of China but the expulsion of the Republic of China, a founder member of the United Nations and a Permanent Member of the Security Council. The second resolution, i.e. the Albanian resolution for unseating the Republic of China was defeated by 57 votes to 46 with 17 abstentions. Guyana voted against this resolution on the ground that it sought to treat the matter as one of credentials only ignoring the realities of international life and the fact that two quite distinct national entities had emerged out of the old China since the United Nations was established 22 years ago. The third resolution proposing the investigating committee was defeated by 62 votes to 34 with 25 abstentions. Guyana abstained on this resolution which, incidentally, was supported by the United States, which in our view sought to postpone the problem merely and not to come to grips with it in a meaningful way.

[THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the General Assembly in its 21st Session was once more presented with making a choice between two unsatisfactory alternatives. Honourable Members may recall that when the Prime Minister dealt with this matter in his opening speech he drew attention to the Albanian resolution and invited hon. Members to draw their own conclusions as to the motivations behind a presentation which virtually guaranteed the rejection of the proposal to seat the Peoples' Republic of China. This is another of the realities of international existence that we need to take account of when we try to interpret the East/West confrontation by traditional ideological concepts. It would not, I think, be wise for any of us to be dogmatic about the question of China's representation. The question has been before the General Assembly for the last 16 years, but it does not follow from this that a solution may not be in sight and it may be that before too long the United Nations will accept the reality of two Chinas - at least for so long as this remains a reality.

4.40 p.m.

The second question is the matter of South West Africa. The administration of South West Africa had originally been entrusted to South Africa under a League of Nations Mandate of 1920. When the Trusteeship system of the United Nations was set up all the mandatory powers, except South Africa, agreed to convert their mandated territories into Trusteeship system.

South Africa formally refused to do so in 1947. In 1950, the International Court of Justice expressed the view in an advisory opinion that South Africa continued to have obligations under the Mandate and that the United Nations as the successor to the League of Nations had supervisory powers in respect of South West Africa. In 1960 Ethiopia and Liberia instituted proceedings against South Africa in the International Court alleging that South Africa by its racial policies in South West Africa had violated its mandate. In July 1966, the Court, by the narrowest of margins, namely by the casting vote of its chairman, rejected the application without ruling on the merits of the case on the ground that Ethiopia and Liberia had not established any right or interest regarding the subject matter of the claim. This decision of the International Court produced widespread disappointment in international circles and the matter eventually came before the General Assembly on a draft resolution sponsored by 54 Afro-Asian states providing for the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee which would recommend practical means by which the territory could be administered with a view to enabling its people to exercise the right of self-determination and the right to achieve independence. The resolution required the committee to report to the General Assembly at a special session convened not later than April 1967 and this resolution was eventually agreed to by the overwhelming vote of 114 in favour with only South Africa and Portugal voting against and with Britain, France and Malawi abstaining. In addi-



tion to establishing the committee, the resolution re-affirmed the international status of South West Africa, declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations in respect of the administration of the territory and the moral and material well-being and security of its indigenous inhabitants, and decided that the Mandate was terminated and that South West Africa would henceforth come under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

Guyana, of course, supported the resolution and Sir John Carter spoke in support of it during the debate in the General Assembly. Today, which has been designated by the General Assembly as "International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination", the House would I am sure allow me to refer to what Sir John said on that occasion:

"In our view, Mr. President, South Africa through its many violations of the trust placed in it has forfeited its mandate over South West Africa, and my Government feels that this 21st Session of the General Assembly should take immediate steps to bring about the withdrawal of South Africa's mandate over South West Africa. Our interest is the people of South West Africa and we feel that failure by this organization to take effective action to guarantee freedom and self-determination to these people will not only be an indictment to us all but also a comfort to the

racists and their supporters and admirers everywhere."

The report of the *ad hoc* committee will come before a special session of the General Assembly which has now been convened for 21st April of this year, that is, in exactly one month's time. In many ways the authority of the United Nations will be placed in issue if South Africa refuses to respond to the call made upon it by the resolution "to refrain and desist from any action, constitutional, administrative, political or otherwise, which will in any manner whatsoever alter or seek to alter the present international status of South West Africa".

As in the case of Rhodesia, it remains to be seen whether a single regime can at this stage of organised international effort be allowed to challenge international society and to flout the international order in which mankind everywhere has reposed its trust. Guyana will continue to play its modest part in responding to this challenge and in upholding the authority of the United Nations. I hope I have said enough to show that the Government in this particular area of external affairs has approached these crucial issues of world order, at the level of the United Nations, with seriousness, with intelligence and with a sense of responsibility.

And so, whether it be in the Caribbean with our traditional West Indian Friends, or in the Western hemisphere of which, since Independence, we are so obviously an integral part; whether it be in the Commonwealth

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL]

in which we may now play a purposeful role in company with old friends, or the United Nations where we must, on a wider stage, win respect and support for Guyana and make our own contribution, however small, to the lofty aims of the world organisation — we have in these first ten months since independence made an effective, if modest, start. In the area of external affairs, we have all eternity ahead of us. What we must do and what we have tried to do is to lay effective foundations on which we may build securely for the future.

4.50 p.m.

In these present efforts and, indeed, in all our endeavours in the future our most valuable and most lasting resources are our people, and I should like, before ending my speech to pay a tribute to the officers of Guyana's Diplomatic Service at all levels, and to all the many others, including those persons from outside the Diplomatic Service who were members of our delegation to the 21st Session of the General Assembly, who worked with them and have, not merely with willingness alone, but with enthusiasm and devotion, helped in our total effort. To them all, I wish, on behalf of the Government, to place on record our appreciation of the contribution they have made to what, I suggest to hon. Members, has been a worthy start in the area of external affairs since independence. [Applause.]

**Dr. Ramsahoye:** This Government, in relation to foreign policy, must find its activities

circumscribed by what is going on in other countries in this hemisphere. It is true that other countries in the hemisphere are motivated by self-interest. But I am bewildered by the fact that in all its activities in relation to foreign policy, this Government does not appear to be motivated by self-interest for there are several things which demand urgent and pressing attention. There are things which demand a clear-cut statement of policy and these things are not being tackled by the Government in the way in which they ought to be tackled.

This country is being held to ransom by the United States and by Great Britain because it is clear that whatever assistance is being given by these countries is given on terms and if the terms are not agreed to, the assistance will not be given. I am convinced that we cannot, in our deliberate judgment, take decisions which we think are in our best interests. I think that the needs for compromise are of such weight that our own policy is over-burdened by considerations which relate to the satisfaction of the great powers, and if this is so, then at least some member of the Government should be honest enough to let us know in this House. Let the nation know what are the things which cause our foreign policy to be circumscribed.

This Government is not trading with the East, it is only trading with the West and whatever assistance it gets comes from the West. This appears to be the result of some deliberate

policy and we need to know for sure whether this is so. We need to examine the basis upon which the Government has committed itself to signing trade agreements with only the West, and taking aid from the West only. As I see it, this Government must remember one important thing. The strength of the Government in foreign relations, among other things, is directly proportional to the strength and unity of the country as a whole.

When the Prime Minister was the Leader of the Opposition, he used to regale us with the need for unity. Yet there is not, within the institutions of Government in this country, any institution in which the views of all sections of the population are reflected. There ought to be a committee of foreign affairs and the members of that committee should be members chosen from both sides of this House. The members of the Government will find that if there is such an institution, it will be possible on some occasions to use it as a smoke-screen in order to rebuff pressures from outside. They could always say, "The matter is not our responsibility alone. We represent only half of the population and the other fellows represent the other half, and they must have some say in it, too."

The Government is definitely under pressure. Any Government which has to present a White Paper saying that the subsidies must be cut and several things must be done in order to prevent expenditure and save revenue is in difficulty. If you are in financial difficulty internally,

and if you have to turn abroad for aid to solve your financial problems, you must see that pressures will be put on you from the persons from whom you are borrowing. National unity at home is vital for a strong external policy, and some attempt ought to be made to get us out of the financial morass in which we are going further and further with every passing day.

The Government ought to have presented a White Paper on foreign policy so that we could see the policy we are expected to follow, and then we would have been in a better position to debate this matter. *[Interruption.]* I cannot conceive of this Government conducting a debate on a question as important as foreign policy without setting forth a White Paper on it. However, we are here discussing the question, and I only mentioned it because it would have made things much easier if we had followed another procedure.

I wish to refer particularly to what I consider to be an important facet of political life in this country. There is no doubt that the present Government is a creation of the United Kingdom and United States Governments. *[Interruption.]* In providing that so-called solution to the Guyana question, the U.K. Government must have found it obvious that it would have had serious repercussions.

5.00 p.m.

It seems to me that so far as the United Kingdom and the United States are concerned, this Government's only purpose is to

.. RAMSAHOYE]

occupy the seat of Government to keep the P.P.P. out. The hon. Member Mr. Thomas said that: In every other sphere of activity this Government cannot count on the friendship of these great nations in this hemisphere. The test is Ankoko. They have not said a word about the encroachment on Ankoko, and how could one expect them to say anything if one has any idea of the extent of British and American investments in Venezuela?

British and American investments in Venezuela take up almost the entire amount of foreign investments in Venezuela and if the push ever came to the shove they would prefer Venezuela and the investments there than the fourteen sugar plantations which they have here. Therefore, we are in this position. We cannot worry with the doctrines of international law. The doctrines of international law have nothing to do with the Venezuela/Guyana boundary dispute and with the encroachment on Ankoko.

The Venezuela boundary dispute is the creation of people who wanted to embarrass the P.P.P. Government in the early years of its office in this country. This dispute was resurrected for the purpose of embarrassing the P.P.P. Government because it became clear that the P.P.P. was likely to form the Government at the time when it arose. While the P.P.P. was in office this dispute was carried to considerable proportions.

In 1964, Venezuela's Foreign Minister, in a letter dated 4th March to Sir Douglas Busk, re-

affirmed, in no uncertain terms, the deliberate intention of the Venezuelans to recover what they claim to have been their territory which they had been deprived of by the Arbitral Award of 1899. He further said in his letter that they would leave nothing unturned and that they would not stop in their efforts until they had recovered what was tantamount to stolen territory. They have not changed their opinion and the Venezuelans have put forward several bogus arguments for making a dispute of this. The Venezuelans have produced every invalid argument they could have thought of. They said that the Tribunal exceeded its jurisdiction. They said that the British had changed the plans and had submitted false plans for the genuine plans while the arbitration proceedings were going on.

Every conceivable bogus argument that could have been advanced was advanced by the Venezuelans in resurrecting this matter, so that so far as international law is concerned, the Venezuelans are really not interested in that. Their argument that the Tribunal made a fraudulent award is, in fact, a smoke-screen for deep political subversion. They want to put that up as a front but, in fact, they have taken a decision that they are going, in any event, to take that part of our country. They have taken that decision and we are at the other end of the line. We should be able to say that the arguments are invalid and we must look to our political friends who would help us to guarantee the territorial integrity of Guyana.

The hon. Attorney-General and Minister of State (Mr. Ramphal) said that we are not without friends. Would the hon. Prime Minister be prepared to tell us who are our friends and what they will be prepared to do to guarantee the territorial integrity of Guyana in the event that Venezuela decides to take by force that portion of the territory which she claims she has been wrongly deprived of? Let us know our position. My thesis is that as it is today the Government is quite friendless with respect to that issue and that so far as the United Kingdom and the United States are concerned, they have greater interests to preserve than the territorial integrity of Guyana. The time has come when this Government should try, at an early date, to press them to a commitment to say whether they will be prepared to guarantee the territorial integrity of Guyana. If they are not prepared to do so, let the hon. Prime Minister tell us. Let us know. This country really needs to be told the truth about what is happening with respect to the claim by Venezuela.

We are told that the Mixed Commission is looking into some matters but I am sure, without knowing it, that the Mixed Commission can make no progress. From the document I read while a Minister, indicating the intention and the feelings of the Venezuelans on this question, they are not going to be moved. Sir Douglas Busk received that letter from Venezuela's Foreign Minister. It commenced in the most damning language against the then Premier of this country (Dr. Jagan). He was condemning

Dr. Jagan for saying that we would not concede one inch and that we have no intention whatever of entering into any negotiations on this question. Dr. Jagan had said that Sir Douglas Busk received this letter from the Foreign Minister referring to this issue and asking him to make the necessary arrangements to have the letter communicated to Dr. Jagan. In the final paragraph he reasserted Venezuela's intention to take over some of our land.

We must therefore realise that the Venezuelans are serious and that we have to be equally serious. We must not wait until they try to take the territory, as they have taken Ankoko, before we begin to do something about it. We must know our position now. We have fought from slavery and indentured service. We came here like cattle. Under the Roman Law slaves had no rights and even after abolition of slavery the freed slaves and the indentured servants were like mere cattle in this land. It was a hard and bitter struggle. There was great sacrifice. Many men had fallen by the way before we had reached the position we were at in 1959.

While it is true that the Independence of May 1966 was nothing more than a constitutional manipulation, it did, in fact, bring us formal Independence. This was a great concession at the hands of the imperial power, but once they have given us they have put us in a position to carry our struggle against tyranny a little further. We must therefore realise that there is nothing to be lost by trying to

[DR. RAMSAHOYE]

press whichever friends we say we have into a commitment. This commitment is a purely political commitment.

Let us divorce commitments from doctrines of international law. What doctrine of international law regulated what happened in Santo Domingo the other day? What doctrine of international law could have prevented the State Department from saying that it is not going to have a Communist Government, or any Government it does not like, in this country? Do not tell us about doctrines of international law. Tell us the politics. The politics of the thing is that if we do not have friends to guarantee our territorial integrity we will lose our land.

5.10 p.m.

Therefore, it is your bounden duty to make such efforts and to indulge in such manoeuvres and exercises as to bring you that alliance which you need. That is the position. Let us not say that this is not so. The position as I see it is this: so far as this Government is concerned those people will give it a little loan to keep the Government going when it is absolutely necessary, but this Government is not prepared to take steps to guarantee our territorial rights in the face of pressures from abroad. I do not blame this Government for making use of the accommodation of the great nations on both sides of the Atlantic. I understand that in the context in which it is operating it is necessary for it to work with this sort of accommodation, but no matter how much

accommodation this Government is getting it must tell the nation the true position relating to Ankoko. So long as you are fighting to keep our land, we will be with you and will follow you in the struggle. You do not have to worry about that, because you have the full support of this side without reservations. Look around and you will see what is happening in this country.

Take Surinam, for instance, and you will see that the people are coming over to our land. When the boundaries were being laid down somebody thought that it should be drafted in such a manner that the Surinamers would get the benefit of it. Every day you can hear about trouble in the river. Although Surinam was a party to settlement of the boundary between British Guiana and Dutch Guiana it still wants to forget that and to claim a few thousand square miles of our land. That is rascality, but let us prepare to meet it. Let Surinam not find us unprepared; we must be on our guard. As it stands, there need to be some vigorous effort to have some rights over the river. We should have full rights and use regarding navigation of the river, and our people should not be arrested for being on either side of the river. The time must come when we will have to take serious action.

For instance, if there was a Foreign Affairs Committee in this House to discuss matters, we would all know what is taking place. If this Government feels that its half of the population can go it alone, then that is all right with us. Anyway, I cannot

concede that right-thinking people could consider that course. The time has come for the establishment of a Foreign Affairs Committee, and the time has come for this country to resolve this dispute with Surinam. Surinam is now claiming certain rights with respect to the Corentyne River, and the rights claimed by Surinam are to the exclusion of our rights.

We must remember that, so far as treaties are concerned, some people will deliberately, as a matter of political stunting, break them. That is the case with Venezuela and Surinam at the moment. When the boundaries were sited and the marks were clearly defined, Surinam was a party to the arrangement and yet Surinam is asking for 10,000 square miles more because it is said that the river does not run the way it was intended to run. Every conceivable argument will be brought with respect to this matter, and we cannot leave ourselves in the position where we do not have the political strength to resist these inordinate claims.

My learned friend the hon. Attorney-General and Minister of State observed that this is a matter of diplomacy. I do not think so, and I do not think that things can be minimized by such a statement. We talk about diplomacy and international law. Today, more than ever before, we see that strong nations attack and dominate the weaker ones. If the weaker ones will not submit to their will, then they will use the gunboat. That is the position, and we must realise what it is to live in a world and with a

foreign policy in which we are virtually friendless except for the purpose of having a few sweets handed out to the Government. Some people have no respect for this Government. On any occasion when the hand of friendship is extended to this Government, that gesture is related to keeping certain members in the seats of Government and for no other purpose whatsoever. Why should we allow ourselves to be used like this?

It is true that we are not part of a great nation, but we can still work hard for the things we need. When the P.P.P. was in office it had initiated certain social changes whereby this country would be able to survive the hardships and tribulations which were likely to arise in the absence of foreign aid. The P.P.P. Government was an outstanding example of how effort could be made in this direction, if aid or promises of aid were actually refused. It is time that we should begin to reconsider what was the policy of the last Government and compare it with the policy of this Government in order that we may place ourselves in the position in which we were years ago. Let us try again to do something to help ourselves.

We know that, so far as the people in the imperialist countries are concerned, the end justifies the means. [Interruption.] So far as this Government is concerned, certain people will do anything which will enable them to remain in power so that they can take hold of the country. That is the position today. It

[DR. RAMSAHOYE]

cannot be denied that the P.P.P. Government attempted to make social changes for the benefit of the country. Anyone acquainted with our political history will agree that trade, commerce, industry and the banking system in this country were in opposition to the social changes introduced by the P.P.P. Government.

It will be observed that this Government has brought back certain portions of Kaldor's Budget in spite of what certain hon. Members had to say when the P.P.P. Government introduced a Budget containing certain recommendations by Mr. Kaldor. It has brought back the portion in relation to capital gains tax. This Government has made itself bankrupt; it has put itself in a precarious financial position, and now it comes to tell us something about foreign policy! If, tomorrow, the banks in this country say that they want their money; if they recall their loans and refuse to grant extended credit to this Government, then the whole machinery of Government in this country will collapse. If the banks recall the loans this country will be in serious trouble. We must first try to get national unity and a strong financial position before we can talk about a foreign policy.

5.20 p.m.

I have spoken about the two boundary disputes. I agree with my learned friend the Attorney-General and Minister of State that it is necessary for us to make friends of these people, people who will shake our hands in one way and then do us in in

another way. It is still necessary for us to try. I agree that it is very necessary that we should be able to establish relationships with the University and it is very essential we should seek their co-operation and gain support in extending university education. That too, has its limitations. Once we seek their support the whole principle comes to be, "What do you expect in return?"

Mr. Speaker: Time!

The Minister of Information (Leader of the House) (Mr. Bissember): We had agreed to an extension.

Dr. Ramsahoye: We must remember that when we get assistance in order to improve our university education there may be strings tied to the assistance and we would have to examine very carefully what we do in this respect. We must never forget that we have borrowed substantially from their institutions. Without the work they have done we would not manage our own institutions in any substantial measure. Therefore, it is not only gratitude and tradition, it is in our own self-interest to seek their co-operation and friendship in carrying our university education further.

In this respect, I must say, here and now, that I will support any measure which is intended to enable, by virtue of co-operation and participation, the establishment of a Faculty of Law in this country. It is essential that we should have lawyers adequately trained, at reasonable cost, to serve the people and to champion



the rights of the people. In any system, whether it is socialism, whether it is capitalism, whatever it is, it is necessary to have man's rights and obligations determined by law. It is vital there should be efficient and well-trained people able to serve.

So far as our entering into other organisations is concerned, other hon. Members have spoken and I only wish to say once more something about Britain's entry into the European Common Market. The United Kingdom is making frantic efforts to join the European Economic Community. Under the Treaty of Rome this great alliance will, for example, be responsible for exporting sugar, not purchasing it, and we must remember that if circumstances in England warrant it, England would be prepared, whether in 1972 or before, to jettison the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement if it finds it more profitable to associate with the European Economic Community on terms under which it would have to abandon the Commonwealth Agreement.

Think of what will happen to us in this country. The world market price for sugar is about \$93 a ton and they pay us over \$220 a ton. The cost of production in this country is about \$160 a ton. Where would we be if we did not have this preference? We may not have it if Britain enters the Common Market. This is 1967. As far as I understand, this Agreement goes to 1972, but with the way international politics works, we do not know how long this Agreement will last. Therefore, we must begin to plan

now for what will happen if England enters the European Economic Community and leaves Guyana and the West Indian territories.

We talk about sanctions in Rhodesia. Sanctions cannot work. I agree with my hon. and learned Friend in expressing concern over the Rhodesian sanctions. Sanctions cannot work because South Africa is assisting Rhodesia and the United Kingdom will not tackle South Africa because two-thirds of the foreign investments in South Africa are owned and controlled by the British. The United Kingdom Government would not care to tackle South Africa, because they would have to impose sanctions against South Africa and they would be cutting their own economic throats if they were to attempt to do this.

These are the positions which have been taken and what I have been trying to say is that there is a principle behind all these dealings, behind all this talk about legality, the rule of law, and the hemispheric position. These nations all get together behind closed doors and they try to do each other in. I do not say in the final analysis we may not be done in, but I do urge this Government that we should only allow ourselves to be done in after a valiant and noble struggle. [Applause.]

Mr. Bhagvan: I wish to express my differences with the positions held by members of both parties and to point out that in all these vital issues there are no two opinions. We see this from the mere fact that it is possible to divide the world into

[MR. BHAGWAN]

So many parts and there are so many distinctions, geographical as well as qualitative, that I suggest that there is capacity for more than a third position in this country today.

If we were to interpret what has been said by the Government we would run away with the idea that foreign policy has been determined in isolation from internal developments as well as from consideration of the internal political structure. This is a very unrealistic base from which to move in relation to our foreign affairs policy.

Secondly, the Prime Minister has attempted in the course of his address to put new paint on an old house with the hope that this would suffice for rehabilitation. This third point is that the Minister of State has not done us much justice in that he has given us a mechanical presentation of details to serve as an addendum to the Prime Minister's opening speech. In due course I will deal with some of the points made by him.

With respect to the position of the People's Progressive Party I have differences with the expressed views. What I find of greater importance than a mere statement of ideals and an expression of objectives is the practical political position which the People's Progressive Party holds in this country. It is not enough in the circumstances of Guyana for the Prime Minister, Mr. Forbes Burnham, and the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, to make very brilliant statements on the

foreign affairs of this country, for if you were to examine their positions and go beyond words to find out whether singly or together they could carry out these policies, you would find there is no basis for the execution of their plans.

5.30 p.m.

The Prime Minister frequently attempts to project an image of neutrality but something very different is being practised. We should start to examine what has been done internally. The Prime Minister once made an excellent statement. He said that Guyanese can never expect a conservative programme or policy by the Government. What is the position? Has there been any precise statement about the stages which the Prime Minister envisages in the ultimate development of the country? Could he state clearly what is his post-independence policy, and what is his ultimate objective? He gave us a very reassuring statement but that is not satisfactory. If one would look at it from a conservative angle, he and Mr. d'Aguiar would be wedded for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Sydney King once wrote an article projecting Mr. Burnham as the leader of the Guyanese revolution. Working on such a two-faced programme, one would have to do certain things internally to emphasise in every detail the independence from external control. If you consider what has been happening in Guyana, it is not surprising that in foreign policy one finds that the imperial powers are constantly behind Guyana's door. For example,

nothing has been done to remould Guyana's institutions. The Minister of Local Government sleeps on Local Government reorganisation. There is no one at the moment who can formulate a radical programme in Guyana. In fact, the present programme is a conservative one.

There will have to be a rapid replacement of colonial oriented representatives, as well as representatives who have tarnished themselves in their performances in the past. It means that we will have to get an enlightened and progressive university, not the "Canadian" University of Guyana that we now have. We will have to have an independent university that is controlled in every respect by Guyanese, leading ultimately to a situation where the tutors are recruited locally or at least about 75% are recruited locally. Of course, we can only do that if the leaders of the Government and the Opposition were able to inspire the people and mobilise them. It is doubtful whether the performance of many of the Ministers in this Government warrants the mobilisation of the masses. It is not surprising that a lot of the initiative for local development had to come from foreign personnel who are highly skilled, but who had to build simple projects. We have to rely on the U.K. Overseas Programme to send people here to show us how to set up youth camps and so on.

Another point we have to consider is independence of the trade unions. This independence has to come on the basis of self-reliance at home. The Minister

of Labour said that strikes occur because the trade union movement has been corrupted by external help. If trade unions are left on their own they cannot reorganise themselves, and that is why Taylor Woodrow would constantly have to put the hammer on. If there is no internal dynamism, you are going to have external subservience. You are going to have Guyana appearing always as a beggar at international doors.

Dr. Ramsahoye spoke about national unity. He spoke about external dependence. The United States of America does not like Guyana because it has the seeds of revolution. Therefore, to suggest that the Americans are going to come here to guarantee our integrity is very puerile.

5.40 p.m.

When we consider all these points we will find that the Government has not adopted any radical change at all, nor has it expressed any intention that it will accept this phase. We have had very objective isolated instances of qualified radicalism within a dominant framework of conservatism. These can be indicated by some genuine efforts - in the field of co-operatives and Caribbean unity - which have been partially successful but which have been hampered because of political problems. I must say that enough money was not spent in the field of co-operatives. I shall have something to say about Caribbean unity later.

What explains the Government's present foreign policy? The political situation in Guyana

[MR. BHAGWAN]

definitely limits the capacity of either the Government or the Opposition to maintain an independent position in foreign affairs. The P.N.C. is in a numerically weak position, that is, it is not the largest party numerically in this country. It has to depend on the U.F. for support. This, in itself, poses certain contradictions and this, in itself, makes the Government as a whole very susceptible to imperialist control and opens the country wide to foreign intervention. Because of the numerical position of the P.N.C., it has had to seek an external ally, and that ally is the powerful United States of America.

The conservative policies of the Government, on the other hand, automatically place it in the position where it can have no other allies but the conservative forces in the world. The conservative forces in the world today are definitely the U.S.A., West Germany, the United Kingdom and some other capitalist countries. I am talking in terms of the struggle for changes in the societies in various parts of the world. Whatever may have been the history of the U.S.A., the fact is that it has become increasingly conservative in its attitude about things at home and abroad. This Government cannot break from its allies unless it is in a position to reorganise the situation internally.

Now there are two courses: either the P.N.C. breaks with the U.F. and goes and seeks an alliance with the P.P.P. thereby establishing a greater strength of the masses, solidifying the

masses, building up their enthusiasm and making them very aware of the problems posed by the imperialists, or the Government will have to seek the alternative course of going above the heads of the P.P.P. and unifying the masses without the help of the P.P.P. The position is that the Government has not been attempting to follow either of these courses. It has not been attempting to find any common ground with the P.P.P. nor has it been attempting to cross ethnic barriers. The Government has been consistently condemning certain people in this country, whether they belong to the P.P.P. or whether they hold radical positions. It is pushing out the young radicals and pulling in old conservative elements.

With respect to the cultural problem, which is the biggest problem in this country, the Government has not settled down to the fact that such a problem exists and that it needs a great deal of patience, determination and courage to try to make an opening towards the Indians who do not support the Government. I should like to hear from the Government a clear statement of the policy it has pursued since it has been in office to solve the cultural problems in this country. The P.N.C. has been unable to find allies in other sections of the community because it has made no genuine effort to win allies from other sections.

When we look at what has actually been done we will find, of course, that the proof of the pudding is always in the eating. The Prime Minister says that a policy of neutrality has been

pursued. He said that the Government has been acting with reasoned judgment in making decisions at the United Nations. What is the fact? There is an alliance with the United States, the Canadian Government and the British Government. The old imperial powers have strengthened their position. There has been no decolonisation at this level. We have strengthened all our relations with the imperial powers and there is now an imbalance. Diplomatic policy connections have been established with western capitals only and all we have got is a lot of talk. Nothing concrete is being done so far as the public is concerned. Diplomatic relations have not been established with communist countries as well as those normally referred to as the Third World.

I do not accept the Prime Minister's argument about the difficulties to decide which group we must join. I would think that the Prime Minister is well aware of what is happening internationally and the choice is very simple. Countries like Africa, Tanzania, Malaya, Algeria and Egypt occupy very progressive positions internationally. I could not imagine that he would ever think of going to some other states in Africa to establish diplomatic relations.

The Government has still restricted trade with the communist countries. Castro, whom this Government denounces so often, has himself established connections with Canada, the United Kingdom and France and has broken away in a great measure from the

restricted trade policy that was forced upon him in relation to the communist bloc. This Government does not even consider that it is in its international self-interest to bring down trade barriers and let us have a diversified trade policy that has some consistency with its declared aims of neutralism.

The Government's policy with respect to Latin America is very contradictory. I should like to refer to the border problem with Venezuela. I admit - and in fact I advise - that when you are dealing with border problems blood should not rush to your head. Even countries with nuclear capacity, stronger countries, are more amicable than you are in their problems and disputes. We should not be booming guns and cannons and shouting from the roof tops. We must be able to follow a cautious policy and try to gain the friendship of our Venezuelan neighbours but at all times maintaining our dignity and emphasising the justification of our position.

5.50 p.m.

I do not suggest that we bend over backwards to meet the terms of the Venezuelans, and I do not think it is consistent with our national dignity for the Government to have allowed the Venezuelan warships to remain at the mouth of the Demerara River. So far as this country is concerned, Venezuela had committed an act of aggression when it occupied Ankoko. The Venezuelans have been giving us trouble for a number of years, yet we seem to be bending over backwards at all

[MR. BHAGWAN]

times and putting ourselves in a humiliating position. In this context the Prime Minister has been treated with contempt.

Here is where we will see whether the Prime Minister means what he says. Venezuela is certainly distinct from the question relating to Cuba. Venezuela is a puppet of the American Government; its people are in revolt, and there is a revolutionary guerilla movement going on there at the moment. The peasant masses in Venezuela are practically starved; so far as I am aware, only the cities have been able to retain bright lights. Venezuela is not concerned with international affairs. Cuba has a courageous and radical Government, and the Cubans are trying to revolutionize their society. While it is true that Venezuela may have sent this country greetings on its attainment of independence, nevertheless, the distinction between Venezuela and Cuba has to be noticed. We are bending over backwards for Venezuela, while we are trying to berate Cuba. The Prime Minister cannot apologise for this policy at all.

What has changed in Santo Domingo since the Prime Minister went to the U.S.A. to warrant his statement that things do not seem as they appeared to be when he made his original statement in Santo Domingo? What can he say to justify his recantation? He will have to explain this inconsistency to this House. He tells us about neutralism and neutral politics in the world, and he must also tell us why he recanted on his statement in Santo Domingo

We observe that the Government has been making some positive efforts to get CARIFTA going, and that is a good move. Any concrete move towards Caribbean unity in the present circumstances will be to the ultimate good of Guyana. I am quite positive that you can have no proper plan in the Caribbean unless everybody agrees. The entire region is faced with the same problems as Guyana. It is no good waiting for somebody to initiate Caribbean unity. Ask Eric Williams, Bustamante or Sangster about this matter. Unless somebody makes a move people will just sit and wait on each other. While this Government is pursuing a policy of unity in the Caribbean, we have the U.S.A. putting pressure on the Government to join the O.A.S. Dr. Eric Williams who used to champion Caribbean unity is now talking about assessing the O.A.S. The Canadians also want to join the O.A.S. The U.S.A. prefers a bloc in which it can dominate, control and dictate to the countries, and Caribbean unity will be undermined. I should like the Prime Minister to tell us something about this matter. This Government wants Caribbean unity, but the U.S.A. is doing everything possible to get the Caribbean territories to join the O.A.S.

I am advising the leaders of Guyana to come together and call a conference immediately to discuss the problems connected with Caribbean unity. Dr. Jagan, who leads the P.P.P., has been making statements recently to the effect that he supports Caribbean unity. I understand that a certain amount of inconsistency had developed when the P.P.P. was in

power with respect to Federation of the West Indies. Let the Prime Minister call Dr. Jagan's bluff. I am sure that many other people in this country would like to see Caribbean unity become a reality. Let the leaders get together, discuss the matter, and work out a comprehensive plan for Caribbean unity that will lead to the integration of all Caribbean territories.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time! This debate has to come to an end on Friday at 6.30 p.m.

**Dr. Jagan:** I beg to move that the hon. Member be given 15 minutes to conclude his speech.

**Mr. Ally seconded.**

*Question put, and agreed to.*

**Mr. Bhagwan:** The realities involved in Caribbean unity must be faced. I know that all of us have in our minds the question of Caribbean unity, but when it comes to the question of discussing it that is another matter. Some of us shy away from the question of Federation. It is said that the P.P.P. did not want Federation. It has been one of the fundamental mistakes by the leadership of the P.P.P. that it turned its back on Federation. I want to point out that the Prime Minister is also making some fundamental mistakes in approaching not only Caribbean unity but the Ankoko issue. He must review the failures which have been pointed out to him.

I feel that if we want to get rid of the trouble connected with Federation, then we must start discussing seriously and know

where everybody stands. The members of the P.N.C. want Caribbean unity, and the members of the P.P.P. say that they are prepared to support it, but when it comes to matters of grave importance we do not hear them. There must be unity before anything can be done. That is a problem which the last Government had to face when it attempted to introduce certain social changes in this country. Because of its weak position it fell down.

I would say that the effect of all these failures, the effect of Government's Foreign Policy in aligning itself with the reactionary elements of the world today, is a very extreme cynicism. In fact the poems written by Martin Carter can do justice to the development today. He has written some very excellent poems describing what we are doing today.

6 p.m.

Everybody accepts dishonesty, everybody thinks that Jagan will act in a certain way and Burnham will act in a certain way and they must not accept any principles. A current has crept into the society in which Burnham has become a god. It is only a question of power, of being able to speak to the police, of having "big" friends. These are the criteria which operate at the moment.

The "big" people in this society who have money are moving fast to make more money and while they are making a lot of it, civil servants are doing their jobs mechanically. Workers are going on strike because they see

[MR. BHAGWAN]

no hope. The unemployment problem, the racial problem, the problem of frustration in jobs, all these problems are going to explode at some stage. I hope that the leaders will prevent this explosion. An alliance with imperial powers has been holding back economic development. There is an influx of foreign culture of the worst sort. Some aspects of American culture, which can certainly be considered morbid, have been taking over Georgetown. Ask the Minister of Education about it. Many organisations at the moment have direct connection with foreign elements and can only work if they get advice from some expert from the United Kingdom, or if they get money from the United Kingdom. This is the external stimulus which is now motivating the entire basis of political development in our country.

I am advising this Government: it has to start changing its approach. It has definitely to break both with the conservatives at home and with the Americans, or else the masses in this country are ultimately going to end up in revolt against the situation. In fact, the masses have started taking a hand now and it may be possible to force the hand of this Government and bring some sense into the leaders of the Opposition in this country.

One positive development in the society today is that the workers have been rejecting a lot of trade union leaders, realising that what has been handed out from the top is corrupt and is also designed to keep them in conditions of exploitation and

subjection. The masses in this country are going to become fed up and will start rebelling against the present political set up. Only then will we get some sense knocked into the heads of our leaders.

Mr. d'Aguiar: It has been said - and with this I agree - that foreign policy should contain within it a measure of idealism and a measure of realism. I would suggest that the ideal that we should pursue in our foreign policy is the ideal of a good neighbour. We should develop a 'good-neighbour' foreign policy.

I do not believe it is possible to conceive of any greater ideal than that. It does not mean that because we try to be good neighbours we must either be dominant or submissive. Good neighbours need not be one or the other. The more powerful personality need not dominate and the weaker one need not be submissive. It is undoubtedly the most sensible policy for any Government to pursue, the policy of 'good-neighbour'.

I think that from what I have seen in the course of my overseas visits when I attended Conferences of the Commonwealth and Conferences of I.M.F., which included representatives from nearly every part of the Commonwealth and from almost the entire world, I have found that there is ample evidence of this Government's pursuit of the policy of good neighbourliness.

First and foremost, we should be good neighbours with the Caribbean islands, with whom we



have historical associations, and we should be good neighbours with our continental friends. I think Guyana is in a particularly happy position in that it can unite in its foreign policy ideals with reality. Any foreign policy must contain a measure of realism and when we look at the reality of geography we see that we are a part of the American continent. It is only sensible, therefore, that we play a neighbourly part in that continent, which includes North and South America, the Caribbean and Canada. This is where geography places us and it is only common sense to move forward and to progress in the geographical sphere in which we are. We are a part of the American continent. We are, in fact, a part of the richest continent in the whole wide world. Why should we not try to use that position to the best advantage of the people of Guyana?

The historical reality of the situation is that we are closely tied with the history of the other former British West Indian Caribbean islands. Here again, we can pursue ideals and realism at the same time. We can develop good-neighbourliness with these Caribbean islands and we can progress into the formation of Caribbean regionalism and the greater American regionalism. That, I think, is the future of foreign policy. We are in a transitional phase between being strictly aligned to the United Kingdom, which is so far distant and fitting ourselves into a historical and geographical situation. We need to face the realities of geography and history and also the realities of trade.

6.10 p.m.

In 1966 we exported \$182,000,000 - in round figures - of goods from Guyana. The biggest importer - \$40 million - was the United States of America. The second biggest importer - \$39 million - was the United Kingdom. The third biggest importer - also \$39 million - was Canada. The fourth biggest importer - \$14½ million - was Trinidad and Tobago. Therefore, the reality of our trade, just as the reality of anyone who does business, is to be friends and to develop greater friendship with our customers. The simple shopkeeper, I am sure, would try to be friends with his customers. The committee of any club will try to see that the members of the club are happy together, so that the trade reality is one that means we should retain special friendship with the people with whom we do the greatest amount of business, those who purchase the greatest amount of our products.

The third reality that we have to face is politic. We are aligned with free democracy. We are aligned with that type of democracy in which Elections are free and impartial, the type of democracy that does not exist in the countries to which the Opposition gave its allegiance. So, I simply submit that our ideal should be one of neighbourliness, and this ideal can become a reality because of our geographical, historical, commercial and political situation.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about neutrality. He claims that we are not neutral.

[MR. BHAGWAN]

I have not found him to be a neutral type of person. I have never heard him say one word of praise about any of the countries that are our neighbours, the countries with which we have historical ties, and with which we do business. In my business, abroad, I have found that there exists a strong degree of goodwill and friendship between our Government, for instance, and the Governments of Jamaica, Barbados and St. Lucia, and to a lesser extent - I would wish this "lesser extent" to be increased - the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. It is clear to anyone who attended these Conferences that the image of Guyana has improved hundreds of times since the election of this Government. It is quite clear that our neighbours are our friends and we are the friends of our neighbours. Why should we turn back upon this and pursue a policy of becoming enemies of our neighbours? I simply cannot understand the mentality that puts forward such a proposal. It is true that we have problems with Venezuela, but that is all the more reason for us to build up friendship with our other neighbours on the continent of South America.

The question of the Organisation of American States was raised and my views are, putting aside the Amendment for Admission which the hon. Prime Minister referred to, that there are good reasons for admission, and serious consideration should be given to our joining the O.A.S. The reasons which were put forward for joining the O.A.S. by the Rt. Hon. Dr. Eric Williams, are, I think, worthy of careful

consideration because they are based on sound logic. One of the reasons which he gave - and I quote from his speech as published by the Trinidad Government - reads as follows:

"The dominant note of the contemporary world is the development of regional associations. There is the Organisation of African Unity in Africa, the European Economic Community in Europe; and the United Kingdom is now making a serious bid to enter that community. There is the European Free Trade Association; there is the current interest of Australia and New Zealand in developing some form of association together with Malaysia and perhaps the Phillipines in the Far East."

Then he went on to state that:

" . . . in the Western Hemisphere there is the Central American Common Market and there is the Latin American Free Trade Association Treaty of 1960 looking towards a Latin American Common Market, and, as you are aware, it has recently been reported that Venezuela is getting ready to join that Latin American Free Trade Association."

There is another very important point. Dr. Williams pointed out that membership of the O.A.S. will provide military security, and he quoted Article 15, Chapter 3 of the Charter of the O.A.S. which states that:

"No State, or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indi-

rectly, for any reason whatsoever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements."

Therefore, you are protecting your frontiers. At the moment we have the problem with Venezuela and our frontiers would be guaranteed with a minimum of military forces on our part, with considerable saving to us.

He made a third point. He said that the ideals of the Organisation of American States as they were amended at the recent Conference were completely in accordance with the ideals he sought. I am sure that our Government in Guyana seeks the same ideals. It is worthy perhaps, to quote what these ideals are. They come under the Revised Article 3, Chapter 7.

"To accelerate their economic and social development, in accordance with their own methods and procedures and within the framework of the democratic principles and institutions of the system, the member states agree to dedicate every effort to achieve the following basic goals:-

- (a) Substantial and self-sustained increase in per capita national product;
- (b) Equitable distribution of national income;
- (c) Modernization of rural life and reforms leading to equitable and efficient land-tenure systems, increased agricultural productivity, use of undeveloped land, diversification of production, and improved processing and marketing systems for agricultural products;
- (d) Accelerated and diversified industrialization, especially of capital and intermediate goods;
- (e) Stability in the domestic price levels, compatible with sustained economic development and social justice;
- (f) Fair wages, employment opportunities, and acceptable working conditions for all;
- (g) Rapid eradication of illiteracy and expansion of educational opportunities for all;
- (h) Protection of man's potential through the extension and application of modern medical science;
- (i) Proper nutrition, especially through the acceleration of national efforts to increase the production and availability of food;
- (j) Adequate housing for all sectors of the population and

[MR. BHAGWAN]

- (k) Urban conditions that offer the opportunity for a healthful, productive, and full life."<sup>1</sup>

6.20 p.m.

These are ideals which are entirely compatible with our own ideals, the ideals of our people, and they are more easy to bring to fruition if we can join into a greater economic unit and establish enormous markets because of the expanded Free Trade Area. The Agreement with Barbados and Antigua is, I submit, a mere beginning. The end should be a vastly expanded Free Trade Area from which the whole of this region could benefit so that all of its people could also share in the benefits.

My submission is this: In Guyana we are in the happy position where ideals can be put on equal ground with reality. Our ideal is the establishment of a good neighbour policy. Basically, our neighbours are the Caribbean islands, the continent of America, South America, the United States and Canada. We do not seek to establish submission to any one of those territories, nor do we seek to dominate any unit, but we seek to be good neighbours and our policy so far has been in that direction, as has been evidenced by the mass goodwill we have achieved and which we now enjoy with the Prime Ministers of the other Caribbean territories.

I feel that we do not have to go into high flights of dialectics and philosophy. We simply

have to bear in mind what St. Paul said: "Love your neighbour." That is the right basis and the most simple one. We do not need to be great philosophers to understand that. It is the answer for us and it is the answer for all the territories with which we are neighbours. I look forward to the day when the whole of this hemisphere is even more united than it is now and I would hate to see the day when we turn away from our neighbours and look to some far distant country which can do no good for us.

Mr. Chandisingh: As we approach the concluding stages of this debate on foreign policy - the first such debate in this Parliament since Independence - we must take note of the fact that the Government has either been unable or unwilling to present a thorough, well worked out policy in advance for us to study and analyse. It strikes me that, in the foreign relations field, the Government's policy is perhaps of the same order as practised in the internal field - the policy of expediency, of gambling, of moving from one gamble to another. This, however, may be the appearance but from what we have heard in the actual debate - we have heard contributions from the Prime Minister, the Attorney-General and Minister of State and the Minister of Finance - it is quite clear that these aberrations of the Government have a basis in definite policy. It is this that we should try to analyse in the course of the next few minutes.

I should also like to take the opportunity, at this stage, to call upon the Government to

periodically report to Parliament on its activities abroad. I have in mind the activities of the Government's representatives at the United Nations as one of the primary spheres of activity. We have heard about the stand taken in respect of about three or four issues but, certainly, there must be many other issues which go before the U.N. body that would be useful to bring to the attention of Parliament and also to the Guyanese people. I should like to give an example. I understand that, recently, there were two new Conventions which the U.N. adopted - at least the initial stage - and these Conventions have to do with the retention of certain rights, the guaranteeing of political, social and economic rights and the concretising of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We would like to know what our Government's stand is on such matters and how our Government intends to implement these rights.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Deputy Speaker will take over now.

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

**Mr. Chandisingh:** We would like to know the Government's attitude on this question. We would like to know how it intends to implement these rights as they pertain to our local conditions, particularly bearing in mind the apparent move towards the abrogation of such rights in our land.

The Prime Minister outlined the Government's foreign policy. He described in a general way the

philosophy behind the Government's foreign policy.

6.30 p.m.

We would agree, generally speaking, with its basic formulation, the question of principle, national self-interest, etc., but what we have to look at carefully is the implementation of things and the way in which such principles are implemented in practice. We know, for instance, what Salazar has done in Portugal. Hardly any country in the world will take a different stand in so far as a general principle is concerned, with respect to the specific stands we have taken in relation to South Africa and Rhodesia. This Government can hardly do anything else. We expect the Government to take such a position, because there is hardly anyone, except a few die-hards, who would go against the recommendation of the United Nations in relation to South Africa and Rhodesia. But it is in other areas where we look forward to seeing a concrete, progressive stand by the Government.

To put it another way, I would refer to the Prime Minister's pronouncement on self-interest and say that Guyana's foreign policy should be directed to creating the most favourable conditions for the rapid advance of the Guyanese people. Practically this would mean that we would have to win genuine independence for Guyana both politically and on the basis of economic independence. Such, I would imagine, would be the direct aim and objective of our country's foreign policy and we should pro-

[MR. CHANDISINGH]

vide conditions for the realisation of these objectives. I would go further and state that these conditions could best be realised in circumstances of world peace. Secondly, in the context of the success of the struggle, to put an end to colonialism and imperialism in all their forms; thirdly, these conditions for our country's advance can best be promoted by the advance of world socialism against world capitalism. Perhaps there are other fields which would facilitate our country's advancement, but these three seem to me to be the three main points which would provide conditions for our country's advance.

Let us examine the record of this Government to date. First, let us take the question of world peace. I know that many spokesmen of the Government have taken the line that Guyana is a small country with a small population and, therefore, Guyana cannot be expected to play the role that super powers can play in the question of foreign policy with respect to world peace. Granted that Guyana is a small country, relatively speaking, with a small population and certainly cannot play the same role in the sense that it does not have the power of the super powers; nevertheless, it can make its voice heard in the international field on the vital matter of world peace.

I am sure everyone will remember the statement made by the famous Soviet diplomat which included the phrase "Peace is indivisible". What affects areas in other parts of the world will

also affect our country. What is our Government doing with respect to world peace? How is it playing its part in order to enhance world peace? What are the areas of world tension today? I would submit that two areas mainly provide the centres of international tension: One in the East, namely the American aggression against Vietnam, and the second danger is the re-arming of West Germany with nuclear weapons. This will certainly have something to do with the peace in Europe and in the rest of the world.

Let us take the question of Vietnam. We have observed that this Government has said nothing about what is taking place in Vietnam. While it is true that other Governments have made their voices heard to the extent of calling for an end of the Vietnam war, this Government has remained silent on the matter. Everyone else has spoken out very clearly in this matter. Even the Pope has made a pronouncement on this question. Dr. Eric Williams has also spoken out clearly on this question, but this Government has remained dumb. This Government has to follow the dictates of its masters, the imperialists. This Government is trying to balance itself on the tightrope. We saw the same thing taking place when we were discussing the question of the two Chinas, and many other Governments are trying to walk the tightrope.

So far as Vietnam is concerned, we are told that both the Americans and the Vietnamese are responsible for what is taking place in Vietnam today and they must take action to see that

peace is restored; but such a pronouncement merely condemns both the aggressor and the victims alike, and it does not go to the roots of peace and justice.

With your permission, sir, I would like to quote from an article by Bertrand Russell, world-famed philosopher, which was reprinted in an American newspaper called *Workers World* on March 17, 1967:

"To demand of the Vietnamese that they negotiate with the United States is to treat equally the victim and the attacker. This can be clearly seen if we ask ourselves whether a demand to the Poles or Norwegians would have seemed just after the Nazi attack on their countries!"

6.40 p.m.

On the question of negotiations, the Vietnamese have already, in 1954, gone through negotiations so why should they need to go through further negotiations in order to put a stop to the war, in order to have American troops withdrawn from Vietnam, or as a further step in order to end unconditionally the bombing of North Vietnam?

Bertrand Russell also pointed out the reasons why the decisions of the previous negotiations were not implemented. This is what he said:

"Quite apart from this basic issue; the right to self-determination; there is the history of the particular

struggle in Vietnam. Negotiations already took place - in 1954. The Vietnamese had defeated French colonialism after nine years of bitter struggle during which eighty per cent of the French colonial war was financed by the United States. Because of their belief that the Geneva Agreements provided for fair elections, non-intervention on the part of foreign powers and eventual unification through mutual consent, the Vietnamese agreed to divide Vietnam into North and South.

"Shortly afterwards, Eisenhower stated that anyone who knew anything about Vietnamese affairs knew that Ho-Chi-Minh would receive at least four out of five votes in a fair election. The elections were obstructed and the United States set up a regime in the South under the control of American officers posing as advisers. They selected former police spies of the French occupation army who were hated and despised by the population. Ngo Dinh Diem, a wealthy Catholic land-owner from the North, was installed in power. The elections agreed upon in the negotiated settlements of 1954 at Geneva were never held. U.S. officers and troops began to pour into South Vietnam in what came to be known as America's 'secret war'. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese were killed. Over eight million people were placed in forced-labour camps characterized by barbed-wire, torture and starvation."

[MR. CHANDISINGH]

He goes on -

"It should be abundantly clear that the very presence of the 'United States' troops in Vietnam is the grossest violation of painfully negotiated agreements. To ask the Vietnamese now after twelve years of torment to negotiate about the violated negotiations while the violation continues is to insult them . . ."

In conclusion he said -

"We must side with the Vietnamese who defend every value which the peace movement has espoused abstractly. The end of the war in Vietnam will depend on our capacity to speak and act clearly, alerting people to its origins and motive force."

People like Bertrand Russell and other Governments are not afraid to challenge the injustice, the barbarity, the inhumanity of man against man practised by Americans in Vietnam. Our Government is too timid to say anything about it, or if it does, will come out with some weak, ambiguous statement, the net effect of which will be to tell the Americans, "Please continue; we just have to say this. You carry on, we are behind you. We will do nothing to arouse public opinion against you". This is the important factor: the genuineness of the Government's pronouncements on such matters will depend on whether it will be prepared to carry out public campaigns to arouse public opinion against American intervention in Vietnam.

Let me proceed to other seats of possible war in the world. Already there is intervention in Vietnam which at the present time is also being escalated. West Germany: What is the Government's attitude towards West Germany acquiring nuclear weapons either directly or indirectly, either individually or through some umbrella or collective organisation, multilateral nuclear treaties, etc? We all know that the revanchists of West Germany are hotting up their claims to territory in Eastern Europe which would long have been settled according to war-time agreements between powers. Clearly our Government must have some policy toward such revanchism.

We do not say that the Government should try to create enmity all over the place. This is not the point we have made in this debate, but in the course of developing friendly relations with states, demonstrations of friendship must be accompanied by critical expressions where those states are concerned in the interest of world peace.

Let us turn to another aspect of Government policy under the same covering of world peace - the Government's attitude toward the People's Republic of China. We have heard from the hon. Attorney-General and Minister of State that when the issue came up before the United Nations the Government abstained. - [Interruptions.] - the Government voted against the resolution for the admission of the People's Republic of China to its rightful place in the United Nations. Note the term "to its rightful place in the United Nations".



This means, and it has meant in the past, that the Government of China was and is entitled to a seat in the United Nations, and not to a seat only but to a seat on the Security Council as one of the five major powers which had taken part in the war against Fascism, Japanese militarism. On that basis the Government of China has a right to occupy that seat. The Prime Minister - to use his own term - suffers from myopia and will not see the 650 to 700 million people in China. He only sees the five to twelve million people in Taiwan.

This is what I meant when I said earlier on that the Government tries to give the appearance that it is walking on a tight-rope, but the net result is that it is aligning itself with imperialism. In this case it is quite definitely refusing to play its part to allow the legitimate Government of China to take its rightful seat in the United Nations. I am not speaking of a seat in the United Nations, but along with Taiwan, and Taiwan in the Security Council.

I should like to turn now to the second condition which facilitates the development of our country and its people from colonial status, that is the success of the struggle against imperialism in all its forms - against imperialism.

6.50 p.m.

Let us take the policy of the Government. When it should have been defending democracy in the Dominican Republic, it shameless-

ly backtracked. The Prime Minister condemned aggression in the Dominican Republic, and then as we all know, he changed his mind and justified American aggression there. How could such a Government decide a question of foreign policy on the basis of such whimsical views? Did the Government not study the situation before it made a pronouncement on the intervention? If the Government did not study the situation, well, then, it was not doing its duty. From the trend of Government's policy, it is subject to the dictates of its American masters.

I have already spoken of the Government's lack of concern over Vietnam. Let us take the question of non-intervention of states in the affairs of other states. This is one of the important principles which has to do with the struggle against imperialism. What does the Government think? The Government can tell us what it thinks about Hungary. What is its policy on the declared objective? [The Prime Minister: "What do you think about Hungary?"] The Prime Minister is trying to be funny. [The Prime Minister: "I am not being funny. What do you think about Hungary?"] What does the Government think about the United States' pronouncement that it retains the right to intervene in any country where it alone thinks it is necessary? Does the Government accept this policy? If not, has it said anything in protest against this policy?

The Prime Minister referred to the desire to develop relations with the countries of

[MR. CHANDISINGH]

Africa, Asia and so on, the Third World countries. Would the Prime Minister, in his reply, indicate which of these countries he intends to develop friendly relations with? Does he mean countries where the C.I.A. has set up its boys? Is the Government sincerely desirous of having unity, particularly with those countries which are forging ahead against neocolonialism? This is the only way in which it can bring about the movement towards genuine independence and economic freedom for Guyana.

We heard that a tremendous achievement was made in respect of the Atkinson base. But what are the precise terms of the new Agreement? This is what I should like to know because it is understood that the Americans reserved the right to use that base whenever they wish.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** You have a minute to wind up.

**Mr. Chandisingh:** The third point, sir -- [Interruption.] I will wind up if you insist. The third point that I listed among the conditions for development is the advancement of the socialist bloc in the struggle against world capitalism. The reason for this is that, today, the socialist bloc offers greater opportunities, both political and economic, for development of the underdeveloped countries. The socialist world is playing a very important part in the world.

Now, we should take into account that non-alignment does not mean praising the bully and his victim equally, or praising

the just and the unjust as the Minister of Finance seems to think we ought to do if we are not taking sides. The whole question of non-alignment is not interpreted in this way. It is against intervention by imperialists, in the affairs of the underdeveloped countries, and it is against the use of agents and spies such as the C.I.A. and the Peace Corps.

In seeing to it that aid is received in conditions where the industrial potential of the country can be realised, agriculture can be developed along with industry. This is the path that we have to take and this is the only genuine course that our country or any other underdeveloped country can take in the present circumstances.

7 p.m.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Time!

**Dr. Jagan:** I beg to move that the hon. Member be given an extension of 15 minutes to continue his speech.

**Mr. Linde seconded.**

**The Prime Minister:** We will give you 10 minutes.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All right, you are getting 10 minutes.

**Mr. Chandisingh:** I did refer to the question of military bases and blocs. This new agreement which the Government has made seems to be one which places our country in the camp of reaction because the U.S. imperialists are in a position to use our country

for suppressing the progressive democratic movements developed in Latin America, to station planes or military equipment etc. at short notice, and to set up all the apparatus which can be used in any counter-revolutionary move against the rising national liberation movement that is growing in Latin America. This is a shame so far as our country is concerned, and while perhaps we may say that the agreement may be an advance, it can hardly be said to be an advance in the context of the Government's policies.

The Prime Minister and others have referred to Cuba and Guantanamo. Why have they not moved against Guantanamo? May we ask this question: Would the U.S. have made an agreement with this Government to remove the 99-year lease for the use of Atkinson Field if the regime in this country was one which was vigorously pursuing a socialist policy, a policy of non-capitalist development? Would the United States have done so? We say that the Government must go much further and terminate this agreement now. It must declare that it will not allow U.S. imperialism to use our country for the purpose of suppressing the national liberation movement.

I should like to comment on the question of the O.A.S. It is true that the Government, or one side of the Government, tries to give the impression that it cannot join in any case, but even if it could join it still has to consider it. The Prime Minister said that; then the Attorney-General and Minister of State carried it further and made it clear that the intention is to

join as soon as the obstacles are removed and just now the Minister of Finance clinched the whole argument by definitely arguing in favour of joining the O.A.S. But we feel that the O.A.S. is again a tool, an instrument of U.S. imperialism in this hemisphere.

If the O.A.S. is such a democratic body designed to preserve collective security etc. in Latin America, why was Cuba expelled? Cuba is a state with a different social system, a state which has advanced to a higher social and economic system, and it was expelled from the O.A.S. because of the possibility that it would "infect" the other countries. A similar situation arose in respect of N.A.T.O. in Europe. When the eastern countries and the Soviet Union asked: "May we join your defence bloc if this is to protect the whole of Europe? Can we be members?" they were refused membership which showed that this was an aggressive bloc.

The economic agreements are nothing but avenues through which American monopoly capitalism seeks to penetrate the economics of Latin America. We all know, from different reports from people from right, left and centre, that the Alliance for Progress has not produced the results it claimed and many people in Latin America are worried about this question. Our Government should be concerned. I would say that the O.A.S. is nothing but a hangman's noose in so far as countries like ours are concerned and we should not, in these circumstances, permit our country to join the O.A.S.

[MR. CHANDISINGH]

I will now come back to the final point I want to make. I just want to refer to the fact that even European countries have been penetrated by American monopoly capitalism, and this causes problems in those countries. There was an article in the *Graphic* which showed that most of the factories producing cars and all sorts of other goods in England are controlled by the United States. A Canadian paper called *Ottawa Citizen* points out - and I quote:

"An increasing number of responsible Europeans .... feel ominously threatened with the fate that has already befallen Canada, where 60 per cent of all productive capacity now is U.S.-controlled,"

so we should not expect that this monopoly octopus is going to conduct its foreign relations to give the economic aid for development that is not being given in other countries. The net result is the economic stranglehold on our country. Where the socialist world comes in is that it acts as an alternative to the slavish dependence on capitalist western aid, and not only are the terms of such aid favourable but also the direction in which this aid is given.

What we need is industrialisation in those sectors which will make us economically independent - and by independent I do not mean self-sufficient - and which can give our country and our Government the lever with which to control and speed up our advance. We need to change the terms of our trade and all of

this can be done if our Government adopts a genuinely non-aligned policy, if it adopts a policy of greater association in terms of setting up, as a first step, diplomatic missions or a diplomatic mission in the socialist world.

7.10 p.m.

This would give you the opportunity to establish trade relations, technical relations, cultural relations and so on, and all of these things would have the net effect of enabling us to escape from the octopus that is strangling us today.

The Prime Minister (replying): I am tempted to believe, from the remarks by the Opposition that, so far as principle is concerned, there is no difference between us. I believe I have heard two statements from the Opposition benches: (1) that it is necessary in the pursuit of our foreign policy to regard the nation's self-interest; (2) that in circumstances such as ours, undeveloped or underdeveloped countries as we are, political non-alignment is what is to be pursued. But I find it a little difficult to square this thesis by the Opposition with the examples which, with Houdinilike frequency and skill, they pull out of a hat.

Now, let us consider the criticism which has been made with respect to China. Non-alignment means that you do not automatically vote with either bloc; it does not mean that you automatically vote with the Soviet bloc to show your independence. The naivete or the

dishonesty of the Opposition is alarming. I have already explained that in the Resolutions Committee one of the members of the U.N. had pressed that the resolution for Red China's admission to the U.N. be a simple resolution. The Russian delegate intervened and opposed such a resolution adding another clause for the expulsion of the Republic of China which he knew would have the final effect of keeping Red China out. These infants in the Opposition will say things and adopt postures allegedly progressive but they do not realise that this is a matter of high manoeuvring between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R. refers to the Chinese as the "Yellow Peril". We on this side of the House are not naive enough to believe that American imperialism is non-existent, but neither are we naive enough to believe that there is no such thing as Russian imperialism.

Let us refer to a statement made by Nyerere recently to the effect that it is the epitome of childishness to believe that there is only one type of imperialism. Ask the Albanians about the imperialism on the other side. But if it were left to the members of the Opposition, charming in their naivete, glorying in their ignorance, one would say that there is no such thing as imperialism on the other side! They talk about N.A.T.O. N.A.T.O. is obviously a military pact between the Western European nations. [Interruption] The Warsaw pact is one which is dominated by the Russians. Why was there at one time Polish resentment? Why at one time was the

Polish Minister of Defence a Russian, Marshall Rokossovsky?

We must understand that there are two super powers. We must also understand that in issues in which these two super powers are concerned they will endeavour to protect their own vital interests and that small countries like ours can only be like the ham in the sandwich. Let us be realistic. There has been posed this question: Why has not the Prime Minister made a statement on Vietnam? A statement on Vietnam was made by the Prime Minister at the United Nations. "In Vietnam, for instance, it is my hope, and I feel it is the hope of this Assembly, that an honourable and acceptable means will be found to substitute discussion around the conference table for the bullets on the battle field." [An hon. Member (Opposition): "Just like Johnson."]

Let us apply what little brain power is left us on that side, and let us ask ourselves this: Could the Americans have carried on the campaign in Vietnam without the connivance of the U.S.S.R.? Stop being children and naive! That is a fact. Can little Guyana get into the mix-up and start pontificating, when the U.S.S.R. has told the U.S.A. that the "Yellow Peril" should be destroyed? We have heard a great deal about the conditions of trade with the U.S.S.R. Of course, I must add that Dr. Ramsahoye did not allude to Vietnam in his discussion and pontifications and things of that type.

[THE PRIME MINISTER]

The hon. Dr. Jacob made the point that this Government has not sought Soviet aid, but has been content to accept aid from the Western powers. As far as I am aware, we are not discussing the question of aid at the moment. In 1963 - let those who have any scintilla of honesty left in them deny this - a Russian Trade Team came here, and the Secretary of the governing party, the P.P.P., remarked, after useless discussion and bargaining, "these fellows bargain harder than General Motors executives."

7.20 p.m.

Let them deny it if they want. [Interruptions.] I will ask Messrs. Del Conte and Taylor Woodrow about your dishonesty.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Do not be irrelevant, please!

**The Prime Minister:** It is known that nothing came out of the bargaining between the Russian Trade Team and the then Government of British Guiana. It was admitted that the Russians were pushing a harder bargain than the representatives of General Motors would have pushed.

This Government of Guyana has not refused to accept Russian aid if it is offered. I spoke to the Russian Ambassador in Bridgetown. We discussed the question of a Russian Trade Team coming here. I said, "We are interested. Let us know what you have to talk about, what you have to offer and we will discuss it." One thing I made quite clear to him: that this Government will not tolerate

scholarships from the Russian Government to the People's Progressive Party. What he said to me was, "We have stopped doing that".

Let us examine those countries. Let us not fool ourselves. Let us examine the terms on which Russian aid is granted. The Russians, like the British, the Americans and all the big powers, are not philanthropists. They drive hard bargains. They seek, like any other major power, to tie their aid. Let this be clearly understood; sometimes with the Western powers technical assistance is not included as part of the deal or the loan. Not so with our friends the Russians. This I have on the information of a representative of a Government whose country has received Russian aid. We do not quarrel about the terms on which Russia gives her aid. We do not quarrel about the terms on which everybody gives aid. One has to try to get the best terms in the circumstances. There is usually a clause, when Russia gives aid, about the gold standard. Now, Russia is not on the gold standard, but when she is distributing largesse to these poor underdeveloped countries the clause is put in just in case there is devaluation. There is nothing wrong with that, but why should big men stand up here and try to say that the terms of the Russian assistance are the best in the world. There are circumstances in which we get better terms, one way or another, and this Government is prepared to take assistance where the terms are satisfactory, and we will not be

pushed into positions and into postures.

We hear about C.I.A. There is C.I.A. Every major power has an intelligence service. What happened to the frogman when Khrushchev went to visit the United Kingdom? What happened to the Russian intelligence service that Sekou-Toure threw out of Guinea? Small nations cannot find the money, the means to keep world-wide intelligence services but let us not get mixed up and behave as if one nation keeps an intelligence service and another nation is an angel. Every major nation has an elaborate intelligence service by means of which it seeks to pursue its own ends.

The hon. Member, Mr. Ranji Chandisingh, is no expert in logic. He said that a great deal of fuss had been made about the Atkinson Base and the return of the Base to Guyana, and in the case of Guantanamo he makes no explanation. He merely says that the Americans made an Agreement to release our land and would not have done so if they (the P.P.P.) were in office, a Government which was pursuing a socialist policy - according to him. It may be that his proposition is right, but let us examine the two positions together. He says, or implies, or infers, that the United States of America would not have given up the Base or the right to reactivate the Base at Atkinson if there were, according to his shibboleth, a progressive Government in Guyana. They would not give up the base in Cuba because it has a progressive Government, a socialist Government. Now, the big socialist Government in Cuba cannot throw

out the United States, but little Guyana with a smaller population than the Cuban army can fight the United States according to Mr. Chandisingh's thesis!

There is no doubt about the fact, when we pass over this childish argument, that the terms which Guyana negotiated, the conditions under which it got back its territory from the United States, lead to one conclusion: that the terms are much better than those that were got by Trinidad or Barbados or Jamaica or by any of the Caribbean territories. The right of the American Government, under the new Agreement in specific circumstances approved by the Guyana Government is to overfly having filed a Flight Plan and to stay over in specific circumstances. Guyana does not lose its right to deal with any offence committed by any American personnel. The American Government further agreed that if there were to be circumstances in which any stop-over has to be made, it would remove such American personnel as the Government of Guyana objects to. Further, the American Government is prepared to pay for any facilities extended under the Agreement.

Let us be realistic. Realism is not cowardice. I would remind my hon. Friend of the remark by Enobarbus when he said that Antony was showing so much courage because he was frightened. That is the position in which they want to put us. We must be so stupid, so insensitive to the realities, that we must go, according to Jewish and Christian legend, with a little sling-shot to knock down Goliath. These are

the people who would lead our country! Fidel Castro cannot move them from Guantanamo! Guyana gets them to move out and to sign an Agreement, where, after seeking permission, they can make use of certain services for which they would pay. Yet, says the Opposition, we have not acted in accordance with the national interest.

7.30 p. m.

We were regaled by an analysis of what led up to the Venezuelan claim to five-eighths of our territory. It is not for me to argue whether or not the analysis is accurate. It has been said that the U.S. Government inspired the Venezuelans to make this claim. Without accepting the accuracy of that analysis, let us accept it for purposes of discussion. That position having been reached, the Venezuelans claimed that they were cheated in 1899. Our predecessors in office agreed with the British to an examination of the documents, and sent one Mr. H.R. Persaud to examine those documents. I am assuming that he was capable of examining them.

Then there is the Geneva Agreement of February, 1966. In that Agreement, there is no concession by the Government of Guyana to the effect that there is a dispute with respect to the border. There is a claim by the Venezuelans that the Award was null and void, not that the border was wrongly fixed. I have discussed this matter in this House. There are some who have ears and will not hear, and there are some who have eyes and will

not see. The hon. Dr. Ramsahoye exclaimed that the Americans and the British have interests and investments in Venezuela which are more important to them than the integrity of the border of Guyana. I agree. The next point - another exclamation. Where are your friends? If the Americans are not our friends and will not help us, and the British are not our friends and will not help us, are you going to tell us that the Russians are going to help us? I concede that American and British investments and trade interests in Venezuela are great, and are such as to lead their Governments, in their self-interest, not to get embroiled in the affairs of Guyana. That is probably an accurate analysis, but why must the Government of Guyana be blamed for that?

The Government of Guyana pursues discussions in a Mixed Commission, it pursues discussions at a conference table, and it exchanges notes in the tradition of international relations. It is also pursuing the friendship and seeking to get the favourable interest of other nations at the United Nations, in the Commonwealth, and in the Caribbean. What more can we do in the circumstances? To criticise the Government's stand, you must be in a position to offer an alternative which makes sense in the physical circumstances of the present.

But there can be no other. Russia has decided. Let us say we go to Kosygin and say: "This arch-imperialist Johnson and the arch-imperialist Wilson have investments in Venezuela which are such that they would not help



us." Do you remember the situation way back in 1962 when Kennedy asked Mr. Castro to remove his missiles? Mr. Castro said: "I am not removing them". But Mr. Krushchev wrote Mr. Kennedy and said: "Dear Mr. President, I have decided to remove my missiles by my men on my boats from Cuba". They were put there by one super power and another super power said: "Look, you had better remove them", and the two super powers reached agreement.

Is the suggestion being made that, in the circumstances, we must seek Russian aid? Even if we sought it we will not get it because Russia said that she will not be embroiled in this hemisphere again. Must we not, therefore, use what abilities we have at our disposal, what pressures can be brought to bear? Must we not seek to enlist where we can have world opinion on our side? It seems to me that it is nothing short of disloyalty to be making a song and dance over the Ankoko affair, for what impression do you give the Venezuelans but that there is division in Guyana. There is the Opposition making noises about Ankoko and enjoying itself at the expense of the Government over an invasion of our territory. [Mr. Luck: "We demand a positive policy over Ankoko."] The capacity to use words is not coincident with literacy. What more positive policy is required than this? The Guyana Government has stated categorically its intention that the territory which was formerly known as British Guiana should remain the territory of the nation of Guyana.

7.40 p.m.

According to the maps which were drawn and signed by the Commissioners for Venezuela and Britain in 1904, Ankoko is divided into two parts - the eastern part belonging to Guyana, the western part belonging to Venezuela - and we have never moved from that position. I would not mention that certain people in the previous Government - the "Gasolene Constitution" man - drew wrong maps.

We have not accepted Venezuela's proposition either that the Award was void or that the territory up to the left bank of Essequibo is Venezuela territory. We have not accepted the Venezuelans' more recent contention that the entire island of Ankoko is theirs, but we have decided to sit down and talk. [Interruption.] The infants will say that we must not talk. Do what? Mobilise all the sling-shots in Guyana? That is what the Opposition would do. Mobilise them! Let us move down and invade!

I submit that it is necessary, in this context, to realise that there are physical and material realities. I am sure that there can be no doubt about this fact: that the Opposition's thesis really is "Let us say that we are non-aligned but let us, on the other hand, take every opportunity to lambaste the West." The Government, on the other hand, when it says that it is non-aligned pursues this course to its logical conclusion.

It is noteworthy that in opening this debate, and during the course of the speech of the hon. Attorney-General and Minis-

ter of State (Mr. Ramphal), the Government never attempted to call anyone imperialist or non-imperialist. It is noteworthy that there are on record a number of instances on which the Government of Guyana has not voted on the same side as the major Western powers. It is noteworthy - if I may just add a final point - that for all the one-sidedness of the accusations, Russia's and the trade of the eastern bloc with South Africa in diamonds has increased over the last few years and China's trade with South Africa has also increased. Guyana's trade with South Africa is nil. The U.S.A. trades with South Africa. The West German Government trades with Rhodesia. The Guyana Government does not trade with Rhodesia or South Africa. At least on this occasion the position of the Guyana Government is different from the position of both of the major powers, of both of the super powers.

It has been suggested that we should start pontificating on revanchism in West Germany. We would not like to see another Hitler arise in Germany but in the areas in the associations where we are represented the question of Germany revanchism has not been raised. It has not been raised at the United Nations or at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference. Are we gratuitously to come out and start pontificating? Of what benefit is that to us? We have strong views on the rebirth or possible rebirth of Nazism but (a) the question has not arisen in any of the forum in which we have representation; (b) we do

not see that any purpose can be served by our devoting our energies and our efforts to pontificating and delivering philosophical treatises on a question on which we can have little or no effect. The people who are to decide whether or not there is going to be another Hitler are the Russians and the Americans; not even the Chinese will have any say in that.

*Question put.*

**Dr. Jagan:** Division!

*Assembly divided: Ayes 21,  
Noes 12, as follows:*

<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Mr. Wharton	Mr. Bhagwan
Rev. Trotman	Dr. Ramjohn
Mr. Mahraj	Mr. Linde
Mr. Kasim	Mr. Ally
Mr. Budhoo	Mr. Khan
Mr. Blair	Mr. Luck
Mr. Joaquin	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Duncan	Dr. Ramsahoye
Mr. Clarke	Mr. Hubbard
Mr. Bowman	Mr. Chandisingh
Mr. deGroot	Mr. Chase
Mr. Singh	Dr. Jagan - 12
Mr. Merriman	
Mr. Jordan	
Mr. John	
Mr. Correia	
Mr. Cheeks	
Mr. Bissenber	
Mr. d'Aguiar	
Dr. Reid	
Mr. Burnham - 21	

*Motion carried.*

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Resolved,** "That this Assembly do now adjourn until Tuesday, 28th March, 1967, at 2 p.m."  
[Mr. Bissenber.]

*Adjourned accordingly at 7.40 p.m.*